

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 177

Date: 18-09-2023

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 108

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	
	Alexandra Tark	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Nick Holtman	
EvaCom	Teodora Cîția	

Proposed agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Announcements
 - 2.1. Chairman
 - 2.2. Program Director

[Johan] I was wondering, you had midterm interviews with 6 to 8 students. What will be done with the gathered information, will it directly be transferred to the teacher?

The midterm interviews were conducted in a new format. Pseudo-randomly selected students were interviewed in the lunch break. In the future, actual random selection should take place. For this interview, Hiske went up to students and asked if they wanted to be part of the midterm. Random selection of students is better to avoid bias and could be part of the EvaCom's responsibilities. The interviews should be worthwhile for the students and for the teachers. Together with students, there should be thought of improvement for the evaluated module. There will be 2 EvaCom members and 2 students, it will be a 30 minute interview.

Sasha raised the punt of the evaluation in last minutes. Sasha thinks it sounds better now. The smaller scale setup can feel more serious, which is positive.

Wim took inspiration from Applied Physics for this evaluation interview setup. The end goal is that the teacher will pick up on information and improve their education. The lecturer will work together with a group of 4-5 students who can generate ideas for improvement. It should be a workshop kind of session. The students present at the evaluation may be the same as the students working on the improvement plan, but it does not necessarily need to be the same students.

Applied Physics courses always starts with: "last year the evaluation showed us this...". Attention is brought to changes in the course with respect to last year. This sends a message to the students that helping with the evaluation helps the community. This setup will hopefully counteract the demotivation of students to participate.

The EvaCom was struggling with getting useful information from the SEQ because this evaluation experiences low participation rates. For the EvaCom, providing lunch can be a means to motivate students to participate. This is something to discuss.

Oscillation can occur with student feedback. One year, students will tell you that they want to see a certain change. When changed, the next generation of students will tell you that they prefer the initial situation. Therefore, there is a difference in the changes that can be made. Some changes can be implemented directly. One example being the slides being unclear. For bigger or more complex changes, teachers should be wary of this oscillation effect. To combat oscillation, changes can be postponed until it is clear that a critique is maintained over a longer period of time. In Applied Physics, all comments from students are dealt with. However, the comments that did not make the cut are accompanied by an explanation why they are not dealt with.

Winnie presents a case of a course where students sustain a critique that no proper project planning is given. This however is a deliberate choice, to acquaint students with making a project planning. If such critiques are sustained, even when it is accompanied by such an explanation, it is good to refer to the learning objectives and outcomes of the course.

The program committee would like to see an update of this type of evaluation after one or two months.

Student numbers

This year, around 170 (*update: 123 first years, 170 including pre-masters) students started in the first year of Industrial Design Engineering. Many pre-masters started this year; around 50. The pre-masters are following some first year courses and some second year courses. Most have unique programs because the pre-masters are from different backgrounds.

The new influx is only 38% international, which is lower than the previous years. It was expected that Dutch students would postpone their studies until this year, when the financial support was reinstalled. So even though it was expected that student numbers would decrease, this situation seems to have combatted that expected decrease.

In the masters there was only a small number of students. Hiske remembers it being 23 or 25. But there are many master students still in the program and finishing up their master.

2.3. Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus

-

2.4. Others

[Johan] Something was removed from the agenda this morning?

The agenda point was added on Friday but due to a miscommunication it was brought to the agenda too soon, so it was removed after the weekend. The agenda point will come back on the agenda after being discussed internally.

3. Approve agenda

The agenda is approved.

4. Approve minutes meeting 176

Wim wonders if the minutes of the previous meeting in June were already approved. But since this was the most recent meeting, the minutes will be approved or disapproved this meeting. The minutes stated information about the Boost Your Academics (now Boost Your Competences) integration in the master program.

The initial idea was to award one EC for attending a Boost Your Competences workshop. There is some unclarity and discussion if this should be done and if so, if it were one or two workshops that had to be attended.

If this system were to be implemented. An assessor and or an examiner should be assigned for that particular part. The idea is that it's not a separate EC course.

The minutes say "The idea now is that in every track, all master students are attending one meeting where a Boost Your Academics workshop is given". The use of the word 'meeting' is not really suited in this context. Boost Your Competences are masterclasses which consists of two or three meetings.

The point is raised that pre-master students are given a course in academic skills, right before they continue to the master. There is no risk of Boost Your Competences becoming a repetition of these academic skills courses because the Boost Your Competences offers a wide variety of competences. The pre-master students can opt for a competence that was not discussed in the preceding academic skill course.

Every quarter, there will be a master kick-off day for the new master students. The first master kick-off will take place on the 13th of November. In that session, all students will be asked to assess their academic competences. From this assessment they can decide what they want and need to improve still. Which can then be linked to the Boost Your Competences master classes. From this starting point, students can select one or two master classes. Students are free to do more.

The masterclasses will likely take 2 or 3 times a session of 2-3 hours. So the maximum time spent on a masterclass would be 9 hours. Students can bring their own work to the masterclasses. So the masterclasses are rather something to help you, then to add a workload.

The PC discusses if the masterclasses should be obligatory and if so, how many should be obligatory. Most are in favor of one obligatory masterclass, to get students acquainted with the concept. Based on their competences mapping, students can opt to take on more masterclasses.

The point is raised of master students living elsewhere, because of their graduation project location. For the current students who have moved away already, this could indeed be a problem. This is something to keep in mind if this regulation was made definitive. Ideally, students would take on the masterclasses prior to their thesis. However, some masterclasses make more sense to participate in during the writing process of your thesis.

IDE implementing this regulation would be a bit of an experiment. Other programs are curious about this matter too.

Conclusion, the PC recommends to make master students follow at least one Boost Your Competences masterclass. Besides, students should attend the master kick-off where they will map their academic competences.

There are no other comments about the minutes. As an update on last meeting's minutes it is mentioned that some of the important changes of the EER have also been discussed in the staff meeting. So colleagues and staff are informed about the changes. There has to be some communication still to the students.

5. Discuss and agree on the final Year Plan

The final Year Plan was discussed in the informal meeting and shared with the EvaCom, such that the EvaCom knows which deadlines to meet in the yearly plan.

There are some important decisions to make still about the new curriculum. The moments of these decisions should be aligned with this year plan. This should be included in the yearly plan.

There is also a timeline for that. Kostas needs to plan and schedule the room. Especially since people agendas are getting full, so if people agree with the dates the rooms will be booked by Kostas.

6. Action Points from previous meetings(s)

There is one action point that should be changed to “executed by Geke and Wim”.

7. EvaCom

The EvaCom holds a pitch about the quartile 4 evaluation results. Before the pitch, Zen raises two points. First, the EvaCom was not sure what skills they would get from the module in general. So an overview of learning objectives could be of use to the EvaCom. Second, points were raised concerning Design Sketching being not very well integrated into the module. Design Sketching mentioned that was on purpose. Highlighting such things is of purpose to the EvaCom.

Bachelor evaluation

Next year all ratings will be on a 1-5 scale. Right now the EvaCom had to compare different scales which made it difficult.

Studyload and ECs scored very well, motivation a bit lower and course material and final assessment is scored the lowest. The Bachelor course feedback states that there is a quality difference in tutor feedback. Also, students say the syllabus could be more versatile and detailed.

Design Sketching was evaluated as having a high study load and being a very packed course. It did not help that the test dates of this module overlapped with deadlines. There were also comments concerning the final grades. Students got their portfolio back, but there were no comments attached to it. This made it difficult for students to know what they had to improve on.

Electronics was evaluated to be overloaded with information. Students felt like topics were simply told rather than explained thoroughly. So they felt like they missed information during the lectures. Last year there was no lecturer because he quitted from the department. Last year used online resources. This year a PhD student took on all the workload. The PhD student was told to use the material that was there. The PhD student was very overloaded and he said he didn't want to do it again next year. Also, the TAs were ill-instructed and did not know which information they could, or could not, share about the assignments. There have been consistent complaints about electronics in the recent years. A complete overhaul of the course is not possible because next year will be the last year that this course is given. The PC recommends to find a new teacher for this course.

Concerning the tools, the students would prefer less tools, but more in depth. Right now, students feel as if the tools are not as useful as they could be. The relation of the tools to learning goals is a bit unclear.

Another recommendation of the EvaCom is to separate Dynamics and IFEM in the new curriculum.

Dynamics is found to have a demanding schedule. For students, it is still up in the air where the differences in learning information between different studies are. It was also mentioned that more TAs are needed for the weekly assignments. It was hard to find a TA for help now.

In IFEM the sample exam was not representative of the final exam. This has already been discussed with the lecturer. Plus, the pace of the course was too fast now to keep up with, especially in combination with dynamics.

Master courses evaluation.

Green Belt, lean six sigma

This course was found to be too easy and could be more in depth. Answers to questions could be found in the book. This course is given by a company. The EvaCom is not sure why this course is given by a company. Johan followed the course. The idea is that you can obtain an official green belt certificate when following this course. Therefore, the course has to be given by a company.

[Geke] It's not our usual policy, right? So this apparently is something that someone has decided we should offer to our students. And then because we don't have the qualification to do that, we are hiring someone to do it.

[Hiske] Yeah, I think it. Has already been a long time ago, but I think it was seen as a very nice opportunity because you can get a belt, right?

[Geke] Correct. That is indeed a nice idea. The question now is, should we offer that as a program?

This course flags up three years in a row now, therefore, the discussion rises if a company given course should be offered in the program, so students can get a green belt. This course is in the MOPD track.

[Hiske] It could be a nice part of the academic competences.

[Johan] This belt is more of a theory certificate, you officially also need to do some something in practice and make so much money and then you earn the complete belt.

It might be nice to offer such a course. But perhaps in a different format. Maybe broadening or opening up this bit in the whole system of the belt. It could be that the UT teaches you the skills and then you go to apply and test for the certification. The PC would like to know more about the history of the course, the way it is taught now and the costs associated with the course.

The PC approves of the pitch format of the EvaCom.

7. Bachelor curriculum revision update

This is the final year of the curriculum revision. There will be no more postponements. A year plan was made. Almost every month at least some something like eight or nine sessions are planned to work on the curriculum, which are half days, also some full days. For some days, students are involved as well. In the beginning of June the "fleetwatch" (Dutch = vlootshow) will give the full picture of the modules: what is in there? What are the name changes? In June

the “baby shower” is a happy moment welcoming the birth of the new curriculum. The steering team is finishing this up now, asking around what everybody their main idea is of the improvement of the curriculum and what they think the main objectives are. Wim wants to work on creating more clarity about the learning objectives in courses because many lecturers say they should make more clear how their courses are related to the other courses in the module. This is also important for students to be better able to understand, how does this part fit into what I'm going to become as a professional? This will be discussed on the 5th of October.

During the evaluation, IFEM and dynamics were discussed. There is some unclarity if those courses will still be in there. This is exemplary of how every module raised questions and also starting points. Those have been summarized for the steering team to respond to. This week the steering team will discuss the gathered information, to see if everything is covered and to discuss everything with the program teams.

In the new curriculum, there will be a larger emphasis on reflection. where am I going to? What does it mean? Therefore, in the second year, there will be more options and choices for students to make. This stimulates reflection. Time will be incorporated for this. But there is still unclarity how the module will then be aligned.

A portfolio will be introduced, which will need special attention. The steering team will think about the rationale behind each year. Students should be able to reflect. Where am I more or less? What did the I actually learned this year? How will this take me to the second year? There is an idea to create a bit more space in between the modules that can be used for reflections. Module teams should be informed about this potential time for reflection. Because the design teams might pack their modules fully now, leaving no time for reflection. Geke stresses that the module teams should keep in mind that the design is not finished, so they cannot say “no, it’s already full and cannot be changed”.

Per module teams it differs how students are involved in. It needs to be assessed how this is going. Things seem to be going well with the involvement of students in the module teams. It is on the agenda to inform the outside world and students again about the developments of this new curriculum.

8. Q4 Evaluation Report
9. Any other business / Question round
10. Closure

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
<i>Action:</i>	<i>Target date:</i>	<i>Executed by:</i>	<i>Status/remark</i>
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September 2023	Geke and Wim	