

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting 193

Date: 12-05-2025

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Staff	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	
	Francesca Toso	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
Students	Johan Stekelenburg (vice-chair)	
	Nazli Farid	
	Arthur Lin	
	Arwen Hunter	

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Ilanit Lutters - Weustink	
S.G. Daedalus	Martyna Mariak	Absent
EvaCom	Teodora Citia	Absent

One-time guests	Name	Present/Absent

1. Welcome
Several colleagues are still in master's exams, which are taking a bit longer than expected. They should be joining shortly. A special welcome to Ilanit, who is joining the PC for the first time in her new role.
2. Announcements:
 - 2.1. Chairman: -
 - 2.2. Program Director: A brief update: we have continued working on improving the assessment procedures for master's work, as part of the PDP. We held another working session this morning. Toward the end of the academic year, we will start implementing a rubric that we originally developed in concept for one of the tracks. We aim to update it and apply it across the entire master's program, based on what we already have and within the current rules and regulations. It's still somewhat fragmented, so we want to clarify and streamline it. At the start of the next academic year, we'll hold a meeting with teachers to align on this.

[Geke] Any updates on the number of students starting next academic year?

[Wim] The high numbers of the previous years seem to be declining slightly. We expect 85/90 new students this year.

[Hiske] I thought it was even a bit lower, a 17% drop.

[Geke] In general, it is important to note that numbers are slightly lower than last year, and the decline from last year is continuing.

[Wim] There are a number of reasons. But for example, the European influx is decreasing, but the influx outside of Europe is increasing. However, the number of people who are accepted is much lower because of world problems. In the Netherlands there is still a lot of uncertainty, such as whether we can continue teaching in English.

[Geke] Any updates on the language of the program?

[Wim] No, but UNL made a proposal which went to the ministry. Their proposal is that we should not have to do assessments of languages etc. But the universities themselves can decide if they want to continue in English or not. The proposal they made was to identify some major programs and restrict a set of programs, mainly in the west because those numbers are much larger. I read that some of the parties in the second chamber are really positive about it, but the minister responded that it is okay, but not enough. It is part of the still ongoing discussion.

2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus: -

2.4 Others: -

3. Approve minutes meeting 191 + 192:

Meeting 191:

We talked about it in meeting 192 and Loes made a note about it. However, there was no consensus and there is still a whole agenda point missing. It needs to be added.

[AP Loes: Use the discussion from meeting 192 to complete the minutes of meeting 191.]

Meeting 192:

Johan had some comments that Loes already integrated earlier today. One name was misspelled, but Wim has corrected it.

4. Action Points from previous meetings:

AP 1 – 191: Follow up on the generation of guidelines for students to discuss financial matters and IP matters with the organisation

AP 1 – 192: Contact marketing & communication to fix broken links on the master's track pages and check alignment between the internal and external webpages

AP 2– 192: Discuss the varying flexibility in elective options across tracks with Armagan

These action points remain open. Wim is very busy and needs a bit more time.

5. Status development Year 2 and 3

[Geke] This was discussed during the informal PC meeting last week. The comments presented here were made collectively. Some modules are still under development, which makes things unclear. Wim, can you give an update?

[Wim] Based on our first iteration with the PC, we clarified both our needs and what you need to better assess the proposed curriculum. We sent out an updated format, which includes extra guidelines and explains how the choices were structured. There are more choices in the second year, and you also indicated that it is not always clear how that is organized. It should be clearer now.

Modules 5 and 6 are clearer and more ready for implementation than Modules 7 and 8. Module 8 has undergone different changes, while Module 7 requires more guidance from the steering team. This because a number of issues and the process of bringing it towards the PC also made it clearer that we needed some stronger decisions on certain points. Later this week we have a meeting where we can address some of the concerns or issues or questions that you have raised already. To answer the question if it is still feasible, we have the plan to get back to the blueprints. Especially for module 7, to better assess how it was intended. Some things are core, but we have to define whether all those other ideas really help the design. In conclusion, Modules 7 and 8 still require further development.

Questions and comments:

[Geke] Who will be teaching these modules?

[Wim] For the OER this isn't necessary, but knowing the teachers can help provide a clearer picture. We will continue to gather and finalize details before summer. We are also preparing to advise students who must retake courses. There are meetings planned with study advisors and Hiske. A student session is also planned, where module coordinators will present the program.

[Geke] It is important to clarify to students how choices are made, what options they have, and when something is a choice vs. a group negotiation. How does it affect their profile. Because these choices are a really new thing.

[Arwen] And how will this be communicated to the students? In a Word document? I would suggest a visual overview.

[Wim] In an upcoming curriculum meeting, we will identify exactly when choices occur and how they work. Development coaches can also help students make strategic decisions. One of the key curriculum questions is: can we support students in becoming the

IDE professionals they aim to be? Module 4 will end with a session explaining Year 2 options. We'll also repeat this during the Year 2 kickoff and in various communications.

[Geke] The other important thing is that for module 7 and module 8 specifically, a lot of things were still quite vague or unclear. Do you need an advice of the PC? We can also make a bit more general advice, because we do see the general idea for the second year, but we also have some concerns, so we could also write an advice that lists those point because I think they clearly indicate what still needs to be done.

[Wim] Last year, module 1 was clearer than module 4. And this year for module 7 and 8 the same. Module 7 starts in February next year; more detailed information is less necessary than for module 5 and 6.

[Geke] We also talked about the Milos. In one milo there are already three things, high level important things.

[Wim] We need to become a bit more specific, also based on what we started off with, with the blueprint. We define a strategy how to get there (blueprints), the one I talked about in the beginning of these points.

[Geke] Any other things that we should raise now?

[Ilanit] I am a bit worried about the specialisations. I think it is nice that you can choose, but maybe the groups will be too small, and I don't know if that's a good idea.

[Geke] This is already decided a long time ago. And having choice is the only thing where we can solve the expansion the field. And having choice means splitting up the group. But maybe a good point for discussion; are we splitting up too much? And we should highlight all the consequences so that students know why they are taking or why they should take certain courses.

[Geke] We will write an advice capturing the key points raised today.

[AP Geke: Write some advice for the curriculum developers for module 7 and 8 based on the discussion of the PC meeting.]

6. PDP IDE

Skipped this point for today due to time constraints. Will be discussed in the next meeting.

7. MSc. IDE - EER

[Geke] We briefly reviewed it in the previous informal meeting, but we did not have a lot of time to look at it. We checked mostly the highlighted things; all other things were the same as last year or are equal to mechanical engineering and civil engineering.

Feedback:

- P.15, article 4.2.

What does the approval by the master coordinator entail? Is that a check on? Is it enough ECs?

→ It is just a simple check. In general, the most important thing is that the track coordinator approves the ISPs. Before it was the program director. Conclusion: We keep it as it is.

- P.16
We had some suggestions for how to phrase it a bit differently, because the master program does not consist of an internship, and now it sounds like it. There was a question. Because you can do this as a capita selecta, but it is currently not clear and also no consensus in the group if this is allowed. It is the way how it is phrased. Different teachers say different things. Can we do an internship as a capita selecta?
→ We need to define what an internship is. We can use the phrasing that it does not include a mandatory internship. But we cannot use the last sentence, that is confusing. We skip the sentence that it cannot be part of the 120 EC program. Also, on the webpage it is stated that you can do an internship as a capita selecta. This is correct, but then worried about the sentence in the EER that it cannot be part of the ECs. Conclusion: Change the first sentence and end after track coordinator.
- P.19, article 4.6.
It says a student can withdraw from an examination until the start of the exam period. That is new in the rules, but it is very unclear. Maybe it has something to do with the booking of rooms for the exams?
→ Conclusion: It is all very unclear. And Ilanit will check this with Kristel.
- P.20, article 5.11.3.
It specifies what policy frameworks this relates to, and we thought it is wise putting links there, because we have no idea.
→ Conclusion: Ilanit will check if there are links to make it more helpful for students, as well as for staff.
- P.29
We thought that maybe some courses seem to be missing for tracks.
→ For MOPD it is complete, and for HTR as well. Only for ETD it is not the complete overview, otherwise it would be twice as big. Discussed with Dave and put this in the overview and then later on if they fill in the ISP, they see the complete list. Now it looks like ETD has more options. Is this fair? Conclusion: Explain this in an extra sentence or add an additional section.

8. BSc. IDE – EER
[Geke] We tried to do the same in this document.

Feedback:

- P.29, modules 5 to 8.
We thought it was a bit unclear what the new sentence is; "individual focused areas can be explored through project work and assignments for electives or for opportunities for specialization."
→ We want to make clear that students have more freedom in the second year. The first part is clear of the sentence, but the second part can maybe be rephrased. Conclusion: "... as students can focus on personal development goals in project work and assignments."

- P.31
A mistake in the ECs in module 8. Or is that because the tools and projects are all in one now?
→ Hiske checked this with Eric. But it is different from what is in the other document. It should be the 9 / 6. Conclusion: Check this with Eric.
- P.35, article 4.3.
Should we refer that appointed by the examination board or something like that?
→ Yes, it is about the examiner. Conclusion: Hiske put between brackets that it is pointed by the examination board to make clear that not everybody can be chair except there is a list of people who can be chair.
- P.40
These are the transitional arrangements. And I think they should be revised again when we have the information from module 7 and 8.
→ Conclusion: Hiske will change this if it is clearer, otherwise she will do it over and over. She shows it to us, so we can discuss it in the last meeting of this year because transitional arrangements are an important thing.

9. Any other business / Question round:

-

10. Closure: 13:50

PC – Action points			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 1 – 191: Follow up on the generation of guidelines for students to discuss financial matters and IP matters with the organisation	Before next PC meeting	Wim	
AP 1 – 192: Contact marketing & communication to fix broken links on the master's track pages and check alignment between the internal and external webpages	Before next PC meeting	Wim	
AP 2 – 192: Discuss the varying flexibility in elective options across tracks with Armaganweek	Before next PC meeting	Wim	

AP 1 – 193: Use the discussion from meeting 192 to complete the minutes of meeting 191.	Before next PC meeting	Loes	
AP 2 – 193: Write some advice for the curriculum developers for module 7 and 8 based on the discussion of the PC meeting.	Before next PC meeting	Geke	