

Semester Documentation

Semester 4 – Class of 2020

EduCo of 2020 Daphne Nelissen

d.m.nelissen@student.utwente.nl

Sofie Verhees

s.b.verhees@student.utwente.nl

Guido van der Heijden

g.a.m.vanderheijden@student.utwente.nl

Elena Dalova

e.dalova@student.utwente.nl

Margot Schipper

m.schipper-2@student.utwente.nl

Table of Contents

Leadership of Multidisciplinary Groups	6
Summary of the Course	6
Perception of the Course	6
Suggestions	7
Agreements	8
Machine Learning	9
Summary of the Course	9
Perception of the Course	9
Suggestions	10
Agreements	11
Intercultural communication	12
Summary of the Course	12
Perception of the Course	12
Suggestions	13
Agreements	13
Trust, Crisis and Risk perception	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Summary of the Course	14
Perception of the Course	14
Suggestions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Agreements	Error! Bookmark not defined.
GIS	17
Summary of the Course	17
Perception of the Course	17
Suggestions	18
Agreements	18
Sensors & Sensibility	19
Summary of the Course	19
Perception of the Course	19
Suggestions	20
Agreements	20
Semester Project	21
Summary of the Course	21
Perception of the Course	21
Suggestions	22
Agreements	23
Semester Overall Evaluation	24
Perception of the Semester	24
Discussion	25

Suggestions
Agreements

25
25

Introduction

This EduCo Semester Documentation Semester 4 consists of the evaluation of the ATLAS electives offered to second and first years, the semester project (“Wicked Problems”) and the semester organization as a whole for the Class of 2020. The data used to evaluate these categories was collected through the End of Semester EduCo Semester 4 Survey, which is based on the “[EduCo criteria](#)”, while normally also a Mid-term Survey is used. The reason for not having the latter survey is that nothing of the semester was at the point that a topic could be surveyed. The survey consisted of a set of statements for each topic. The students were asked to rate them on a scale from 1 to 5; with 1 being the most negative attribution (never, very poor) and 5 the most positive attribution (always, very good). There were a total of 13 respondents for the end of semester questionnaire (out of a possible 35 respondents; some section can be not applicable to some respondents), and the mean averages and standard deviations of these results were used in this evaluation. After the set of statements with the 1 to 5 scale, students had the opportunity to give open feedback, which is evaluated in the *Discussion* section of each evaluation. Aside from these questionnaires, qualitative feedback received throughout the year was implemented into *Discussion* sections, where appropriate.

All the evaluations have a similar structure; they start with a short *Summary* of what occurred in the course/project/semester, followed by the *Semester Survey Results* for the set of statements, and a *Discussion* based on these results, the open feedback, and other feedback from students throughout the semester. In this discussion, strengths and weaknesses are highlighted. Then potential solutions to problems from the EduCo are placed in the *Suggestions* section. The last section on *Agreements* describes the agreements that were made with the project coordinator (Barend Köbben) and/or semester coordinator (Fokko Jan Dijksterhuis), during a meeting where the results and suggestions are discussed.

Leadership of Multidisciplinary Groups

Created by: Sofie Verhees, 4th of July, 2019, Enschede

E-Mail: s.b.verhees@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2018/2019, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Fokko Jan Dijksterhuis

Summary of the Course

Team leaders of the semester 4 project applied and were selected in advance of the project start. To help them in their role as leader, they follow the 'Leadership of Multidisciplinary Groups' elective. This 3 EC elective accounts for the additional tasks as leader (estimated to be about 1 EC) that is combined with 1 EC literature study and 1 EC writing of a paper/report. This was under supervision of Fokko Jan, who got the team leaders together regularly, to exchange experiences, share ideas and questions, and help them with coaching and discussion of ideas from theory and literature. In the end, the leaders wrote a paper/report, based on their experiences and the literature as well as executed a workshop on conflict management to the first year students.

Perception of the Course

n=3, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. This course sufficiently conveyed both theoretical and applied knowledge	3.3	0.6
2. This course featured both group and individual work	4.3	0.6
3. During this course, students were provided with a sufficient level of guidance	3.3	1.2
4. For this course, there was a variety of possibilities to prove your competence	4.3	0.6
5. This course facilitated personalization	4.3	0.6
6. This course related to the semester project and other courses	5.0	0.0
7. The course material was useful and relevant	3.7	0.6
8. This course allowed for an even distribution of the workload over time	4.0	1.0
9. The communication about learning goals, schedule, deadlines and possibilities for evidence was clear	3.3	1.2
10. Feedback given by the teacher(s) was complete, useful and timely	3.3	0.6

11. The teacher was sufficiently available for questions/feedback about the course	3.7	0.6
12. The teacher seriously took students' feedback about the course into consideration	4.0	0.0
13. Sufficient knowledge input and support was given to reach the learning goals set for this course	3.3	0.6
14. The teacher(s) taught the course in an engaging and effective way	2.3	0.6
15. The format of the course was engaging and conducive to learning the course material	4.0	1.0

Other remarks:

- The course might benefit from a bit more structural and theoretical approach next time.
- There was a lack of guidance and structure in the course, which meant that the students basically set up the course themselves. This did allow for a lot of personalization

Discussion

In the discussion with students, the same was said as is already mentioned in the remarks of the questionnaire: the students needed to setup the course themselves, which decreased the amount of structure and theoretical knowledge that could have been studied. This also led to less support from the elective in the setting up of the project.

Next to that, the leaders as well as the other students were of the opinion that it would make more sense to involve the project group more in the assessment of the elective. As the main purpose of the elective was to help the leaders to lead their project group, feedback from the project group on their behaviour as leader would be valuable in assessing the leaders' development.

However, overall the elective was helpful for the leaders, gave much room for personalization and the students felt that they learned a lot from it.

Suggestions

- To increase the chance that the beginning of the project is not bothered by setting up the leadership elective, it is suggested to select the team leaders earlier, so they can discuss the set up of the course as well as the approach to the project before the project has started.
- To involve the project group more in the assessment of the elective, it is suggested to the teacher to ask for feedback on the leader from the group members or have a feedback session with the group members.

Agreements

-

Machine Learning

Created by: Elena Dalova, 4th of July, 2019, Enschede

E-Mail: e.dalova@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2019/2020, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Ruud van Damme

Summary of the Course

Machine Learning was a course for 2nd and 3rd years and master's students. It was a shared course between ATLAS and TN. A total of 6 ATLAS students attended the course.

The course had no lectures and a weekly tutorial of 4 hours, during which students could work on assignments and ask questions. The course used Python and covered from introductory to advanced topics. The course had two possible tracks: a 3 EC track in which students only do assignments and a 5 EC track in which students add their own 2 EC project. The students doing a project were expected to pick a more advanced topic than the course material, such as reinforcement learning.

Perception of the Course

n=4, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. This course sufficiently conveyed both theoretical and applied knowledge	4.0	0.8
2. This course featured both group and individual work	4.3	0.5
3. During this course, students were provided with a sufficient level of guidance	2.5	1.3
4. For this course, there was a variety of possibilities to prove your competence	4.3	1.0
5. This course facilitated personalization	4.5	0.6
6. This course related to the semester project and other courses	3.5	1.0
7. The course material was useful and relevant	4.0	0.8
8. This course allowed for an even distribution of the workload over time	4.8	0.5
9. The communication about learning goals, schedule, deadlines and possibilities for evidence was clear	3.5	0.6
10. Feedback given by the teacher(s) was complete, useful and timely	3	0.8

11. The teacher was sufficiently available for questions/feedback about the course	4	0.8
12. The teacher seriously took students' feedback about the course into consideration	4	1.2
13. Sufficient knowledge input and support was given to reach the learning goals set for this course	3	1.2
14. The teacher(s) taught the course in an engaging and effective way	2.5	1.3
15. The format of the course was engaging and conducive to learning the course material	3.3	1.3

Other remarks:

"The course setup was different than I expected: no lectures, but only working sessions. This made it sometimes difficult to learn the material (as the book was way to complicated as well)."

"There were not lectures unfortunately. In the beginning the material was very confusing but it became more understandable with time"

"Entire course was self study. Would've been nice to have a general start to each lecture that recaps some theory to help the students understand everything, as the theory is super abstract"

Discussion

ATLAS students had several difficulties with this course. The main point of feedback was the lack of lectures: students felt like they did not receive sufficient guidance to solve assignments, especially in the beginning of the course. Students found the book to be unclear, too focused on statistics and difficult to work with. On the other hand, they did find the tutorial sessions useful. Assignments were perceived as difficult and abstract, but at the same time very good for learning. Overall, ATLAS students felt that they learned a lot during this course.

Suggestions

- Have multiple smaller assignments, rather than a big one every week
- Provide different learning materials
- Give lectures

Agreements

- According to Ruud, it would be difficult to create multiple small assignments. It is possible to split the larger assignment into their constituent parts, but this wouldn't be practical and there is nothing stopping students from working on the assignments in steps if they wish to do so
- Ruud will provide different learning materials. He already started giving better materials during the course. Next time, he will either prepare a reader or compile good (online) resources for each topic
- Ruud does not think lectures are necessary, and fears that if students know there will be a lecture, they might skip the self-study and come unprepared. He does agree that a single introductory / overview lecture is a good idea. For next year he will possibly assign materials for each tutorial and hold a discussion of the material at the beginning of the session - this way students still need to self-study and come prepared.

Intercultural communication

Created by: Daphne Nelissen

E-Mail: d.m.nelissen@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 2/4, 2018/2019, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Ardion Beldad

Summary of the Course

This three-EC elective aimed at introducing students to the most relevant theories, concepts, and principles of intercultural communication. The course had about 5 interactive plenary lectures, which consisted of a lot of discussions. For each lecture, the students read and prepared to discuss 3 academic papers. For this elective, students made an exposition paper on the culture of the country they are going to for the study exchange, what difficulties they thought they would experience and what aspects of communication they would be good at.

Perception of the Course

n=2, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. This course sufficiently conveyed both theoretical and applied knowledge	4.0	0.0
2. This course featured both group and individual work	3.5	0.7
3. During this course, students were provided with a sufficient level of guidance	4.0	0.0
4. For this course, there was a variety of possibilities to prove your competence	4.0	0.0
5. This course facilitated personalization	5.0	0.0
6. This course related to the semester project and other courses	3.0	0.0
7. The course material was useful and relevant	5.0	0.0
8. This course allowed for an even distribution of the workload over time	4.5	0.7
9. The communication about learning goals, schedule, deadlines and possibilities for evidence was clear	4.0	0.0
10. Feedback given by the teacher(s) was complete, useful and timely	5.0	0.0
11. The teacher was sufficiently available for questions/feedback about the course	5.0	0.0

12. The teacher seriously took students' feedback about the course into consideration	4.0	1.4
13. Sufficient knowledge input and support was given to reach the learning goals set for this course	3.5	0.7
14. The teacher(s) taught the course in an engaging and effective way	5.0	0.0
15. The format of the course was engaging and conducive to learning the course material	5.0	0.0

Discussion

The course was perceived as doable, although there was a lot of reading. However, this was compensated for by the smaller final assignment. Overall, the course was appreciated by the students and perceived as interesting.

Suggestions

-

Agreements

-

Trust, Crisis and Risk perception

Created by: Guido van der Heijden

E-Mail: g.a.m.vanderheijden@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2018/2019, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Ardion Beldad

Summary of the Course

Throughout this 3EC elective course, the different disciplinary perspectives on trust will be explored and the roles of trust in crisis and risk communication will be highlighted. Specifically, the course will look into the dynamics behind the creation of trust, the effects of trust on people's attitude and behavior, and the strategies employed to repair trust violations. Furthermore, the course will also look into the psychology of risk perception and the critical role of trust in crisis and risk communication.

Perception of the Course

n=5, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. This course sufficiently conveyed both theoretical and applied knowledge	4.2	0.4
2. This course featured both group and individual work	3.4	1.1
3. During this course, students were provided with a sufficient level of guidance	3.6	1.1
4. For this course, there was a variety of possibilities to prove your competence	3.0	1.9
5. This course facilitated personalization	4.8	0.4
6. This course related to the semester project and other courses	3.2	1.3
7. The course material was useful and relevant	4.2	0.8
8. This course allowed for an even distribution of the workload over time	3.6	1.1
9. The communication about learning goals, schedule, deadlines and possibilities for evidence was clear	4.6	0.5
10. Feedback given by the teacher(s) was complete, useful and timely	5.0	0.0
11. The teacher was sufficiently available for questions/feedback about the course	5.0	0.0

12. The teacher seriously took students' feedback about the course into consideration	5.0	0.0
13. Sufficient knowledge input and support was given to reach the learning goals set for this course	4.2	0.8
14. The teacher(s) taught the course in an engaging and effective way	4.4	0.5
15. The format of the course was engaging and conducive to learning the course material	3.8	0.8

Other remarks:

- ++, can't really say more

Discussion

Suggestions

Agreements

GIS

Created by: Guido van der Heijden

E-Mail: g.a.m.vanderheijden@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2018/2019, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Barend Köbben

Summary of the Course

Spatial Data & Geo-information Science (also known as the “ATLAS GIS elective”) aims to give students an understanding of GIS, remote sensing and other geospatial technology. Furthermore, students should learn how and in which cases to apply this technology, and be aware of as well as be able to use (software) tools related to spatio-temporal data. The course is set up by an introductory lecture, several guest lectures and student-given lectures. For each of the student-given lectures, groups of 2-3 students have to transfer their knowledge regarding a self-chosen deepening subject. This is regarded as the theoretical knowledge of the elective. Each student also has to show practical knowledge through one of the three provided assignments or by proposing and executing a self-chosen assignment

Perception of the Course

n=7, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. This course sufficiently conveyed both theoretical and applied knowledge	3.6	0.5
2. This course featured both group and individual work	3.7	0.8
3. During this course, students were provided with a sufficient level of guidance	3.1	0.9
4. For this course, there was a variety of possibilities to prove your competence	4.0	0.6
5. This course facilitated personalization	4.6	0.5
6. This course related to the semester project and other courses	4.1	0.7
7. The course material was useful and relevant	3.6	1.0
8. This course allowed for an even distribution of the workload over time	4.3	0.8
9. The communication about learning goals, schedule, deadlines and	4.1	0.4

possibilities for evidence was clear		
10. Feedback given by the teacher(s) was complete, useful and timely	3.7	1.3
11. The teacher was sufficiently available for questions/feedback about the course	4.4	0.5
12. The teacher seriously took students' feedback about the course into consideration	3.9	0.7
13. Sufficient knowledge input and support was given to reach the learning goals set for this course	3.6	0.5
14. The teacher(s) taught the course in an engaging and effective way	3.4	0.8
15. The format of the course was engaging and conducive to learning the course material	3.6	0.5

Other remarks:

- There was a lot of choice for gathering evidence: could choose the topic of presentation and there were four assignments to choose from.

Not a lot of theory, studying, etc, but rather practical: doing a presentation and assignment. So you only learn the things required for the assignments. A focus on theory could provide the student with more GIS knowledge.

Deadline for the assignment could be way earlier, instead of half a quartile after the course ended. This way you also get feedback sooner

Discussion

Suggestions

Agreements

Sensors & Sensibility

Created by: Elena Dalova, 4th of July, 2019, Enschede

E-Mail: e.dalova@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2019/2020, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Pascal Wilhelm, Jose Alvarez Chavez, Fokko Jan Dijksterhuis

Summary of the Course

Sensors & Sensibility was an introductory course about different kinds of sensors. Lectures took place once a week, and were primarily about discussing the assignments. The course had three assignments: a presentation on the history of sensors, a physical model of a sensor, and a small research project using a sensor. A total of 8 ATLAS students attended this course.

Perception of the Course

n=3, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. This course sufficiently conveyed both theoretical and applied knowledge	3.0	0.0
2. This course featured both group and individual work	3.3	0.6
3. During this course, students were provided with a sufficient level of guidance	3.7	0.6
4. For this course, there was a variety of possibilities to prove your competence	4.3	0.6
5. This course facilitated personalization	4.3	1.2
6. This course related to the semester project and other courses	2.0	1.0
7. The course material was useful and relevant	2.7	0.6
8. This course allowed for an even distribution of the workload over time	3.0	1.0
9. The communication about learning goals, schedule, deadlines and possibilities for evidence was clear	4.7	0.6
10. Feedback given by the teacher(s) was complete, useful and timely	4.3	0.6
11. The teacher was sufficiently available for questions/feedback about the course	4.3	0.6
12. The teacher seriously took students' feedback about the course into consideration	5.0	0.0

13. Sufficient knowledge input and support was given to reach the learning goals set for this course	3.7	0.6
14. The teacher(s) taught the course in an engaging and effective way	3.7	0.6
15. The format of the course was engaging and conducive to learning the course material	4.0	1.0

Other remarks:

“With some changes, this course could be really interesting within Atlas, as it is one of the most integrative courses out there”

Discussion

The main feedback points for Sensors were that the level is too low for second-year ATLAS students. Additionally, students said that the course required a lot of work and hours which did not lead to much learning. It was missing a sufficient amount of content for an entire semester, so it felt rather empty. Students agree that the course had a good setup and the potential to be very good and interesting, if more content is added.

For the research project assignment, students found that they were unable to learn from it because they could not set up meaningful research in such a short amount of time - so they ended up with very simple or faulty designs and had to use poor equipment. 4th semester ATLAS students already have enough experience with research to learn much about experiment design, and the assignment did not teach enough about sensors.

Suggestions

- The course would be better given to 2nd semester ATLAS students
- Alternatively the level and amount of content should be increased
- Alter the last assignment so students don't have to write a research paper, and can focus on the practical side of using sensors.

Agreements

Semester Project

Created by: Sofie Verhees, 4th of July, 2019, Enschede

E-Mail: s.b.verhees@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2018/2019, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Barend Köbben

Summary of the Course

In this project the focus was on spatio-temporal aspects of wicked problems. There were three project groups of about 11-13 students that all focused on a different wicked problem. In the first phase, the students mapped and modelled this problem. They identified causes and origins, stakeholders, and critical issues. In the second phase, they split up into groups of 2 or 3 to develop a mitigation strategy for one of the critical issues using their own expertise. The mitigation groups found their own expert to advise, supervise and assess them. The whole group came back together in the third phase to look back on the wicked problem, to integrate and critically evaluate the mitigation strategies and to look ahead with a future outlook.

Perception of the Course

n=16, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. In the project non-Dutch students were not put at a disadvantage	3.8	1.4
2. All ATLAS domains/courses that were taught in this semester could be integrated in this project	2.9*	0.9*
3. Tutors/consultants were informed about the project, and had relevant knowledge	3.2	1.2
4. Tutors/consultants were readily available/accessible for students.	3.1	1.2
5. This project had a well-communicated and logical set-up	3.3	0.9
6. The students were provided with relevant information/knowledge that could be readily applied within the project	3.3	0.9
7. The project was based on a problem that includes both social and technical aspects	4.2	1.0
8. This project clearly stated which assumptions may be made by the students	3.1	0.9
9. The procedure for project assessment was clear in advance	3.7	1.1

* question has 15 responses

Other remarks:

- Finding experts for mitigation strategies proved to be very difficult and time consuming and once we had contact, the information form provided was still very ambiguous as to what is expected from them
- There should be more and more elaborate feedback
- many questions are not relevant to this semester project. Overall it was well set-up and the outcome was very dependent on what the group does/decides. It would be good to put less responsibility for the team into the leader's hands

Discussion

Firstly, the students found the bigger groups an interesting and a good learning experience. Also, the fact that we could work on a self-chosen real-world problem was positively experienced by students. They found this more engaging and they felt the project was more able to (possibly) contribute to society.

However, after the first phase, students would like more feedback, so you know if you're on track or not. After the presentations of phase 1, the feedback was mostly verbal and was less focused on what to improve than the students would have preferred.

For the second phase, a lot of students felt that they lost some motivation for the project. They focused on their smaller groups but were not motivated to know what is going on with the rest of the groups, even though the students did feel this would be useful and interesting.

Secondly, some group had some problems with finding a supervisor. All groups that did find an expert/ supervisor found them really useful and insightful. Therefore we find this a crucial part of the mitigation phase. However, sometimes it was difficult to find a supervisor on our own which could hinder the mitigation group's development significantly. Therefore there should be a good back-up plan in place. Next to that, many assessments of mitigation groups were dependent on the supervisor, of whom many did not know what to expect from ATLAS students. Also, the assessment form did not allow for detailed feedback or useful feedback for SER.

Lastly, over the course of the project, students did not always feel like they had enough information about what they needed to do and how they would reach the semester goals.

Suggestions

- To make the feedback of the first phase more useful for improvements and the SER, it is suggested to make it more controlled and nonverbal, so e.g. a feedback form or a feedback session per group.
- To motivate students more in the second mitigation phase, it can be more promoted to have sessions with your group to get together and talk about the mitigations that are being developed. This could go through the leaders or the description of the mitigation phase on canvas.

- To avoid mitigation groups being hindered by not having an expert, a good back-up plan should be discussed. This could involve a proposed list of people who are willing to be a supervisor on general topics related to the wicked problems that were chosen.
- To improve the assessment form of the mitigation phase, it is suggested to remove the good/excellent/fail part and add more specific questions (how was the procedure, how was something else), as this is expected to give students more similar feedback and more material for reflection.
- To give students more guidance on the goals of the project, it is suggested to have more presentations about how the students can reach semester goals and to generally give more information about how certain parts of the project work.
- Lastly, we think that more sessions with the other bigger groups would be nice as we could learn from each other and are also generally interested in what are peers are doing.

Agreements

-

Semester Overall Evaluation

Created by: Daphne Nelissen

E-Mail: d.m.nelissen@student.utwente.nl

Semester, Year, Class: Semester 4, 2018/2019, Class of 2020

Teacher(s): Fokko Jan Dijksterhuis

Summary of the Semester

This semester consisted of 27 ECs, of which 9 were dedicated to the semester project and 18 to electives. These electives could be chosen from ATLAS electives or from all over the UT. There was little class interaction, only some self-directed learning sessions from time to time concerning the PDP, MTE and SER.

Perception of the Semester

n=16, scale=1-5

EduCo Criterion	Mean	SD
1. The semester planning was clear and changes were communicated on time	3.8	0.8
2. The expectations for this semester were clear	4.1	0.6
3. An evenly spread out workload throughout the semester was possible	3.4	0.9
4. The semester was coherent	3.7	0.9
5. Students were able to make informed and meaningful choices about the combination of courses within the semester	4.1	0.9
6. During the semester students were introduced to various topics that can assist them in narrowing down their interests towards a possible Master's program.	3.8	1.0
7. The semester allowed for personalization	4.6	0.6
8. Each student had an informed mentor that helped the student in his/her academic and personal development	4.3	0.9

Remarks:

- Some of the above questions are not relevant for semester 4 it seems: e.g. 3 and 4. These depend on the electives of a person.
- There was more variety of courses offered by Atlas but would like to know other possibilities sooner. The electives page by Barend was very useful but would've been better if it was fully available earlier in the year

Discussion

General:

Overall people were satisfied with this semester, but since almost everything takes place outside of the ATLAS structure there was also not a lot to be dissatisfied with.

PDP/SER: there was some discussion about the PDP of semester 4 at the beginning of the semester, as some believed that this was too strict and limiting. However, as the plans of the new PDP were already presented to us, many students believe that this more free way of writing the PDP, and the separation between the new semester goals and the academic profile benefits the writing of their PDP.

Next to this, there were some comments about the PDP/SER cycle not really being a cycle. It is seen mostly as two separate things, as the PDP is not looked at while assessing the SER and the word limit of the SER does not allow for reflection and evaluation of all goals and things mentioned in the PDP.

Suggestions

Students are curious to see how the new PDP, and possibly SER set up, is going to work out and if this will change their experience. However, since this is already being set up, all we can do is encourage these developments and student participation in them.

Agreements

-