

Agenda PC - IDE

Meeting

183

Date: 15-04-2024

Time: 12:45 – 14:00

Place: Z - 109

Minutes secretary: Loes Munsterman

CC:

Guests:

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

Permanent guests	Name	Present/Absent
Programme Director	Wim de Boer	
BSc. Coordinator	Hiske Schuurman-Hemmer	
MSc. Coordinator	Elora Luijkx	
S.G. Daedalus	Alexandra Tark	
EvaCom	Zen Duckers	Absent

One-time guests	Name	Present/Absent

1. Welcome

-

2. Announcements:

2.1. Chairman: Geke is sick, Johan will lead this meeting.

2.2. Program Director: -

2.3 Officer of Educational Affairs, SG Daedalus:

The PC should discuss what to do with internalisation in the programme. Do we want a Dutch course, the whole thing in Dutch? This must be figured out by the PC.

[Wim] We are waiting for the central guidelines on how to take this further. But it is indeed the responsibility for the programme management and committee to decide whether or how we want to work on Dutch tracks. We have been discussing this. In the proposal letter is said that there can be regional differences, depends on whether on your educational vision. And, that we must look at the domain. Conclusion: there is nothing official yet, so we will wait.

[AP Kostas: include this topic in the next meeting so we can talk about this.]

2.4 Others: -

3. Approve minutes meeting 180:
 - Small spelling mistake. But already corrected.
 - Both minutes approved.
4. Action Points from previous meetings:
 -
5. Bachelor curriculum revision update

Improvements and changes since the last version:

[Wim] Stick to the document what I prepared for previous meeting. I add some information to it, trying to respond to the issues that you raised. Comments:

1. Overview of how modules contribute. We looked for this in the Excel sheet. A lot of modules already had a stronger or less alignment with the PILOS. With the smaller and bigger excess, it is a bit easier to understand. The examination board requires that the courses hand in their assessment plan. And part of the assessment plan is how do courses relate to the PILOS. We are now working on this level of detail.
[AP Wim: sending the version with more detail on this topic before the next meeting.]
2. The alignment on the MILOS. We tried to harmonise the feedback. We worked on that and checked that with the teams.
3. The skills line. We added a small chapter, sort of summary, on what we intend to do on that. I think the picture is clearer now.
4. About sketching. We put quite some effort into this topic. We are still in this process, but I made a small summery. In module 1 and 3 there are particular courses in which the teachers already are involved. In module 6 there is going to be a course and also a bigger course in module 8. For module 2 and 4 we have planned meetings with Tom, the steering team, and the project coordinator of these modules to see what kind of skills the teachers expect in that particular project. And how can we facilitate that students are at that particular level that they need to be, and if not, how we can include workshops for extra support. Also ask Tom how it is building up to the third year.

Questions and comments:

[Johan] Question about sketching in module 6 and 8. And you stated below make a choice. So, is this a subject of choice? So, a part of the bachelor students will have this course, and some have not?

[Wim] Yes. We made room for students, so that they have more of a choice and more ownership in the curriculum. We want them to help to become the designer that they want to be. And how do we facilitate that. The same thing is for dynamics. This is how we solved this now. Give students the option to decide.

[Johan] Is the examination guides only for the first year or for the whole new curriculum.

[Wim] For the whole curriculum. The module coordinates of year 1 will hand in their sheets for the courses of the first year in May. And then we have an educational consultant assessing it, checking it with the ILOS, giving feedback etc. This could even lead to improvement of some of the intended learning outcomes of those course, also from an

educational perspective. And then formalise it in the beginning of June. A certain goal in the course relates to one or more PILOS. That is the level of detail we are still working on.

Further improvements and comments:

5. The complexity of the project. We had a small inventory last Wednesday. We discussed about defining the complexity of the project. We summarized what we found in the document. In the beginning of the bachelor more guidance with the project, but at the end the complexity increases. This is because there is less guidance, more self-steering and responsibility for students. It gave us some insight, but there are still some questions for module 3. Whether or not it is too complex already in the first year.
6. The transitional arrangements. Latest version in the document.

Questions and comments:

[Robert] Now some courses have less or more ECs. How does this work for students who have to retake those courses?

[Hiske] It depends on the course of course. In the end it is the total amount of EC the students have. What will happen if the student has certain courses not passed yet? The easiest way is a resit. In some cases, this is not possible, because students did not follow the course. Then an individual solution for an alternative is the other way to solve this problem. If the total is still 60, then this is not a problem.

[Niek] Is the person that evaluates the assessment per course also considering the entire module and the module workload?

[Wim] No, the workload is calculated and evaluated by ourselves.

[Hiske] There will also be a meeting about this with the module coordinators this afternoon.

[Niek] Are you also considering that there could be too many deadlines for all courses combined?

[Wim] This is also discussed in the upcoming meeting. There is a responsibility for the project management and coordination to produce a plan which is doable. There are already some detailed plans.

[Johan] Good to hear that there is already so many details. Any other points about the curriculum revision?

[Daedalus] We have an issue with finding a new board. This is because students will stop now and then come back in the new curriculum. That is quite an issue. After their board year they will have to finish module 7 and 8. We already discussed this in the morning.

[Wim] The new module 3 is very much what is now in module 7. This is another way of looking at it. And in module 8 the dynamics courses are still the same but named differently. But good that you mentioned it. Also, for student teams, other boards. It is a general issue.

[Johan] This will be an equal situation between Daedalus and the programme director. And once there is a solution you will let us know?

[Daedalus] Yes, we have to find ways.

[Wim] One other thing. The PC also must give their consent to the new curriculum. Not sure how we should do that, but I want to have this approval from the PC. We never have it 100% ready. But are you confident that we are on the right way?

[Johan] When do you need this approval?

[Wim] Maybe you can discuss it informal and send your approval.

[AP all PC members: discuss the new curriculum in the informal meeting and approve the changes for the next meeting.]

6. EER update

[Hiske] Still have discussion. General EER and programme specific EER for the bachelor. And what they are planning to do is a general ET part. Huge discussion. I think that we should keep the general part as it is and put all the other stuff in the specific part. But other educational programs did not degree on that. But after the discussion we are all on the same page.

[Winnie] Except on the words. That is really bad.

[Hiske] Actually I am now waiting for an update especially on the general ET part. And as soon as we have that I can start with creating the programme specific one. In the meantime, we already discussed most of the important things that will be done. That are four things:

1. Transitional arrangements.
2. Binding recommendation.
3. Compensation regulation.
4. Distinction rule.

Point 4: The distinction rule:

[Hiske] My suggestion is put it out of the EER. So, remove it.

[Wim] One thing we can consider is that other programmes do not have it. And we are looking on harmonising our EERs. So, either everybody does it or not.

[Winnie] So it would not be in the general part of the EER. But we can have it as a special addition in our specific part. But the question is if we want that.

[Kostas] We can discuss this also internally and see if we can optimize.

[Wim] I found it a bit confusing. So, I would not mind if we lose it, but if the PC wants to stick to it, we can respect that.

[Johan] We will talk about it in the informal meetings.

[AP all PC members: discuss the distinction rule in the informal meeting and come with a conclusion in the next formal meeting.]

Questions and comments:

[Johan] Planning wise I have a question. Because I see in the year planning, we have today's meeting to give consent for the EER and then next time discuss the draft EER. Is there for next meeting something concrete we can already have a look at?

[Hiske] Not sure if this is possible, because you have the informal meeting already in two weeks. But for the next PC meeting I hope that I already have the ET general part that I needed to get started. And then I can already make the setup for the new one and I can send it to the PC, so we are able to discuss it during the next PC meeting.

[AP Hiske: make a setup for the new programme specific EER for next PC meeting.]

[Winnie] Last meeting I was there as a representative from the PC. But because we did not get through everything in time there is an additional meeting. But I had the feeling that it is consuming a lot of time, and it is more like a discussion only between the programme management.

[Hiske] Not completely true. Because the things that are discussed over there the PC should agree on that in the end. If we say we do not want to have the general ET part, then you are done actually.

[Winnie] It is still weird because I cannot speak for every one of the PC. We have a different approach compared to other programmes. While other PCs review the entire EER before the meeting of the general EER, we do it the other way around.

[Hiske] Important is that for the bachelor the general part is UT wide, we cannot do anything about it, and it has already been finished and is available. For the master, the general part of the EER is ET wide. We are still waiting on this part.

[Johan] My main question is, are you confident that we can approve everything in time?

[Hiske] I think we can discuss the EER next time. The main differences of the EER of this year are how the programme will look like. So, the list of courses is different and so we need to have the transitional arrangements different than this year. And further maybe the distinction role. This depends on remove it or not. And we are discussing the compensation rule within IDE. And finally, the binding recommendation.

[Johan] Maybe these can be implemented in a document, whether it is the correct format or not. At least we have something we can talk about in the informal meeting.

[AP Hiske: compile the main differences in a document before the informal meeting (29th of April).]

7. Any other business / Question round

-

8. Closure: 13:42

PC – Action points			
Action:	Target date:	Executed by:	Status/remark
AP 1 – 183: Include the topic about internationalisation within the programme in the next agenda.	Before next PC meeting	Kostas	
AP 2 – 183: Sending a document that provides a more detailed overview of how modules contribute.	Before next PC meeting	Wim	
AP 3 – 183: Discuss the new curriculum in the informal meeting and approve the changes.	Before next PC meeting	All PC members	
AP 4 – 183: Discuss the distinction rule in the informal meeting and come with a conclusion.	Before next PC meeting	All PC members	

AP 6 – 183: Make a setup for the new programme specific EER.	Before next PC meeting	Hiske	
AP 6 – 183: Compile the main differences of the EER in a document.	Before the informal meeting (29 th of April)	Hiske	