

## Minutes Program Committee ME/VU - SET



Date : **Wednesday September 23, 2020**

Time : **08:45 – 10:30 hour**

Room : **Home office**

### Present:

Chairman:

M.B. de Rooij

PC-members:

B.R. van Eijk, F. Krekt, H. Steenstra, I.T. van der Veen, M. Shahi, A.H. Vuuregge, S. Wilcox, M.E. Toxopeus, E.E.G. Hekman, J. van Asselt(absent), M.I. Abdul Rasheed, E.T.A van der Weide,

Permanent guests:

E.M. Gommer, A.F. Heutink(absent), G.G.M. Stoffels(absent), J.B.W. Kok (absent)

Evaluation committee

S. Buse, C.A. van der Veen

Minute maker:

P.K. Ravilla Subramanyam

Guests

M.J.B. Duyvestijn (absent), N. Lammerts van Bueren, P.C. Roos, J.G de Kiewit

Absent:

<mentioned above>

### 1. **Opening + Introduction**

The chairman opens the online meeting at 8:45.

### 2. **Announcements**



M.B. de Rooij shared the information about training courses available for the program committee and suggested the new members to enlist for the course. However, more information to be gathered regarding the type and participants of the course.

F. Krekt notified that the student members of the Program committee are divided into ME and SET accounting to split in the PCs. Few of the SET PC members are not invited for the respective meeting thereby must contact Jim Kok for the issue as suggested by E.M. Gommer.

### 3. **VU Evaluation year 1**

P. Roos presented the Evaluation of B- ME programme "Internal Evaluation 2019-2020"

Successfully implemented the programme for Semester 1 and 2. Also, adapting minor adjustments compared to last year. Few changes include scheduling the UT visit, some Corona driven unfavorable cases, lessons learned from last year. Semester 2 involved a lot of effort from Teachers and supporting staff to transfer and adapt to online teaching due to the Corona situation.

Mathematics and Academic skills are taught by VU staff went very well. Transfer of teaching staff for few courses like Statics, Thermodynamics and Projects went smoothly from UT to VU.

Roos mentioned the biggest problem faced is finding a dedicated tutor which is currently under discussion within VU.

Good overall study success rate with 11 dropouts of total 57 students. And have a positive BSA of 37 by the end of year.

Panel meetings was helpful in gathering feedback from students in interaction with teachers for course improvements. Course evaluation was overall satisfactory however some aspects to be addressed regularly. Continuous assessment was one of the elements introduced, have been implemented

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (SET)

satisfactorily. CA1 was better received than CA2, which needs more attention in the Semester 2. Teachers' experience with the new programme is also considered and it was noticeable positive with freedom, co-teaching, RTTI. With RTTI, a student gets a specific feedback which is linked to other courses. RTTI was a pilot which lead to promising results and will be extended due to the Corona.

P. Roos mentioned the event scheduled for Semester 3 which looked promising for Student personal development with the "Leonardo Project". First-year UT/VU team has been nominated for ECIU Team award for the work in setting up curriculum.

M. Toxopeus suggested concept of shadow tutoring which maybe practical during the period of online work due to Corona. VU tutors possibly learn from experienced tutors the way of interaction with students. Roos agrees with the idea but points out the problems associated with tutors to be present throughout semester. But with proper planning, agenda meetings, tutor-students meeting, coordination with UT tutors should work better, clarifies Toxopeus.

## 4. Course evaluation Q4

(annex)

The evaluation committee presents some of the results from the reports.

### ➤ VU Semester 2

In general evaluation committee received very low response which made insufficient individual reports but few of the comments can be made from them, S. Buse explained in below courses.

*Calculus:*

The course has an average score of 3.7. Students are were positive about the guidance as to which practice exercises were useful to do and the availability of the teacher during lockdown time. Students suggested to more clearly explain regarding the subchapters discussed in the lecture.

*Project Energy Transition & Sustainability:*

The project was rated with an average score of 4.1 and the students were very enthusiastic about the topic and relevance of the project. But the students found the project description somewhat vague, and they struggled to find out what was asked from them.

*Academic Skills 2:*

Good score of 4.2 for a bachelor course. Students were very positive about the feedback sessions regarding the teamwork and suggested to have more of these sessions.

*Engineering Thermodynamics:*

Excellent score of 4.6 for a bachelor course. In general students are satisfied with the course, tutorials as the teacher was available when needed and no comments for improvements. Student feel that the teacher giving presentation did not make the slides.

*Renewable Energy Technology:*

The course has an average score of 3.8. Students commented that the lectures did not cover most of the contents of the tutorials and the exam.

*Design Engineering:*

Scores excellent with average of 4.7. Students appreciated the clear and interactive lectures.

Teacher responded to the students' feedback regarding lecture which was just before particular assignment mentioning that he will reschedule the presentation. Teacher stated that he will include more examples and exercises to make it easier to understand the organizational structures of a company lecture.

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (SET)

## *Manufacturing Systems:*

Sufficient Score of 3.4 for a Bachelor course. Unfortunately, there were no open comments or suggestions to draw a conclusion.

## *Life Cycle Analysis:*

Sufficient Score of 3.5. Students found the lecture slides cluttered at times, and too much information is given on a single slide.

## *Continuous Assessment 2:*

The course scored an average of 2.8, which is insufficient for a bachelor course. Unfortunately, there were no open comments or suggestions to draw a conclusion. The factor "quality of study material was good" scored very low and student feel that the structure of the lecture was not good.

Toxopeus highlights that the teachers' response being very less. Buse was not completely sure regarding the response and mentions there might be coming in. Toxopeus remarks that it is very valuable to have a response from teacher. Also, the students should be motivated to provide feedback, PC members stated.

*P. Roos leaves at 9:49*

## ➤ **Module 8**

## *Dynamics 2:*

Sufficient response and the course scored an average of 4.0. Due to online lectures, students were satisfied with the way the online YouTube lectures which was short and stated that they liked the possibility to re-watch them. Students were not happy with the exam structure and mentioned that they did not have enough time to finish some parts and suggested to have a single exam.

## *System and Control:*

Sufficient Score of 3.8 for a Bachelor course. Students felt that the lectures were unclear, and the pace was too high. They mentioned that the online tutorial was very useful that they could re-watch recordings. Students stated that they had a hard time staying concentrated during the online lectures and suggested to split the lectures into parts. The course has improved in general as the rating was not enough last year but is sufficient this year.

## *Project Mechatronics:*

The course has an average score of 3.0 which is just enough. Students thought the project was interesting but too difficult to do and the given information was found to be vague. They commented that the tutors were not knowing anything about the project material. Suggestion provided to have an online demonstration for the working concept which could help the students to visualize.

E. Gommer mentioned that there were lot of complaints related to module 8. S. Buse shared his experience with module 8 and stated that few courses were difficult, and tutor was not that much of helpful. I.T. van der Veen also shared her insight of the problems with the re-sits of few course and mentioned that students were not able to present their knowledge on the project with the type of exams conducted.

**Action point: E.M. Gommer to contact Module Coordinator and teaching staff to address the complaints received.**

*N. Lammerts van Bueren leaves at 9:53 and E.E.G. Hekman leaves at 9:58*

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (SET)

## ➤ Master Courses

### *Design Principles for Precision Mechanisms 2:*

The course has sufficient score of 3.7. Students would like to have clear learning goals of the lecture and stated that not all of content needed for the project was discussed in the lectures. Students were not satisfied with the oral exam as a replacement to written exam to present their knowledge about the course.

### *Elastomer Science & Engineering:*

The course has an average score of 4.3 but the response was made by only 3 out of 7 students which is not sufficient to draw a conclusion.

### *Experimental Methods:*

The course scored 3.9 with insufficient response rate. Students were satisfied with the course structure with online lectures and tutor meetings.

### *Rheology & Processing of Thermoplastics:*

The response was made by only 4 out of 12 students and the course scored 4.4 but it can not be considered as representative and draw conclusions.

*Evaluation committee leaves at 10:10*

## 5. Minutes last meeting June 17, 2020

(annex)

### Minutes Faculty Council (? new minutes available)

Page 1: no remarks

Page 2: no remarks

Page 3: no remarks

Page 4: no remarks

M. Toxopeus propose to inform SET program committee regarding the work done on EER. Rooij agrees with that and appreciate the work of Toxopeus towards SET committee.

#### Action points:

103: related to Action point 136, to be removed

111: can be removed

120: planned to do that later in September

126: can be removed, not relevant

131: stays

132: can be removed

134: done, can be removed

136: stays

138: stays

139: stays

140: done, can be removed

## 6. Progress Students

J.G de Kiewit joined the meeting at 10:18 and gave an overview of the performance of first year students. She mentioned that there was not much of difference in positive binding recommendation compared to last year. Regulation with Binding recommendation was softened due to large number of students with less than 45EC and not providing enough reason. Also, the difference between International and Dutch

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (SET)

students almost vanished in terms of results, meetings with Study advisor. In general, International students are facing financial problems and issues related to scholarships.

M. Toxopeus commented that the problem is not only limited to Program/Faculty rather a University issue. Kiewit clarified that a study advisor can help with reducing the stress due to financial situation however, the University have some emergency regulation but limited to cover tuition fees.

*J.G. de Kiewit leaves at 10:32*

## **7. Any other business**

I.T. van der Veen pointed the necessity of new PC members as there only two Bachelor students in the Program committee. Krekt highlights that the search is ongoing to recruit from Bachelor through Info-Mechanical Engineering and trying to find other ways to connect and convey to students.

## **8. Subjects next meeting**

M. B. de Rooij shared the Year plan for 2020-21 with some points to be discussed and asked the members to make remark with the plan.

M. Toxopeus highlights that it is difficult to discuss the attendance of students in the next meeting due to online teaching. However, it will be important to be discussed in the long term. Rooij agrees to remove it from topic comments for next meeting. Bachelor assignments topic to move to later month of March-2021 upon comments by E.M. Gommer due to online education and results might be pressing. Krekt likes to retain and discuss regarding the Bachelor assignment topic and appreciates the idea of Rooij to have sub-committee to prepare and have discussion about the topic rather than postponing and agrees Gommer.

*E.M. Gommer leaves at 10:39*

Toxopeus commented that the coordinator of Bachelor assignment to be involved in the meeting and Krekt, B.R. van Eijk, H. Steenstra, M.I.Abdul Rasheed agrees to form a sub-committee involving coordinator to prepare for next meeting.

## **9. Closure**

The chairman closes the online meeting at 10:48.

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (ME/VU)

SUSTAINABILITY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (SET)

	<b>Action: (Agenda point)</b>	<b>Introduced on:</b>	<b>To be completed on:</b>	<b>To be completed by:</b>
1	Let the evaluation committee discuss the course evaluations (in response to PC-377)	01-11-2001		
120	Discussion with C. Scholten about quality of oral exams in the first year.	16-10-2019		E.M. Gommer
131	Get statistics on grades and correlation, regarding the entry requirements.	01-04-2020		A.F. Heutink
136	Contact Hoekstra regarding the Evaluation response comments on Manufacturing Facility Design course	13-05-2020		E.M. Gommer
138	Check with Simone for minutes last meeting (Faculty Council)	17-06-2020		M.B. de Rooij
139	Ask if oral exam is public (regarding EER ME UT/VU)	17-06-2020		E.M. Gommer
141	Contact Coordinator and teaching staff of Module 8 regarding complaints from students	23-09-2020		E.M. Gommer