

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 164

Date: 14-02-2022

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: MS Teams

Minutes secretary: Ilse Akkermans

CC: CES, Simone Steinmeijer

Guests: Ata Aydin (evaluation committee)

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

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Jan Willem Polderman	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijckx	
S.G. Daedalus	Jasmijn Poorts and Luna Claasen	

Proposed agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Announcements
 - a. Chairman
 - b. Program Director

This Friday was Taster Day, which is an study-orientation activity encompassing 2-3 hour sessions, which mimicked the experience of studying IDE. High school students and some of their parents attended. The sessions consisted of mini lectures about statics, materials and design sketching and they held a design battle in which students got to experience team work. The taster days are an experiment/initiative, the whole ET faculty had a taster day this Friday. This was not ideal for high school students who were in doubt between two studies within the ET faculty.

- c. Luna is now officially installed as a board member of Daedalus

d. EvaCom

Ata will leave after the EvaCom agenda point, therefore we will start with the EvaCom agenda point.

3. Minutes last time

There is unclarity about the part about the protocol for introducing a new master course. The minutes say it should be called differently but it doesn't say what the better name would be. There was a name suggested. Ilse will listen to the recording again and add that name to the agenda. The proposed header was "Seeking advice of the PC about the fit of a new master course" and will be added to the minutes of meeting 163.

4. EvaCom 1st quartile

This was discussed internally already. Problems with master's course are already solved, the corrected version can be found on teams. The EvaCom has used the new proposed format for the latest evaluation reports.

a. Feedback on the report

Passing rates are referred to in statistics section, but numbers cannot be found. This was discussed when developing the new format and it was decided that the raw data was not needed. The raw data is not relevant to the feedback. It is little informative for evaluating course quality rather than uncovering trends in passing rates.

[Jan Willem] Emile van der Heide, his resit yielded much better results and passing rates. Emile felt there was not enough time to contemplate on contents of his course, now he has changed his mind. Changing the duration of his course back to 10 weeks is not desirable, still, the resit could be an indication that having more time might be beneficial to the course results. However, 2 EC should be doable in half a quartile. So in this case the evaluation should focus more on the workload than on the passing rates. Does the evaluation pay attention to the workload?

[EvaCom] The evaluation does evaluate the workload too.

b. Using grades in the report

There is a new grading system from this year onwards. 6 questions per course are asked, each category gets a grade instead of giving the course an overall grade like before. Grades have an effect on teachers. Low grades can be insulting or make people feel bad and high grades can make people ignore criticism. So the emphasis should be on the verbal side of the evaluation.

[Rianne] Grades can be useful for looking at trends. If a trend shows something has changed it can be a nudge to check the report in detail. There is still a matter of statistical relevance here, if there are only a few people filling in the evaluation. Still, this same issue arises for comments. If it is mentioned once, how do you weigh comments and grades? Combining grades and qualitative feedback can make them outweigh one another. One strong opinion versus multiple anonymous grades.

The new EvaCom evaluation system uses the same method as the master evaluation, which works quite well. Indeed, the old system has flaws. A grade is not constructive feedback, but it can be useful for trends and to check if something is below standard. With only comments that cannot be checked. Conclusion: data is insightful, it does not need to be grades but can be scale-wise too. Consensus for EvaCom: leave it as it is, try it out for a few modules. Suggestion, maybe use SEQ as a way to gather data. Try converting the verbal feedback to quantitative data.

c. Formal complaint from the EvaCom

OLC received a formal complaint from the EvaCom. A lecturer made comments in his lecture which undermine the validity of the evaluation, the EvaCom felt discredited in the lecture. The EvaCom expresses concerns about the effectivity of the evaluation if a lecturer openly discredits the evaluation. They are concerned about students undermining evaluations as a result of this.

1. As a program committee we cannot take action on the specific lecturer
2. We have to evaluate quality assessment, the OLC checks the EvaCom. It is important that evaluations are statistically relevant thus it is important that many students fill out the evaluation seriously.

On the 2nd point we could act, but actually, program management should act on this. Geke is a supervisor of this lecturer and will take action.

d. Affirmation

[Jordyn] Who affirms the teachers if they change after evaluations and who comments on that, saying “well done, thanks for changing”?

[Jan Willem] Formerly, the program committee advises management. If something needs to be improved, they need to think about how to do that. From the students you will never hear this because next year there’s a new round of students. It can be expressed by the grades. Even though grades don’t say it, it can feel as such. It is a good point. Maybe it would help if the evaluations were sent directly from the EvaCom to the Program Committee. Hiske and Elora are in the Program Board/Management, they might need to discuss this matter.

[AP program board, Hiske, Elora] Think of a way to comment on change/improvements in courses directly to lecturers.

5. Action Points update:

a. AP1 – 163 Pre-master evaluation:

Still in progress. The acquisition of a purely pre-master coordinator is no longer the case. Elora is currently the pre-master coordinator.

[Elora] There was a vacancy for the position, but they are now inquiring what other masters need for a pre-master coordinator. For the time being Elora is the pre-master

coordinator. In doubt, whether evaluating all pre-master programs is of added value because most pre-masters courses are already evaluated in bachelor?

There are some specific pre-masters for pre-masters only. Courses with 180 students starting each year. There are too many different pre-master tracks involved that only evaluating via EvaCom would be too narrow because it would only ask the IDE pre--Master students. There are evaluation committees in each study branch. Those committees could collaborate and send out a digital survey instead of evaluating via a panel discussion. University College students will leave university once the course is done so it makes sense to do it as a survey instead of a panel. The survey could be put out on the Canvas page.

- b. Instagram post new student member OLC.

There was a candidate for the position already. There will be a meeting soon to get to know this person.

- c. AP 1 – 159: Next academic year, discuss how the 'giving and receiving feedback' workshop went and what the effects are, after module 1.

This is an action point to stay. EvaCom cannot really evaluate this because EvaCom is heavily involved in this course. Jordyn thinks the internal evaluation for the first-round shows that it is possible for the EvaCom to evaluate themselves, but not sure if it is good enough. Jan Willem will sit together with Hiske and the EvaCom to reflect on these sessions.

[AP EvaCom] Arrange a meeting with Hiske and Jan Willem to evaluate the receiving & giving feedback course.

- d. AP 5 – 159: Discuss plans for a follow-up meeting of the assessment.

Can be removed from the AP list. It is a focus point but no longer an action point.

6. Design for Additive Manufacturing

Master course up for approval. Bit different from the biomimicry proposal from last time. Main focus is on ME and the course is already part of the courses in ME. This course was approved by the IDE program committee. Can this course be put on the list of electives for IDE? Students may propose any subject from the whole university as an elective but if we put this course on our list, we support the contents so therefore we should discuss this. Tom Vaneker is giving a course on additive manufacturing and 3D printing which seems similar looking at the course name and description What is the difference between these courses?

Should be clearer what the differences are between the two courses and why they should exist alongside one another. Tom Vaneker knows about both courses and is probably the best person to give some clarification on this.

[AP Alberto] Write a proposal to Tom Vaneker to ask for clarification on the difference between the existing master course and the new master course proposal on additive manufacturing.

Geke, Eric and Marieke will discuss ideas developed over time about structure and framework of bachelors. It takes some time, but they are getting somewhere.

7. AOB

-

8. Meeting closed

13:59

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
<i>Action:</i>	Target date:	<i>Executed by:</i>	Status/remark
AP1 – 164: Think of a way to comment on change/improvements in courses directly to lecturers.		Hiske, Elora, Program Board	
AP2-164 : Arrange a meeting with Hiske and Jan Willem to evaluate the receiving & giving feedback course.		EvaCom	
AP3-164: Write a proposal to Tom Vaneker to ask for clarification on the difference between the existing master course and the new master course proposal on additive manufacturing.		Alberto	
AP1 – 163: Pre-Master courses Evaluation. This should be the task of the pre-master coordinator of the faculty. There will be a new person on this position soon. Jan Willem will inform the committee once he knows more about this.		Jan Willem	In Progress
AP 2 – 161: Share the results of the survey on assessment she did with Jan Willem		Rianne	Unknown
AP 3 – 161: Yearly report PC-IDE		Alberto	In Progress
AP 4 – 160: Prepare a summary of the conversations held with the original BSC curriculum		Jan Willem	In Progress

committee. What is the common ground starting to look like?			
AP 1 – 159: Next academic year, discuss how the ‘giving and receiving feedback’ workshop went and what the effects are, after module 1.			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>