

# Agenda PC - IDE

## Meeting 176

Date: 26-06-2023

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: OH-110

Minutes secretary: Ilse Akkermans

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	
	TBD	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Jan Willem Polderman	
	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Nick Holtman	
EvaCom	Teodora Cîtia + Zen Duckers	

1. Welcome
2. A new committee member, Jody, will be joining the committee from September. Jody will arrive a bit later this meeting.
3. Announcements
  1. Chairman
    -
  2. Program Director
    -
  3. Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus
    -
  4. Others
    -
4. Approve agenda
5. Approve minutes meeting 175

No comments were made on the minutes of the previous meeting.

6. Action Points from previous meetings(s)

Two weeks ago a new student member, Sacha Alexandra, has been found. She has been invited to join the PC. Sacha would officially join the committee from September.

## 7. Bachelor curriculum revision update

The program development plan was shared with the PC for review. It was noted that the PC did not need to approve or disapprove the plan but were asked to review it and provide comments. After discussing the revision update in the informal meeting, the conclusion was that the plan was quite ambitious. Therefore, Mascha requested to minimize the Action Points (APs). According to Wim, some of the APs were transferred from previous years. Via the bachelor curriculum, some APs already came together and resolved themselves.

On the topic of the Discipline Council: the distinction between the External Advisory Board and the Discipline Council was discussed, with the need to clarify the roles and involvement of external stakeholders in advising the program. The topic would be further discussed in the taskforce.

The lead in the Bachelor Curriculum revision has been handed over to Wim by Jan Willem. This formality happened during the meeting in Hengelo. On the 6<sup>th</sup> of July, a next meeting is scheduled during the lunch break. This meeting would include students. Nick will end out the invitations to the students. There is an overlap with an EvaCom evaluation of module 8. The EvaCom has invited students at 13:45, but the start time will be at 14:00. Therefore, no real problems are envisioned.

## 8. Discuss the EER

### *Bachelor EER*

**Statistics** | The removal of the compensation regulation around statistics and calculus and the effect on the Binding Study Advice (BSA) was discussed. Hiske found numbers of passing rates of calculus and statistics. The number of students passing calculus courses was analysed, and it was found that there are still students from the 2020 cohort who need to pass calculus. The estimation for this year's cohort is that around 20 students will need to red both calculus 1a and 1b. Of those 20 students, 14 already have passed statistics.

Statistics acts as a compensation, allowing students to "fail" calculus. The concern was that students might delay taking calculus, leading to difficulties later in their studies and potentially increasing dropout rates. The impact of removing statistics from the BSA was uncertain, and further analysis would be needed. The aim of removing statistics from the compensation is stimulate students to focus more on calculus. With the new curriculum, statistics will change. So one cohort of students would only have one year to pass the courses from their first year. It was suggested to communicate the rule changes clearly to students. The PC agreed with the removal of statistics as compensation for calculus and noted that the transitional arrangement would exempt postponed BSA students from this regulation.

**Rules section B5, student guidance** | Changes to the rules in section B5 (student guidance) were discussed. The tone of the guidelines was softened, following the PC's previous suggestions. The PC recommended adding a section to address situations where study advisors may deviate from the guidelines.

**With distinction** | The introduction of the "With Distinction" recognition in addition to cum laude was discussed. It was noted that the grading system and the difficulty of obtaining high grades, particularly in projects, could impact the number of students achieving cum laude. The PC expressed support for recognizing outstanding work but raised concerns about the grading system and the substitution of cum laude with "With Distinction." "With distinction" should not be the solution to

problems with obtaining cum laude due to the grading system of IDE. Especially within projects, the bar is set high to achieve such high grades. In Mechanical Engineering, project grades are excepted from the cum laude-regulation. However, for IDE, projects are seen as the backbone of the program. So excluding the projects seems to be too drastic. There is a concern that cum laude will be seen as unattainable, leading for a shift in focus of students to “with distinction”. Wim indicates to be willing to have a look at this and how individual student effort can be appreciated in projects.

The way the regulations around the distinction are written now do not include exceptions. The PC raises the question if there could be a paragraph that the examination board may deviate from these rules in exceptional circumstances. However, it should be noted that exceptions by the examination board may not become common practice.

#### *Master EER*

The final version of the Master EER was not yet included in the documents for the PC to review. The PC had provided feedback to a document, but the updated version was still pending.

**Article 5.1.2** | This article raised some concerns, including the lack of clear communication to all parties involved and the replacement of the green light moment with an additional assessment. The PC found the implementation unclear and was hesitant to provide a positive recommendation without further clarification. A formal green light moment was missing in this process, it seems to be replaced by an additional assessment of which it is unclear if this a formal, or informal assessment.

The idea behind this regulation is that students should graduate 1 year from the start of their graduation project. There should be a procedure and milestones with which you can say that someone is not going to graduate within a year.

The discussion highlighted the need to define the assessment process more precisely, particularly regarding when and how the assessment should take place. The rules regarding milestones and the colloquium were also discussed, and it was emphasized that the rules were already in place, although not explicitly stated in the EER.

The PC recommended updating and detailing the rules in a more precise manner. The rule itself is not the problem, but the lack of documentation and detailing is. This update would need to go past the examination board again, so an updated version will need to be made quickly if it must be included in this EER. The update will be made brief for now, because elaboration will take a bit more time. A sentence in the spirit of: “First register, so that start date is known, and set a maximum duration of a year, unless supervisor decides otherwise” should be added. The start date of the students should be registered well and the main responsibility should lie with the supervisor to prevent too much of a burden on the examination committee. The examination committee should only grant immediate assessments if the students requests this after a negative advice from the supervisor. In the instance of immediate assessment is questioned if there is an objection to the maximum grade being a 6. There seems to be no clear objection against this.

In conclusion, The PC states a need for clear documentation and a transparent process. The possibility of revisiting and revising these rules in the future is supported.

**Boost your academics** | The idea of Boost Your Competences becoming a 1 EC course is off the table. The idea now is that every track, all master students, are attending the kick-off and at least one Master class on Boost your competences

From now on, EvaCom will give a short pitch to the PC about the evaluations, because lengthy reports are not really needed, only for the details. For the master evaluation, the lecturers have not responded to the feedback yet, but they have been reminded of this fact.

[Zen] What is the PC looking for in these reports?

The EvaCom has received much feedback on their reports in recent times. This has caused confusion as to what the PC is actually looking for in the report. The PC would like to first stress that they are not dissatisfied with the reports. But the non-final reports are not very useful. It is the little inconsistencies that cause problems. One example being that the colour coding is inconsistent, or varying scales are used.

The PC would like to see trends, to see if there are changes or outliers in the course evaluations over time. For the pitch, slides with tables would be useful, such that more details can be requested based on the tables.

The EvaCom continues to struggle with the response rate of the evaluations. This is a larger problem, not only within IDE. The evaluation of master courses is on the program development plan for next year.

10. Any other business / Question round

-

11. Closure

14:10

The next meeting will be after the summer, in September.

Year Planner: [\[link\]](#)

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September2023	Geke and Jan Willem	