

# Minutes PC - IDE

## Meeting 163

Date: 10-01-2022

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: OH210

Minutes secretary: Ilse Akkermans

CC: CES, Simone Steinmeijer

Guests: Ata Aydin (evaluation committee)

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

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

### Proposed agenda:

1. Welcome. (Until 12:45)
2. Announcements (Until 12:50)
  - Chairman  
Luna will be the successor of Jasmijn as the representative of Daedalus.  
The February meeting will probably also be online unless the covid-restrictions are lifted.
  - Program Director  
Students are requesting online exams due to quarantine or inability to come to the campus.
  - Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus  
Luna will take Jasmijn's spot after February. Luna is a second year IDE student and will attend the OLC meetings from now on.
  - Others
3. Approve agenda (Until 12:52)

4. Approve **minutes meeting 162** (*Programme Committee (PC) for IDE/Documents/General/02-Minutes/Draft Minutes/ [162] Minutes Programme Committee 20211115.docx*) + APs from previous meetings(s) See below (Until 12:53)  
Minutes are approved.
5. **Protocol** (*Programme Committee (PC) for IDE/Documents/General/03-Documents/02-Various Topics/2021-2022/Protocol.docx*) for the request to introduce a **new master's course** (*Programme Committee (PC) for IDE/Documents/General/03-Documents/02-Various Topics/2021-2022/Pre-proposal 18 11 21.docx*). (Until 13:33)

A protocol for introducing a new master's course has been written. The OLC is asked to give feedback on this protocol.

The protocol does not include a discipline council. Currently, it is unclear who decides which staff members are assigned which responsibilities if a new course is introduced. There is a protocol on cancelling other courses when introducing a new course but it is unclear who is to decide which courses should be cancelled. This could be seen as the task of the PC, as they have to approve the curriculum. Yet, the PC has no role in the organization of education and the division of tasks over staff members. Not everyone seems to be in favour of introducing a discipline council but it is also agreed that it should not be the responsibility of the PC either. Jan-Willem notes that we should not mix responsibilities with tasks. Organizational aspects do not need to be included in the protocol. This leads to the conclusion that the header of the document should be changed to make it clearer what the protocol is about. The protocol is not about introducing a new masters course, but about seeking advice of the PC about the fit of a new masters course.

Point nr. 8 is about graduate projects. The audit committee requests to strengthen the connection between the curriculum and the research done in the department. The phrasing must be adjusted because now it reads as if master courses need to connect to graduation projects. It is optional for graduates to do their graduation following from a master's course they followed.

Point nr. 3 is also a bit vague in phrasing.

The protocol document now holds two lists, it might be wise to put the second list before the first list and use it as a checklist before writing a proposal.

### **Feedback on the attached proposal "Nature-inspired Design":**

[Alberto] Thinks the course is applicable to different IDE students but unsure about the amount of lectures. Are six lectures enough to cover this broad field?

[Geke] What misses in the proposal is a description of what students will learn and what they will do. Other than the ELOs, which are specified and clear, it is unclear what exactly the assignments will be

For future notice, it would be useful to have the proposer present at the OLC meeting to answer questions. This should be added to the protocol.

[Kostas] Parts of this subject are already covered during other IDE courses, there might be overlap. This overlap should be aligned by teachers and perhaps even be minimized.

[Johan] It is unclear if the course will have a more technical- or design focus. Biomimicry is a field and not a goal in itself, without a goal it can feel overwhelming. It is still a bit unclear what can be expected from the course by reading the proposal.

[Winnie] Expects there will be an audience for the course. The intro introduces the course as material- and surface focused. This could be misleading if the course is supposed to be about construction. The focus should be checked with Dave and Hanneke.

[Jasmijn, Luna] Seems like an interesting course and seems to focus more on the materials indeed.

[Niek] Not really convinced yet as the topic seems quite specific. Students who are interested in biomimicry might already have done research on this for themselves.

In general, the committee thinks it can make an interesting course that has an audience and holds a place in the curriculum, but the proposal is still unclear on certain points. The course is intended to start in Q4 of this year. Jan Willem proposes to use 2022 as a trial year and give the course green light for now given that the given comments are used to improve the course and that it is assured that there is no such course already.

6. Follow-up discussion of Jan Willem, Rick and Jasmijn (AP5-159) (Until 13:37)  
This is about a follow-up meeting after Rick gave a presentation at a staff meeting about subjective. The examination board has sent a request/order to improve subjective assessment. This is being worked on, individual actions are taken now to deal with this.
7. Bachelor curriculum revision (Until 13:40)  
Before the Christmas break there was a discussion 12 students about the scores in the national student survey. Subjective assessment is also a point that came up during this discussion. Second assessors have been implemented in courses and this seems to be received well by students. Jan Willem will bring subjective assessment up as an agenda point again by himself later again. It does not need to be on the next agenda.
8. Johan will present information on Delft IDE Programme (Until 14:00)  
Johan went to the Bachelor IO open days of the TUDelft. TUDelft classifies IO as: people, technology and business. They described IOers as anticipated on the world of tomorrow, developing future solutions. Their focus lies with sustainable solutions, initiate future transitions with focus on more sustainable life and mobility and change focus between stakeholders. IO professional is someone who shapes the world as a multidisciplinary expert, untangles complexity and can deal with uncertainty of the design process. Learning principles of Delft are: always designing and active learning. Students own responsibility and learn designing by doing so. Students have one big project per semester of 10EC and per module two subjects of 5 EC. There is a reflect and look ahead session called IDME at end of every project. Selling points of Delft are that they are the biggest technical university and that they have the biggest IO department. They have their own Design Thinking methodology and aspects of other technical faculties are used withing IO. Delft doesn't seem to be that much different from the UTwente. The main differences are: less courses, bigger courses, more future directed. Less teaching probably has to do with the workload for teachers with so many students. UTwente spends more time on designing, focusses on being a smaller university, open door policy and not having one explicit design method. It is unclear how TUDelft test the 5 EC courses and how they have woven in the technical courses.
9. Evaluation of the pre-master courses by Hiske (Until 14:05)  
Hiske mentioned she had discussions with pre-masters but there has not been an actual evaluation. The evaluations are not about one specific type of pre-master, just about the experience of pre-masters. So pre-master courses such as academic research skills should be evaluated. This should actually be the task of a the pre-master coordinator of the faculty instead

of Hiske's task. There will be a new person on this position soon. Jan Willem will inform the committee once he knows more about this.

10. Any other business / Question round

(Until 14:05)

Next meeting the evaluation of Q1 can be discussed.

11. Closure

(Until 14:10)

Year Planner: [\[link\]](#)

PC – Open action items from previous meetings			
<i>Action:</i>	Target date:	<i>Executed by:</i>	Status/remark
AP2 – 162: Instagram post for the new student member		Ata	Unknown
AP 2 – 161: Share the results of the survey on assessment she did with Jan Willem		Rianne	Unknown
AP 3 – 161: Yearly report PC-IDE		Alberto	In Progress
AP 4 – 161: Replacement for Rianne (maybe an international student?)		Student members	In Progress
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	In Progress
AP 1 – 159: Next academic year, discuss how the 'giving and receiving feedback' workshop went and what the effects are, after module 1.			Unknown
AP 1 – 156: Re-establishing Discipline Council	September 2021	Geke and Jan Willem	In progress. <i>It would be nice to talk with Laurens van den Acker and Jonathan Bennink.</i>