

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 172

Date: 13-02-2023

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: CR-3A

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	Absent
	Niek Reeze	
	Oyku Ballikaya	Absent

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Jan Willem Polderman	Online
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	Absent
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Nick Holtman	
EvaCom	Jordyn Abrahams	

1. Welcome
2. Announcements
 - Chairman
 -
 - Program Director
 -
 - Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus
 -
 - Others
 -
3. Approve agenda
4. Approve minutes meeting 171

Two points should be changed. With the AP about the discipline council there seems to be a remark which is not in the right place. It concerns the sentence “There will be an update about the program director from Geke”. This will be edited.

Secondly, there was a remark in the minutes about a training which people could state interest for. However, this training is not open to everyone as previously stated, but only open to one person. Kostas will join this training.

4.1 Update: guidelines for the order of passing courses

Hiske is not present, but Geke wanted to ask for an update about the document about the guidelines for the order of retaking courses. This document was discussed in the previous meeting. For clarification, the guidelines should state that in its basis you should give priority to first year courses. The guidelines should be a help, and not a replacement, of the study advisors. It is okay for the guidelines to refer back to the study advisors for additional help and advice.

There is still some confusion about the exact goal and terminology of this document. The document should and will act like a guideline, as it cannot be enforced via the ER. Yet, the potential consequences of not sticking to the guidelines can be stressed more. One consequence could be that no additional effort will be put in if a student decides to ignore the guidelines. A version of the document can already be found on the internal IDE website. There is section 'rules and guidelines' where the ER is posted as well. The feedback of the PC on the latest version of this document will be discussed by Jan Willem and Hiske tomorrow.

5. Action Points from previous meetings(s)

AP 1 – 168: Find one or potentially two new student members

This AP is done, there are new student members in the PC.

AP 2 – 168: Make a proposal about the discipline council

This AP will be done in March. In the university are different councils for certain disciplines. For example, the engineering council. There used to be a dedicated IDE council, but that is now gone. There is gap to be filled for this, so a document needs to be made to specify what a council should be doing for IDE. Alberto remarks that there should be a clear differentiation from what the programme council vs the discipline council should be doing.

AP 3 – 161: Yearly reports PC-IDE (2020-2021 and 2021-2022)

Done. Needs to be assessed if it is clear. There are no requirements for the report so it just needs to be checked if all that was done is in there. There should be a formal agreement during the next meeting and then the report can be forwarded.

AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council

This AP can be merged with AP 2 -168

6. Bachelor curriculum revision

Jan Willem gives an update about the bachelor curriculum. Last week there was a meeting with all the meeting teams in Bad Boekelo. The module teams of modules 1-7 and 11 are definitive. Module 8 is still missing. The module teams spent an entire day on alignment, identity of the graduates, and started with a visualization of the story/route of the IDE student. This route spans the activities of an IDE student from starting the program to graduating.

During the day it was concluded that more time was needed to achieve a higher quality of content organization and module alignment because this turned out to be more complex than anticipated. The ambition is now to introduce the new curriculum one year later. The timeline will be updated in the next 1-2 weeks.

Participants indicated that those dedicated “curriculum-forming” days, or half-days, are received well. So the possibilities to organize more of those days is being looked into. On the topic of student involvement: The three students from the program committee joined the day. Students should be informed on the progress and students can provide input and suggestions.

At the head of creating the new curriculum is still the steering team of Geke Ludden, Eric Lutters and Marike ter Maat. Marike’s role will be expanded as she will act as a project leader from now on. Marike is an educational expert and will take on the role of project manager.

[Niek] If postponing the deadline, will you take a step back? It seemed to me like some module teams are already far ahead and have a concrete plan in mind?

Currently, there are concrete plans but the plans are not aligned. The PC advises to combine a bottom-up and top-down approach. It might be needed to take a step back in the process, not necessarily the progress. Marike is already asking one person per module team to be a representative. To see how everything can be aligned into one story.

[Johan] The idea of the regular meetings is good. Will the locations always be outside university? The change of location does make it feel important, but considering student involvement some alternatives could work better?

The location and frequency of the meetings is something that has to be discussed still. It needs to be considered that bringing in a lot of students also brings in many different opinions. Pizza sessions, like organized last year, might work well again. There is a positive outlook that students, especially masters, will attend those events. Master students have a good overview of the bachelor curriculum. It could also be considered to reach out to alumni for their opinion. Especially because they know how the curriculum connects and translates to industry.

7. Evaluation of 1A

Motivation from the lecturers in the bachelor is scoring low but the learning materials are alright. This is a complex point to tackle. The grades are significant because half of the first years had to fill in the evaluation. Winnie felt as if it is not necessary the IDE staff that is graded demotivated. A cause for non-IDE staff being experienced as demotivated might be that staff outside IDE not always stresses the importance of their courses too much. Lecturers might put course material off as “you will not need this much because you are IDE”. Another cause could be the high failure rate. When studying for a resit there is little involvement of the lecturer. This could influence the perception of the motivation. Besides, there is a high failure rate for the resits too, which is often not in favour of the course perception in general. Lastly, it can be caused by a circle, students being less motivated which decreases the motivation of the lecturers. The feedback section is positive so it is unclear which type of motivational stimulus is then required to improve the motivation. This week there will be evaluations so there can be questions added to find out where the motivational aspect is coming from.

For the masters evaluation, *Create the Future* was graded less than previous years. There were 6 students who graded the course. The teacher has already been spoken to. The teacher indicated that there was last minute communication and some changes to the course had to be made. Also, the course went down from 10 EC to 5EC so this year was different from previous years. These changes could have led to the lower grade.

The question rises how students in the master can be motivated to fill in the evaluations. Filling in a survey before the final submission of an assignment, like in the bachelor thesis, seems to be the best. Another option would be to notify the teachers to remind students to fill in the surveys. For some settings, paper questionnaires might work better. And the last option would be classical discussions at the last collective activity of the course.

Some general remarks about the evaluation concern some typos in the document and colour coding which is off. Also, the PC was not able to make annotations in the document, which they would find useful. Jordyn will make it available for the PC to annotate these minors issues. The proofreading seems to not have been done very thoroughly. Proofreading is also not the task of the PC. The EvaCom will have a look at this and for future rounds enable annotation in the document.

Eleora wonders why a specific master course is chosen to be evaluated, even though this course does not originate from the IDE program. Every masters course is evaluated in a two year timeframe. Jordyn will ask the person responsible how the courses to be evaluated are selected.

On page 4, the evaluation of the bachelor courses states that there was communication in Dutch. This is an English program. Students may correct teachers on this behaviour. There is still a sentiment of speaking Dutch amongst staff. This issue will be raised in a staff meeting. It will be difficult to raise awareness amongst students that it is allowed to ask for English communication because it should not be their responsibility.

8. Any other business / Question round

a) Update new staff member

A new staff member is difficult to find. Some more active stance will be taken on this.

b) Update new programme director

There is no update on the new programme director

9. Closure: 13:51

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 2 – 168: Make a proposal about the discipline council	March 2023	Geke	

AP 3 – 161: Yearly reports PC-IDE (2020-2021 and 2021-2022)		Alberto and Kostas	Finished, requesting formal approval
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September 2023	Geke and Jan Willem	Can be merged with AP 2-168