

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 185

Date: 17-06-2024

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	
	Winnie Dankers	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	
	Robert Breugelmans	
	Niek Reeze	
	Martyna Mariak	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Alexandra Tark	Absent
EvaCom	Zen Duckers	

One-time guests	Name	Present/Absent

1. Welcome
-
2. Announcements:
 - 2.1. Chairman: EvaCom will show some information of the evaluations. An extra agenda point after discussion minutes and action points.
 - 2.2. Program Director: Parents day today. Meeting of Smart Academic Year this week, this is with the Program Management from all universities.
 - 2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus: -
 - 2.4 Others: Niek his last meeting today, he is finishing his bachelor. Also, Robert is leaving in September probably.

[AP PC committee: Find some new PC members before summer and communicate this.]

3. Approve minutes meeting 184:
No comments. Approved.
4. Action Points from previous meetings:

AP 3 – 183: Discuss the new curriculum in the informal meeting and approve the changes.
Done.

AP 4 – 183: Discuss the distinction rule in the informal meeting and come with a conclusion.
Combine it with the EER advise.

5. Pitch on Q2 by EvaCom:

They made a roadmap:

1. Mid-term interviews: short interview where we had a meeting with four students where we asked them some questions. We asked the lectures for some questions if they have specifics.
2. End-term questionnaire: at the introduction to the new module.
3. End-term feedback workshop: with the lecturer present, where we talk actively with students and try to keep, start, stop or improve some things and we try to be very solution focused so that the teacher can implement stuff for the next year.
4. Quartile report: feedback to the lecturer.

Notes:

- TPM 1 is missing. We had a problem with data gathering.
- Now more visual than last time; the bluer you see, the better the course is evaluated.
- Numbers don't add up to a 100 percentage. What you see is the number of students that answers the questions.

Bachelor module 2:

Project "ideation":

Not real problems, besides that groupwork is not the thing that is focused on. Therefore, more red than blue. Question might should have been formulated differently.

Calculus 1B for IDE:

Group activity question isn't the right to ask, solo course.

Construction:

Overly positive, no real problems.

Production 1:

Same as for construction.

Discovery:

Some things can be improved here:

- Students liked feedback before they handed in.
- More explicit requirements.
- Less confusion on expectations of students.

Self-reflection:

How productive they were on class etc. Conclusion: we are on the right track. A high improve here.

Bachelor module 6:

Project "consumer products":

Criteria were not clear here. Something to keep in mind.

Technical Product Modelling 2:

Mostly positive.

Graphic Design:

First time in new format, therefore also an end-term workshop for them.

Improvement points:

- Because ME-students are involved and they have their own vision, this will reflect badly in your graphic design grid, which is your personal grade.
- There was a lot of being sidetracked, some information that wasn't necessarily.
- Furthermore, more individual feedback and an intro to the web page.

Product Market Relations (PMA):

Overly positive.

Self-reflection:

Positive.

Masters:

Still on the old format of infographics. It is not the perfect one. We are working on changing this into a more presentable format too. For now, the more negative the score, the more negative scores were assigned. All the master courses have low responses. In the future is the plan to make it more interactive too.

Multisensory design:

Overall, quite good.

Empirical Methods for designers:

Also, quite good.

Packaging Design and Management 2:

Study load is quite high.

Surface Engineering for Look and Feel:

Overall good. Also, a question about the use of AI, teacher is very into this topic.

Therefore, this was his input to implement this in the questionnaire.

Conclusion: Look in the different master courses; what are the differences between these courses? What is the difference between the study loads? Make it clearer, but don't make more study load.

Questions and comments:

[Kostas] Compliments, nice improving over the years. Something that can help us further, is to maybe flag topics that are repeating the whole time. Then we can see a pattern.

[Hiske] When will this be available for teachers?

[EvaCom] After this meeting. Full report will follow for the graphic design teachers.

6. Bachelor curriculum revision update

[Geke] The most important update is that the presentation of the bachelor's curriculum is tomorrow.

[Wim] I hope that everybody will be able to join us. It will be more interactive than last time.

Questions and comments:

[Geke] Is everything ready for the first module? Because this is our last meeting for September.

[Wim] You have to look at the level of what is ready. For example, we have an agreement from the PC. And the next thing is the EER. All the things we have to check and

thick until well the rooms and information on Osiris everything is ready. But we are getting there. But also, still preparing things.

[Geke] Do we have enough development coaches?

[Wim] We had a meeting yet. Some are still doubting whether they could do it. But I think we have at least 12 persons now. And maybe it adds up to 13 or 14. We are getting there.

[Geke] You also send us a Programme development Plan. Title is not everywhere, it missed on priority 3 and 4.

[Wim] Putting the titles there. Priority 1: IDE curriculum. Priority 2: master programme. Priority 3: mid-term evaluation. Priority 4: language assignment. Last year the PC requested less priorities, because it became a lot throughout the years. Therefore, we have some priorities and to be able to get there, otherwise maybe it might be too much. Some things are not for one year but will continue. I did try to make it to three, but it became four anyway because of the political situation. In the mid-term we are going to focus on the bachelor.

[Johan] Why is Delft and Eindhoven involved in this mid-term evaluation?

[Wim] We follow the same framework as them. We are like a group. Every university will put in their own important points. And we ask the committee of it is future proof and ask on feedback. Whole idea is learning from each other.

[Geke] Are there any updates on the point of internationalization?

[Wim] Notes of last meeting are still valid. ME made a start of filling in the forms that we need to fill in and based on that I made a start with that. But the government is still in the process of starting up.

[Jodi] How is the enrolment of international students for next year?

[Wim] It is a bit lower. But I don't know the exact number. It is more the Dutch students that decreased, not so much the international students. We depend on our international students, otherwise we are too small.

7. EER update

[Geke] We discussed a lot of changes already, bachelor and masters. Now it is the whole concept. Are there any topics we want to discuss? Starting with the bachelors, especially the programme specific part.

Questions and comments on bachelor's part:

[Johan] Compliments to Hiske. Don't have many comments. Only one thing about the Bachelor thesis project: now there is said that this project is carried out externally as a company. My suggestion is to remove generally and instead.... "Or internally connected to a research group at the UT".

[Niek] Internally is only for losers...

[Geke] Question about the graduation committee for the Bachelors. You say "if applicable and available client supervisor". Because they are not all part of the committee. I think that should say that they are part of the committee as a guest.

[Hiske] I can also leave out the complete graduation committee. The thing is that this was the grey part, which was a suggestion from the general ET part. And I thought I will improve it, because in my feeling it is double information because it is also in the syllabus. The question is, should it be in the EER? Conclusion: I will remove the last sentence out of the EER and then problem solved.

[Wim] What about the distinction rule?

[Geke] We discussed it again in our last informal meeting. We said let's just leave it there and give us a recommendation to reflect on how it works in the new curriculum. And, how it can be assessed on an individual basis. Conclusion: the distinction is now out, and now the cumlaude is still there. The problem with the cumlaude was that not many students received this title, so we will put in our advice some sort of recommendation. Please evaluate if cumlaude is still reasonable to have or how we can get students to get a cum laude. That was our agreement in the last meeting.

[Geke] No other comments, we go to the masters.

Questions and comments on master's part:

[Jodi] One comment I have is around the pronoun "he". I think we should take that out.

[Geke] Good point.

[Jodi] I don't know if this is something for in the EER, but some students get paid by a company for their thesis and some don't. I find it sometimes really complicated, because we don't really have any regulations on that.

[Johan] For the bachelor there is a document you can hand in to the company.

[Eleora] For the master we don't have some document as in the bachelor. But I don't think this belongs in the EER.

[Geke] I like the suggestion that we can offer the students something that they can use like a reference. So, a document only for students with guidelines. But indeed, not in the EER. Maybe it is good to discuss this a bit, how we are thinking about this. A student well being prospect. We can talk about this in another meeting, in September.

[AP Kostas: Include the topic of company payments for students master's thesis in the next agenda.]

[Geke] Any other remarks?

[Johan] Indeed, a lot more. First, it's about doing a bachelor's, for example, in Eindhoven, without all the engineering courses. Then, these students can unconditionally proceed to the master's program here in Enschede.

[Hiske] That is something we don't have any influence on.

[Geke] It is difficult and also weird, because we all have different names for the study, industrial design or industrial design engineering. But the thing is we have to align with the reference framework, we cannot change everything.

Then some points of Johan about the PILOS, but we cannot change them. And a lot of comments left in his document. Johan will send this afterwards to Elora. So, she can see the remarks.

[Hiske] General thing: at this moment, they already have started with a working group of the EER for next year. Please let me know if there are comments or feedback.

[Robert] One comment is that I could not find something about “Boosters Academics”. We still have to do something because that should be part of the requirements for the Masters Graduation project.

[Elora] Not in the EER, but in the learning goals of the teachers. The course description.

[Robert] And when will this start?

[Wim] at the start of the new academic year.

[Geke] We have to write our advice and I hope you can also help us with that Johan.

[Elora] No big changes, so no need to check it again before.

8. Any other business / Question round

-

9. Closure: 13:59.

PC – Action points			
<i>Action:</i>	<i>Target date:</i>	<i>Executed by:</i>	<i>Status/remark</i>
AP 1 – 185: Find some new PC members before summer and communicate this.	Before summer break.	PC committee	
AP 2 – 185: Include the topic of company payments for students master's thesis in the next agenda.	Before next PC meeting	Kostas	