

# Agenda PC - IDE

## Meeting 191

Date: 10-03-2025

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Martyna Mariak

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Staff	Geke Ludden (chair)	Present
	Jodi Sturge	Absent
	Francesca Toso	Present
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	30 minutes late
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	Present
	Nazli Farid	Present
	Arthur Lin	Present
	Arwen Hunter	Present

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

One-time guests	Name	Present/Absent

1. Announcements
  - a. We have a midterm coming up this week
    - i. Wim is a part of the midterm evaluation committee in Eindhoven and will also partake in the evaluation in Delft – he will take notes of any interesting things and questions to bring back to the Programme Committee
    - ii. The midterm in Twente is taking place on Thursday (March 13<sup>th</sup>) and several members of the PC will be involved in it
  - b. Module 4 is not yet fully on Osiris – only Linear Algebra is there
    - i. Hiske is waiting for all of the information from the lecturers, she is only missing information for one course now, so it should be done soon
2. Approve minutes meeting 189
  - a. At the end of section 5 it is mentioned that the course “Create a future” is not a part of our program – this is not true, “Create a future” is part of IDE masters – the statement should be removed from the minutes
  - b. Policy for students and compensation for students for their final projects at companies – creating guidelines for financial matters and
    - i. **AP:** Follow up on the generation of guidelines for students to discuss financial matters and IP matters with the organisation
  - c. Minutes are approved with the aforementioned changes
3. Action Points
  - a. AP 2 – EvaCom needs to ask how many students in certain electives are IDE students/other study students
    - i. Hiske will send an email to EvaCom with contact information to the person responsible for the courses
    - ii. A system needs to be set in place for evaluating courses that don’t have many IDE participants, as they are still the responsibility of the program
  - b. AP 3 – questions for all the master courses are the same, however they are different from the Bachelor questionnaire
    - i. Make a standard set of 6-7 questions, maybe allow the teachers to make 2-3 questions on they own, as it makes the responses more comparable/coherent in between the courses
      1. Maybe the questionnaire for masters and bachelors should be more similar
    - ii. Masters actually fill in the answers to open questions like “Any other comments?”
4. Q2 evaluation of the new curriculum

Several concerns are raised about the module being very content-heavy, which leads to a high workload for students. There are also remarks about the group dynamics not always working out well.

It is noted that the timing of the evaluation might influence the results, since all students are still enrolled at that point. This may lead to different feedback than would be expected later in the academic year.

Mechanics of Materials stands out as a specific point of concern, receiving notably low scores. Wim mentions that issues in this part of the module already became clear during the midterm. Action is taken at that time, and for the coming year, the plan is to improve the course — either by offering additional support to the current teacher (such as co-teaching) or by asking a more experienced lecturer to take over.

Not all teacher feedback was available during the first review of the evaluation. One of the teachers was on holiday, and the decision was made to postpone the discussion until all input was gathered.

#### 5. Status development Year 2 and 3

- a. The steering team will create a better template for the module teams to fill in the information for it to be more clear
- b. Not all module teams are as finished/as ready as they should be
  - i. The module teams need a little bit more time
    1. A proposition has been made to discuss the next version of the document in May instead of April, as the version delivered in April will probably not be satisfactory to the PC and will be needed to be discussed anyway
  - ii. For now the teams will try to answer the questions to their best abilities
- c. Module 8 – some information is missing, there were no clear explanations as to why the changes (seemingly drastic) were made
  - i. The module 8 is closer to what was initially intended, and the changes are now easier to explain – still needs to be done properly
  - ii. The team is facing some challenges regarding the organisation, names, staff, etc.
  - iii. The content of the module is within the blueprint, and it should stay within that blueprint
  - iv. There was a decision made in the end to change the choices that students will be able to make in Module 8
    1. The Dynamics and IFEM are still there to allow IDE students to jump to the Mechanical Engineering Pre-Masters
    2. Some contents from Module 11 were shifted to module 8 (IFEM and Dynamics) and vice versa – something was shifted from module 8 to module 11 (that needs to be checked)
- v. There will be a recap made on what changes were made in between the versions, for now the focus was more on the organisation level than the contents
  1. The content changes should be well argued, to prevent any illogical order of courses from happening or other similar mishaps
- vi. There are guidelines on the website that are no longer applicable – they concern courses from the old curriculum that no longer exist
  1. This probably needs to be updated on the website, however for now Elora is ill and cannot take care of that

2. Maybe at least an update along the lines “we are switching in between two curriculums, please contact your study advisor for better information”
  - d. The next discussion on the curriculum update will happen on May 12<sup>th</sup>
    - i. What if there are still comments/places for improvement?
      1. There will still be a month to work on it
    - ii. The new EER will also need to be discussed – the deadline for the new EER to be sent in is on 16<sup>th</sup> of June – meaning it also needs to be an agenda point on May 12<sup>th</sup>
      1. It would be useful to already have the new EER in April
      2. What feedback on the EER is expected from PC?
        - a. The feedback should only be on the specific part (Hiske will highlight the changes made in the document), mostly to highlight things that seem very strange/weird
        - b. In Eindhoven there is a both Dutch and English version of the EER, the Dutch one is leading and provides clarity in case of any inconsistencies
          - i. we only have an English one
  - e. It would be nice to contact the Coordinators of Module 5 and 6 to have complete versions of their modules before the May 12<sup>th</sup> – they are higher priority than Module 7 and 8
6. A.O.B.
- a. Johan was wondering whether PC members need any special preparation for the Midterm Review – the answer is no
  - b. Francesca joined the feedback session, it was quite helpful and nice – there are differences between IDE PC and CE Pc, like for example having informal meetings in preparation for the formal ones – this was found quite helpful
  - c. The feedback points from Francesca, Nazli, and Arthur from the feedback sessions are now in the yearly report

PC – Open action items from previous meetings				
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:		Status/remark
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		
AP 1 – 191: Follow up on the generation of guidelines for students to discuss financial matters and IP				

matters with the organisation				
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--