



## Minutes for the meeting of the Program Committee ME/VU

Date: **Wednesday, February 15, 2023**

Time: **8:45 – 10:30 hour** Room: **HR Z109**


**Present:** Iqbal Abdul Rasheed, Genie Stoffels, Harm Askes, Matthijn de Rooij, Mina Shahi, Ilse van der Veen, Nienke Wiering, ~~Reel Schoorlemmer~~, Lisa Gommer, Marije ter Horst, Mark van Donkersgoed, Edsko Hekman, Charlotte Geuß, Marten Toxopeus, Eva van Os

**Absent:** Adelien Heutink, Boukje de Gooijer, Taha Khan, ~~Jeep van Manen~~, ~~Michael Kuik~~, ~~Jurnan Schilder~~.


**Minutes:** Chrissa Manoli

### 1. Opening + Introduction

### 2. Announcements

- 
- Matthijn announces that the PC needs to submit the Annual report which has already been composed and uploaded on the Teams environment. The report includes a description of the program committee as well as the actions and decisions that it has taken so far. All members are advised to go through the document and make changes (if they think it is necessary).
  - Ilse informs that she did not manage to find another first-year student to join the PC as a student member. Marije will provide some help with that.

### 3. Minutes & Action points January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023

- 
- 1) *Subcommittees discuss their next action on each topic (master assignment, course evaluation, replacement of Matlab with Python) – continued.* **The action point is discussed further during the current meeting. Removed**
  - 2) *Subcommittees discuss their next action on each topic (continuous assessment) -- continued.* **Action point. Discussed further during the current meeting. Removed**
  - 3) *Encourage a first-year student to join the PC during the tutorials.* **Action point. Is discussed further during the current meeting. Revised.**
  - 4) *Remind students about the importance of their participation in the course evaluations.* **The evaluation committee tried to persuade students to fill in the evaluation forms and participate in the evaluation meetings. They suggest they did not manage to persuade students to fill in the questionnaire to increase the response rate. Members are brainstorming solutions to make the evaluations more appealing (e.g. providing lunch, etc.). Revised.**
  - 5) *Invite Mark to participate in the EER training for the PC.* **It can be removed.**
  - 6) *Ask Frank van den Berg about training.* **Lisa suggests that he was positive about it and Matthijn will reach out to him more formally about it. Remains.**
  - 7) *Send an email and keep updated about the evaluation of the continuous assessment.* **Updates are going to be provided during the meeting. Removed**

### 4. Course evaluation Q1

Bachelor Courses:

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

## MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

### a. Vector Calculus

- The questionnaire was filled out by 16/181 students (9% = non-representative report).
- The course Vector Calculus scored an average of 3.7, which is sufficient for a bachelor's course. The highest scoring points (4.1 both) were "The module part I think is relevant to my education" and "the English of the study material was good."
- The lowest scoring points were "the teacher gave good feedback on the work done.' (2.9), and 'Due to the lectures the learning material became clearer.'(3.2)"
- Students made the following suggestions for improvement: Provide more practice materials and examples on how to use certain theorems and improve the quality of lectures.
- The lecturer has not given a response (yet).

### b. Dynamics

- The questionnaire was filled out by 32/181 students, which gives a response rate of 18% and makes the report representative (sufficient % = 13%).
- The course Dynamics 1 scored an average of 3.1, which is sufficient for a bachelor's course.
- The highest scoring point was 'I think Dynamics 1 is relevant to my education.' (4.5).
- The lowest scoring points were "Overall appreciation'(2.2)". 58% of the students found the study pressure to be too high, while 36% found it to be good.
- The student mentioned that they found the course to be interesting and important for their study. However, they felt it was unorganized and felt they had insufficient time for the exam.
- Two questions were added regarding 'how much the examples given during the tutorials made the subject clearer,' and regarding the clarity with which these examples were solved. For Loendersloot, they scored 2.9 and 2.6 respectively. For Palthe, they scored 2.5 and 2.6 respectively. For the tutorials, a question was added regarding how helpful the teaching assistants were in explaining the learning material which scored 3.7.

### c. System Analysis

- The questionnaire was filled out by 25/181 students, which gives a response rate of 14% and makes it a representative report (13% is sufficient).
- The course System Analysis scored an average of 4.1 which is good for a bachelor's course.
- The statements that scored highest were 'The English of the information on Canvas was good.' (4.6), and 'The English of the study material was good.' (4.5).
- The statements that scored lowest were 'The teacher gave good feedback on the work done.' (3.2), and 'Due to the tutorials the learning material became clearer.' (3.7).
- Students indicated that the online lectures were not good. Nevertheless, the students thought the overall course structure was good. A suggestion for improvement is to reevaluate the tutorials.
- The teacher was surprised by the comments about the tutorials and was wondering whether having more Tas would be valuable.

### d. Project Precision Mechanisms & Ac. Skills 5

- The questionnaire was filled out by 17/181 students, which gives a response rate of 9% which is not a sufficient report as the percentage should be 13% and above.
- The Project Precision Mechanisms & Ac. Skills 5 scored an average of 3.6, which is sufficient for a bachelor project.
- The highest scoring points were 'I think the project is relevant to my education (4.1), and 'This project was suitable to work on with a group' (4.0)
- The lowest scoring points were 'I was well aware of the points on which I would be graded.' (2.9), and 'The project description was clear enough to understand what was asked from us.' (3.2).
- Students suggested that the course can be improved by ensuring that students can ask their questions and ensuring that the tutors are aware of the project and have all the information

needed to help the students. Finally, more time for the project exams is necessary, so that students can show what they know.

### Master Courses:

#### **a. Basics for process simulation.**

- The response rate was 14% as 8/46 students filled in the questionnaire The Response rate for this number of students must be at least 35% to be considered a representative report.
- The course Basics for Process Simulation was rated with an average score of 3.9, which is sufficient for a Mastercourse.
- The highest scoring statements were 'The information about the course was adequate'(4.3) and 'The requirements for the exam were clear' (4.5).
- The lowest scoring points were "The learning outcome of the course is relevant for my academic development" and 'The use of a black-or whiteboard, sheets, or PowerPoint was good', both with a 3.3.

#### **b. Energy Conversion Technology.**

- The response rate was 14% as 10/74 students filled in the questionnaire.
- The response rate for this number of students must be at least 28% to be considered a representative report.
- It scored an average of 3.9. All the statements scored sufficiently again.
- The highest scoring statements were "The contents of the course are interesting" (4.3) and 'The learning outcome of the course is relevant for my academic development' (4.4).
- Students thought that the lectures were too extensive, and students felt that they did not know what to expect from the exam, (leading to them receiving a lower grade).
- Lisa says that she received complaints from the students about the course but that is not reflected in the evaluation report.

#### **c. Fundamentals for numerical methods.**

- 8/ 75 students filled out the questionnaire. This gives a response rate of 11%. The response rate for this number of students must be at least 28% to be considered a representative report.
- The course was rated with an average score of 4.1, which is good for a Mastercourse.
- All statements were scored sufficiently.
- There were some extra questions about the videos of last year that have been added to Canvas. A lot of students used them to study and prepare better while they also participated in the live lectures.
- Students thought the exam was too difficult; there were not enough practice materials and hence, did not know what to expect from the exam.
- The teacher (E.T.A. van der Weide) does not agree that there are not enough practice materials. There are two exams on Canvas and Newton can provide students with extra practice materials.

#### **d. Integrative design of biomedical products.**

- The questionnaire was filled in by 21/74 students giving a response rate of 28% which is exactly the required percentage to be considered reliable and sufficient.
- It received a score of 3.8 and the statements were sufficient. The teacher added a comment about the materials that students used to prepare.
- The highest scoring statements were 'The teaching staff's proficiency in English was sufficient.' and 'The coordinator was available for questions' with 4.5 and 4.3 respectively.
- The lowest scoring points were 'The content of the course material (book /dictate /hand-outs/ sheets) was relevant.' And 'The duration of the presentation was just right.', both with 3.2.

- The teacher added some extra questions about which learning activities were employed by students to learn and prepare for the exam.
  - In the open comments, students said that the content is related to the design process and that they would like to have more information about sociological cycles and systems.
  - The members suggest that it would be useful to share the results of the course evaluations with other studies.
  - Members suggest that it would be useful that the PC review the course evaluations of elective courses from other studies that the evaluation committee receives that are embedded within other studies.
- Members suggest that it would be useful to discuss during the PC meetings the student evaluations of elective courses where ME students have participated in even if they are provided by other committees (e.g., biomedical engineering).

### **5. Updates subcommittees Master assignment, Matlab / Python, Continuous Assessment**

#### **A. Master assignment:**

- Marten says that the members of the subcommittee had a fruitful meeting about the questionnaire of the Master assignment for students and supervisors.
- The documents are available to all members on Teams.
- A meeting with Adeliën is also planned about how the questionnaires are going to be sent.
- If everything goes smoothly, they are expecting to have the results ready to be discussed in the PC meeting of May.

#### **B. Matlab / Python:**

- There are not many updates about Matlab and Python. Genie has made some notes but has not received feedback on the topic. No clear conclusion has been drawn regarding the preferences towards Python or Matlab.
- The next step is to contact lecturers and professors and consult them on their preferences on the topic.
- The goal is to consider the advantages and disadvantages of both Matlab and Python and discuss their preference.
- It would be useful to create a questionnaire inquiring about the lecturers' preference.
- Students have expressed interest in getting Python skills because they are more useful in the workplace.
- Student members suggest that Matlab has more useful features than Python.
- Genie will provide an update.

#### **C. Continuous Assessment**

- During their meeting Nienke and Boukje discussed that it would be a good idea to involve the evaluation committee on the topic as they are ones already performing the evaluations.
  - They had a questionnaire called the continuous assessment test.
  - Nienke had some remarks and questions about its content and structure.
  - More updates are going to be provided during the next meeting on the topic after Nienke reminds her about the topic.
- More updates are also going to be provided during the PC March meeting

### 6. Update Matching (Lisa)

- The first two days of the match took place. Some volunteers of the department assisted Students are exposed to all educational methods of the ME study program. The next matching activities are scheduled for 24/02 and 24/03.
- Lisa will give a short presentation explaining the reasons why students are performing the mandatory matching activities.
- Student assistants receive training on how to assist with the matching activities.
- Mark Rijkeboer will also be invited to the next meeting.
- Lisa will provide an update on the topic at the next meeting.

### 7. Bachelor ME (Lisa)

- The Bachelor ME will be moved to be updated during the next meeting.

### 8. Criteria Graduation Award (Lisa)

- There is a document on Teams about it. The Faculty board requires to choose a Master student to receive the thesis award. This student will be assigned to the most interesting final project topic.
- Simone provided Lisa with the names of the students with the highest grade.
- Lisa requires some help from the members to create a small subcommittee to be juries and decide which student has the most interesting profile based on the criteria.
- Teacher members will participate in this subcommittee and will have to read the five summaries of students and make a decision.
- Mina and Harm volunteer to provide support to making the choice about the best final project topic.

### 9. Any other business

- Marije suggests that the information on the courses on Osiris is insufficient, and some students felt that the description of the course is with their experience.
- Marije has created a plan about it and will provide an update during the next meeting.

### 10. Action points meeting 02/2023

	<b>Action: (Agenda point)</b>	<b>Introduced on:</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>To be completed by:</b>
1	Update the participant list of PC members and the webpage of the PC (maybe with the help of Simone)	15/02	Pending	Genie, Ilse
2	Encourage a first-year student to join the PC during the tutorials (or through study associations)	23/11	Remains - Revised	Lisa / Marije
3	Encourage student participation in the course evaluations (establishing a particular day and providing lunch while students fill in the evaluation questionnaires)	23/11	Remains - Revised	Evaluation Committee + PC Members
4	Discuss (in future meetings) the evaluations of elective courses which ME students have attended	15/02	pending	Evaluation committee
5	Send an invitation to Frank van den Berg about training	11/01	Remains - Revised	Matthijn

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

## MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

6	Invite Mark Rijkeboer to the next meeting	15/02	Pending	Matthijn
7	Osiris course description improvements (discuss next meeting)	15/02	Pending	All members

*\*Points 2 & 3 are pretty much the same thing*

### **11. Closure**