

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

5

Date: 04-12-2019

Present:

Chairman:

Dr.ir. H.J.M. Geijselaers

PC-members:

B.R. van Eijk, F. Krekt, H. Steenstra, I.T. van der Veen, N. van der Werf, ir E.E.G. Hekman dr.ir. M.B. de Rooij, dr. M. Shahi, dr.ir. E.T.A. van der Weide

10

Permanent guests:

S. Buse, drs. E.M. Gommer (absent), A.F. Heutink, G. Stoffels

Evaluation committee

-

Minute maker:

S. de Groot

Guests

A. de Kiewit (absent)

15

Absent:

1. Opening

The chairman opens the meeting at 8:47.

20

2. Update UT/VU (P. Roos)

Evaluation 1st semester:

- Structure is developing.
- Students are overall satisfied. The evaluation was a lunch meeting with students, they were able to choose courses and give feedback.
- Low attendance at some courses, particularly at UT moments: of the 55 students an attendance of 40 or lower. Main issue: activities that do not require an attendance in Enschede ('regular' lectures or tutorials).
- VU attendance is about 50 out of 55.
- Trying to find a solution for (foreign) students who have difficulties (for example no OV card). Agreement was that foreign students should be enrolled at UT, not VU.
- Grades: some students are in trouble (no exact numbers yet). It would be interesting to see a comparison between UT and VU.
- 1 or 2 students have quit. Who are the other students that want to quit? Are these the students that do not come to UT?
- Feedback teachers UT/VU: concerns level of achievements, demanding for teachers, but they enjoy it. Still discovering how it works.

25

30

35

Plan/changes:

- Plan to reduce time at UT in the second semester. Now it is 25% attendance at UT. P. Roos wants to revise this attendance and lower it, proposes to reduce the 10 moments to 6 or 7 for semester 2.
- Can let students come for a whole day. Combine the practical with lectures, so they do show up.
- P. Roos wants to arrange discount on campus card, so students can do sports etc on campus.
- February UT/VU evaluation meeting: students and teachers will be there.
- **Action point: F. Krekt send what you want to discuss to P. Roos.**
- A teacher and student have been found that want to join the OLC.

40

45

50

Concerns:

- 2nd semester risk: less experienced teacher staff. Need to pay attention to that.
- P. Roos is concerned that UT value is not really there.
- Concerns about the limitations of the time at UT.
- Another concern is that UT loses grip on the whole program. Putting lot of effort in the programme and VU ends up with new program, not UT.

55

P. Roos expects to grow or at least intends to.

60 P. Roos leaves at 9:24.

3. Minutes last meeting & Minutes Faculty Council

Page 1: B. van Eijk and N. v/d Werf were not present.

Page 2: 'Van der Weijde' not 'Van der Heijde'. Line 68 'Gabi' not 'cabi'.

65 Page 3: no remarks

Page 4: no remarks

Page 5: 'Muizen' should be 'Muijzer' '. Annet de Kiewit.

Action points

70 1: stays

103: stays

111: J. Kok will be there next meeting.

115: no answer yet

116: written and send.

75 117: draft on sharepoint, **put on agenda for next meeting.**

118: keep track on this point. Compare results UT/VU students.

119: stays

120: stays

121: on the agenda today

80 122: stays.

Action point: drs. E.M. Gommer investigates whether 1 starting moment for master SET students is possible, instead of 2.

85 *Minutes Faculty Council*

FRET-334-2019-09-24

FRET-335-2019-10-08

90

4. Announcements

B. Geijselaers: received 2 letters from H. Riaz, he will look at them for next time.

Next time the UT/VU discussion will be shorter.

95

A. Heutink: Bachelor ME evaluation has had a low response.

- Suggestion A. Heutink for second module: in order to create more awareness of the (impact of) evaluation sessions, 1 student from each project group will be participating which counts for academic research skills.

100

- Suggestions from others:

- Assignment for every student for academic research skills. Find out if this is feasible.

- Ask all project groups to give 2 names. Send personal e-mail to these people. Cannot be mandatory, because it should be graded.

105

- Give the students also a response about what is done with their evaluation.

SET master: N. v/d Werf says over 20 responses (which is a good share of total).

Action point A. Heutink: look into (other) possibilities to evaluate the bachelor students.

110

5. TOM 2.0 (G. Stoffels)

The idea is to make separate courses, with minimum of 3EC if that is possible.

Osiris changes so that it is possible to fill in partial grades, but every grade put in Osiris counts.

115

So do not register them if you want to change them (for instance, if they fail one part and have to resit both parts).

Problem is that students have different priorities in project and courses. 1st year students do not let courses go, because they have a BSA. But for 2nd year students, have to look into this

120

problem.

Action points

Suggestions:

- Treat project same as other courses, otherwise there will be differences in priorities.
- Set requirements for projects (pass some amount of projects).

125

Registration of EC: look if the number of EC still match the hours of work necessary.

G. Stoffels: we keep the same compensation with the grades. Binding recommendations: count number of EC, we don't have additional rules. Students have 1 resit for every course within the same year.

130

The members agree on plan.

135 **6. Digitalization in Math exams (H. Riaz)**

There were complaints from students about digitalization of math exams, that they are unfair. The exams are now in Chromebooks, where students have to fill in final answer. Minor fault in calculations result in a wrong final answer.

140

G. Stoffels: compared paper grade to digital grade and says that it was not so different.

H. Riaz: in Maths it is more important how to solve it than final answer. Even a minor difference is still unfair.

145

Action point M. de Rooij: find out more about alternative ways for digital (math) exams and prepare an update for next meeting.

7. Video lectures (M. de Rooij)

150

M. de Rooij talked about his experience with video lectures and wanted the opinion of teaching staff and students on this topic.

Personal experience M. de Rooij:

- Lectures were filmed, so students can look back. He noticed a positive difference in oral examinations. And the attendance was not lower.
- Students were positive. Only a few used it as replacement.
- A lot of students (already) use film material (youtube etc.) to learn something.
- Maybe video lectures can be used to give master courses a second time in a year (that will consist of these video lectures only)

155

160

Overall thoughts were that in most of the times video lectures cannot fully replace normal lectures, but maybe can add something extra to a course or to watch the lecture again. Thoughts were that it could only be a full replacement if it allows to follow courses at other universities or a course that is not given in that semester.

165

The conclusion is that video lectures can be a nice addition, but most of the times not a substitution. It depends on the course etc. Cannot close on this topic, every teacher can think about this for their course.

8. Any other business

170

B. Geijselaers: Think about your experience with bachelor thesis work. What is the level of this work, how does it work, the grading etc. **At some point it will be put on the agenda.**

9. Closure

175

The chairman closes the meeting at 10:37

Faculty of Engineering Technology
Mechanical Engineering – Sustainable Energy Technology
Programme Committee

	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		
103	Talk to the teacher about Manufacturing facility design	03-04-2019		L. Gommer
111	Add agenda topic 'delays in master due to internship' when annex is finished	08-05-2019		BOZ, J Kok
115	Invite H. Muijzer to the next meeting to talk about the robotics master	11-09-2019		B. Geijselaers
116	Write a note on the recommendations for the quality plan	11-09-2019		B. Geijselaers
117	Write a note to M. Dohmen, J. Kok, M. Shahi, L. Gommer and the SET student about splitting the PC	11-09-2019		B. Geijselaers
118	Ask P. Roos about the evaluation committee for the VU and the results of the evaluation.	11-09-2019		F. Krekt
119	Talk to M. de Rooij about helping with the project for design and construction	16-10-2019		L. Gommer
120	Check with C. Scholten about the quality of oral exams in the first year	16-10-2019		L. Gommer
121	Prepare a document about video lectures for next time	16-10-2019		M. de Rooij
122	Contact A. de Kiewit about alternative study routes	16-10-2019		F. Krekt
123	Send list on what to discuss during UT/VU meeting in february to P. Roos.	04-12-2019		F. Krekt
124	Investigate whether 1 starting moment for master SET students is possible, instead of 2.	04-12-2019		drs. E.M. Gommer
125	Look into (other) possibilities to evaluate the bachelor students.	04-12-2019		A.F. Heutink
126	Find out more about alternative ways for digital (math) exams and prepare an update for next meeting.	04-12-2019		M. de Rooij