

Agenda for the meeting of the Programme Committee ME/VU

Date : **Wednesday February 14, 2024**

Time : **10:45 – 12:30 hour**

Room : **HR Z109**

Present: I. van der Veen, V. Schenkelaars, S. Ahmed, M. Toxopeus, M. Sahi, H. Askes, E. Hekman, M. Rijkeboer, L. Gommer, K. de Boer-Dirksen, M. de Rooij, M. van Donkersgoed, M.I. Abdul Rasheed, T. Sannes (online), Boukje de Gooijer-Hoeven (Online), T. Wassenberg (minute taker), A. Heutink

1. Opening + Introduction

The meeting was opened at 10:45

2. Announcements

- Since Timme is now in the Newton board he can't be in the PC anymore, he is therefore looking for a replacement.
- Charlotte could not be present due to the Business Days. Taha was involved in a traffic accident and thus also could not be present. Nienke could also not be there.
- According to the year planning "Look into timeline issues in modules / projects" should be discussed. However, it was deemed that this was not on the level of the PC and should be left to the coordinators.
- Lisa mentioned that the accreditation dates have been set: 16 and 17 October. She also mentioned that the SWOT analyses are currently being done.
- Ilse mentioned that Peter Hagenaars has not contacted her yet for the Student Chapter. Lisa expects him to do so after the break.
- Lisa mentioned that on the 21st of March there will be a teachers course on international classrooms.

3. Course evaluation Q1

- Saif mentioned that that in total 11 courses were evaluated, including MOD01,

BSc MOD01

Statics | 12% turnout | 32 students | 4.3 rating

- According to the students extra TA's would be beneficial.
- The teachers acknowledged the difference between the lecturers and said they are working to make all lectures more uniform.

Technical Product Definition | 7% turnout | 19 students | 4.2 rating

- The passing rate after first test was 68%.
- Students commented that the quality of the lectures could be improved.
- Tox mentioned that The Krone should discuss with students what exactly can be improved about the lectures.
- Tox asked why not all subject showed the first-time passing rate. Saif explained this was due to some result not coming in time.

Manufacturing Systems | 12% turnout | 30 students | 3.4 rating

- The passing rate after the first test was 53%.
- Students found the subject relevant to their education.
- Due to the large number of prerecorded lectures the appreciation was lower.
- Mark mentioned that these results are the same as last year and that it is a shame noting changed. Lisa will discuss this with Wieteke de Kogel-Polak. **AP Lisa**

Project Design of a Mechanical Tool & Academic Skills 1 | 8% turnout | 20 students | 4.3 rating

- Students enjoyed the project.
- It was unclear on what points they were going to be evaluated during the exam.
- Saif mentioned that this is a complaint the Evaluation Committee received for every project.
- Tox mentioned that perhaps the tutors could take some time to go over the rubric with their project group. **AP Lisa**

TIME | 27% turnout | 74 students | 4.2 rating

- The passing rate after the first test was 53%.
- The students appreciated that the exam was in the 2nd week.
- There were some small remarks about the reader. The teachers mentioned that they will improve this.

Calculus 1A | 15% turnout | 42 students | 3.5 rating

- The passing rate after the first test was 75%.
- Students thought the quality of the study material and online lectures were good. However, the screen quality of the online lectures was somewhat low.
- The PC mentioned that the question "The teacher gave good feedback on the work done" was too vague and proposed to change it to "The teacher gave useful feedback".

MSc

Engineering Acoustics | 64% turnout | 16 students | 4.0 rating

- The teacher's availability was appreciated.
- The planning however could be improved/ structured better.

Fluid Mechanics 2 | 38% turnout | 27 students | 4.0 rating

- Students did not like that the assignment was handed out late, resulting in work during the second module.
- The quality of the lectures from the new teacher was criticized.
- Lisa mentioned it might be useful for the new teacher to add his own question to the evaluation form.

Maintenance Engineering and Management | 24% turnout | 16 students | 3.8 rating

- The students appreciated the learning outcomes.
- It was not appreciated that the planning kept changing and that it was not clear if it was a lecture or tutorial. Besides this the grading of the assignments was found to be unclear.
- Tox mentioned this is due to the large number of lecturers for this course.

Solids and Surfaces | 41% turnout | 12 students | 3.9 rating

- The passing rate after the first test was 100%.
 - This is because a grade was only given when you had a pass.
- The quality of the lectures and availability of prerecorded lectures was appreciated.
- The students would have liked more practice material.

Structural Dynamics | 26% turnout | 11 students | 3.5 rating

- Students enjoyed the conduction of experiments.
- The quality of the lectures could be improved as well as the organization of the Canvas page.
- Harm mentioned that he thought the response of the lecturers is low, especially for the subject in need of improvement.
- Matthijn mentioned that he only had a day to reply to the evaluation. Mina added to that that a reminder a week before the deadline would be nice.
- Lisa mentioned that there was a lot of discussion about the resit of Dynamics 2. She and Mark Rijkeboer are working on it.

4. Minutes January 10 2024

- Tox mentioned that it should be highlighted who made the minutes.
- Tox mentioned that he really appreciated the minutes.
- Page 2, line 23. Should be made clearer that only 3 people got a negative matching advise.
- Page 2, line 39. SWAT should be SWOT.
- Page 3 line 16. Should be an action point.

Action Points last meeting

	Action: (Agenda point)	Introduced on:	To be completed by:
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	Send Veerle's email address to Matthijn	10/01	Veerle/Marije
4	Send the letter to Lisa that the PC approves of SSI	10/01	Matthijn
5	Make the course list of SSI together with Adeliën.	10/01	Lisa
6	Send the finalized course overview to Lisa.	10/01	Sebastian
7	Use the Binding Recommendation criteria from now to create new recommendations for last year's together with Olaf	10/01	Genie
8	Contact the study advisors and ask them to put the AI Policy in the Rules and Regulations and communicate this to the students	10/01	Genie
9	Continue the brainstorm Student involvement, community, and fun stuff in a next meeting	10/01	Matthijn

Action point update

1. Has not been done.
2. Has not been done.
3. Has been done.
4. Has been done.
5. Has been done.
6. Has been done.
7. Unknown if this has been done.
8. Unknown if this has been done.

5. Alignment EERs programs (Karin)

- Karin explained that she was here because Marsha could not make it, and that if there were any questions that she could not answer a meeting with Marsha could be arranged.
- Karin explained that the goal of the Alignment EERs programs was to make a guideline EER for all ET programs. One for the Bachelor and one for the Master. This because the EERs of the different ET studies have large overlapping parts. However, they are currently written down in different manners, and thus a EER guideline is proposed to have unity between the different EERs. The guideline is more structured making it easier for students and the examination board to refer to specific item numbers. Nothing changes in the sense that the PC stills has full responsibility of approving the EER. In the future however it can be split in the general part and the Study specific part. The guideline is not finished yet so alterations can still be made.
- Karin explained that if more questions arise there will be a follow up.
- The PC agreed to wait until the official proposal for further and more in-depth questions.

6. Committee Continuous Assessment

- Boukje explained what the Continuous Assessment is: At the end of each semester the teaching material of that semester is recapped in an exam. The number of questions per subject is relative to the amount of EC's. With an exception for the Project & Academic Skills. The amount of question per exam increases per semester. The test is multiple choice, and all material can be brought to the exam except online material. A minimum of 60% is needed for a passing grade.
- Boukje explained that this still leaves a problem of knowledge not being retained between semesters.
- In general, the students like the assessment. Since they have a clear overview of what they do and do not know.
- The students receive feedback on the test per learning line, so they know what to focus on for the resit. Besides this the results give an item analysis so it is now how each question scored and thus if a question should be reviewed.
- The exams use a database of questions from all subjects. Boukje guessed it took around 200 hours to fill this database, but also mentioned that this was dependent on how fast teachers replied and how many questions they submitted.
- Boukje mentioned that she will be on maternity leave from June onwards.

7. Any other business

8. Closure

The meeting was closed at 12:26.

	Action: (Agenda point)	Introduced on:	To be completed by:
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	Use the Binding Recommendation criteria from now to create new recommendations for last year's together with Olaf	10/01	Genie
4	Contact the study advisors and ask them to put the AI Policy in the Rules and Regulations and communicate this to the students	10/01	Genie
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