

Agenda for the meeting of the Programme Committee ME/VU

Date : **Thursday May 11, 2022**

Time : **12:00 – 13:45 hour**

Room : **Home office**

Present: Adi Abas, Michael v. Kuik, Roel Schoorlemmer, Eric, Pieter Roos, Marten Toxopeus, Lisa Gommer, Matthijn d. Rooij, Edsko Hekman, Harm Askes, Harold Steenstra, Sarah Wilcox, Abdul Rasheed, **Charlotte Geuß, Khan Taha, Ilse v.d. Veen, Joep v Manen, Abdul Rasheed, Eva v. Os. Adalien Heutink,** Boukje de Gooijer, Michael van Kuik, Mina Shahi, **Nienke Viering.**

Absent:

1. Opening + Introduction: 12.10

2. Announcements

- Lisa Gommer: Estimates of new students: 310 ME first year students. It is the only study program that is still growing in the UT. The curve is close to flatten. There will be a meeting with the rector to discuss possible numerus fixus policy to prevent the growth. The details of numerus fixus will have to be worked out further. This figure is still an estimate.
- ME VU has a growth of roughly 13%. This might make it possible so that people with double enrollment with the UT and VU it would be nice to give them a recommendation to go to the VU.
- Growth path VU: growth +20 students per year. It is not meant to be a 'satellite study' with a massive number of students Pieter said.
- The influx of a high number of students causes concerns regarding the educational management and the facilitation of project group work.

3. Minutes meeting 30-03 (Annex)

A) Minutes

- page 1:
- Pieter was not absent in last meeting.
- Daan should be removed from the list
- Edsko was not there, Mina was there as well as Nienke Viering. Sarah was absent. The name Harm Askes is written down in the wrong order. Tom and Teun were also not present.
- Action point Boukje was not there to invite Michael. But that has been resolved.
- Page 2: nothing
- Page 3: nothing
- Page 4: nothing

B) Action point list

- 160 is resolved & removed,

- 161 is also resolved,
- 162 not really action point it still should be somewhere in our planning but not in the action point list. We could put 162 to a subject to discuss in the next meeting.
- 163 context: more students are following different study courses but are not directly shared with the other studies. It should be Adeline there and not Lisa.
- 164: it will be discussed today so it can be removed. Topeux added that the method of discussing that should be discussed before the meeting is a waste of time, double discussing a subject see 165.
- 165: connected to 164. Take out this point because we should not have a meeting before the meeting.
- 166: not entirely clear. Can also be taken out.
- 167: Unclear, it might be important so Lisa will discuss it with Monique.

4. Evaluation quarter 2

Eric starts:

- Evaluation commission, 11 courses. Most of them insufficient response rate (below ...)
- Module 6: Elasticity theory, 3.4. Recommendations: check quality prerecorded lectures. If live lectures are possible really do that.
- Tribology: 2.5, insufficient. Many students found the tutorial questions unclear. Make it more clear and add Genie, Lisa and Matthijn with the teachers (Jude and Tanmaya) have already handled the problem. Matthijn should take his name out of teachers list. It might be low because this is the first time that they've thought in the NL. The teachers are aware of this problem.
- Processing polymers: 4.2, students were pretty happy with the organization. More practice exercises and more Q&A sessions. Just 7 students respond. The committee will work on this, some students were not even aware of the evaluations. Lisa wants an appointment with the chair of the evaluation committee. Roel reminded that there was a plan to have some time for the first lecture to review old courses. Roel will add a meeting.
- Project: 3.4, sufficient low response rate. Specializations were not clear how it was graded so maybe add a rubric.
- Advanced thermodynamics: 3.7, sufficient. Recommendation is to make practice and real exam more like each other.
- Automated production systems: 4.5, appreciated course.
- Composites: 4.3, sufficient. Nice pace, reevaluate the poster idea.
- Computational and structural optimization: 4.6, good. Include more practical examples during lectures.
- Fluid mechanics 1: 3.8, 40% thought the pace of the lectures were too slow. Have the lectures nice and on campus. Some students felt the examples were not clear, so use a tablet.
- Laser materials processing: 4.5, good. The course felt too intensive, with a too high workload. Decrease the workload was a recommendation. 14% response rate (5 students) maybe just these 5 students who experienced it and not the entire group.
- Learning .. control: 4.4, too high pace ½ of students. Math was a bit too fast, use more time for this.
- Document was not visible, learning and adaptive control had a wrong course. The right document needs to be sent by Eric
- Gabriëlle Tuijthof is the new teacher for integrated design of biomedical products, she also has something of the biological ...(in the mail). In integrated design focusses now more on the design methods with more examples for designing. The project will be a little bigger. There will be a new course in the ergonomics part, she wants to focus on a more in a workplace ergonomics. The connection between the topics (product documentation/ certification and workplace ergonomics) is not entirely clear. These should be 2 separate courses of 2.5 EC's but not possible.

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

- Design methods could be a prerequisites
- Odd to surge 2 different topics together, we could advise them to make some connection between the two courses.

5. Update course integrative design of medical products and ergonomics

- Gabriëlle Tuijthof is the new teacher for integrated design of biomedical products and biomedical device design and Production Technology.
- In integrated design focuses now more on the design methods with more examples for designing. The project will be a little bigger.
- There will be a new course in the ergonomics part, she wants to focus on a more in a workplace ergonomics.
- The connection between the topics (product documentation/ certification and workplace ergonomics) is not entirely clear. These should be 2 separate courses of 2.5 EC's but not possible.
- Design methods could be a prerequisites
- Odd to surge 2 different topics together, we could advise them to make some connection between the two courses.
- Most new staff always think that the students are BME students but there are also IDE and ME students. Arko specifically asked Gaberiella to take that into account.
- Top: Keep integrated design and add a design part
- Arko: it would be nice to have an evaluation for the Biomedical products master. He would like to know what's up after this year.

6. MSc EER

- Master will be discussed now.
- The meeting will take place until 13.30 due to time limitations.
- We will discuss:
- Bachelor EER, make a task division on who reads what, so 2 for first 10 and then 2 for the last 10.
- Send small, detailed changes to Lisa.
- Page 1: fine
- Page 2: no comments
- Page 3 and 4: fine
- Page 5: nothing
- Page 6:
 - Change is okay. Faculty board fell over the word 'corporate environment'. Maybe it would be nice to change it to 'professional working environment'. The essence is that you work in a working environment. It is better to be correct than stylish.
 - Maybe change it to company environment, some did not agree.
- Page 7:
 - Certain job descriptions/ entities are not described in the definition page in the beginning for example a research group and professor are not clarified.
- Page 8: no remarks
- Page 9: Toxopeus will share it.
- Page 10:
 - odd formulation in the change. Trainee engineer is not defined (above training). Maybe change it to trainee, or student. The updated sentence should be fixed. Toxopeus had sent possible alternative
- Page 10:
 - Research group is again not defined. Chair is better or department. Department is a little bit vague. The 5 EC can be used for the study tour, but study tour not defined. It

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

is not about “EC part” but about extra comments.

- Page 11:

- 4.2.1 The sentence is wrong, omission of words. Comment Adalien is fine with this.

- Page 12

4.5.2) a lot of students choose courses from other universities. The UT should have comparable courses. Check

4.5.5) So HOW do the specialization coordinators know how many EC's are rewarded by BOZ when discussing the exchange program with the student?

There should be a conversion of the credits of other universities in EC. Which there is, the this [link](#).

- Page 13

4.8.1) there is a lot of contradiction on the EER document.

4.9.2) correction time – refers to the exams but does not refer to the assignments.

If the grade is not announced within a week the student should contact the study association and file a complaint.

There are a lot of time constraints for correcting the assignments and publishing the results

4.11.2 & 4.11.3) are either contradicting each other or they are redundant. Should be careful of finalizing the finalize section

7. Any other business

8. Subjects next meeting

Continue reviewing the EER for the MSc program from section 5 and continue with the BA EER the following time.

9. Closure 13.36

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

[illegible]