

Concept MINUTES OF THE PROGRAMME COMMITTEE-EE/EMSYS MEETING
05 December 2017 14.00 hr.

5

Present:

Bert Molenkamp – Anne-Johan Annema (Program director) – Rob Kers – Roel Mentink – Stef van Zanten – Ray Heuting – Lynn Bruins

10

Absent with notice:

Luuk Spreeuwiers – Loes Segerink – Andre Kokkeler

Absent without notice:

Rowan de Vries

15

1. Opening

Start of the meeting at 14:06

2. (Concept) Minutes programme committee 07 November 2017 (6634)

No remarks to the minutes

20

In response to the action items:

89, There is no SEQ but there has been an evaluation, Annema received this evaluation yesterday (4-12) this was not included in the pieces for this meeting. Next meeting it will be included.

25

102, This action point is concluded, it cannot become a join-in minor but there are possibilities for making it an in-depth minor.

104, Molenkamp looked for contact addresses for the OLC. Each education uses a different address to contact the OLC but it will all end up with Marian Tibben. This is fine so the action point is concluded.

30

105, this action point remains.

106, this action point remains.

Points of attention:

35

3. Incoming/outcoming mail

4. Announcements

Chairman:

No remarks

40

Programme Director:

In January there is another advisory board meeting for EE, Annema want to bring a few points to attention in that meeting. Especially the soft skills that are included in the curriculum right now.

StOEL:

45

Mentink asks if there are responses of the teachers for modules 4 and 8, he would like to know what the teachers think of the evaluations and if they see points that they will change in their module after seeing the evaluation.

Annema says that there are no responses from the teachers yet but he is looking into improving this part. In the past the OLD added a letter to evaluation with attention points for the teachers of the modules, Annema wants to start doing this again.

50

Van Zanten mentions that it would be valuable for the people designing the digital tests to have the SEQ of module 4 where digital testing was used. Annema will look into this, and make sure they get the SEQ.

5 Next meeting there will be a reaction from the teachers of module 4.

10 Van Zanten mentions that they started with the soundboard group for Canvas, he wonders if one of the teachers of EE is involved in this process. He mentions that he is involved from the student aspect but a teacher aspect would be good as well.

15 Mentink says he heard people talk about philosophy of engineering and he voices his concerns about the use of participation grades with this subject. If there are no official complaints but only rumours there is not much that can be done, Mentink will look if there are serious complaints from students about philosophy of engineering.

15 **5. EEG Evaluation module 12**

Kers mentions that the participation grade Mentink just talked about for philosophy of engineering is also used in module 12.

20 Van Zanten says that there should be more clarity how the participation grade is built up. There were enough other aspects to grade people so it was not even necessary to include such a grade. Annema will contact the exam committee to notify them about this weird participation grade in module 12.

20 **6. OKC Evaluation module 8, signal Processing and Communications**

25 The most concerning point of this module is the enormous workload in module 8, Annema is already working on module 8 to see if it is possible to take more material out of this module.

Bruins mentions that last year there were a lot of complaints about the exams because they seem integrated but are still separate tests where you can fail a complete subject but still pass the exam by compensating with the other 2 subjects.

30 Annema says that it is convenient for this module that you can compensate for other subjects because otherwise even less students would pass the module because of the workload.

Mentink asks if there is already a new teacher for the subject communications. Annema does not have an answer yet.

35 **7. SEQ Evaluation IEEE, module 1**

The general outcome was a lot of complaints about the Math, Mentink mentions that parts would be taken out of the math course but that was not done. The students still had to learn those parts.

40 Van Zanten says that he thinks the new math course is an improvement but it will take some time before we see results. Sometimes the math does not connect with the other subjects in a module, especially module 3 and 4.

Bruins would like to see pass rates of module 1 to see if there are huge differences compared to previous year and now because of the new math course.

45 Mentink asks about the practicals and if they will be improved, because there were complaints about that. Van Zanten says that he already has a meeting with Eric Klumperink to discuss the practicals and improve them. The lab assistants also noticed that sometimes the practicals can be very confusing for the students, but they are going to improve this.

50 There were also complaints about the English documents because there are a lot of mistakes in the documents. Annema says that they are looking for students to read through the documents and improve the level of English, this will be done on a short term.

50 **8. SEQ Evaluation Computer Systems for EE, module 5**

No shocking information in the evaluation of this module.

55 **9. SEQ Signaalwaarden**

Bruins mentions that there is a large difference in the grades for EE and CS students in the module computer systems. Molenkamp mentions that this is mainly due to a new teacher for the CS students which has some starting problems.

55 **10. Any other business**

11. Questions

Kers mentions that he is finishing his study and that he is looking for a replacement. Bruins mentions that de Vries might have the same problem because he is too finishing his study.

5 Scintilla wants to make the OLC a bit more known before they find a new person for the OLC.

Van Zanten says that he might know someone who would be a suitable replacement for Kers.

10 Bruins mentions that Scintilla wants to organise a lunch lecture to make students more aware of aspects like the OER and OLC. After that it should be easier to find new people for the OLC, perhaps someone who is not a 4th year student or higher.

15 Bruins mentions that it might be a good idea to plan a meeting when the new OER is put together so a lot of the changes can be made before everything is typed out. This would save a lot of trouble and time.

Mentink mentions that students find it confusing that there is a ROMP OER and an EE specific OER.

12. End of the meeting

20 The meeting is closed by the chairman at 15:02

Action items

No	Description	From meeting	Responsible
89	SEQ for the course Modeling and Simulation	01-11-2016	OLD
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
106	Discuss with other OLDs if it is possible to open more modules as minors	07-11-2017	OLD
107	Make sure the SEQ of modules with digital testing are used when designing the new digital tests	05-12-2017	OLD
108	Find out if there are serious complaints from students about the subject philosophy of engineering	05-12-2017	Mentink
109	Contact the exam committee about the use of the participation grade in module 12.	05-12-2017	OLD

25

Complete action items

No	Description	From meeting	Responsible
102	Make module 7a available as a minor for EE-students	03-10-2017	OLD
104	Look up if the OLC can get an email alias	07-11-2017	Chairman

30

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