

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

To: Dr. P.K. Mandal, Programme Director AM
Prof.dr. J.N. Kok, Dean EEMCS

From: Programme Committee AM (OLC-TW)

FACULTY OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE

FROM
T x 31 53 489 3380
PC-AM@utwente.nl

DATE
7 June 2021
OUR REFERENCE
EWI21/BOZ/10409/MvdK

PAGE
1 of 2
CC:
--

SUBJECT
Advice EER Bachelor Applied Mathematics

Dear Programme Director and Dean,

In the meeting of June 1, the Programme Committee of Applied Mathematics has discussed the draft EER for the academic year 2021-22. We appreciate the constructive discussion we have had.

Regarding the Faculty section, we have two suggestions:

p8, Article 4.1.14, 15: We recommend to use a dot (.) instead of (,) for decimals.

p10, Article 5.1.4; We recommend that this article mentions the title of this document, and moreover, that it is updated to "Rules and regulations of the examination board" as it is called faculty-wide. Keeping it has the advantage of clarity regarding article 8.8. The text belonging to 8.8 should not be a separate heading. Furthermore, we think it should be "defines" in 5.1.4, as "examination board" is singular.

Other than that, we give a positive recommendation on this Faculty section.

Regarding the Programme Specific part for the Bachelor Applied Mathematics, we have the following major issues.

In the version that we received the Cum Laude rules were adjusted to be similar to that of TCS for double degree students (p27, article 7). We oppose that change as that then also conflicts with the double degree with the bachelor Applied Physics. We note that double degree students receive two separate diplomas. We believe it to be natural that requirements for Cum Laude differ for different programmes. We propose the following change.

First, change article 7.1 so that it mentions that Cum Laude for the AM diploma is awarded based on the rules for a standard bachelor Applied Mathematics, i.e. article 3.5 on p11. Second, add a statement that Cum Laude for one programme does not automatically imply Cum Laude for another

programme of a double degree. Finally, we recommend to add this whole article as well to Annex II for the double degree with Applied Physics.

We think article 3.11 is not strong enough. A complete evaluation cycle would include mentioning what is done with this information. We suggest to formalize our current practice to ask module teams to reflect on this input and formulate ideas for next year's edition of a module, and courses to describe the PDCA cycle better. To include that we ask to change "information about the student's learning experiences" to "information about the student's learning and teacher's experiences", and add in article 3.11.a "Reflections by the module team or teacher".

p9, 2.9: We note that the description of modules 11 and 12 does not match the actual content.

Reflection on Mathematical Research I is not prior knowledge, as the student draws up a research plan here, and part II does not prepare for the Bachelor's Assignment, but instead focusses on an unrelated case. We propose the following wording to correct this:

"The course Reflection on Mathematical Research I prepares the student for the Bachelor's Assignment, while Reflection on Mathematical Research II prepares the student for reflection on modelling, related to the Bachelor's Assignment."

p10, Article 3.3 no longer mentions the numerical equivalent grade 6.0 for an exemption. We disagree with this change. While it matters for very few cases and then only for Cum Laude, in those cases, exemptions should be seen as low grades.

Please also note the following comments:

p6, item r; add . at the end.

p10, article 3.4e; please adapt to "numeric grades" instead of "grades".

p11, article 3.5b; please mention that grades with EX is included in the average. The comma before "are" in the last line can be deleted.

p15 and further, Please put the table caption on top to improve readability.

p20, we acknowledge that the ECs for Dynamics&Relativity and Experimentation I have changed meanwhile, and will be updated.

If the proposed changes for the major issues (Cum Laude, Evaluation, Module description, Exemptions) are adopted, then we give a positive advice for the Programme Specific Part of the B-EER for AM.

Best regards,



Hil Meijer
Chair PC-AM