

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

5

Date: 28-11-2018

Present:

Chairman: Dr.Ir. H.J.M. Geijselaers

OLC-members: B.R. van Eijk, ir. E.E.G. Hekman, Dr. M. Shahi,
dr.ir. E.T.A. van der Weide,

10 Permanent guests: dr. G.G.M. Stoffels, dr ir L. Gommer, L. van Dijk

Minute maker: T.D. van der Molen

Absent: M.P.A. van Bergen, R.A.J. Elshof, J. de Groote, F. Krekt,
dr.ir. M.B. de Rooij, S.R. Sewmangel, Ir. M.E. Toxopeus

15

1. Opening

The chairman opens the meeting at 08:49

20 **2. Announcements**

J. Kok will not be here for the next meeting but on February 27th he will prepare a note on capita selecta in the master. He also wants to discuss internships for foreign students, since they are currently struggling with finding a company.

25 A report on the effects of cumulative testing can be found in the sharepoint, named: "Master Thesis Marlou Stinenbosch"

3. Minutes PC meeting 17-10-2018

Page 1:

30 12: M. Shahi was absent, L. van Dijk was present. In the future add absent people to the list.
24: should be NMME

Page 2:

35 G. Stoffels mentions that there are problems in testing international students for programming skills. It is noted that there is also a lack of academic skills such as working in groups and scientific writing.

71: EC should be PC

Action points:

40 41: L. Gommer wasn't sure what the action point was exactly. It is decided that the evaluation committee can contact J. Kemna directly. Action point is passed to the evaluation committee.

78: L. Gommer says she hasn't gotten to it. Action point stays.

81: done

88: done

89: done

45

(M. Shahi enters the meeting at 09:07)

90: Still needs to be done. Action point stays

91: done

50

91: done

92: done

93: done

89(2):done

93: done

55

It is asked to add the agenda point under which the action point was given to the action point list.

60 **4. Audit and accreditation**

How have people experienced the rehearsal visitation? The practice committee is usually more strict than the actual committee. Some found the questions a bit vague and hard, but mostly they were okay. The practise committee appreciated the fact that everybody seemed to work like a team.

65 Below are some practise questions to get a better idea of what to expect:

What is the goal of this committee?

70 According to one of the members, the goal is to have some oversight on the content and quality of the programme. L. Gommer explains that the PC as a committee has the responsibility for the quality of the bachelor and master programme. Also the PC is an advisory committee to the programme director in our case, since there is a strong collaboration.

What is something that you are really proud of?

75 One of the members says he is proud of the information on the VU collaboration, getting teachers to go to English pronunciation courses, the revision of module 8 and the master renewal. G. Stoffels also mentions the EER and the revision of that.

What is the first thing you want to go for as PC?

80 The UT/VU collaboration should be the first priority.

What are you as a PC going to do about teacher workload?

85 **This is a difficult question, since hiring more staff is not something the PC can do. B.** Geijselaers replies that the PC can give signals to the management about the problems when they occur, L. Gommer confirms that the PC is already doing this and that it is even more important with things like the VU/UT collaboration coming up.

Why is there just one PC for SET and ME?

90 Because both programmes have many things in common, including staff and courses. G. Stoffels explains that this was because SET started very small and as a spin-off from ME.

How are you cooperating with the examination board and the faculty board?

95 One of the student members is also in the faculty board as student member. There is always someone from Newton in the faculty board and PC.
The programme directors are permanent guests in both the PC and the examination board. Since we are a smaller university we have a lot of interpersonal contact. So when there is a need for communication between the PC and someone, they simply go to the people involved.

100 ***What do you think of the quality of the programme? And why?***

We always get good marks from the students on the national student survey (NSE). There is of course always room for improvement. L. Gommer urges the committee to comment on the achievements of working with project based education, instead of commenting negatively about the educational model. According to B. Geijselaers, one of the achievements of the programme is that other UT programmes have implemented our way of project based education.

105 A large percentage of our bachelor students contribute to master education and employers and internship providers value our students.

110 L. Gommer also stresses that the visitation is purely about Mechanical Engineering, not UT in general.

5. Education

115 ***Open days***

There were lots of people during the last Open Days and each group had some international students.

120 **Module 1 & 5**

The bachelor coordinator and the study advisor have to decide on the preliminary advice (BSA), according to obtained results. Students get a positive advice if they pass all the courses, 33% has passed all courses. Manufacturing, and technical drawing are okay this year. After resits pass rate for calculus is 80%. The Project is mostly passed. A bit less than 27% of the students have to do more than 2 resits. However some people can't do those resits anymore since they have already taken place. There are some students who have some really high grades. Last year there were only 4 students who had high grades. There are also a lot of international students who have good results, which is an improvement compared to last year.

130 The pass rate for statistics has dropped this year, but manufacturing systems has increased; there will always be ups and downs.

135 A short discussion about the size for lecture rooms and other facilities takes places. There is a group currently involved in addressing the issue of space. It is decided to send them a letter to ask about involvement in this project.

AP L. Gommer: Send an email to D. Korringa about involving the PC in the group working on the issue of rooms and space.

140 Most results for module 5 aren't in yet, so module 5 cannot be discussed.

6. Update VU-UT Project

This afternoon there will be a meeting with the faculty board and the departments regarding the UT/VU collaboration. Several members of the PC will also attend.

145 The PC is looking for? who is going to teach what, how the facilities will be organized since there already is a shortage of space, details on the curriculum itself and what the criteria are for an exit strategy and who will make the decision to exit if this is needed, who has the responsibility. As a programme director, L. Gommer is responsible for the programme. There was a guarantee that there would be no additional workload on the current staff, but there are doubts that this will be met. Some teachers / members have already stopped their involvement due to the increase in workload.

150 Furthermore, there seems to be a lack of involvement from people at the VU, most positions are either blank or filled by high level people who cannot actually get involved. L. Gommer explains that there are some people involved from the side of the VU, mainly in mathematics and academic skills.

7. Any other business

160 **Privacy ruling**

B. Geijselaers explains that due to the new privacy rulings it is no longer allowed to publish grades and student numbers online in such a way that they are accessible for all students. This means it is not allowed to publish a pdf with grades on canvas.

165 A. de Kiewit is there to support people to work with Canvas, she can help people with working with the grade center function in Canvas. There will be an e-mail about this shortly.

Facilities

170 The group working on the facilities has already made a report, but this is still confidential.

8. Closure

The chairman closes the meeting at 10:22

175

Faculty Engineering Technology
Mechanical Engineering – Sustainable Energy Technology
Programme Committee

<i>Action points</i>				
	Action: (Agenda point)	Introduced on:	To be completed on:	To be completed by:
41	Ask for FR minutes from FR	08-06-2016		BOZ
1	Door evaluatiecommissie de vakevaluaties laten bespreken (n.a.v. OLC-377)	01-11-2001		
69	Talk to J. Kemna about rewriting the evaluation manual (3)	07-02-2018		Evaluation committee
78	Talk to the teacher about improving the tribology course which has had the same recommendations for the last few years	14-03-2018		L. Gommer
94	Send an email to D. Korringa about involving the PC in the group working on the issue of rooms and space.	28-11-2018		L. Gommer