

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 186

Date: 23-09-2024

Time: 12:30 – 13:45

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	
	New Member	Now still Winnie
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	
	Robert Breugelmans	
	New member	Present --> Nazli
	Martyna Mariak	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijckx	
S.G. Daedalus	Alexandra Tark	
EvaCom	Zen Duckers	Theodora instead of Zen

1. Welcome
-
2. Announcements:
 - 2.1. Chairman: -
 - 2.2. Program Director: -
 - 2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus: I am (Alexandra) University Council now, and we have a few points about the TA issue and stuff like that now. And my homework was to take this to the PC and talk about it.
 [Geke] A point we have discussed in our informal meeting two weeks ago. And obviously more people see this as a concern that the hiring of TA's will be less, and it is also something that we still need to work out at program and department level. There is some analysis being made now of how TAs are used in different courses. For us it does not mean that we completely stop with working with TAs, but the financial situation does mean that we have to reduce the number. We are looking at this course per course. Is this enough information for now?
 [Alexandra] Yes, it is fine, but it is more that there is also a big concern about the quality of education that is going to remain. It would be nice if all three of the studies within the faculty can assess the quality equally.
 [Geke] Not a responsibility of the PC. But Wim has a meeting this afternoon with this as the main subject. The most important thing when taking decisions on whether hiring TA's is the quality. But we also have to look for other solutions.
 - 2.4 Others:

[Kostas] Can someone take care of the agenda for next meeting?
[AP Johan and Geke: take care of the agenda for next meeting.]
 [Johan] Starts with his Master Thesis, this is in Utrecht, therefore he might join the meeting online sometimes.
3. Approve Yearly Meeting Plan:
 Already discussed a bit in the informal meeting. No other comments, so Kostas can book the rooms for the rest of the year.
4. Approve minutes meeting 185:
 No comments. Approved.
5. Action Points from previous meetings:

AP 1 – 185: Find new PC Members.
 Staff level: Winnie is leaving the PC. Three people so far have interests in joining the committee.
 Student level: Two new members: Arthur (bachelor) and Nazli (master).
[AP PC committee: Send details of both new members to Kostas.]
AP 2 – 185: Include the topic of company payments for students' master's thesis in the next agenda.
 For this meeting there is no time. It will be placed in the agenda for the next meeting.
AP 3 – 185: Presentation of the Evaluation Plan for the new curriculum.
 Left over from last year. Maybe in the next meeting.
6. Pitch on Q3 and Q4 by EvaCom:
 Quartile Report 2A and 2B:
 All bachelor courses have end-term questionnaires. The courses with a star have had also mid-term interviews and end-term feedback workshops. The statements of the end-term

questionnaire are always the same for all courses unless requested by the lectures to be different. Overall, the statement that most students disagreed with is that the criteria for which they would be assessed was not clearly explained beforehand. This is the trend for most of the evaluated courses.

Bachelors Year 1 (Mod 3):

Project 'Realization of Products':

- Some students find the grading criteria a bit vague and difficult to understand.
- The speed of the project was quite challenging. But students have enough time to plan their activities regarding to the project, because they have a free day. So, the conclusion is that some points are contradicting to each other.
- Results for the end-term questionnaire are rather good.

Mechanics of Materials:

- Some of the difficulties are that the timeline, number of lectures and topics covered by each lecture were not clearly explained beforehand, so then there was a bit of a confusion what happens when and how the students could manage their own time.
- TAs were very helpful.
- The bonus assignments were effective to test their knowledge, but also to keep them on track with the curriculum.
- The results of the questionnaire are again mainly good.
- Changes: All TAs should have a baseline for how they graduate. Students noted some differences.

Statistics:

- Again, rather good. Some of the answers are quite split. Most of the students agree, but one/two students strongly disagree.

Production 2:

- Bit similar, a bit more to strongly agree with the statement and a relatively low number of students that disagree.

Design Sketching 2:

- Quite good results, most students strongly agree with the statements.

Self-reflection:

- Most students agree with the statement, but for the first and fourth statement some students disagreed.

Bachelors Year 2 (Mod 7):

Project 'Design for Specific Users':

- Points were more for the module as a whole, not necessarily for the content of the project.
- Main points are that some information was covered both by cognitive ergonomics and design and styling, it is just repetition and time filled up by information that has already been covered. And that linear algebra could use a more visual approach.
- Project organization was good. The deliverables were well explained.
- Changes: the pace of the project would be adjusted to better serve the workload for the students.

Cognitive Ergonomics:

- Most of the answers are good, but students tend to just agree, not strongly agree with the statements and two statements got a strongly disagree.

Design and Styling:

- Pool is quite split. This questionnaire has different questions, since this was a request by the lecturer. Good that they have their own questions.

Linear Algebra:

- Rather good results. A small amount of disagreement.

Self-reflection:

- Disagreeing answers are towards the fact that this module helped me expand my area of knowledge.

Master courses:

Product Life Cycle Management:

- Overall score is a 5.6. Based on respondents of 12 students.
- Some course specific questions.
- Here is a difference, we have a neutral answer. In the next evaluations we excluded the neutral option.

Design Histories:

- Overall score is an 8. All the answers are positive, just a few of them are neutral.
- Bigger number of respondents.

Questions and comments:

[Kostas] Is the first evaluated master course an improvement or a decline?

[Theodora] We don't know. Not every course is evaluated every year. If this course has a low score, it probably will be evaluated next year again. And also, a new teacher is a reason to evaluate the course.

[Kostas] Is it feasible to have a little green or red arrow that indicates that there is an improvement or a decline?

[Theodora] Yes, this is possible.

Bachelors Year 1 (Mod 4):

Project 'Smart Products':

- Quite good results. Only the statement with assessment has a strongly disagreed opinion again.

The number of respondents is very low. Probably holiday is the main problem of the low respondents. We skip the rest of the module in this evaluation for this reason.

Bachelors Year 2 (Mod 8):

Project 'Virtual Product Development':

- Teachers are helpful and approachable.
- A lot of tips for the teachers, see the slides.
- End-term questionnaire have quite good results.

Introduction to Finite Element Method:

- The lectures are a bit too fast. The pace was a bit too quick for the students to interact during the lectures.
- Great use of the slides. But during lectures it goes to fast.
- The tip is to split the information and have a bit more time for questions.
- The only statement with a quite negative respond was that the visual notes before each class were a valuable part of the course. But not a very big red flag because they have already a lot of information on the slides.

Dynamics:

- The communication with the staff was good.
- The questionnaire shows some different responses, than previously for the other courses. It seems like the feedback received during the course was not just adequate in supporting their learning. As well as for the sufficient opportunities to get feedback from the teaching staff.

Self-reflection:

- A lot of (strongly) agreement. Only a few students disagreed with the statements.

Master courses:

Engineering Project Management:

- Overall grade of 7.2 with 17 responses.
- The question that got most strongly disagreeing answers is that the staff was ineligible enough to answer the questions well.

Smart Mobility:

- An overall grade of 6.9, and the total number of respondents is 10.
- Most of the answers are towards agreeing and strongly agreeing.

Nature Inspired Design:

- The grade is a 7.6 based on the responses of 8 students.
- Some disagreed answers to the rubrics. This is an interesting point.

Questions and comments:

[Theodora] We will look at the trends if they go higher or lower.

[Theodora] For the upcoming evaluations there is no free lunch anymore. So, I don't know how many students are interested.

7. Language "assignment":

[Geke] Wim has made a start with filling in answers to the question within the assignment. We discussed it briefly in our informal meeting and Johan and Robert also gave some tips directly on the document. There are now two versions of the document. Will both of you briefly highlight some of the additions and comments that you made:

[Johan] Overall, a very good explanation. The main comment I had was that the format was really pushing towards certain answers already. to one solution. It really limits to find some sort of in between solutions which I think is beneficial for everybody. This was missing in the document.

[Wim] This is an inventory at UT level. The law is still not there. What we have learned is that a two-track option is a no-go. We are allowed to continue in English or not. That is straightforward. We have to make good arguments to stay in English.

[Johan] Maybe we can give Dutch students what extra documents with Dutch terminology for example.

[Wim] That is an option, then we don't talk about the Dutch track.

[Geke] It is not necessary for Dutch students, but beneficial. But it sets them apart, that is the downside. Privilege them maybe.

[Wim] I think and if you want to agree with that, that we should try to keep it as it is.

[Geke] I am happy with all the addition in the document, because they make the case even stronger.

[Wim] Can maybe somebody in the end run through the document, because at the end of the week I need to submit it. The format of the document stays the same. I work with other programmes to have a similar approach in answering questions.

[AP Johan and Geke: Take a final view on the language "assignment".]

[Robert] Sometimes the arguments seem a bit conflicting. Maybe we can turn it around so that it is stronger.

[Wim] I will combine the two documents. Next Monday is the last day to submit. And furthermore, I don't know what to expect. I have no idea of the timeline.

[Johan] What was the response of other programmes at UT?

[Wim] Dutch studies don't have to do this. But for the other studies the response is very much alike what we will submit.

8. Any other business / Question round

- [Kostas] Please respond on the annual schedule as soon as possible, so I can arrange things. If you have disagreements.
- [Robert] This was my last meeting. A thankyou from everyone.

9. Closure: 13:30

PC – Action points			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 1 – 185: Find new PC Members (only at staff level)	Before next PC meeting	All PC members	In Progress
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	
AP 3 – 185: Presentation of the Evaluation Plan for the new curriculum.		Wim	
AP 1 – 186: Take care of the agenda for next meeting.	Before next PC meeting	Geke and Johan	
AP 2 – 186: Send details of both new members to Kostas.	Before next PC meeting	All PC members	
AP 3 – 186: Take a final view on the language "assignment"	Before Monday 30-09		