

### MINUTES OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE-EE/EMSYS MEETING

06 March 2018 14.00 hr.

5

#### Present:

Loes Segerink – Stef van Zanten – Roel Mentink – Lynn Bruins – Cas Doornkamp - Ray  
Hueting – Bert Molenkamp – Anne-Johan Annema (Program director) – Luuk Spreeuwers –  
Hugo Masselink

10

#### Absent with notice:

Andre Kokkeler (Program director EMSYS)

Absent without notice:

15

#### 1. Opening

Start of the meeting at 14:03

#### 2. (Concept) Minutes programme committee 06 February 2018

Ray Hueting his last name is misspelled.

20

#### In response to the action items:

105, Annema says that they will still use the MyDAQs in module 3 but they will use less  
Labview and more Matlab. Van Zanten says that he would like to know if the faculty can  
buy the MyDAQs, otherwise the STORES needs to do this.

25

Segerink says that she can look if the MyDAQ is required for module 1.

Van Zanten says that we force students to buy a MyDAQ which they only use a few times  
in their study, the MyDAQ is very expensive for students and the University does not  
provide a good alternative. Van Zanten would like to see that the University provides the  
MyDAQs on a hand out basis.

30

Molenkamp asks how we are going to do this.

Annema says that he will look at the budget and see if the University can buy the MyDAQs.  
The action point will remain.

35

110, the action point is completed. See outgoing mail

111, the action point is completed. See outgoing mail

40

112, the action point will remain, Annema still needs to look at this.

According to Annema the students that were doing a master course at one of the chairs  
can just continue this course and there will be no change except for a change in name.

There is only a change for new students that still have to start their master at one of those  
chairs.

45

Mentink says that they changed the names of subjects and of the masters so a master  
student in his master will get different subject names on his degree when he graduates.

Annema asks if there have been complaints from students that there has been a change in  
the master course.

Segerink says that we then should just ask Cora Salm or Remco Wiegerink if there are any  
changes for master students, then we know the answer.

50

#### Points of attention:

### 3. Incoming/outcoming mail

#### Incoming:

Breedveld evaluation Modeling and Simulation

*This becomes point 7 on the agenda*

Request quality agenda of Degree Programs

*This becomes point 6 on the agenda.*

#### Outgoing:

FR tevredenheid Engels taalniveau

Breedveld evaluation Modeling and Simulation

### 4. Announcements

#### Chairman:

#### Program director:

Monday there is a meeting with the teachers from the philosophy subject, especially in module 12 and in the master.

Mentink asks if one of the philosophy options will be removed, so only philosophy in module 12 or in the master but not both. Annema says that he wants to reduce the amount of philosophy in general.

Yesterday there was an additional resit for the math of module 2.

#### StOEL:

They found a replacement for Rowan de Vries for the OLC, Maarten Bonnema (student). He will try to join next meeting.

### 5. Implementation act (Wet versterking bestuurskracht)

There was an option to do training for the OLC, the deadline for replying was unfortunately the 14<sup>th</sup> of February.

Van Zanten says that the SU did something similar for student members of the OLC so there is still an option for students to do a training there.

### 6. Request quality agenda of Degree Programs

Bruins says that the idea is that there is extra money available for the faculty which should be used for improving the quality of the education.

Annema says that on page 2 of the document there are a few topics that are addressed.

Segerink says that the document says that the OLC is involved in the process.

Annema says that they indeed asked if the OLC can prioritize some of the topics that they deem important.

Mentink mentions that there could be extra equipment in the Westzaal, there is room for more workspaces but the space is not used efficiently.

Segerink says that would be a good option because the number of students is rising every year.

Segerink asks if we should involve the students in the process and let them think about ideas that can be improved and should have high priority.

Bruins says that the students have been informed by UReka.

Molenkams wants to conclude that most priority is on points 1 and 6, when those points improve the study success will get better as well.

Bruins mentions that there are not a lot of study spaces in general available, so maybe we want to put some priority on that.

Spreeuwiers mentions that under point 1 there maybe could be money to train student assistants so the quality of the assistance gets better and maybe the students are willing to assist multiple years.

Van Zanten mentions that getting student assistants for multiple years will get more difficult because of TEM.

Segerink asks if we should look at point 5 and if one study advisor is enough to provide everyone council.

5 Molenkamp says we know have points 1,5 and 6 where under point 1 the main concern is teachers. Under point 6 is improving the Westzaal, the MyDAQs and creating more study spaces. He asks which point has the highest priority.

Point 6 has the highest priority, then point 1 and last point 5.

## 10 7. Breedveld evaluation Modelling and Simulation

As a result of the previous meeting Molenkamp contacted Breedveld with the question to respond on the evaluation of his subject. Breedveld responded to this evaluation.

15 Segerink says that it is mandatory that the grading is known to the students. She also does not understand how he can say that it is not his problem that there are no student assistants.

20 Molenkamp says that there is money available in the module so he does not understand why he cannot get a student assistant.

Molenkamp suggests that Annema contacts Breedveld about his response on the evaluation to solve the problems that arose in the evaluation.

## 25 8. AOB

Van Zanten mentions that the University is working on a language policy, and that it would be an option to discuss some parts of the policy at the OLC. There are certain responsibilities in this document for which the teachers are responsible.

Van Zanten asks if the teachers know that this policy gives them responsibilities.

30 Molenkamp says that we can put it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Van Zanten will mail the language policy to Masselink so it can be put on the agenda.

## 9. Questions

## 35 10. End of the meeting

The meeting is closed by the chairman at 15:04

### Action items

No	Description	From meeting	Responsible
105	Look if the MyDAQ is still useful as mandatory equipment for first year students. And if the University can buy the MyDAQ and lend it to students.	07-11-2017	OLD
112	Contact Remco Wiegerink to ask about the master tracks of SC and MSS and what the situation is.	06-02-2018	OLD
113	Contact Breedveld to talk about the evaluation of modeling and simulation and try to solve the problems in this evaluation.	06-03-2018	OLD

40

## Complete action items

No	Description	From meeting	Responsible
110	Email teachers for a response on the module evaluations	06-02-2018	Chairman
111	Notify the FC-EEMCS that the standards of admittance (on the level of English) should be the same as the university of Delft, and that the OLC would like to see personal conversations with international students.	06-02-2018	Chairman

5

## Points of attention

No	Description	For meeting	Responsible
02	Update OER 2018-2019 -	April 2018	OLD EE/EMSYS
06	February 2018: Ask teachers for major changes in their courses (for discussion in the OLC meetings; OER 2018)	May 2018	Key-user
07	Election new chair OLC	June 2018	OLC
08	Look into the relevance of philosophy of engineering in the master.	April 2018	OLC