

# Agenda PC - IDE

## Meeting 182

Date: 18-03-2024

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 105

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	Absent
	Winnie Dankers	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	Absent
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	
	Robert Breugelmans	
	Niek Reeze	
	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	

One-time guests	Name	Present/Absent

1. Welcome
  -
2. Announcements:
  - 2.1. Chairman: people not being here
  - 2.2. Program Director: -
  - 2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus: half past one leave
  - 2.4 Others: -
3. Approve minutes meeting 180:
  - Comments, more of a summary. Make it a bit shorter and emphasize the important things. Have a look at the previous minutes.
  - Point zero: not three versions of the EER, one version of the EER: University wide part, faculty wide part and a programme specific part.
4. Action Points from previous meetings:

*AP 1 – 181: Check if it is possible to have two different types of EER for one program. Come back to it in point 7.*

*AP 2 – 181: Prepare information package for next meeting, for the 1<sup>st</sup> year. Done. Everyone has it now.*

## 5. EvaCom Pitch Q1 Evaluation

### **Slides with report of quarter 1A:**

#### Module 1:

##### Difficulties:

- Getting timely and helpful answers from tutors.
- Expectation management regarding the group members and tutor.
- Planning of the final presentation and exam.

#### Calculus 1A:

Fills within the average of the other courses as well. Not worrisome.

##### Design sketching:

##### Have some difficulties:

- No central overview of the deliverables.
- Students did the assignments twice (in class they did sketches for the project, but they also did them at home).

#### Materials:

##### Some more points of feedback:

- Time was short.
- Combining lecture slides.
- Some students were unsure of everything on Canvas was part of the exam.
- The content of the different lectures was hard to relate to other subjects they had in the project.

#### Statics:

- Big fluctuation in the number of chapters and materials that they had to cover from week to week, made it hard for them to anticipate. → Time management is difficult.
- Lot of verbal information rather than written information. After class it is hard for the students to keep up with what is being taught.

#### Module 5:

Didn't have interviews. Rely on the questions that we asked.

#### Human Product Relations:

- Received very well.

#### Energy & Heat Transfer:

- Some wavering things, but in general it is a bit more of an engineering course. A bit tougher for some students. Making them more negative.

#### Production 3:

- Overall, quite positive

#### Physical ergonomics:

- Also, quite positive.

Information about Q1 will also go to the new module coordinator for the new module one.

#### Masters:

##### 3D printing processes and use:

- A bit of unclearness of what the student needs to be able to reproduce on the test or the final assignments.
- Lot of content in a short time.
- Too limited printers. So, it seems for them as a big waste of time. You're just waiting.

##### Brand Management:

- In general people are quite satisfied.

##### Packaging Design and Management:

- Quite well.

##### Sources of innovation:

- Quite well.

*Questions and comments:*

[Niek] Can you explain the graphs?

Zero is the optimum. The range is showed here. But not clear how to interpret these graphs. So most important is to get clearer graphs.

[Robert] Some of the master courses are only evaluated by 4 students.

[Zen] Hard to see why master's student do not fill in. Don't have physical sessions, what we do in the bachelors.

[Robert] Why is not every master course evaluated every module?

[Zen] So many master courses that it is just like staff wise not possible to do every master course. Select and then make sure that they are repeated every two years.

[Robert] But it is only a questionnaire?

[Zen] Yes, but it is still some post processing to put in a readable form.

[Robert] Maybe it could be a solution to have it for every course every period. It would then become a habit.

[Wim] Differences between the two approaches: bachelors and masters. We are going to bring them together, so it is going to be 1 committee. Differences will become much smaller. And more flexibility within the team. Also, the rationale of the evaluation is going to change. Conclusion: have this workshop.

[Winnie] Can specific premaster courses also be included in the evaluation? A lot of these courses have never been evaluated.

[Wim] All the education we provide, should have the quality assurance. Every master course should be evaluated in some way because there is always something to improve. So, we should include the premaster courses as well as minors. There were some problems with that as well.

[Geke] There is a central minor evaluation. An online questionnaire.

[Geke] Presentation is already a much nicer way of sharing the results of the evaluation with us. Very helpful.

## 6. Bachelor curriculum revision update

Wim has shared a document that brings together all the information that we have so far about what the new curriculum will look like. Bit more detail for the first year than for the second year.

### Academic skills line update:

[Charlotte] There was a question about how far is the academic skills line now and are they really going to be in there? Therefore, I send them to the PC. At the beginning I did a quick analysis of the PILOS and see what kind of categories are in there. And looked at civil engineering, mechanical engineering how they have organised their academic skills. They have 5 categories, and I almost copied these names. Because alignment within the faculty would be nice. And after that I was thinking about how to build up a line for these different categories. Every category has learning objectives that students should be able to obtain at the end of the bachelor.

Module 1 to 5 it is already quite specific. Discussion for the others is planned.

### *Questions and comments:*

[Johan] How much hours per module is spend on this? And how is that distributed in the modules?

[Charlotte] Most likely it is part of the project hours. In each module there will be two or three workshops. An estimate is 4 to 6 hours.

[Johan] And schedule wise. If a module plans a specific time slot for projects, then this might also be time for a workshop?

[Charlotte] This will be given in the schedule. There is time reserved specifically for the skills.

[Johan] How would it be graded?

[Charlotte] It will probably not be a separated grade, but it will be part of the project assessments. And students must attend.

[Johan] By skills line I think of the lighthouses. So, looking back, looking forward.

[Charlotte] And that is where the professional development coaches take a strong role. And they are probably connected with the skills education, but especially with the professional identity part.

[Johan] Second part of the question: how is this planned timewise? What do the students need to deliver?

[Charlotte] Much under development. Still haven't found a nice portfolio yet.

[Wim] We have a development coach that will guide 10-12 students during the year and maybe during the whole study. This is really involved in the programme. We need to document certain things what do we already learn and what to learn for the second year. We want to set up a system that will be able to facilitate the development of and if you want to call that a portfolio then yes this is the portfolio.

[Geke] Important for the lighthouses is that it is not only reflecting on what I learned. Also, what is my identity, what choices am I making. It is all part of it.

[Johan] So in conclusion: the definition of the lighthouses is not just the portfolio. It is more personal like that you have this discussion with the development coach. Discussion about where am I right now and looking back and forward.

[Winnie] It could also be interesting to sit together with the development coaches to really understand what is going on in a specific cohort. How can we as teachers make small changes to better suit their needs.

[Wim] Exactly do this. Learning and understanding what is going on in the groups.

Some confusion about development coaches and student mentors. Sounds similar.

[Charlotte] We must make this very clear. But the student mentor is more for more living on your own kind of questions and the professional development coach is not what this is about. More personal.

[Alexandra] They need to be clarified. Now we have many different persons where students can go (student mentor, study advisor and the development coach).

[Wim] Not sure if these student mentors will stay. Not very helpful.

[Geke] An update will follow about how the academic skills, but also the portfolio and the professional development coaches will be integrated into the programme.

#### Curriculum update:

[Wim] It is a lot of information. But at least we tried to bring it all together now. It also helps us to see if some things are missing. We have also been busy with introducing the modules.

Also, the base for what we put on the website. Please feed us back what is missing. It is not completely complete yet; we are still working on it. But the next version will be complete.

*Questions and comments:*

[Niek] About the contents. I think the PILOS, MILOS and ILOS are a bit long. Don't think this should be the function of the PILOS. I think it is more about the communication and now personally I want to give them titles or to shorten them to make the point clear. And I think now they are too specified.

[Wim] This is normally what it is looks like. Not to communicate with students that much, it is for us and a tool for the communication with the teachers.

[Robert] For me it is sometimes a bit unclear why certain PILOS are connected to certain modules.

[Geke] This is the way of filling this in.

[Wim] In the end you want to see that the PILOS are covered. There are many ways to look at it. Maybe we could refine it. Some of the modules already have a complete rationale why something is chosen or not.

[Niek] What happened to design sketching. Currently it is a very big part of the first year, which I don't think is a good thing. But now it is not the same. So, I'm interested to see the decisions made and the reasons for that.

[Geke] There are more courses that are not literally coming back in the description of courses. This has to do with the fact that we didn't want so many smaller courses. There is still a bit of design sketching in module 1.

[Alexandra] I'm also a bit concerned where the design skills are like rendering skills and computer drawing etc. Very important for a designer.

[Geke] It is still there, but it is presented in a different way that will also mean that students will experience it in a different way.

[Winnie] Discussion about the sketch tablet. For everyone or should it be something part of the elective?

[Geke] We would discuss this next week and then decide.

[Robert] If the courses are getting bigger and more different components are included in every course, how will the assessments look like? Because if you are better in one thing better than the other, maybe you can still get a sufficient grade.

[Geke] There is no mention of assessment in this document.

[Wim] Different ways to deal with that. You could say this is a core objective of the course and without passing that one, you still cannot pass the course even though the other ones are high.

[Niek] What is the progress on the integration of calculus and other mathematics courses. To me it is still a big challenge.

[Wim] We are moving but it's a big ship which goes slowly. Module coordinators are open to help us improve things. Teachers are talking about this, how to integrate this. But I think this is not something we can solve before September. This is an ongoing commitment.

7. EER update

[Hiske] There are different parts of the EER:

- Institutional part: that is really the general part, for example the enrolment. About student facilities, about management and participation. Really general. For all students at the UT.
- Two other parts: both called the EER. So, education and examination regulation.
  1. First: the general part. This is almost the same for most of the programs.
  2. Second: the program specific part.

[Hiske] And about this specific part, the faculty of ET asked if it was possible to align it a bit more. Which means that not all the parts are the same, because it is a programme specific part. What we want to decide and that is also up to you, we want certain things to be common, the same in all the programme specific EERs for ET.

What they want to do: they set up the specific part and on the 8<sup>th</sup> of April a meeting is planned. The question if is of at least one of you, a representative, can be there at this meeting?

[Geke] We can discuss this next week.

[Hiske] I also have an email with a document with a bit of explanation. But the information about the program specific part of IDE is still missing.

[Hiske] Program specific part, two things:

- Some changes due to the new curriculum. So, I started with making transitional arrangements. So, what to do and how to change it also with the substitution table. What kind of courses can students follow if they miss something. I will send it to Geke or Kostas so that you can discuss that.
- About the binding recommendations and what to do with it. I have some ideas about that, but according to time we can't discuss them now. I can show you that next meeting.

[Geke] There will be one EER for the program, right? And students must look up what rules are for their cohort. And it will be made clear what regulations are for which?

[Hiske] Yes, in the transitional arrangement it is stated, and it is completely clear.

[Geke] For the meeting in April we will receive the draft EER?

[Hiske] That is a bit of the question, because we are only to discuss the general thing of this specific part in April. But I can look at the EER and see what the big changes are.

8. Any other business/ Question round

-

9. Closure: 14:03.

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 1 – 181: Check if it is possible to have two different types of EER for one program		Hiske	Done
AP 2 – 181: Prepare information package for next meeting, for the 1 <sup>st</sup> year		Wim	Done