

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

Date: **Wednesday June 7, 2023**

Time : **8:45 – 10:30 hour**

Room : **HR Z109**

Present: M. Sahi, M. Rijkeboer, G. Stoffels, M. Abdul Rasheed, I. van der Veen, M. van Donkersgoed, T. Khan, H. Askes, N. Wiering, M. ter Horst, M. Toxopeus, E. Hekman, L. Gommer, M. de Rooij, T. Mes, C. Geuß (online), J. Schilder (online), B. Gooijer-Hoebe (online)

1. Opening + Introduction

The meeting was opened at 08:48

2. Announcements

- The committee received an email from the coordinator of Advanced Programming in Engineering (APIE) asking if they agreed to reduce the number of lectures for the course. It was concluded that the committee didn't have a say in this matter, and the decision solely rested with the teacher.
- Harm mentioned that he has become the head of the Civil Engineering department, but he will still remain as the head of the Thermal Fluid Engineering department. So, he can and will continue to be part of this programme committee.
- Ilse mentioned that she won't be able to attend the first two meetings of the programme committee in the next academic year due to her internship. Mark will take over as the vice chairman during that time.

3. Minutes March 29 2023

The minutes weren't uploaded yet. But that doesn't matter

4. EER MSc + BSc

**EER MSc**

- The visibility of textual changes was raised as a concern, prompting Lisa to consult Adelen regarding possible actions before the upcoming week. Lisa acknowledged Adelen's busy schedule.
- In Article 2.1.1b, the term "adjoining" was suggested to be replaced with "related."
- A suggestion was made to spell out all universities in 2.1.a.
- The meaning of 2.3.3 was questioned, leading to clarification that HBO students can complete a pre-master program in six months and then proceed with the remaining three courses in the master's program. To avoid confusion, renaming it as "remaining master courses" was proposed.
- Ilse expressed uncertainty about the intentions of 3.1.a regarding specializations and research groups. Lisa explained that these are the intended learning outcomes of the ME program and cannot be altered.
- Clarification was proposed for article 3.2 to indicate that the mentioned EER also applies

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

## MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

to students currently enrolled in the robotics specialization.

- It was emphasized that the committee does not have the authority to address matters concerning another master program in article 4.4.2. The suggestion was made to rephrase the statement, focusing on the ME portion within the double master.
- In article 4.4, it was suggested to replace all instances of "two master" with "double master."
- Concerns were raised in article 4.8.5 regarding the clarity of ME students' option to pursue internships at other universities. Marten pointed out that in such cases, other universities tend to treat these internships as company experiences. To encompass this, the definition of "companies" was recommended to include external research institutes as well.
- The meaning of article 4.9.5 was unclear, leading to the proposal of changing it to "work together transparently" and omitting the last two sentences.
- In article 5.1.1.5, the term "securing" was suggested to be changed to "indicating."
- Iqbal noted a sequencing issue in article 5.1.1, suggesting that point 4 should precede the previous point.
- The reference to "the restriction" in article 5.1.1.6 was unclear.
- In article 5.1.1.4, a missing piece of the sentence was identified, and it was proposed to add "without having 60 EC."
- Lisa mentioned that the examination board desired a more precise ruling with specific numbers in article 5.1.2. It was clarified that the ruling itself had not changed, only becoming more exact.
- Article 5.1.2.1.3 was noted as being present to address extreme cases where the examination board can intervene. Lisa assured the committee that if this ruling becomes too stringent, she would inform the committee and take appropriate action. Edsko highlighted the absence of any mention of the double master, which Lisa agreed to include.
- In article 5.1.3.1, the term "department chairman" was changed to "research chairman."
- The recommendation for article 5.1.3.4.b was to replace "twice" with "in two" and specify that this requirement applies to both ME and SET programs.

### EER BSc

- It was suggested that any concerns regarding the guidelines should be collected and utilized as valuable input during the creation of the new guidelines.
- In article E5, it was observed that the inclusion of computer skills such as "Matlab and Gabi" was not explicitly stated. Therefore, it was proposed to add "computer practicals" to ensure clarity.
- The modification of the table for the ME program was not mentioned.
- In the third bullet point of section I, the meaning of "minor block" was unclear. It was meant to say that if a student intends to pursue a minor in the first quarter, they should only have a maximum of 4 unfinished EC in that specific quartile. Furthermore, "minor block" should be revised. Marten added that it should also be rephrased to accommodate the VU context.

### *BSC assignment UT ME discussion*

- The discussion revolved around the concern of increased student delays when providing more opportunities to finish assignments, impacting both students and staff.
- Mark van Donkersgoed argued for maintaining flexibility, mentioning the possibility of starting assignments in February and having monthly start options for the ME program.

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

## MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

- The aim was to ensure a smooth transition to the master's program, reduce workload, and avoid delays.
- Proposed changes included allowing students to start assignments at their preferred time, completing them within 10 weeks, and receiving grades at the next available opportunity.
- Concerns were raised about practicality, meeting academic research skill requirements, and the tracking of the 10-week period.
- Mark Rijkeboer suggested reducing conferences to 2 but keeping 4 starting moments.
- Due to time constraints, the discussion was unable to proceed further. As a solution, Mark Rijkeboer proposed sending a proposal via email to allow everyone to express their opinions and facilitate reaching a consensus.

### 5. Any other business

Matthijn mentioned that it would be a good idea for the programme committee to know the examination board rule. He will therefore add it to the year plan so it can be discussed in the next year.

### 6. Closure

The meeting was closed at 10:42