

# Agenda PC - IDE

## Meeting 181

Date: 12-02-2024

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

Members	Name	Present/Absent
Teachers	Geke Ludden (chair)	
	Jodi Sturge	
	Winnie Dankers	
	Kostas Nizamis (secretary)	
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
ET Vice-Dean of Education	Mascha van der Voort	

0. Extra Agenda Item: Faculty effort to align EER between programmes.

An update is given on the EER alignment between programmes. Every year the EER was determined by each programme. This year it's changing. The central parts are going to be determined on a university wide level. Items that are applicable to change are programme specific parts. Rules and regulations should be better aligned, as there are not many differences in these parts. The basic frame will be given for the EER of the bachelor programme, so there is plenty of space to implement programme specific parts. Here, some of the regulations can still be better formulated. We can also learn from other faculties. For the master's programme, one EER is proposed for all parts, of which there will be a draft version ready by march.

[Discussion Point]: There are already two EERs, should these rules also be implemented in the old one, or only the new one?

The new curriculum will only apply to a new EER. This means that there will be three parts of the EER. A university wide general part, a general part for the faculty, and a programme specific part. The programme specific parts will be restructured. Rules like if exams are outside or inside a module are different for the current curriculum.

1. Welcome

-

2. Announcements:

2.1. Chairman:

2.2. Program Director:

Announced already in the minutes, but we had our thousandth master diploma award the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February. And also last week we had our second Master Quartel Kickoff Day. Both were celebrated with cakes.

2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus:

There is a new board and a new officer of educational affairs. Not any news yet. From now on Alexandra will represent SG Daedalus instead of Nick. She must leave the meeting early due to the committee market.

2.4 Others:

No other announcements.

3. Approve minutes meeting 180:

[Niek] Small remark that says that I will be leaving the PC or the board. That's Nick. Nick and Niek. Nick left, not me, Niek. Confusion will be over.

4. Action Points from previous meetings:

*AP 1-156: Re-establishing Discipline Council*

Geke says that we can agree that this is now in place, and we will evaluate how this works. But for now, this should be enough, and we are not looking to establish councils where we maybe don't need them or extended councils that may be there.

5. Bachelor curriculum revision update:

The following points came from our informal meeting as a program committee.

**What about staffing challenges when running the 2 programs in parallel?**

[Wim] It was just the other day we had the fleet parade, and then the day after we had a meeting. I think I shared all the videos and PowerPoints and so on. So probably that still is the most accurate update and tomorrow we have another session. So in between, things are going on and I think we will comment on that, but maybe first listen to your questions.

Important for the program committee is to hear a bit more about what challenges are there around staffing when these two programs run in parallel and what solutions are there? And there are a few pain points. Also, if we listen to colleagues, we hear that there are some worries here and there about how are we going to make sure we have enough tutors in module 3 for example, but also teachers teaching everything.

[Geke] But especially also in the transition when the two curricula are running next to each other. And it is also good to think of solutions if people need extra support. And people need to teach a course in the new bachelors first year, but they are also preparing a course for the second year or what is happening there.

[Winnie] Did you also think of maybe having at least two people responsible for one course so that if someone is sick or something else happens that there is always someone else that you can contact. And it also helps for reflecting within the courses.

[Wim] Did we do this before?

[Winnie] I know that it is the case for some courses that I for example coordinate module 4 and for some courses there are like four people that I can approach if I have a question. And for another course it is only one person, so it feels a bit like a risk factor if there is only one person. In the master's it sometimes happens that a course drops out. But in the bachelor's, it is such a solid curriculum.

[Niek] Can you maybe tell something more about the development coach? Because I have never heard of that term, and I have no idea what it means. Is it kind of a mentor for students?

[Jodie] We are at the beginning of exploring what it could be. We talked about maybe every student having a development coach, which I think is a little bit difficult to manage. So, maybe it is about having a smaller group of students start coaching them, seeing what they need, and then developing a bigger program. It is more like the soft skills that you acquire. We talk about the lighthouses, for instance.

[Niek] So students have the student mentor, development coach and study advisor for their personal stuff.

[Jodie] That is something we talked about. There is a bit of a crossover and who is doing what and how do we improve.

[Wim] We don't have somebody from the team, we did have, but we don't have anymore. Somebody who was teaching in the IDE program because you are meeting them, but then there's in one module or in one course. So, the whole idea is now that you get a relationship for at least one year.

[Johan] Is this connected to the skills line?

[Wim] Yeah. So, there are 5 competencies in the skills line and in our start up meeting two weeks ago we said that this is the 5<sup>th</sup> competence of being a professional who can reflect, so it relates to that.

[Johan] Okay, because that was also missing during the fleet parade. And the whole skills line, the lighthouses, which is a big thing. So, is this your answer for the lighthouses?

[Wim] Yeah. So, and this and this is not a new idea. We have been building on this idea for some time already. And we had a workshop in the afternoons like I talked many times about which we have tomorrow again. So in in November we had a whole session about this. So many ideas about reflection and so on came out, but we are still finding or searching on how to organize this and so this is going to be the next step.

[Johan] For that, and I'm just thinking, is it an idea that you can come up with the ideas that you have for basically the working out of the skills line? So, there might be these groups or the portfolio we have heard that we as the program committee can also have a look at it and maybe give some advice about it because, if I heard you correctly, you're still sort of generating ideas. Because I think it is so important and I have not heard that much concrete yet and it is February already.

To make things clear, there are 5 lines within the skills line or the professional competences. And this is one of it and the other one, they are very much already part of the whole curriculum redesign and there is a big Excel explaining what is happening where.

[Geke] I think it is a good suggestion because for all the modules we have seen quite a bit of input already in PC.

[Wim] No, this is a way to look at the whole curriculum, but we can take that perspective, maybe explain that or I can send you already is prepared. And I think it is very clear.

[Robert] For the development coaches, maybe it is smart to look at the differences between the coaches because if you spend time with someone for years you are formed by those people, so try to prevent that students differ too much from each because they have different coaches.

[Jodie] We talked about that, like having training or guidelines on what the coach is doing. And I think the coaches would have to come together and say these are the types

of advice that the students are looking for, this is where we think that we can help push them help them with the developer portfolio. But I think there will be a pilot component of how it will work. But everyone must be on the same page, and no one can give extra or less. Everyone must give the same.

[Johan] I think that indeed these are practical things we need to discuss about how this should be worked out. This part of the skills line. It would be good if you sent all the ideas and concrete things you have yet so we can discuss it during the informal meeting and generate an opinion of it as PC. Yeah, I also have these thoughts. So, it's good to discuss it. We would like to see an evaluation strategy.

**We would like to see an evaluation strategy.**

[Geke] Yeah, and here's the point about the curriculum that came out during our informal meeting is about evaluation. And not evaluation by the students because that is another thing, but also how will the first year's modules be evaluated? Because it is the first time that this is happening. It's good to do like overall evaluation also next to the normal module evaluations, which is a good evaluation.

[Wim] It also relates to the structure and still thinking about that when we start doing it. But I have some experience from previous programs outside the university of how to do that. And I think also the answer lies to me also in, in building a structure. I'm thinking of in preparation of a module, we'll have that module team there and we'll have some, I don't know, one or more sessions and then we'll have the module and there is something happening. And then at the end of the module, there is something going on, but then already the second one is starting and there should be a moment in which the two module teams meet each other.

[Geke] And do you see this as something that comes with the plan for the new curriculum?

[Wim] Yeah. So, this evaluation question or what do we learn, or does it work out, or do we need to change things. This should be part of that structure and the plan for the new curriculum.

[EvaCom] I think we can help facilitate that. But before we do that, we need to look at what the quality assurance wants to do in terms of broadening our risk responsibilities. Because I've been noticing a lot of external pressure into consolidating everything into a smaller work group, less time spent, so this feels like it's another section we add on. So, we would have to decide whether we want to take that on or do something that someone else needs to do.

**6. EER**

[Geke] There is just a new, but then clearer. But it also means it must be clear in the news what is for which cohort. And I was worried when Mascha said we will give you the framework in March because that would mean you would have to work hard to give us the new EER in April,

which is already soon. So, can we already discuss? Or can we look at the framework and see what kind of changes that brings?

[Hiske] I think there are two major issues that will change for next year, one of them might be binding recommendation. Because at this moment our students should have 45 EC. This will still be the case next year and they need to pass the physics, calculus and sketching courses. I don't think that we need to change a lot for defining recognition.

[Geke] Would it be possible to have a closer look at this point in our next meeting? Just to prevent longer discussions on the EER in a moment where we don't want to have longer discussions anymore. In March look at what would be the new rules for the new program. Do we already have an idea of what they should be? Can you prepare that for our March meeting?

[Hiske] The main point I think is writing regulation. And the other one is transitional rules, but that is more about how we are going to ensure that students can pass the study program. Will be a bit complex.

[Geke] But it will also already be helpful to have an overview of what will be the main points that we need to look at for the EER. What is important to discuss and then we can start the discussion.

The general part is just the same for everybody. And the specific part is the description of the program, but that is general. It is more about what industrial design engineering is, and it is assumed that that won't change that much. We have the final which we discussed. That will change next year because we have a new pilot. So, then we will have two versions of pilots.

[Geke] But probably you will have different rules in the program specific part that apply to certain cohorts. So, you will say in the program specific part, this rule applies to this cohort and this rule applies to these cohorts.

[Hiske] I'm not sure if it is allowed to have two different types of ERs for one program.

[Winnie] To me it sounds much easier to have two separate documents, because this sounds like the manual that you have for the two different products where you constantly need to look at.

[Geke] Can you check this?

[Hiske] Yes, I don't know where, but I will try to check this.

**[AP Hiske check if it is possible to have two different types of pilots for one program]**

[Geke] We notice now and maybe it will indeed be an option to still have two program specific parts where you can say this program specific part applies to this cohort and this

program specific part applies to these cohorts. It would make it much more transparent; I think.

[Hiske] The main problem is that it sounds like an easy solution. But it will only work for students who have passed all the courses. To be honest, that is only such a small number of students. Most of the students are mixed.

[Geke] But they still follow the rules for their cohort. Because they will follow the transitional.

#### 7. Any other business/ Question round

The meeting planned for March 11<sup>th</sup> will be moved forward to March 18<sup>th</sup>, to keep account for the curriculum development meeting planned for March 11<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon.

As there was not enough time to present the quarter finals, the presentation will be moved to the next meeting, as an additional point on the agenda.

[Wim] We want also to get your consent to the problem. So, within the curriculum renewal, there are many, many levels of details. So, I was also wondering what you say is a good way to offer you information to get your feedback on.

[Geke] I think we need quite a level of detail because as you already hear from our questions worry also about the workload staff and so we need to know who will be teaching things. We need to know how the professional skills line is organized. General, I think schedules. It is more like Osiris information.

[Wim] Yes, we have organized it now per module, but within that file there is this course detail. But then I would like to suggest the following, if that is okay with you, that we provide a package of materials which gives you information for the first year on module level and with the course details. But then for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year on module map because that is still a bit further away and that details, we are still working on.

**[AP Wim prepare package for next meeting]**

#### 8. Closure

13:54

PC – Action points			
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	
AP 2 – 181: Prepare information package for next meeting, for the 1 <sup>st</sup> year		Wim	