

## Agenda for the meeting of the Programme Committee ME/VU

Date : **Wednesday March 27, 2024**

Time : **10:45 – 12:30 hour**

Room : **HR Z109**

Present: M. van Donkersgoed, I. van der Veen, V. Schenkelaars, J. Nahuis, C. de Geuß, M. Toxopeus, H. Askes, A. Heutink, G. Stoffels, M. de Rooij, M. Rijkeboer, T. Khan, N. Wiering, M. Shahi, E. Hekman, B. de Gooijer-Hoebe (online), I. Abdul Rasheed, T. Wassenberg (minute taker)

### 1. Opening + Introduction

The meeting was opened at 10:48

### 2. Announcements

- Job explained that he will replace Timme. Ilse should check if Job is on Simone's List. **AP Ilse**

### 2b. Minutes previous meeting

- Adeliën was not mentioned in the present list.
- "Minute maker" should be "Minute taker".
- Action point 7 should be appointed to Lisa and include that it is for Project 1.

### *Action points previous meeting*

	<b>Action: (Agenda point)</b>	<b>Introduced on:</b>	<b>To be completed by:</b>
1	Ask Simone to upload the minutes on the UT PC- website	29/03	Matthijn
2	Plan meeting with chairmen PC ME/SET/IDE/CE	13/09	Matthijn
3	<del>Use the Binding Recommendation criteria from now to create new recommendations for last year's together with Olaf</del>	<del>10/01</del>	<del>Genie</del>
4	<del>Contact the study advisors and ask them to put the AI Policy in the Rules and Regulations and communicate this to the students</del>	<del>10/01</del>	<del>Genie</del>
5	Continue the brainstorm Student involvement, community, and fun stuff in a next meeting	10/01	Matthijn
6	Discuss feedback Manufacturing systems with Wieteke	14/02	Lisa
7	make tutors take the time to go over the rubric with their project groups for Project 1	14/02	Lisa

### Action point update

1. Will be checked but keep as an action point just in case.
2. Low priority, keep on. As a reminder to meet more often.
3. Has been done.
4. Has been done.
5. This is a continuous point.
6. Lisa was not present at the meeting, so it is kept on.
7. Should be appointed to Lisa.

### 3. Progress students UT + UT/VU

#### Result UT (Positive advice = 25-30 EC)

Advise	2024	2023	2022
Positive	40%	28%	26%
Neutral	21%	15%	20%
Negative	18%	35%	38%
Stopped	12%	23%	18%
30 EC	18%	12%	8%

#### Results VU (Positive advice = 30 EC)

Advise	2024
Positive	17%
Neutral	27%
Negative	36%
Stopped	20%

- The low number of students with all 30 EC in 2022 is probably due to a Material Science exam a lot of students failed.
- Since at the VU students get positive advice if they have all 30EC the numbers are different.
- The numbers show a decrease in negative advice and dropouts, which seems to suggest that the matching is working.

### 4. Dutch track ME

- Matthijn explained that the PC needed to discuss the options of offering a Dutch ME track. The options were:
  - a. A fully Dutch-language track in addition to the English-language bachelor, both at UT and in Amsterdam
  - b. The UT bachelor's track remains English-language, the UT-VU track converts to Dutch and then becomes our Dutch-language track.
  - c. A limited Dutch-language track in addition to the English-language bachelor, both at UT and in Amsterdam, with students who choose the Dutch-language track receiving examinations, study materials and guidance in Dutch and being assigned to project groups with only Dutch students.
  - d. Other, namely ... Change bachelor program back to Dutch again (Without an English track)
- A discussion ensued about if having only a Dutch track at the UT should also be an option. Matthijn explained that this discussion was about the possibility of having a Dutch track besides an English track. And therefore an only Dutch track would not be discussed.

**\*E. Hekman left the meeting because he did not agree with the fact that the chairman did not want to include option d in the document (completely changing the ME-program back to Dutch) in the discussion\***

- Option "a" was quickly dismissed due to the following reasons:
  - All lectures would have to be given twice, thus taking more time and needing more space.

- New Dutch study material had to be found.
- Dutch students may not meet the English requirement for the master anymore after following the Dutch bachelor.
- In general, it would lead to a lot of work and may be difficult staff wise.
- Option “b” was found to be the more favourable option due to:
  - The VU programme was primarily made to appeal to Dutch students living in the west.
  - The staff at VU is less international than at the UT.
  - One of the reasons for the Dutch track proposal is the housing crisis. This is a valid concern in the west however less in the east.
  - Boukje and Jurnan expressed that should we be required to have a Dutch programme they would prefer for the VU programme to turn to Dutch.
- Option “c” was found to be less preferable due to:
  - It would not solve the initial problem since the programme would still be primarily in English.
  - It could lead to discriminatory issues and biases.
  - It would divide the international students from the Dutch students even more then it is now.
- Option “d” was not discussed by the PC.
- This resulted in the PC agreeing that option “b” was the preferred option. With the notion however that most of the PC would not prefer having a Dutch track.

## 5. Draft EER grey / orange parts

- **Draft EER ET BSc general section**
  - *Preface:* canvas.utwente.nl should also be added.
  - *Article A1.2:* “Assessment schedule” should be changed to “Assessment plan”.
  - *Article A1.2:* The definition of mandatory should be defined.
  - *General:* The “Safety” article should be in the general part not in the programme specific.
  - *A3.1.1:* Essays and reports should also be mentioned.
  - *A3.6.2d:* “sat” should be “set”.
  - *A3.7.1:* This is not in line with the rules of the examination board. Since those rules say at least two people should be present. “examiner” should be “examiners” and “third party” should be “additional people”.
  - *A3.8.7:* “shortly” should be defined.
  - *A3.8.8:* “student” should be “students”.
  - *A3.10.1:* “student” should be “students”.
  - *A6.2.1:* “first year” should be “first academic year”.
  - *A.6.2.5:* Should indicate how fast it should be assessed.
  - *A.3.2:* “first year” should be “first academic year”.
  - *A.6.2.7:* Should specify that it is a negative BSA.
  - *A.2.7.4c:* Include examples of other impairments that lead to extra time.
  - *A.7.2.5:* “good time” should be defined.
  - *A.7.2.6:* Include examples of other impairment that lead to extra time.
- **Draft EER ET BSc programme-specific part**
  - *Programme specific part:* Should include the UT-VU programme.
  - *Article 1.2:* This should be in the general part.
  - *Article 2.3.3:* It should either be 8 modules and 4 semesters or 10 modules and 5 semesters.
  - *Article 2.5:* The title should be “Admission requirements”.
  - *Article 2.6.1:* “should” should be “have”.
  - *Article 2.6.2:* “should” should be “have”.
  - *Article 2.7.2g:* Internship should be defined.
  - *Article 2.7.4:* Why is this only for civil engineering, it should be streamlined.

○ *Article 2.8.3:* Should be removed.

- Since there was no more time left for the meeting the EER was not discussed further. Matthijn will make sure a new meeting is set up before the 8<sup>th</sup> of April. **AP Matthijn**

6. Any other business

7. Closure

The meeting was closed at 12:30

	<b>Action: (Agenda point)</b>	<b>Introduced on:</b>	<b>To be completed by:</b>
1	Ask Simone to upload the minutes on the UT PC- website	29/03	Matthijn
2	Plan meeting with chairmen PC ME/SET/IDE/CE	13/09	Matthijn
3	Continue the brainstorm Student involvement, community, and fun stuff in a next meeting	10/01	Matthijn
4	Discuss feedback Manufacturing systems with Wieteke	14/02	Lisa
5	Make tutors take the time to go over the rubric with their project groups for Project 1	14/02	Lisa
6	Check if Job is on Simone's list	27/03	Ilse
7	Set up a meeting to further discuss the EER before the 8 <sup>th</sup> of April	27/03	Matthijn