

Minutes of the meeting of the Programme Committee ME/VU



Date : **Wednesday June, 16, 2021**

Time : **08:45 – 10:30 hour**

Room : **Home office**

Present:

Chairman:

PC-members:

M.B. de Rooij

B.R. van Eijk, H. Steenstra, I.T. van der Veen, M. Shahi (absent), A.H. Vuuregge (absent), S. Wilcox, M.E. Toxopeus, E.E.G. Hekman, J. van Asselt (absent), M.I. Abdul Rasheed, E.T.A van der Weide, T. Tankink, D. de Jong, P.C. Roos (absent), C.L.B. Geuß, M.T. Khan (absent)

Permanent guests:

E.M. Gommer, A.F. Heutink, G.G.M. Stoffels.

Evaluation committee

C.A. van der Veen, E.M. van Os

Minute maker:

S. de Groot

Guests:

Absent:

<mentioned above>

1. Opening + Introduction

The chairman opens the meeting at 8:52.

2. Announcements

There are 2 new student members in the program committee.

S.K. Wilcox will be absent for half a year starting September as she will do her minor then.

3. Minutes last meeting May 12, 2021 / Minutes FC (annex)

Page 1: no remarks

Page 2: no remarks

Page 3: no remarks

Page 4: no remarks

Page 5: no remarks.

Eindhoven is partly switching to Dutch and students will need an entry exam.

This year, Information science will have numerous fixes. E.M. Gommer is finding out if this is temporary or permanent and how they managed to do that. But as far for ME concerned, the amount of students seem to be the same as last year.

Action points:

146: done

147: done, will be discussed later this meeting

148: done

4. Evaluation Quarter 3 (evaluation committee)

Master courses:

Aircraft and wind turbine aerodynamics

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.6

There were some struggles with the schedule. The lecturer will take this into account for next year.

Biomechanics of human movement

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 4

Some overlap in material and some more practice material is wanted, but overall student were happy with the course.

Energy storage

Response: sufficient.

Average score: insufficient, 2.9 (3.5 is sufficient)

Students felt like questions were not answered by teachers, the requirements for the assignment were unclear and quite some prior knowledge of chemistry was needed for this course.

Human movement control

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.9

Students would like more feedback on their assignments and an overview of the study material for the exam. Overall the students were satisfied with the course.

Machine learning in engineering

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 4

Students would like more guidance in the course.

Multiscale functional materials for engineering application

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.9

Process equipment design

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient 3.8

There were some communication issues, but overall students were happy and the lecturer shared he would improve the course next year.

Structural health and condition monitoring

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 4.6

But the score is not representative.

There is a lot of self-study and students can do oral exam whenever they are ready. As the course is thus not bound to a certain module, the evaluation is also hard to do.

A possibility is to send the questionnaire after every module and do the evaluation after the whole year.

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

Surface technology – Durability for consumer products

Response: insufficient (could be cause that many students were from IDE)

Average score: sufficient with 3.7 (but not representative)

No further conclusions could be drawn from this.

Tribology

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, score 4

Linear solid mechanics

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.4

Industrial robotic systems

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.8

Bachelor courses:

Bachelor project, module 7

Average score module: 8.6

Heat transfer

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 4.2

The main recommendation was providing more practice exercises and find more coherence between the two different parts of the course.

Fluid mechanics

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 4.2

Main recommendation is to include real world uses to give students an idea of how they can use/implement the course.

Project fluid mechanics and heat transfer

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.7

The main recommendations are to review the project lectures on the usability for students and to add some more fluid mechanics that relates to the Fluid mechanics course.

Module 11: Production systems engineering

Average score module: 5.7

Overall, students felt that the module was overloaded.

Statistics

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.8

Recommendations are to change to regular exam and schedule lectorials later in the week.

The teacher felt the final assignment was better than the regular exam, so she does not want to change it back to an exam.

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

Introduction to finite element method

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.2

The main recommendation is to make sure the lectures are clear and engaging and try to include more examples.

Academic research and skills preparation

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.6

The main recommendation is to make sure to give good feedback to the students. But the person giving the feedback is the supervisor and not the teacher.

Academic research and skills societal embedding

Response: insufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.3

Project production systems engineering

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.4

Take more time for the project exams and arrange more possibilities for students to ask questions about the project.

Production management

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.7

Provide more practice exams so students can prepare better.

System engineering

Response: sufficient

Average score: sufficient, 3.7

Give more examples and more interaction during the lectures, clear overview of the course and list the requirements for the essay.

5. **EER BSc ME 2021-2022**

Regarding the Master EER, M.E. Toxopeus (absent in the last meeting) made some changes, which is uploaded on the Teams page of the Program committee.

The first part of the EER is a general part that is sent by the University. There will be looked at the changes M.E. Toxopeus made in this part outside of this meeting.

The other part starts at page 23.

Page 31 section I: should be looked at if it is allowed to state in the EER.

Section K: program management should be changed to program board.

More comments on the BSc EER will be taken into account outside of this meeting.

6. **Scheduling online/offline education (Lisa)**

After COVID situation the university is considering a situation where (due to the large amount of students) part of the education will still be online. This will mean that 20% of the education will be online.

It is now asked to indicate what part of the education can happen online and to bring up ideas how it can be arranged.

A guess is that a 'normal' situation can be happening in September without keeping distance, as students are now being vaccinated. The problem remains that there will be too many students to fit on campus.

An option is to look for spaces outside of the UT. Also, the tents that are now temporarily placed on campus as extra study places (due to COVID), can also be used next year.

It is mentioned that it would be nice to reserve a full day (for example one day a week) for the online education. Then every study program can have an online day on an other day of the week.

Another option could be to have a part of the students in the room and the remaining students watch a livestream at home.

7. **Year plan, additional activities / subcommittees next year**

As is done this year, the program committee can address certain topics to put on the agenda for next year.

Members of the committee can let M.B. de Rooij know if they have suggestions for next year.

8. **Any other business**

M.I. Abdul Rasheed gives a presentation of the Quality of BSc assignment questionnaire. The main goal was to find out the quality of the bachelor assignment, also taking into consideration the students perspective. Next to that, the objective was to find if there is a correlation between the historical performance of the student and their BSc assignment grade.

Ask Ciska how they do questionnaires; which platform should be used, how is the privacy arranged.

M.I. Abdul Rasheed presents the correlation between the grades of the students during the bachelor and the grade of their Bachelor assignment.

Now there has to be thought of how to combine this with the answers of the questionnaire.

AC: send questionnaire to Chantal

9. **Subjects next meeting (September)**

10. **Closure**

The chairman closes the meeting at 10:37

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

	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		
149	Send BSc quality questionnaire to Chantal	16-06-2021		M.I. Abdul Rasheed