

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

5

Date: 15-01-2020

Present:

Chairman:

Dr.ir. H.J.M. Geijselaers

PC-members:

B.R. van Eijk, F. Krekt(absent), H. Steenstra, I.T. van der Veen, N.M. van der Werf, ir E.E.G. Hekman, dr.ir. M.B. de Rooij, dr. M. Shahi, dr.ir. E.T.A. van der Weide, M.H. Riaz, ir. M.E. Toxopeus

10

Permanent guests:

S. Buse, drs. E.M. Gommer, A.F. Heutink(absent), G. Stoffels

Evaluation committee

J. van Manen, A. Knijnenburg

Minute maker:

P.K. Ravilla Subramanyam

Guests

A. de Kiewit (absent), M.Duyvestijn, Noor van Bueren

15

Absent:

<mentioned above>

1. Opening

The chairman opens the meeting at 8:45.

20

2. Evaluation committee reports Q1

The evaluation committee presents some of the results from quartile one.

Bachelor

25

Statics:

The course has an average score of 3.9. Students are overall satisfied with the course module and feedback given to the work done. The module is relevant to their education and the students felt that English language of instruction on canvas was good. Most of students think the pace of the lectures was good. Some points of improvements to be in the preparation for exam without calculator and exams not to be different from learning materials.

30

Modelling and Programming 1:

Sufficient score with an average of 3.1. Students are satisfied with English study materials and information on canvas. Due to lectures the ability to prepare for exam was good. It was clear the students are lacking prior knowledge and it is better to provide more basics lectures during start of the course.

35

Manufacturing Systems 1:

Good score of 3.5 for a bachelor course. Students find structure of the course relevant for their education however the students feel less exercise questions for a better understanding of learning materials and preparation of the exam.

40

Technical Drawing:

Gets an average of 4.0. Students are satisfied with relevancy of their education and feels less Study pressure.

45

H.J.M Geijselaers notices missing remarks from teaching committee for respective courses and report for module 5.

50

Evaluation committee will start module 5 from next year.

Master

Basics for Process Simulations:

Sufficient score of 3.7. Students are happy with the availability of teachers and the exams were well related to major subjects in the course. Students needed improvement in structure of course materials on canvas with coherent and cover all the subjects.

55

60 *Business Models for Sustainable Energy:*

The course scores an average of 3.8. Lecturer being available for the questions and the assignment was really appreciated by the students. Much sufficient study materials needs to provided.

65 *Energy Conversion Technology:*

Sufficient score of 3.9 with the availability of teachers to answer student questions making them happy and feels relevant to the major subjects. Students from various background struggled with the variation in the course and the lecture materials need to be improved and are available at the beginning of the course.

70

Flexible Multibody Dynamics:

Scoring 3.3. The score is insufficient. Students find the course interesting and relevant for their academic development. However, the students are not clear about the requirements of the exam questions.

75

E.M. Gommer remarks that teachers are to be involved in the evaluation of new courses.

Fundamentals of Numerical Methods:

80 Scores 4.1, good for a master course. Students appreciate the use of blackboard and teachers availability for questions. Students need more exercises for new parts of the course. The lecturer assures to provide more pdf in the following year.

Transport Phenomena:

85 Sufficient for a master course, scoring 3.8. Students feel exams were related to major subjects of the course. Insufficient explanation of formulas in the lecture slide was mentioned by the students.

M.E. Toxopeus remarks the general response rate. There is however an increase in student response compared to last year. The evaluation of module 2 is working well with higher attendance than usual.

90

The evaluation committee leaves the meeting at 9 :00

3. Minutes last meeting & Minutes Faculty Council

95 Page 1: no remarks

Page 2:

- M.H. Riaz highlights the submission of his letters to H.J.M Geijselaers. The second letter will be addressed at the next meeting.
- 100 • E.M. Gommer asks if Action point mentioned under line 18 is for SET or ME. B. Geijselaers clarifies the action point meant to be for ME.
- “Van der Weide” not “van der Weijde” in the minutes last meeting page 2 point.

Page 3: no remarks

105

Action points

1: stays

103: stays

111: stays, J. Kok was not present

110 115: done, H. Muijzer will be present next time.

117: stays

118: stays

119: stays

120: stays, “not urgent”

115 122: To be removed

123: stays

124: stays, to be changed to ME not SET.

125: done

126: stays

120

4. Announcements

- 125 ➤ On 26th of February, people from Amsterdam will be joining the meeting and therefore the meeting will be held at later time. But E.M. Gommer, E.T.A van der Weide, I.T van der Veen may not be able to attend the meeting.
- 130 ➤ Change in EER: K. Braakhuis discovered ownership right of EER in contrast with legislation policy of UT. On behalf of ME and SET, program coordinates have submitted a proposal to the Faculty Council in order to remove this article. However, the PC members do not agree with this and will put it on the Agenda on some point.

Action point E.M. Gommer to address Coordinates and Faculty council regarding the intellectual property rights removal from EER.

- 135 ➤ B. Geijselaers will retire from OLC by next meeting. Panel accepted the willingness of M.B de Rooij to be the chairman.
- 140 ➤ S Buse, N. van der Werf announce that this was their last meeting. New members are to be added.

5. Splitting PC (J. Kok)

J. Kok replied to Geijselaer's mail, advising to split the PC ME and PC SET.

Action point E.M Gommer / M.B de Rooij have to make formal decision regarding PC splitting into ME and SET

6. Student progress, MSc thesis / declining results

H. Muijzer has prepared the statics.

- 150 Both national and international students are feeling stressed to finish the master thesis earlier. The disciplinary council argued for the societal relevance not to keep students for long at the university. The statics show that only 4% would complete MSc in two years and around 9% would take an extra 3 months. However, a 45EC thesis should be completed in 7 months working 40 hours a week excluding holidays, extra course work. Monitoring to be done half way from the start of the thesis. If there is any delay of more than 3 months, the student has to go to the examination council for explanation and requesting an extension. This may lead to pressure on students for graduation or discontinuity of the assignment and the student has to work on a new thesis.

155 Upon discussion regarding various factors, the program committee have come to common understanding and concluded that:

- 160 ➤ The thesis work to be assigned with an effective time of 31 weeks. Student has to discuss with the supervisor to plan and put an end date. Supervisor must review the work of student regularly.
- 165 ➤ For proper tracking, student and supervisor are to be notified at half of the effective time.
- H. Muijzer to warn both student and supervisor about overrun in the effective time planned / end date in mobility online. Overrun of 12 months from start date to be reported to the examination board.
- Student must consult the examination board if the work exceeds 12 months from start of thesis.
- 170 ➤ Examination committee to take input of supervisor then make decision either to extend, suggest starting new thesis or change of supervisor.

7. M.Sc Renewable

- 175 E.M. Gommer will have a meeting with the written committee to look at the construction of the curriculum, the contact person of all specialisations and prepare an internal introduction.

8. Any other business

- 180 M.H. Riaz: Lot of things mentioned in letter regarding student final year experience. How to address this issue further?

Action point H. Muijzer to communicate to the teachers regarding experience of final year students

	Action: (Agenda point)	Introduced on:	To be completed on:	To be completed by:
1	Let the evaluation committee discuss the course evaluations (in response to PC-377)	01-11-2001		
103	Talk to the teacher about Manufacturing facility design	03-04-2019		E.M. Gommer
111	Add agenda topic 'delays in master due to internship' when annex is finished	08-05-2019		BOZ, J Kok
117	Write a note to M. Dohmen, J. Kok, M. Shahi, L. Gommer and the SET student about splitting the PC	11-09-2019		H.J.M. Geijselaers
118	Ask P. Roos about the evaluation committee for the VU and the results of the evaluation.	11-09-2019		F. Krekt
119	Talk to M. de Rooij about helping with the project for design and construction	16-10-2019		E.M. Gommer
120	Check with C. Scholten about the quality of oral exams in the first year	16-10-2019		E.M. Gommer
123	Send list on what to discuss during UT/VU meeting in february to P. Roos.	04-12-2019		F. Krekt
124	Investigate whether 1 starting moment for master ME students is possible, instead of 2.	04-12-2019		E.M. Gommer
126	Find out more about alternative ways for digital (math) exams and prepare an update for next meeting.	04-12-2019		M.B de Rooij
127	Need to address Program Coordinates and Faculty council regarding the intellectual property rights removal from EER.	15-01-2020		E.M. Gommer
128	Formal decision to be made regarding PC splitting into ME and SET.	15-01-2020		E.M. Gommer / M. de Rooij
129	Communicate with the teachers regarding factors that cause delay, student experiences	15-01-2020		M.Duyvestijn

9. Closure

The chairman closes the meeting at 10:33