

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 187

Date: 21-10-2024

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Staff	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	
	Winnie Dankers	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	Absent
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	
	Robert Breugelmans	Absent
	New member	Present → Arthur and Nazli
	Martyna Mariak	

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

One-time guests	Name	Present/Absent

1. Welcome
-
2. Announcements:
 - 2.1. Chairman: -
 - 2.2. Program Director: See point 8 on the agenda about the language assignment. Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus: Second and third year are struggling with the new curriculum, but no real points to work on. It is difficult and not everything is clear.
 - 2.3 Others: -
3. Introduction new PC members:
We start with this point. We have two new student members of the PC, Arthur and Nazli. Arthur is a second year IDE student, and he wants to know how the PC functions; therefore, he joined the committee. Nazli did the bachelor here and is now doing the masters in HDR. She has been quite active in university already.
[Jodi] Update on the new staff member. Winnie and I did conversations with four people that were interested. We talked about it who is the best fit based on programming presentation and Francesca Toso will begin with us in December.
4. Approve Yearly Meeting Plan:
Already approved in the previous meeting.
5. Approve minutes meeting 186:
One name is missing but can be filled in now. If that is changed, then approved.
6. Action Points from previous meetings:

AP 1 – 185: Find new PC Members (only at staff level).
Done.

AP 2 – 185: Include the topic of company payments for students' master's thesis in the next agenda.
Not done, but in the next agenda. We can prepare a little bit then.

AP 3 – 185: Presentation of the Evaluation Plan for the new curriculum.
Done.

AP 1 – 186: Take care of the agenda for next meeting.
Done.

AP 2 – 186: Send details of both new members to Kostas.
Done.

AP 3 – 186: Take a final view on the language "assignment".
Done.
7. Evaluation plan for the new curriculum
Wim prepared a presentation. He has been quite busy the last few weeks with talking to different people (Daedalus, EvaCom). He summarizes now where we are:

At the same time as the evaluation, we had the no TA problem and there was the instruction from the Central Board for more alignment. In IDE we already started that between bachelor and masters. But because of the financial situation it accelerates a bit more.

For the evaluation:

- Midterm: we looked at this before. Halfway the courses to evaluate how things are going. Evacom organize this for us and send feedback so that changes still can be made. But something new is that the study association has a bigger role in the

evaluation, we talked about this with Daedalus. This is because we are trying to align the different programs better. Conclusion: Evacom is still doing it, but towards the end of the year Daedalus will taking over.

- Questionnaire: we looked at this before. What is the framework for questioning? We have done some experiments last year and we discussed this in previous meetings. We have a new proposal for the questions (also send to Evacom). We present the questions at the first day of the new module. Much higher response last year with this approach. There are 8 questions now. For the course and project, it is almost the same. These questions try to cover the experience of students. We are using a quantitative method to start the qualitative. No average, because we want to get rid of that. If you have suggestions, then let me know. We are sending this as a proposed set to the teachers. So, teachers can also ask specific questions.

There is no workshop for students anymore, because we have a new curriculum, and Evacom also have less time now, because they are getting back from 12 hours per week to 4 hours per week. So that is different now.

Questions and comments:

[Johan] What do you mean by question 7?

[Wim] There are groups of questions, and this is about how much students will relate to the course. First, we had a question which was about: Was the course relevant to the field of IDE? We got a lot of feedback on that one.

[Alexandra] I preferred the one with relevant, because is more: Did you feel like you did something productive for your bachelors?

[Geke] Discussion about it in previous meetings that not everyone knows what the field of IDE is. And then this new question is more relevant than the old question.

[Winnie] Broadened in this question may be better.

[Wim] The answer to the question will give you as a teacher insight and do I explain clearly enough how my course is relevant for the field. There is a big database with example questions from the domains. I was considering giving teachers some options to choose from. Harder to organize, but a good idea.

[Winnie] Solution for question 7: How did the course increase your confidence as an IDE'er?

[Jodi] I had a question about number 1. It is about their own perception. Wondering if the question: "There were opportunities to actively participate in the course.", is maybe better. Because everything else is about the course, but the first one is about the students. I as a teacher would like to know if students felt that they could actively participate in the course (also thinking about participating within a group). So maybe "could you" instead of "I actively".

[Geke] You could also say: "It was easy for me to actively participate."

[Jodi] As an individual, but then also as a group. Because sometimes it is a bit different because once they are put in a group, they participate a little bit differently.

[Wim] It is hard to have general questions for everybody. It is more work. But what I want is that teachers are interested in the answers.

[Geke] Is this question also a check if they participate in the course or not?

[Arthur] That is how I would interpret. That if I fill in no, that I won't have to fill in the other questions.

[Wim] If the answer was, I didn't participate, and they answered all the questions. How to deal with that?

[Jodi] Maybe engaged for this question: Actively engaged in the course. It is less like they are checking out on you.

[Geke] And another solution is as a prerequisite, that if you did not participate in the course, that you say please don't answer the questions.

[Nazli] We already have that by Evacom.

- Panel: something new but already in some other programs as well. We won't ask Evacom anymore, but the program management will do it. Not the teacher, that was an advice of Sonja. Because otherwise it could be harder for the students to express themselves. With the input we have made questions about the answers, and we will dive in it a bit deeper.

And then there is this line. The student participation ends here, and we will bring it to the team. We call that workshop now.

- Workshop: the workshop is with teachers. And all the information before is input for the workshop. The three points before are in the workshop but also the own experiences of teachers and the marks and tests. It all feeds into that because the big objective here is: how did we do? What did we learn? And what do we want to get out of that. This will not be hosted by Evacom but by the program management. We will feed it back to the PC.

Questions and comments:

[Geke] So the program committee will get the feedback of both the panel and workshop, right?

[Wim] Yes, and the questionnaire just feeds into the panel.

[Geke] In total one report for the PC?

[Wim] We have to see how we will give the feedback to you.

[Geke] The PC I think should still have at one point discuss the complete evaluation of the module.

[Winnie] I think this would be nice after the workshop. Because the workshop reflects on the panel and all the other stuff.

[Geke] Yes after the workshop we can still give feedback as the PC on the whole process of the evaluation.

[Wim] And also, we can put on the agenda a point where we discuss as the PC what points we want to have discussed in the workshop for example.

[Wim] Our experience from last year was that it was hard to find students for the evaluation. Now we are not allowed to have lunches anymore. So much harder. Hiske came with this idea of assigning a specific group which is involved in every module evaluation. A fixed panel.

[Nazli] Maybe we can also use the groups of the development coaches. Every module, one group of those get assigned to that module.

[Martyna] I think the issue is that it will work for the first year, but it will stop working for the second year once people stop repeating courses and it gets a little bit more mixed up on who is doing anything. It is going to be harder to find a group who is constantly doing the module.

[Geke] But you can always adapt when someone falls out of the team. Find a replacement.

[Alexandra] I do think it is indeed nicer to have a fluctuation group. Because at some point it might also start dragging in quite a lot of bias, which is also not great. I think it is nice to keep swapping up perspectives.

[Geke] I liked the idea of the development coaches. That is also a way to not bring bias by selecting people. But just say we take this group together with the development coaches and we assign them to different modules. This also decreases the burden on students.

[Alexandra] If you target a specific group they will come, because it is the management who said it then.

[Wim] Yes, we can try that.

8. Language 'assignment' developments (psych bilingual):

We already talked about this. This was the update we talked about by announcements:

Wim submitted the language file. Afterwards he had another meeting with people from the central level.

[Wim] The conclusion is that we are still waiting on what is coming. Meanwhile there has been some updates in the news about the minister. who even want to tighten things up and wants to become stricter. But still very unclear what it means for us as a technical university, because that is one of the exceptions that they keep on mentioning. As well as us being in the region outside of the Randstad, border region. Maybe we combine the assessment with the other IDE programs from other universities. We didn't conclude on that. Eindhoven is English as well, but Delft is not. Delft probably don't even have to request this, because they are Dutch, but teach in English. It is an option that they want to do it as well and we must be strategic about whether we should join, because there are two options to apply. Either on your own or within a discipline. The central level said that we have to do it with the others, but in the debate, it turned a bit.

[Geke] Psychology at the UT wants to do a bilingual program.

[Wim] I am not sure if they are allowed to. If you do not pass the test, you are only allowed to do Dutch.

[Winnie] So we need to know what the assessment will look like so we can all kind of arguments why to stay in English.

[Wim] The law is still not clear, and the process is also still unclear. We have to wait for that. Otherwise, you put a lot of effort what probably is not necessary. They said within nine months after publishing the law you should have your assessment done. And if you are doing it within your discipline there is 6 months. Let's first wait where they come up with.

[Geke] It is wise that we let this point come back on the agenda. It is still very unclear, but we have to keep monitoring.

9. Status development Year 2 and 3:

[Geke] Back on the agenda of the Program Committee evaluation process to see how it is going.

[Wim] We continued with the sessions for the whole curriculum team, the module teams, we had one at the end of September. The next one is planned in the end of Novembre. Meanwhile the module teams of the second year are very busy. We discussed things which were not so clear that came from your initial feedback. We worked already on that, and we are still working on the feedback. The options where students can choose from in the second year becomes clearer now. Towards the end of the year, we have a more actual version of the document with what we have been working with in April. That maybe would give more insight. We will be preparing that document for January or February.

[Geke] Year 2 will be mostly developed by that time. And year 3 is than still more of an outline.

10. Any other business / Question round:

[Johan] I was looking at our program by googling it. There is still the old curriculum on the Utwente website. I googled: IDE curriculum Utwente and I found the old one.

[Geke] Confusing because the new curriculum is also there and a button for the old curriculum below. Don't use the terms old and new but instead use years. This year and for the previous year's see below.

[Alexandra] One feedback point what I heard from people and their high school friends who were looking at applying to IDE this year, the curriculum being half empty is wat turned away a lot of people. Year 2 and 3 are empty. Maybe place some dummies then.

11. Closure: 13:43

PC – Action points			
<i>Action:</i>	<i>Target date:</i>	<i>Executed by:</i>	<i>Status/remark</i>
AP 2 – 185: Include the topic of company payments for students' master's thesis in the next agenda.	Before next PC meeting	Geke and Johan	