

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 175

Date: 15-05-2023

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: OH-111

Minutes secretary: Ilse Akkermans

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Alberto Martinetti	
	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	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijckx	
S.G. Daedalus	Nick Holtman	
EvaCom		

1. Welcome

EvaCom is present at this meeting, but the quartile evaluation is not on this agenda as this has already been discussed during the informal meeting. Due to the already full agenda this topic will not be addressed during this meeting. The pointers will be forwarded to the EvaCom as they are not major points.

2. Announcements

2.1. Chairman

2.2. Program Director

Last Thursday, 20 bachelor graduates received their diplomas. There was one case where a student mentioned that the invitations for the event were sent out around three weeks beforehand, which might be considered short notice for parents. However, the date was set well in advance. Overall, the format of the graduation

ceremony was well received, with the first graduate sharing their experience in the bachelor program and the last student presenting their bachelor thesis.

2.3. Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus

2.4. Others

3. Approve agenda

4. Approve minutes meeting 174

It was noted that Ilanit was not present at the meeting. Additionally, the phrase "generally accepted that cum laude is between 5 to 10 percent" should be revised to "it is generally accepted that cum laude represents between 5 to 10 percent." The phrase "The regulation is well known" should be changed to "The regulation is known."

5. Action Points from previous meetings(s)

The action points will remain unchanged for now. Regarding the finding of a new student member, Nick is currently in contact with interested students, including one Dutch and two international first-year students. The action point about the discipline council will also remain the same.

6. Thank and say farewell to Alberto that is leaving the IDE-PC

A new staff committee member, Jody Sturge, has been selected. Winnie and Kostas conducted the interviews, and Jody will be present at the next informal and subsequent formal meetings. Jody is a relatively new staff member with a background in health geography from the DPM department. She has been appointed as an assistant professor and will be involved in developing research, she is enthusiastic about focusing on ethics in the new bachelor curriculum, and she will be co-teaching multisensory design with Geke. Jody is already engaged in bachelor supervision and has prior experience serving on committees in previous roles.

7. Bachelor curriculum revision update

A plenary workshop on the new curriculum was held last week in the Horsttower. The workshop aimed to work on assessment plans, but it was concluded that it was too early to do so, as attendees felt they lacked an overview. The next workshop, scheduled for June 6th, will begin with an overview before revisiting the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and assessment plans.

The involvement of students in the curriculum revision is appreciated, and Marike has a list that shows which Teaching Assistants (TAs) are connected to each module. The list is not yet complete, as some details are yet to be confirmed. Once everything is arranged, for the formal appointment, it will be taken into account that some TAs have already been involved for a few weeks or months.

A larger meeting involving all module teams is planned for July, along with a program-wide information meeting during the lunch break. The aim of the meeting is to inform everyone and gather feedback, rather than engage in extensive discussions. This information session will be held in c101 so that there is room for many people.

[Johan] Would it be wise to have an overview of the topics all modules are currently struggling with, particularly regarding the skills-line?

Johan emphasized the importance of dedicating time to the skills-line and addressing other relevant topics such as grading and mathematics. Modules have strict plannings, with every hour being dedicated to something already. It might be important to leave some room for the skills-line. Some discussion is already happening on these topics at various modules. But having a central discussion to provide direction might be useful.

Regarding the mathematics line, it now consists of different parts in the curriculum. An email has been sent out about this issue. Johan, notices he has not received the email. TAs should be on the mailing list for module development, and students should also have access to the necessary Teams. Jan Willem has received specific requests for access but Anne Marie Bos is responsible for managing UTFlex and adding TAs to the Teams.

Furthermore, with regard to the skills-line, independent islands are starting to develop. This issue is already on the agenda of developing the new curriculum. Johan will send a list of remarks regarding this issue to Jan Willem.

[Niek] There is a lack of clarity on why students should learn certain aspects. He mentioned that the incorporation of ECs (Educational Credits) in courses and projects seems inconsistent, with some being counted as part of the project and others as separate courses. The issue of how grading is embedded was also raised for discussion. It should be discussed how grading should be embedded in all modules; embedded in the project or separate grades per course?

The progress made among module teams varies. More attention should be given to providing detailed explanations which help students understand the purpose of each decision. It should be clearer how the new curriculum wants to make the program “shine”.

8. Discuss the EER (Education and Examination Regulations)

8.1 With distinction judicium

[Niek] pointed out that the low occurrence of cum laude may not only be due to the broadness of the program but also the relatively average grading of creative courses and projects. He mentioned that achieving a 9 to 10 grade in technical courses is possible if the material is understood, while projects require an exceptional level of performance to earn a high grade. It was noted that IDE's grading system might be different from other programs.

[Robert] There is also a risk of IDE being “special” again. We are already being regarded differently by the other studies in the ET faculty.

Jan Willem discussed this matter in the management team on education, and there is interest from the ME (Mechanical Engineering) and CE (Computer Engineering) programs. Mascha also supports the idea, and it was suggested to conduct a pilot at IDE first before considering implementation the “with distinction”-judicium across the entire faculty. The duration of the pilot is yet to be determined but is expected to be at least four years. Winnie mentioned an example related to laptop refunds and emphasized the importance of clear communication to ensure all students are aware of the judicium and its regulations.

For the acknowledgment of this judicium, it matters if other programs apply the same rules. Cum laude holds significance when applying abroad, as it indicates a certain level of achievement. It should be examined how “with distinction” can fulfil a role. Also, it is doubted whether introducing a new distinction solves the problem or if it should be examined which grades are actually preventing students from obtaining cum laude. The new judicium should be part of the overall efforts to make the program “shine”.

8.2 Rules under section b5 student guidance

The original text was discussed in an internal meeting already, and suggestions for edits were processed. A legal policy advisor helped determine the best place to include these guidelines, as they are not rules but rather principles. It was agreed that the guidelines should be added to the EER to clarify expectations for students, but with a softer formulation. The use of terms like “strict priority” should be reconsidered, and instead, it was suggested to use phrases like “students are advised.” The communication of possible consequences when not adhering to the guidelines should be conveyed through other channels rather than solely relying on the EER.

8.3 Statistics removal from the list of mathematics courses

The topic of removing statistics from the list of mathematics courses was discussed internally. The decision to include statistics instead of linear algebra in the first year was made four to five years ago to align with the modules and prepare students for IFEM. It was noted that students generally struggle more with calculus courses 1A and 1B than with statistics. Removing statistics from the mathematics list would require students to pass the calculus courses, which could potentially impact the BSA (Binding Study Advice). It was suggested that this change might lead to more students passing calculus, but there were concerns that it could also result in more dropouts. Another option raised was to establish a minimum grade requirement for calculus, such as a 5. The importance of emphasizing the significance of calculus and urging students to pay attention to it was highlighted. It was clarified that any changes made would only affect cohorts before the implementation of the new curriculum, and the BSA would change regardless. This issue will be discussed again, preferably with more data available about the results of calculus.

8.4 Master EER

The examination board indicated that the rules regarding the start date for graduation projects were found to be unclear. The standard duration for a 45 EC project is nine months. However, there should be procedures in place wrap up the work and asses if the project is exceeding the nine months. It was noted that sometimes students are encouraged to work longer to improve their work or grade. To ensure fairness, the period should be equal for all students. Especially taking into account international students who may have time constraints.

The proposal is that there will be an assessment at 44 weeks into the graduation project. The assessment should involve more than just the supervisor. In cases where the project is expected to fail, an extension may be granted by the examination board. Also, the colloquium might be cancelled. The idea of implementing a more formal green light moment and setting a deadline for graduation projects received support, as it would help establish clear expectations and promote equal standards. However, it was acknowledged that such changes might require a cultural shift. The process of determining if a student is eligible to graduate and the proposal to introduce "Boost your academics" courses were also discussed. Boost your academics opted to attribute 1 EC to give it a bit more status. That would take 28 hours off the graduation project. The question rises if this should affect the duration of the graduation project. Also, it should not be the case that Boost your academics is fixing things which should have been fixed before starting the graduation project.

9. Any other business / Question round
No questions
10. Closure 14:00

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
<i>Action:</i>	Target date:	<i>Executed by:</i>	Status/remark
AP 1 – 168: Find one new, possibly international student member		<i>Student members</i>	In progress, Nick is in contact with the interested students
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September2 023	Geke and Jan Willem	