

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 189

Date: 13-01-2025

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Staff	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	
	Francesca Toso	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	
	Nazli Farid	
	Arthur Lin	
	Martyna Mariak	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	Absent
S.G. Daedalus	Alexandra Tark	
EvaCom	Teodora Citia	Absent, but a substitute attended instead

1. Welcome
-
2. Announcements:
 - 2.1. Chairman: -
 - 2.2. Program Director: -
 - 2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus:
[Alexandra] Next meeting is Martyna in my position. And we have to discuss a new member since I am not allowed to be both in the Faculty Council and the PC.
 - 2.4 Others: Kostas is off next month.
[AP Johan and Geke: Take care of the agenda for next meeting.]
3. Approve minutes meeting 188:
Comment of Johan. And Geke made a few simple corrections. Loes will have a look and after that the minutes will be approved.

[Geke] The last meeting there was this advice to put some sort of guideline for the students in the master. And discuss that with the master coordinators. Did you already do this?
[Wim] I briefly discussed this topic this morning. It will lead to some guidelines for the students and supervisors. Related to financial things we discussed, but also ownership. We are not going to work to a fixed format, but we are going to give guidance for both supervisors and students and external parties.
[Johan] Good to have some policy. If you bundle all this information in one guide it will be a great solution, I think.

[Geke] One other comment I have is that in the whole procedure with other universities regarding the Midterm assessment, it might be a good idea to hear how they handle this. If you do not want to make it a formal process, you could consider doing it informally.
4. Action Points from previous meetings:
No action points.
5. Pitch on Q1 by EvaCom:
Quartile Report 1A: module 5 and masters. And after this point module 1 in the new format.

Bachelors Year 1 (Mod 5):

Project 'Human-Product Relations':

- Students were quite satisfied.
- Some students disagreed with the field of IDE. But this was already a point of discussion. It is difficult to understand this question.

Energy & Heat Transfer:

Midterm

- Only one respondent, we did an interview with only one student.
- Workload was hard to keep up with.
- The lecture slides could be confusing.
- An advantage was that the students could frequently seek feedback.

Questions and comments:

[Jodi] Does the teacher have this feedback already?

[Wim] What we do is that we ask two or three students not speaking for themselves but trying to give general remarks on the things that the teacher could follow up right away.

The open question is: 'How is it going?'. After this, the report goes immediately to the teacher as well.

[Geke] Do we know in this case if the teacher could work with this?

[Nazli] No, because he said it is only one student who responded.

[Maryna] I think the big part about keeping up with the workload was that there were three group things in one module. The quantity of meetings increased therefore but the assignments itself were not that difficult.

Energy & Heat Transfer:

Endterm

- There were quite some people that didn't agree that the grading practices were clearly defined and that the instructors teaching methods were effective.

Physical Ergonomics:

Midterm

- Students would like some exercises, and they missed the connection between the material and IDE.
- Unclear to them what to expect from the exam.
- Positive was the ability to ask questions and they like the speed of the course.

Endterm

- Not all students actively engaged in this course because the slides were sufficient.
- The results are probably from another course.

Production 3:

Midterm

- The timeline of the deliverables was unclear.
- They would appreciate more clarity on how the lecture time is divided.
- The lecturer is helpful and approachable, and it is nice to make some practical designs.

Endterm

- All questions have some strongly disagree. Already points discussed in the midterm.

Self-reflection:

- Quite some students disagreed with how they understand the course and the project relate to each other.
- Also, some disagree that they recommend this module to other students.
- Overall, quite positive.

Master courses:

Business Models for Sustainable Energy:

- Overall, quite positive, only some disagreement of the student load.
- Great organisation, well structured.
- At least one person suggested to have some rubric so they could check and make sure they fulfilled the requirements.

Create the future:

- A lot of respondents for this course.
- Some disagreement on the learning target.
- Overall, quite positive.

Governing of Product Development:

- Some strongly disagree on some points. But overall, quite good.

- The lectures provided a clear overview.
- The students would like to have some moment to discuss the progress of the report.

Questions and comments:

[Geke] It would be nice to know how many students are in the courses as well as how many respondents.

[AP EvaCom: For the following evaluations - Give an overview of how many students of IDE followed the course as well as how many responded.]

[Geke] Is this already send to the teachers? And did they react?

[Nazli] It will be sent after this meeting.

[Geke] Can you ask why the questions for the evaluation of the different master courses are all so different? Is this because the teacher created the evaluation?

[Nazli] We can check up on this. And if we know the answer we will send it to Kostas so he can send it to all of you.

[AP EvaCom: Check why questions for the master courses are all different.]

[Jodi] As a lecturer, do we have to give feedback on this evaluation? That would be nice.

[Geke] This is already what we are doing, to give our response on email.

6. Module Evaluation: Module 1 – Ideation:

[Geke] First evaluation of the new curriculum that we see in a new format. We received a long document. It is good to see that most of the elements have quite positive evaluations. But there are also some ideas for improvement. Wim could you highlight some things?

[Wim] Hiske and I were highly involved in the process as was EvaCom and Daedalus. First, we had the midterm and after that we quickly updated the teachers on things, and we are still finding the best ways and the best words to feedback the teachers. The main message is if everything is going well. And maybe some other things that teachers could easily take up and work on.

The questionnaire was sent out with a few questions. It does not provide a complete overview or rate the course, but we will use it as input for discussion. We invite teachers to contribute their own questions as well.

There was a very high response on the questionnaire because we did it at the start of module 2. So, we had all students there and we gave them a bit of time during the lecture. Then we had a student panel session with five students. We looked at the midterm and the questionnaire results and we got a bit more in depth there. We made a very quick report of that.

A week later we had a 2-hour session with all the coordinating teachers of module 1, all together. That worked out really well. Marieke prepared an overview of the best results of all those courses, and she did a quick analysis of those tests as well. And we also asked the teachers to bring their own input. We discussed course per course. At the end of this session, we also noted down things where they want to work on and what to improve. The teachers were satisfied about this approach.

As the program management we want to come back at the modules and courses to see how they are taking up these improvements that they came up by themselves.

For statics for example, it was nice to see for the teachers that the students understood how this course contributes to becoming an IDE'er. And then we had a discussion with

mathematics, because for them this is also a problem. This way teachers can learn from each other.

Questions and comments:

[Geke] There are two courses in this module that have a bit of a concern: theoretical context and calculus.

[Martyna] For theoretical context there were no quizzes this year on canvas and students had no clue what types of questions they could expect on the exam. This is a very easy and nice improvement to implement.

[Wim] For the project as well, it was not as clear as it could be. But we also have to take into account that those are new courses. So, there is a learning curve also within those courses.

[Wim] The coordinator of mathematics also joined this meeting. And next week we have a meeting with the program director of mathematics because we have some ideas on how to improve mathematics. What we want is that they are going to teach it just for our group and not the whole big group. Now it does not align to our approach.

[Johan] Is there any urgency to change something generally on the set up of the first module or can we just repeat the whole thing next year with some small improvements?

[Wim] I think it is the second because we also had those general questions about the module, and they were answered quite positive. In general, we are satisfied and the teachers as well.

[Geke] There were some comments that there was a high workload because of the design sprints.

[Hiske] I think the change from high school to university is already a big chance. All the sprints were long, specifically that week. But they had completely free weekends and evenings. They have free time and that is nice.

[Kostas] I am a bit concerned about the theoretical context. Because this course is supposed to give students information about the identity of an IDE student. But it seems that the theoretical context course does not do that exactly. And the name is also a bit uninspiring. Introduction to IDE is maybe better.

[Geke] We need to pay attention to this course next year to see if it gets better.

7. IDE Midterm

[Geke] Are there any new things to say?

[Wim] I am looking for one student to join the panel at one of the other universities. Additionally, I need some students to join us when the panel visits our university on the 13th of March to meet the committee and address any questions they may have for us.

[Geke] Could this be someone from the PC?

[Wim] Not necessarily, but we do need at least one student from the PC for the meeting on the 13th of March. It is a one-time meeting. The panel will be at the university for the entire day, but your participation will only be required for a 45-minute session. You can discuss among yourselves who is interested and come to me with your decision. The student who joins the panel at the other university will need to travel to Delft. This will take more time, as the meetings there are scheduled for Monday, the 17th, and Tuesday, the

18th of March. It will take 1.5 days and includes an overnight stay at a hotel. Travel costs can also be reimbursed.

[Geke] Think about it and let Wim know. And for the meeting on the 13th here at the university, it is fine to confirm during the informal meeting.

[Wim] Additionally, I will find a way to share the report we have set up. I also need some teachers to join the meeting on the 13th of March, including PC staff members.

[Geke] Maybe nice to have some general teachers as well.

8. Status development Year 2 and 3

[Geke] Are there any important updates?

[Wim] Not really updates. We planned a new meeting with the teachers in February. And we have at least three extra sessions before summer. From the last PC meeting you gave the suggestion to also update students about whether we prepared for. We discussed this point with some colleagues and study advisers, and the advice was to share this information a bit later than February, as originally planned, so we can provide the students with a more comprehensive update.

[Geke] For the PC meeting in March, will we receive documents about the details of year 2?

[Wim] Yes, indeed.

9. Any other business / Question round:

-

10. Closure: 13:55

PC – Action points			
<i>Action:</i>	<i>Target date:</i>	<i>Executed by:</i>	<i>Status/remark</i>
AP 1 – 189: Take care of the agenda for next meeting.	Before next PC meeting	Johan and Geke	
AP 2 – 189: Give an overview of how many students of IDE followed the course as well as how many responded.	For the following evaluations	EvaCom	
AP 3 – 189: Check why questions for the master courses are all different.	Before next PC meeting	EvaCom	