

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

5

Date: 09-01-2019

Present:

Chairman:

dr.ir. H.J.M. Geijselaers

PC-members:

M.P.A. van Bergen (until 10.00), B.R. van Eijk, F. Krekt, ir. E.E.G. Hekman (until 10.00), dr.ir P.C. Roos, I.T. van der Veen, dr.ir. E.T.A. van der Weide, N.M. van de Werf

10

Permanent guests:

L. van Dijk, S. Buse, Dr. G.G.M. Stoffels, Drs. L. Gommer

Evaluation committee

H.J. Kruize, J. van Manen

Minute maker:

T.D. van der Molen

Absent:

mr. K. G. M. Braakhuis, dr.ir. M.B. de Rooij, dr. M. Shahi, Ir. M.E.

15

Toxopeus

1. Opening

The chairman opens the meeting. Because of the absence of the regular minutes maker every participant of this meeting states his name.

20

2. Evaluation reports

The evaluation committee gives an overview of the evaluation reports:

Numerical Methods in Mechanical Engineering:

25

The evaluation was overall positive, but some fine tuning is still needed because of the recent changes, for example the transition from oral to written exam. Striking is that the students that failed the exams were missing prior knowledge, as was seen in the mistakes made. There is a meeting planned with the programme director about this.

30

Transport Phenomena:

Student would like to see more context on the slides to improve their studying. They also would like to have an indication for questions to know how much time it takes. Teacher doesn't agree with everything, because there were only three students.

35

The chairman asks if the members of the evaluation committee can restrict themselves to the evaluations of the courses that seem to face problems.

Maintenance Engineering and Management:

Students don't know what is expected of them and don't know what to study.

40

Programming in Engineering:

Students would like to have a practice exam, the teacher explained that the practice exam was lost in the transition from Blackboard to Canvas but will be available next year

Basics for Process Simulation (SET):

45

Students would like to see a reader or handouts, and think the slides aren't structured enough. The Programme Committee would like to know more about the inconsistent overlap that was mentioned in the evaluation report. The teacher of this course is also the programme director of SET, so there is some uncertainty about who is the right person to talk to about the evaluation.

50

Bachelor courses

Module 1:

55

Almost all courses were sufficient, except for some aspects of *Modpro*. Students indicated there wasn't enough feedback from the teacher, and students struggled with the statics related questions. Also, they felt there weren't really practice questions. L. Gommer indicates that they will revise the questions for next year. The percentage of students who have passed the first time is 70%.

60

Calculus 1A: there weren't enough practice exercises, but the teacher thinks otherwise. 90% passed the first time. For next year, the evaluation committee is advised to analyze and write a separate piece about the part concerning the transition from high school to university.

Module 5:

65 *Dynamics* received a great evaluation, but the lectures were hard to follow, partly due to too much text on the slides. The teacher has promised to revise this for next year. Because of the extended workload of this particular teacher, it is suggested that chair holder will discuss his workload inside the department.

70 The question of how much time students spend studying during the courses is unanswered, so the programme committee suggests to include this information next time in order to keep track of the feasibility of the master. The evaluation committee is thanked for the work they did.

3. VU/UT (dr.ir. P.C. Roos)

75 P. Roos gives an update on the curriculum progress in particular. The design of semester 1 and 2 has been developed as far as that there is a clear idea what will happen from week to week, content wise and time schedule wise. The coordinators of the semesters are the UT-members J. Schilder, A. Pozarlik, A. Martinetti and M. Marra. There are separated design teams concerning Mathematics and Academic Skills with members from the VU as well as members from the UT. A new element is 'Continuous Assessment', to solve the problem of dissipating knowledge. The integration between Math taught by the VU and the ME courses from the UT is getting a lot of attention from the workgroup, A. Ran (VU) is discussing these matters with J. Schilder. The programme committee wants that the practical side of mathematic for engineering is closely monitored.

85 P. Roos continues to elaborate on the new element of 'Continuous Assessment'. The learning goal is to know and to be able to integrate basic concepts over course boundaries, related to study skills. The level of knowledge should increase over the course of the curriculum, and has a cumulative aspect. This level is tested every semester:

- 90 - Either as an individually written summary (semester 1 and semester 3) as a formative assessment. It is suggested that it could be done during an exam setting (two hours to write the summary), to avoid the online circulation of summaries
- 95 - or by the means of an open test at the end of the year (semester 2 and semester 4) which will be graded. These two tests together will cumulate to the rewarding of 2 of 3 EC. There is some concern about summaries appearing online after a couple of years, but the workgroup is thinking about creative solutions to avoid this. The pass/fail regulations have not yet been drafted in more detail.
- 100 - Another thing to try and assure the level of knowledge is inserting an oral lecture between the semesters, reviewing the previous semester and looking forward.
- 100 - All teachers should make an overview of basic concepts and their relationship to other content in the curriculum.

105 Everything is designed to make the links between the course subject more clear and explicit. Although it is a new component in a new curriculum, you could also approach it as an opportunity to try and experiment.

110 P. Roos is visiting the VU more often from now on. There was a delegation of physicists from the VU visiting the UT to get a better picture of what Mechanical Engineering is really about. Wout Cijssouw, a former ME student, has been appointed by the VU for this new programme. There are educational specialists from the VU involved in the development of the programme. The tutors from the VU will be trained in the 4th quartile.

115 The next deadline is the 28th of January, when the Examination Board ME-SET will review the learning goals and final qualifications. Furthermore, there are some concerns regarding staffing for the module 'Design & Manufacturing'; as well as for the 'Precision & Control' module (that module takes place in the third year). Things that still need some time to figure out are the content of the minors and the graduation projects. The goal is to have all the details for the entire programme planned out before the start in September 2019, but some flexibility has to be in there to make adjustments during the running of the programme.

- 120 P. Roos also has some questions for the Programme Committee ME-SET:
- During the first week *TIME* will be taught, should that be done at the VU or at the UT? Teaching *Time* in one week will probably create an overload for the students, normally it has been taught over the course of several weeks. Maybe it should be compressed so it's suitable for one week teaching.
 - 125 - Block 3 consisted of three full weeks at the UT, but now the alternative is three days a week, focusing on time spend in the workshops, what is the reaction of the Programme Committee on this change?
 - How many tests are desirable during one semester or block, and what is an appropriate study load for them? There is some positivity regarding the idea of beginning with smaller tests in the first year.
 - 130 - How does the Programme Committee want to be involved? It is suggested that the members of the Programme Committee will await the results of the Examination Board meeting on January 28th.
 - 135 For more information everyone is invited to the regular information update meetings, monthly in C101.

- 140 Last, there is a question related to the EER and where the rules for the new programme should be specified. At the moment the idea is that the VU/UT programme will be specified in an appendix of the ME EER, but for now it still has to be worked out.

4. Minutes PC meeting

- The minutes of last meeting were too short. The absence list was incorrect:
- 145 a. B. van Eijk was present, M. van Bergen was not present
textual:
 - b. 120: 'Shia' should be 'Shahi'
 - c. 78/79: reformulate sentence
 - d. 140/141: reformulate sentence (more positive formulation)
 - 150 e. 195: 'projet' should be 'project'

	Action points last meeting	Who	When	Remarks
41	Ask for FC minutes from FC	BOZ	ongoing	Not done, L. van Dijk (FC member) will put the minutes on sharepoint
1	Door evaluatiecommissie de vakevaluaties laten bespreken (n.a.v. OLC-377)		01-11-2001	Ongoing
69	Talk to J. Kemna about rewriting the evaluation manual (3)	Evaluation Committee	07-02-2018	Not sure, ongoing and B. Geijselaers will take over
78	Talk to teacher about improving the tribology course which has had the same recommendations for the last few years	L. Gommer	14-03-2018	Not done, ongoing for next PC meeting
94	Send an email to David about involving the PC in the group working on the issue of rooms and space	L. Gommer	28-11-2018	Done. It's about additional space needed for educational as well as research. It is going to be a two-step procedure. September 2019 the Achterhorst will be available. The final solution will be to make space in the Noordhorst + another location yet unknown, ready in 1,5 year from now. Input can be sent to L. Gommer and E. vd Weide, also by students

Announcements

- 155 Feedback from the visitation can be found on Sharepoint. The conclusion was that the visitation committee was very positive about the programme and specially the TOM model. There were some concerns about the explosive growth of students this year and how the programme will cope with it next years. During the Disciplineraad meeting this morning the small scale signature of ME was discussed. All members of the Disciplineraad are in favor of a small scale approach, no matter what. Next question is if students need to be denied access to secure the small scale.
- 160 The idea is that it is possible and worthwhile to fight for the needed facilities if the number of students keeps continuing to rise.

5. Visibility of OLC

- 165 The chair welcomes the new student member, Ilse van Veen
 There are two Programme Committee vacancies for student members, one ME student and one SET student. It is very hard to find students who are interested in becoming a member of the Programme Committee, the mass e-mail and student portal approach don't seem to be working. A personal approach is probably the best way to find new members.

170 **6. Actuality of the programme**

This will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

7. Any other business

--

175

8. Closure

The chairman closes the meeting.

180

Action points this meeting (09-01-2019)

	Action	Who	When	Remarks
95	Ask for a more elaborated explanation on the overlap in <i>Basics for Process Simulation (SET)</i>	J. van Manen / H. Kruize	9-1-2019	
96	Discuss the workload of the Dynamics 1 teacher in the department	B. Geijselaers	9-1-2019	
97	Make the VU/UT slides available on Sharepoint	P. Roos / B. Geijselaers	9-1-2019	
98	Adjust the information concerning the PC on the UT website	G. Stoffels	9-1-2019	
99	Adjust the minutes	BOZ	9-1-2019	
41	Put the FU minutes on Sharepoint	L. van Dijk / BOZ / L. Gommer	9-1-2019	
1	Invite members of the evaluation committee to discuss the course evaluations	BOZ	9-1-2019	continuing
69	Talk to J. Kemna (Premaster Coordinator & Quality Assurance Coordinator) about rewriting the evaluation manual	B. Geijselaers / Evaluation Committee	9-1-2019	
78	Talk to the teacher about improving the tribology course which has had the same recommendations for the last few years	L. Gommer	9-1-2019	

185