

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting

162

Date: 15-11-2021

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: OH116

Minutes secretary: Ilse Akkermans -> Absent (informed the secretary) we will record the meeting

CC: CES, Simone Steinmeijer

Guests: Ata Aydin (evaluation committee)

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Alberto Martinetti	
	Winnie Dankers	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
Students	Rianne Hagen (vice-chair)	Absent (informed the secretary)
	Beatrijs Hinloopen	
	Niek Reeze	
	Johan Stekelenburg	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Jan Willem Polderman	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	Absent or online due to quarantine (informed the secretary)
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Jasmijn Poorts	Absent (informed the secretary)

Proposed agenda:

1. Welcome.

2. Announcements

o Chairman

o Program Director

New COVID-regulations: 75 students are allowed per room. This new measure really came out of the blue on Friday. Quick rescheduling was needed before Monday which caused confusion amongst the staff. For module 2 there is little “damage”, many courses were already split into smaller groups. Only Production has too many students, since this course is together with ME. Therefore, the course will be continued online. Also, Eric Lutters has high quality videos from last year ready so this should not cause any trouble. Module 6 is more complicated. A lot of activities will be online because they cannot be split into smaller groups. Graphic Design was already split in smaller groups but the other activities are with 3 faculties and thus too large to be split up. In the master course only Geke’s course is in danger of having too many students. This can be solved by splitting the group. Other teachers in the master course have around 50 students. There are about 160 pre-master students in this module. The pre-master courses will be held online.

It has been discussed with Hiske to do a separate pre-master evaluation. Hiske mentioned she would have interviews with pre-masters herself instead of having it evaluated by the EvaCom. Pre-master programs are tailor made

so evaluation as a whole is difficult. But it would be nice to have the courses separately evaluated by pre-masters.

[AP Kostas: add to the agenda of meeting 163: evaluation of pre-master courses] -> Hiske

- Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus
- **[AP Jan Willem and Geke: Disciplinary council]**
- Others

3. Approve agenda

4. Minutes meeting 161 + APs from previous meetings(s) See below

Notes on AP 4 -161: The new student member of the OLC would preferably be a master student. The search for a new OLC member could be mentioned during a master's course lecture. It might be an idea to mention that it is a paid position to make it more attractive. Could also be put on the IDE mastermind Instagram.

Note on AP 4 – 160: Jan Willem has arranged an interview with Laurens van den Acker.

Notes on AP 5 – 159: Rick has left the PC. There are a few courses to which this applies and they are working on it. The lecturers of these courses are working on a more objective assessment scheme. Also, by having multiple people grade, the objectivity should increase. Sometimes, there are also problems with project grading and objectivity. The same problem arises when two examiners work together. The grade of the more experienced examiner weighs more heavily. This is a separate thing that might require looking into.

5. New Evaluation Report Template

EvaCom wants to shorten the summary of their evaluations. A new format has been made. In this format there seems to be more text. Putting the data in text-format hinders the communication of the data. Preferably, the OLC would like to see the tables with the data remained. The EvaCom will look into a new format for the tables such that all the data can still be in there but the tables will take up less space. Only the numbers will be in the table. Recommendations will be in text still.

Making a short summary poses the risk that important data will be lost. Or that lecturers will no longer pay attention to all the data, only the data emphasized in the summary. To prevent this, bachelor lecturers have one-on-one meetings about the feedback they receive.

The EvaCom indicates that due to the low response rate there are often open comments which indicate a specific point about a course. However, since the EvaCom ranks the importance of the open comments by their frequency these single open comments are often left behind. The EvaCom wants to prevent interfering with the data and wants to remain objective but also wants to make sure these single comments are heard. Open comments are bind with the SEQ questions now. The SEQ is centrally conducted and automated. This is done separately from the EvaCom evaluations. It is unclear to some teachers that there are multiple evaluations for their courses.

Courses are also given a grade in the evaluation. If this grade is sufficient there is a risk that lecturers don't continue to read the feedback. Removing this grade from the evaluation might increase the motivation to read the entire feedback. However, taking away the grade also takes away lecturers' ability to compare their evaluation to other courses. It should be emphasized that the grades given are about the course and not the lecturers. Jan Willem suggest an alternative grading system

which is less specific than the decimal grading which is currently used. A system using plusses and minuses is suggested.

The Master evaluation report uses a colour coding. This report is fine the way it is.

6. Update on BSc curriculum revision

-

7. Assist Jan Willem with the data analysis

Jan Willem had a meeting with Johan where they discussed the general setting and how students could help. Jan Willem will be in contact with the Viskom (Daedalus committee) because he mentions he has not talked to the professional field enough. He did speak to Fred van Dijk and will hopefully talk with Laurens van den Acker soon. This would be an activity students could help with.

The focus of the activity lies with the questions: What is the identity of IDE and what is an IDE'er? None of these questions is about the curriculum yet. How to implement the outcomes of the questions to the curriculum is still difficult.

Jan Willem also had a chat with Chris Vermaas about that students should know about leading people in IDE: designers and people in the academic world. Academic design research and -engineering are separate fields which do have touchpoints. The difficulty lies with the increasing broadness of the IDE field. Should we make choices or continue with everything? Do we stick with choices we have made or should we change? One thing to add might be a course on 'pioneers in IDE': modern history design engineering. This course would increase awareness of where everything comes from. Currently, there is a bit of design history in Pepijn's course in the bachelor and there is a course on this in the master.

8. Any other business / Question round

(Until 13:55)

[Kostas] Do we continue with physical meetings?

It has been advised to work from home. As the OLC meetings are only once a month they can continue to be held in person. Internal meeting can be done online to keep physical meetings to a minimum.

9. Closure

(Until 14:00)

Year Planner:

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 1 -162 add to the agenda of meeting 163: evaluation of pre-master courses		Kostas	
AP 2 – 162 during meeting 163, ask the EvaCom about the evaluation of module 6, since it is a multidisciplinary course		Winnie	
AP 1 – 161: Make the minutes of the IDE PC public		Kostas	

AP 2 – 161: Share the results of the survey on assessment she did with Jan Willem		Rianne	
AP 3 – 161: Yearly report PC-IDE		Alberto	Not done yet, in progress (15-11).
AP 4 – 161: Replacement for Rianne (maybe an international student?)		Student members	
AP 3 – 160: Make a draft of the advice with respect to (dis)continuation the STAR programme		Geke	Done – advice issued
AP 4 – 160: Prepare a summary of the conversations held with the original BSC curriculum committee. What is the common ground starting to look like?		Jan Willem	In Progress
AP 1 – 159: Next academic year, discuss how the ‘giving and receiving feedback’ workshop went and what the effects are, after module 1.			Arranged, takes place at the start of module 2.
AP 5 – 159: Discuss plans for a follow-up meeting of the assessment.		Jan Willem, Rick and Jasmijn	In progress
AP 6 – 159: Add the follow-up discussion of Jan-Willem, Rick and Jasmijn on the agenda		Kostas	Unknown
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September 2021	Geke and Jan Willem	In progress. <i>It would be nice to talk with Laurens van den Acker and Jonathan Bennink.</i>