

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

5

Date: 03-04-2019

Present:

Chairman:

F. Krekt

PC-members:

M.P.A. van Bergen, ir. E.E.G. Hekman, R. van Eijk, dr.ir. M.B. de Rooij,
dr. M. Shahi, I.T. van der Veen, dr.ir. E.T.A. van der Weide, N. van de
Werf

10

Permanent guests:

Dr. G.G.M. Stoffels, Drs. L. Gommer

Evaluation committee

Minute maker:

T.D. van der Molen

Absent:

Ir. M.E. Toxopeus, mr. K. G. M. Braakhuis, dr.ir. H.J.M. Geijselaers,
dr. ir. J.B.W. Kok

15

1. Opening

20

The chairman opens the meeting at 08:48. M van Bergen is leaving the PC and has brought cake as this is his last meeting. The cake is thoroughly enjoyed by the entire committee.

2. Evaluation reports

25

Modelling and programming 2

The average score is sufficient, but the reader was said to be inconvenient since parts were in Dutch. A common complaint was that the exam difficulty was too high compared to the exercises.

30

Project, analysis of energy systems and academic skills 2

Scores sufficient, students found the project relevant and the LaTeX course was also appreciated.

Processes and properties of polymers

35

Scores a 4.1, only mention is that a few more tutorials would be nice.

System theory

Also sufficient. Students are positive, only remark is that a few more examples would be nice. They also liked that the exam was taken before the Christmas holiday.

40

Tribology

Scores a 2.6 which is insufficient, the points are mainly the same as in the previous evaluation. There are no previous exams and the study material is said to not be related to the lectures. This means that students do not know how to prepare for the exam. They also say that they feel discouraged by the teacher to ask questions.

45

The evaluation committee says that these points are the same as previous years.

The chairman asks if the PC should do something about this. A discussion follows about the Tribology course. The final decision is that L. Gommer will try and talk to the teacher about this. No action point is needed since there still is an outstanding one for this from last year.

50

Project product design

Scores sufficient. Students mention that the workload is not evenly distributed. Also the contribution of the IEM students to the project was unclear for some.

55

Laser Material Processing

Scores really high, students enjoyed the course a lot. The only thing is that the practicals could be integrated a bit better with the exam, the teacher has responded to this feedback by saying that he will look into this for next year.

60

Fluid mechanics of turbomachines

Students are very positive about this course. Only improvement would be some more examples of applications would be nice.

65 **Advanced thermodynamics**

Students are positive. The only thing is that the exam questions were much more difficult compared to the exercises, so the pass rate was very low.

Manufacturing facility design

70 The score is not sufficient, students found the course to be interesting, but the lectures need to be improved. Slides are not always readable, the structure is vague and the English is not very good.

75 It is mentioned that these points are exactly the same as last year. The evaluation committee explains that in a case where the evaluation is the same as the previous year, they report this to the programme director and the PC.

AP (L. Gommer) contact teacher

80 Asked why the response rate is so low, L. Gommer notes that this is a problem since some teachers say that because of the low response the evaluations are not valid.
A teacher member mentions that she sends a link during the last lecture and gives the students 5 minutes to fill it in. This means that the exam cannot be evaluated at that moment, the evaluation is done with the university evaluation.

85 *The evaluation committee leaves the meeting at 09:09*

3. Minutes PC meeting 09-01-2019

Page 1

90 39: "de programme director"

Page 2

116: "N. Spikker"

Some action points are missing

95 **Action points**

41: will stay. It is noted that we have not seen FC minutes for a long while

1: will stay

69: **AP (F. Krekt: get the evaluation committee to talk to the premaster and quality assurance coordinator)**

100 78: enough is said about this

94: Done

100: not sure since absent, will stay

105 101: the programme director talked to some teachers about the incidents. The teacher for Statics wasn't aware of the rules here. It was then proposed (in the disciplinary council) that if there are new teachers coming in they have a meeting with her to explain things like the BSA. The chairman states that it was suggested last time to appoint a coach to new teachers. L. Gommer explains that a mentor will still be appointed to new teachers, but as an extra thing they also talk to her. She is also working on 'The conclusion is to make the mentor role more formal', as stated in the last minutes. The action point will remain.

110 Module 4 is not going very well. The tutors who are very experienced said that the project wasn't very clear and the students confirmed this. L. Gommer put some documentation on sharepoint. She also discussed a multiple choice test with the teacher, he is going to add some colstructions to help students learn about all the topics.

115 The teacher will talk to the company who provides these lectures, after some complaints. about lectures being too long and not interactive. There was also a complaint about the multiple choice exam, L. Gommer will check to see if anything was done about this.

120 102: will stay due to absence

4. Announcements

Drs. D.A.C. (Dominique) Paquaij is the new student advisor for the first year students. She is there to support A. de Kiewit.

BOO is expanding and it might be a good idea to organize a lunch to see who is doing what. L. Gommer mentions that there is also a pilot for track coordinators which adds some people who can take on some tasks done by teaching staff.

AP (L. Gommer: organize an event/meeting to familiarise people with the BOO staff)

M. van Bergen is leaving the PC, he is thanked for his input over the years.

There is a break at 09:35 until 09:39

5. Education

Audit reports (BSc & MSc)

There were three good and one satisfactory score for the bachelor programme, which is rather good. The satisfactory was for the learning goals since they were very general. The visitation committee was also very satisfied about the examination board.

According to the report the quantity and quality of the teaching staff was good.

E. Hekman: There are worries that there is / will be a problem with quantity. At the moment, there are enough teachers. Also, more staff is being hired for the UT/VU programme. E. van der Weide: This information does not tally with the increasing workload of (some) teachers. G. Stoffels: Hiring new teachers will at first cause an increase in the workload.

There were two good and two satisfactory scores for the master programme. The visitation committee was happy about the high level of the master students, but critical about the internship and the quality of assignments. They were also surprised about students wanting to delay their studies for extracurricular activities or to enhance their master assignments. They thought it was a problem that people take longer than the allotted time to complete their masters. The government thinks it is a problem. L. Gommer comments that we should reduce the delay in the Master.

2nd recommendation first year BSc

Only 15% of students got a positive recommendation, which is given to students who passed all the courses in module 1 and 2. This was calculated before the resits for module 2. 41% got a neutral advice, which means the students need to do 1,2 or 3 resits. 27% got a negative advice and 16% of the people quit.

It is possible for students with a negative advice to still make it by the end of the year, if they pass all their retakes or get all the EC's in module 3 and 4. There are 74 out of 170 students who have 30 EC.

0-15 EC rule

There is still a lot of discussion on the higher level about this. L. Gommer prepared a document about this for ME. The suggestion is to not make the BSA more complicated and just stick to the 45 EC rule. We do want some entry requirements for the modules and courses to prevent people from big delays. This means that if people are thrown out of the project they can no longer do it, and if they do finalize it they might need to do a complementary assignment.

The new 0-15 EC rule will be in act from September 2019, but Osiris support for it will follow in 2020.

There is a discussion about the way projects should be handled in this new system. No conclusion is reached. It is noted that this should be fixed in the EER and discussed with the PC.

L. Gommer is not sure why module 5 and 8 are connected in this way, but there was a good reason for it. She will ask the study advisor to clarify.

AP (L. Gommer: ask A. de Kiewit about the reason to connect the passing of module 5 to module 8)

185

UT / VU

L. Gommer has the impression it is going well, more and more names are being linked to functions. She is confident it will be okay.

190

It is also important to assess the EER and see if people are adhering to it. It is suggested to ask the examination board to present to the PC how the EER will be used at the VU.

6. Delays in master due to internships

195

The programme director SET was going to give a presentation about this but he is absent so this point is skipped.

7. Any other business

200

L. Gommer will talk about a proposal for the master renewal next meeting. The master renewal was postponed but some teachers came up with ideas anyway and would like permission to implement them.

AP (B. Geijselaers: add master renewal to the agenda)

205

8. Closure

The chairman closes the meeting at 10:28

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	Get the evaluation committee to talk to the premaster and quality assurance coordinator about the manual	07-02-2018		F. Krekt
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
100	Send action points to evaluation committee	27-02-2019		B. Geijselaers
102	Write proposal regarding splitting the bachelor and master PC	27-02-2019		B. Geijselaers
103	Talk to the teacher about Manufacturing facility design	03-04-2019		L.Gommer
104	Organize some event or thing to make people familiar with the BOO staff	03-04-2019		L.Gommer
105	Ask the study advisor about the reason to connect the passing of module 5 to module 8	03-04-2019		L.Gommer
103	Add master renewal to the agenda	03-04-2019		B. Geijselaers