Annual Report Programme Committee Applied Mathematics Academic year 2018-2019

H.G.E. Meijer

21-10-2019

1 Programme Committee

1.1 Members

During the academic year 2018/2019 the program committee Applied Mathematics consisted of the following members;

Employees. Hil Meijer (Chair), Bodo Manthey, Gjerrit Meinsma, Judith Timmer

Students. Linda ten Klooster, Dieuwertje Alblas, Femke Boelens, Lotte Weedage

In addition the meetings are attended by the programme director (J.W. Polderman), the bachelor coordinator (Y. Veenstra until March 2019), the master coordinator (M. van Grinsven until October 2018, succeeded by J. Schut) and the education officer of Abacus, Justus Sleurink. Manthey and ten Klooster were new members appointed in September 2018. During a meeting with the chairman they were informed about the goal and the rights of the PC. Students discuss agenda items together before the meeting.

1.2 Communication

The staff represents the different groups within the department. Anything specific to a chair will therefore naturally be communicated within, to and from the chair. Students would discuss important items within the student association Abacus. They have a lunch meeting every year to recruit new members and to tell what the PC is about to all AM-students. They are certainly known to their peers as the wish list for the "Quality Agreements" was brought up by the students.

2 Meetings

We assembled six times during the academic year.

Meeting	Main items
2 Oct 2018	New learning goals and descriptions of Modules 1-4 and several master Courses, Evaluations of several modules and Mastermath
20 Nov 2018	Updated learning goals and descriptions of several master Courses, Evaluations of several modules
15 Jan 2019	Changes to existing modules and the Data Science Track, and evaluations
12 Mar 2019	BSc project assessment, Soft skills, Language policy Faculty EEMCS
23 Apr 2019	Master TER, Reflection Report for Educational Site Visit, First annual report of PC-AM
4 Jun 2019	Bachelor TER

3 Advices and Recommendations

Advices concern the right to consent, while Recommendations concern strong suggestions.

3.1 Asked

137 Advice on OSIRIS description of Module 1. Positive, with some suggestions to improve the wording, especially the learning goals. None of these suggestions has been adopted. Not at that time as the module was already being given, but neither a year later.

138 Advice on OSIRIS description of Module 2. Positive, with some suggestions to improve the wording, especially the learning goals. None of these suggestions has been adopted. It is unclear why.

139 Advice on OSIRIS description of Module 3. Some suggestions to improve the wording, especially the learning goals. None of these suggestions has been adopted, as the document given to the PC was not the correct one.

140 Advice on OSIRIS description of Module 4. Some suggestions to improve the wording, especially the learning goals. None of these suggestions has been adopted.

142 Advice on the courses Applied Queueing Models and Stochastic Models in Production and Logistics.
Positive advice after previous suggestions were adopted.

144 Advice on OSIRIS description of Module 3, to replace advice 138.
Positive advice, with many suggestions for improving the text which were adopted.

145 Advice on Module 7 to drop the learning goal regarding writing a project paper.
We agreed for practical reasons but we requested an evaluation to see how AM-students were actually involved in the project.

146 Advice on new course Spatial Statistics.
We agreed after our earlier comments were adressed.

147 Advice on the proposed grading forms for the Bachelor Assignment.
We agreed, and in fact wanted the combined AP-AM variant to adopt the forms of AM and AM-CS to have more substantiated grades.

148 Advice on academic skills workshops in modules 1 and 5.
We gave a positive advice. Alongside we observed that the soft skill academic writing a report was given minimal attention and should be addressed properly in the modeling learning line.

149 Advice on language policy.
We gave a negative advice as it would not be possible to implement the proposal in a fair way.

150 Advice on new course Statistical Learning.
We agreed and gave several constructive comments, that were not included into the final OSIRIS description.

151 Advice on the TER for the Master AM.
We identified a few errors and proposed changes. If adopted our advice would be positive.

152 Advice on the TER for the Bachelor AM.
The document was updated during a meeting, so that we could give a positive advice. The shift of 1EC from Presentation Skills to Programming remains to be discussed for 2019-20 as that educational unit still has to be designed. Because the BSc-coordinator left and the UT-TER framework came in late this process was far from optimal.

3.2 Not Asked

141 Unsollicited advice regarding general UT-Student Evaluation Questionaire for Bachelor Modules. Though students feedback was not particularly negative, students indicated that they are not experiencing any freedom to pursue their own goals. We recommended that the programme reconsiders the projects to make it a more coherent learning line. It is being investigated within the Taskforce Modelling and Programming.

143 Unsollicited advice on Python support in Module 8.
After several years of complaints, we recommend that the programme makes sure the students are properly supported.

4 Course Evaluations

Evaluation of the bachelor programme happens per panel meetings, once per quartile, as well as the institutional student evaluation (UT-SEQ). The latter does not come to the PC automatically. For the master, questionnaires for the evaluation of courses taught for AM are sent to students, but the results did not reach the PC. No big issues arose, a few smaller are listed below. Courses taught within Mastermath are always evaluated, though response rates vary. For Mastermath no specific points were raised, except for a course 'History of Mathematics' taken by AM students but taught for high school teachers with doubtful grading of homework. In addition, we carefully looked at Continuous Optimization the only Mastermath course mandatory for all AM students, and formulated some suggestions for the new lecturer.

- Linear Optimisation (part of module 2). Students point at differences between the book and the level of the test. The suggestion is to come up with a reader.

- Ongoing discussions about the expensive book of Stochastic Models and possible alternatives. The students and the lecturer disagree about how much of the book is being used.

- The course Deep Learning was fine regarding content, but the organization, especially of the grading, was weak. An extensive evaluation by the lecturer was discussed.

5 Self-Evaluation

It is remarkable that so many constructive suggestions are not used at all. What needs to be done is to specifically ask the next meeting what has been done or will be done by the PD or other responsible person with the advice as an action point. Or ask for written reactions rather than discussing oral comments. Also approaching most advices with "No, unless" rather than "Yes, if" may help.

There were only six meetings. Especially in May and June this left too little room for necessary discussions, e.g. the bachelor TER as well as the Site Visit that got little attention from our side. With the upcoming changes due to TOM 2.0 we need to plan more meetings spring 2020, also aligning with the faculty council and the new PD. For fall 2020 we should plan the first meeting earlier, that is, fix it in June for early September. Another issue is documents arriving late, e.g. the student input for the quality agreements or course descriptions. Also for this one more meeting may help, and then they may finish in time too.