UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

FACULTEIT ELEKTROTECHNIEK WISKUNDE & INFORMATICA
DATUM
8 mei 2018
ONS KENMERK
EWI17/BOZ/6526

Concept MINUTES OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE-EE/EMSYS MEETING
8 May 2018 14.00 hr.

Present:
Maarten Bonnema – Olaf van der Meer – Lynn Bruins – Roel Mentink – Cas Doornkamp - Bert Molenkamp – Ray Hueting – Loes Segerink – Hugo Masselink
Absent with notice:
Luuk Spreeuwers – André Kokkeler (Program Director EMSYS) – Anne-johan Annema
                (Program Director)

Absent without notice:

1. **Opening**

2. **(Concept) Minutes programme committee 17 April 2018**

In response to page one of the minutes van der Meer says that Stef van Zanten send an email to Anne-johan Annema about the 'terugkoopregeling' from the University. Annema has not yet replied on this mail.
Segerink says that the MyDAQ will still be used in the first module, at this point the responsibility lies with the program director to arrange that there are enough MyDAQs and money to buy them.

In response to page two of the minutes van der Meer says that it the complete name of Kirsten Voncken should be used.
Segerink asks if it is communicated with the students that Kirsten Voncken is replacing Daphne Boere.
Bruins says that all the students got an email about the situation.
Mentink says that the program director should inform all the teachers.

In response to page two of the minutes van der Meer says that Scintilla would do a quick evaluation of module 8. There has been a short evaluation among the students of this module. The results from that were that the video lectures should not be a reason to no longer give actual lectures.
Bonnema adds to this that the video lectures are longer as normal lectures, so you cannot watch a complete video lecture in the time slot available.
Next to that there is not enough material available to practise with, the exercises that are available have no results. In combination with the limited options for students to ask question this leads to a lot of frustration.
Bruins says that in a normal situation she understands why the solutions are not given, however, because of the video lectures she would like the answers to become public so you can at least check your work.

Molenkamp notices that all the points from the evaluation are already written down nicely and asks if Scintilla can send all the information to the program director directly.

In response to the action items:
119, there is no response yet from Annema so the action point will remain.
120, no update on this point

121, Mentink asks if there are enough tutorials now. Bruins says that they increased the number of tutorials and now it is fine. This action point is finished.

122, this action point remains

123, this action point remains

5   124, this action point is concluded

Points of attention:

3. Incoming/outcoming mail
10   **Incoming:**
Annema: BSc thesis committee requirements
Polderman: Afhandeling Bachelor Romp-OER
Outgoing:
Advies OLC master OER Electrical Engineering en Embedded Systems
15   Advies OER master EE/EMSYS 2018-2019

4. Announcements

Chairman:
20   Molenkamp announces that we need to see if the meeting of 29-5 is necessary. If all the points can be discussed today it is not necessary to keep this extra meeting.
Molenkamp announces that he is not available for the meeting of 5-6, Segerink will take up the chairman duties of that meeting.

25   **Program director:**
-

StOEL:
StOEL is going to evaluate modules 3, 11, 7a and 7b.
30   The evaluation of module 11 is already concluded, the results where very positive. They used the feedback from last year and made some big changes in the module.
Bruins says that most of the changes were focussed in the philosophy part of module 11. This part of the module improved hugely compared to last year.
Van der Meer says that students of module 4 said that there is a lot of difference between the
35   feedback you get from different teachers, the same problem which is occurring every year. Some teachers give a lot of feedback where others give no feedback at all.

5. Bachelor Romp-OER
Molenkamp says that the Romp-OER did not change compared to last year.
40   Segerink says that last year the OLC had notes for the Romp-OER that were not accepted, now at least those changes could be made to the Romp-OER.
Mentink says that according the Romp-OER you have to pass modules 1 to 8 in order to start module 11. The EE specific OER says that you only need 6 out of 8 modules.
Molenkamp says that we can propose the changes and that otherwise we advise against the
45   Romp-OER.
Segerink says that there is mentioned in the Romp-OER (article 4.5) that oral exams are public and should be notified 10 days in advance to the student. Which she thinks is very weird.
Molenkamp says that the 10 days in advance is only to apply for third party people to be present at an oral.
50   Mentink says the exam committee has to grant permission for other people to be present at an oral exam, but it is not specified when/how the exam committee justifies there decision to allow/deny someone access to an oral exam. Mentink would at least like to see in the Romp-OER on what grounds the exam committee grants permission to people to be present at an oral.

55   Molenkamp says that the learning goals have been taken out of the Romp-OER.

Molenkamp says that we will send our feedback and that we advise against the current Romp-OER unless all the proposed changes are made.

6. Bachelor OER EE

5　Molenkamp says that this morning there was a mail with a few adjustments to the OER. Not all of those adjustments are already in this version of the OER.

Molenkamp says that on page 6 (article A5), the language level for admittance to the program is made higher.

Mentink thinks that only raising the level of admittance will not do much because students can
10　still plagiarise on the test.

Bruins says that the matter on admittance of international students will be discussed on University level because this cannot be changed for a single faculty.

On page page 6, Bruins says that requirement for laptops are mentioned in the OER (article A6), however, what those requirements are is not listed.

15　Mentink says that StOEL would like to see the requirements for laptops listed in the OER.

Molenkamp says that then the OER becomes a lot more complicated and the requirements for laptops need to be updated every year.

On page 7 (article A10), there is a proposal to increase the minimum number of students present at evaluations from 3 to 7.

20　Bruins asks if this is discussed with the OKC because getting 7 students is not always that easy.

Molenkamp then suggests changing the minimum from 3 to 5 students.

On page 8, Hueting says that in article B2 point 3 it should be 'projects and lab work are carried out individually and/or by groups of students….' So, and should become and/or.

On page 9 (article B3, point 4), Segerink asks if there needs to be a restriction on the number of
25　retakes students get for intermediate tests. Right now it is not specified how much resits can be given for intermediate tests, Segerink would like to see this specified.

Molenkamp says that in the OER it should say that there will be at least 1 retake, next to that the OER should refer to the module coordinator for more specifications.

On page 9 (article B5, point 2) it says infinite for the validity of sufficient grades, Hueting thinks
30　this is a bit exaggerated.

Molenkamp says that in the past results were valid for 6 years, now your results stay valid unless the material becomes outdated.

On page 10 (article B5, point 4), Mentink would like to see that in module 6 Linear Systems becomes a satellite and in module 8 probability theory as well.

35　Segerink says that we had this discussion last year as well.

Bruins says that especially in module 6 the subjects are not integrated and are independent of each other.

Mentink says that if the subjects are separated the students can no longer skip one subject and compensate with the other subjects, a structure which is being used right now in module 8. They
40　would be obligated to learn all the material and learning goals of the module.

Bonnema says that in the current structure you also have to resit subjects that you already passed but because they use the themes you still have to redo all the subjects, which takes up a lot of time. By separating the subjects the resits would become more specific and easier to learn.

45　Molenkamp says that at this point it is very difficult to make changes for module 8 in the OER because this would require a completely new structure of the module, at this point it is best to only look at module 6 for the moment.

Van der Meer says that linear systems is an important subject in module 6 which is used in
50　module 8. By separating linear systems students would be more motivated to at least finish linear systems so they can continue their study in module 8.

Segerink is still worried that students will choose to only do half the module and then there will become more delay which the University tries to reduce. She would like to see that the modules get integrated better instead of allowing satellites.

5　Bruins says that we can at least try to get this in the OER because on the short-term module 6 will not be improved. On the long-term the subjects of module 6 should be designed differently so they are more integrated.

Molenkamp says that the conclusion he hears is to make Linear Systems a satellite and separate it from the rest of module 6.

10　Molenkamp asks if there are additional point for module 8.

Van der Meer says that with module 8 it is weird that you get EC according to each theme and not with completing each subject of the module.

Molenkamp says that he will communicate with the teachers of module 8 that if the subjects are not integrated next year the OLC will aim to make all the subjects satellites.

15

Molenkamp says that we will discuss page 11 in a few minutes.

On page 12 (article B9), Mentink says that students that want to do a board year or a student team cannot graduate Cum Laude in their bachelor.

20　Van der Meer suggest changing this so it is possible for those students to obtain Cum Laude. This could be done by changing point a, instead of saying 'The bachelor is finished…' it could say 'The credits associated with the bachelor curriculum are finished…'.

Segerink asks why the exam committee does not want to make exceptions for the few people in this situation.

25　Molenkamp says that if the exam committee denies a request a student still has the right to object to this, this should be done within 6 weeks.

On page 16 (Chapter E), Segerink asks if we still use a study planner and if otherwise we can just take it out of the OER.

30　Bruins says that she had this in her first year but it was a very useless thing to use.

Mentink thinks that it might be required by law to provide a study plan to students.

Segerink things that this is not the best use of the time for first year students

Molenkamp says that the OLC will recommend taking out chapter E.

35　Molenkamp says that now page 11 will be discussed in combination with the email from Cora. The content of this email was on how the supervisory committees for the bachelor thesis are formed. Currently those committees are made up from 3 people, 2 of those should be examiners. The third person must be an external member but it is not specified what kind of member that should be.

40　Cora says that sometimes is turns out to be difficult to set up a supervisory committee with external members.

Segerink says that it is not that hard to form a supervisory committee, it just requires some goodwill from people to help each other.

Molenkamp says that he compared the regulations with those of the exam committee. In the

45　OER there are stricter demands as the exam committee asks.

Van der Meer says that it has to be clear for the students who is responsible for forming the supervisory committee, the OER says that the chair is responsible, in reality the chairs say to the students that they have to arrange the external member themselves.

Segerink says that this is the responsibility of the daily supervisor, the supervisor is connected

50　to the chair.

Molenkamp asks if we want requirements for the external -member of the committee.

Van der Meer says that if the chair is responsible for forming the committee they can assess who would be suitable as external member for the committee. If that is someone with enough knowledge about the subject.

Hueting says that if the external member is a specialist on the subject it would be sufficient

5

Molenkamp says that he will combine all the feedback on the bachelor OER. Molenkamp asks if people think it is necessary to discuss the OER on the 29th of May to discuss if all the changes are made.

Bruins proposes that Annema sends an email to the OLC when all the changes to the OER are

10   made, in that case the extra meeting is not necessary.

Molenkamp will communicate this with Annema.

7. New Course Advanced Multiple Antenna Radio Systems
Molenkamp asks if anyone has comments on this new subject.

15   There are no comments, the OLC accepts the new course.

8. Evaluation Module 1 EE
Molenkamp says that they are working with the team of module 1 on changing the points that came forward during the evaluation of module 1.

20   Segerink says that the module will become more integrated.

There will come better assignments for learning MatLab, they will organise a MatLab practise day.

Next year there will be more feedback moments for the students, especially after deliverables.

25   Molenkamp asks if the OLC still likes to hear a response from the module coordinator.

Bruins says that we should stick to the official channels and asks for an official response.

9. AOB

10. Questions

30

Segerink says that Lab on a Chip is nominated for a European award.

11. End of the meeting
The meeting is closed by the chairman at 15:31

35

Action items

No	Description	From meeting	Responsible
119	Send documents about the 'terugkoopregeling' to the Program Director	17-4-2018	Van Zanten
120	Investigate how much MyDAQs are needed next year and who will buy the MyDAQs.	17-4-2018	OLD
122	Send the OKC evaluation of module 4 to the OLC	17-4-2018	OLD
123	See what happened to the semester evaluation of the master courses	17-4-2018	OLD
125	Inform all the teachers that Kirsten Voncken is replacing Daphne Boere as study advisor	08-05-2018	OLD
126	Send the feedback of the module 8 evaluation to the program director	08-05-2018	StOEL
127	Discuss with the teachers of module 8 to integrate the subjects better, otherwise the subjects will become satellites	08-05-2018	Chairman
128	Combine all the proposed changes for the bachelor OER and send it to the program director	08-05-2018	Chairman

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

DATUM
08 Mei 2018

ONS KENMERK
EWI17/BOZ/6526

PAGINA
6 van 6

129	Ask for a response from the module coordinator on the evaluation of module 1	08-05-2018	OLD

5

Complete action items

No	Description	From meeting	Responsible
121	Talk to Chris Zeinstra for extra tutorials for RSN in module 8	17-4-2018	OLD
124	Mail the feedback on the OER to the OLD	17-4-2018	Chairman

Points of attention

No	Description	For meeting	Responsible
02	Update OER 2018-2019 -	April 2018	OLD EE/EMSYS
06	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