

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 166

Date: 14-04-2022

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Hybrid (MS Teams/ OH110)

Minutes secretary: Ilse Akkermans

CC: CES, Simone Steinmeijer

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Alberto Martinetti	Absent
	Winnie Dankers	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
Students	Jessica Bos (in place of Rianne Hagen)	
	Beatrijs Hinloopen (vice-chair)	Absent
	Niek Reeze	
	Johan Stekelenburg	Absent

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Jan Willem Polderman	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Jasmijn Poorts and Luna Claasen	Jasmijn absent

1. Welcome
2. Announcements
 - a. Chairman
 - b. Program Director
 - c. Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus
 - d. Others
 - i. Niek: has to leave early & Nizamis is supervising the exam so they will leave the meeting on time
 - ii. Jessica: cannot access all documents on drive yet
3. Agenda
4. Minutes

Approved

5. Action Points

Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
---------	--------------	--------------	---------------

AP 1 – 164: Hiske and Elora are in the Program Board/Management, they might need to think of a way to comment on change/improvements in courses directly to lecturers. This in order to confirm that teachers implement changes.		Hiske and Elora	In Progress, discussed in evaluation meeting. Teachers did not want to put the changes on the canvas of the new course so another option will be thought of. Next meeting we will explore new options
AP 2 –164: Arrange a meeting with Hiske and Jan Willem to evaluate the receiving & giving feedback course.		EvaCom	Done, happened last week
AP 3 – 164: Write a proposal to Tom Vaneker to ask for clarification on the difference between the existing master course and the new master course proposal on additive manufacturing.		Geke	Letter is finished and will be sent to Elora. Elora will discuss with the track coordinators which track it could be part of.
AP 3 – 161: Yearly report PC-IDE		Alberto	Will be finished before the end of April probably
AP 4 – 161: Replacement for Rianne (maybe an international student?)		Student members	Done
AP 4 – 160: Prepare a summary of the conversations held with the original BSC curriculum committee. What is the common ground starting to look like?		Jan Willem	Done
AP 1 – 159: Next academic year, discuss how the ‘giving and receiving feedback’ workshop went and what the effects are, after module 1.		EvaCom	Done, double actionpoint

AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September 2021	Geke and Jan Willem	In progress.
--	----------------	---------------------	--------------

6. Evaluation report 1B

EvaCom could not join the meeting but they will join the next one.

a. 2nd module, year 1: ideation

- Some teacher comments were not included in the report, there were some problems with the data but this will be solved.
- The evaluation reports a problem with the study load when looking at the module as a whole.
[Hiske] In my opinion there are too many different subjects.
[Niek] The project is individual so you cannot divide tasks and you have to do everything yourself.
[Geke] I do see a lot of comments about students needing to learn planning but that is probably not the only problem.
[Hiske] If we look at the reports of report of module 3 is below 42 hours per week. In reality not many students reach 42 hours.
[Niek] 5 courses plus a project is still much.
- Discovery: Unclear expectations and assignments. This course has changed a lot over time, this year was the second time the course is given in this way.
[Kostas] most important point is misalignment of activities and learning goals.
- Production 1: sound quality problem is not fixed yet
- TPM: Final assignment is a bit of a problem.
- Construction: Overall scores are good.
- Calculus: Audio pre-recorded lectures is an issue. 1st year students seem to not appreciate the sample test being different from the final tests. But this does not only hold for calculus but for courses in general. It must be communicated to the students that making the sample tests is not the ultimate preparation for a test.
[Jan-Willem] This is about learning how to study, something could be done about this in the first year.
[Winnie] Should we also teach them about the difference between assessors?
[Jan-Willem] Well, there should not be so much variety between assessors, there should be a certain bandwidth.
[Geke] We do regular checks to make sure we are aligned.
[Winnie] They hear the grades from one another, but they can't see their work. They can't compare their work to others so if they're unhappy about the work they blame the tutor. Maybe it should be communicated to students that they can go to a second examiner, but on the other hand this should not be the default.
[Hiske] This could also be the reason why some teachers are hesitant in putting the evaluation online because students might think 'grading is always a problem'.

[Winnie] In the evaluation of the 2nd year this sample- vs real exam discrepancy does not seem to be a problem.

The evaluation was attended by 5 students and SEQ by 8 students, which are very low numbers. This will change in the future due to the structure introduced in the giving and receiving workshop.

b. Master courses evaluation

- MSD: does not work well in an online setting and last minute changes had to be made due to personal circumstances so that might influence the grade negatively. Next year there will also be a different topic.

In conclusion master courses are scoring positively. According to the report none of the evaluating students took 'safety by design' but still there is an evaluation in the report. This will be checked with the EvaCom. **AP Kostas** check why 'safety by design' is in the evaluation report of the mastercourses, whilst there were no students present at the evaluation who followed the course.

AP Winnie Ask EvaCom who will make the survey to put on Canvas for the evaluations of pre-master courses.

7. Bachelor curriculum revision

Jan-Willem, Geke, Eric and Marieke have held three meetings at this moment. During the meetings they discussed the boundary conditions for revising the curriculum. They have decided there should be a consistent line of projects ranging from module one to module eight. During the last meeting Geke and Eric defined themes and distributed those over modules one to eight. The last step will be asking the opinion/advice from the PC. They will ask advice on the general scheme, not the detailed curriculum. They will present the structure of the curriculum and themes per module next meeting. **OLC meeting moved to 23 of May due to availability.**

8. Any other business

[Luna] From a VisIO meeting it became clear that the EvaCom had the feeling the OLC did not read the report. However, Luna now noticed the OLC does read the report as she just witnessed it during this meeting so all is good.

[Luna] Lastly, Daedalus turned 20 so you are invited to get cake in the Studio after this meeting.

9. Closure

13:36

Year Planner: [link]

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
<i>Action:</i>	Target date:	<i>Executed by:</i>	Status/remark
AP1-166: check why 'safety by design' is in the evaluation report of the mastercourses, whilst there were no students present at the evaluation who followed the course.		Kostas	
AP2 – 166: Ask EvaCom who will make the survey to put on Canvas for the evaluations of pre-master courses.		Winnie	
AP 1 – 164: Hiske and Elora are in the Program Board/Management, they might need to think of a way to comment on change/improvements in courses directly to lecturers. This in order to confirm that teachers implement changes.		Hiske and Elora	In Progress, discussed in evaluation meeting. Teachers did not want to put the changes on the canvas of the new course so another option will be thought of. Next meeting we will explore new options
AP 3 – 164: Write a proposal to Tom Vaneker to ask for clarification on the difference between the existing master course and the new master course proposal on additive manufacturing.		Geke	Letter is finished and will be sent to Elora. Elora will discuss with the track coordinators which track it could be part of.
AP 3 – 161: Yearly report PC-IDE		Alberto	Will be finished before the end of April probably
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September 2021	Geke and Jan Willem	In progress.