UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

Committee members:
dr.ir. R.W. van Delden, dr. Ing G. Englebienne, dr.ir. J. Klein Brinke, E. Burema, A. Blom,
dr.ir. E.C. Dertien, M. Moneta, S. Buser (Proto)

Advisory members:
dr. A.M. Schaafstal (director Create), dr.ir. R. Klaassen (director ITech),
dr. K. Zalewska (bachelor coördinator), dr. J. van Houwelingen – Snippe (master coördinator),
G. van Ierssel MSc.(Studyadviser and Bachelor coördinator Create VU), M. Snel (director Create VU)

B. Leusink- Bokxem (support staff)
H. Ottenschot (minutes takers)
S. Nanwani Vaswani (minutes takers)

_____

MINUTES MEETING PROGRAMME COMMITTEE- CreaTe/ITech
MEETING NR. 154

Date: **Tuesday March 11 2025**
Time: **09.00 – 11.00 hr**
Location: **RA 2237**

MINUTES PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

1. **Opening**
   a. The meeting is opened at 9:09 by Van Delden.
   b. Van Ierssel will join after 10:00.

Announcements
   c. Klaassen notes that students provided a lot of positive feedback during the EducaCie evaluation for I-Tech last week.
   d. Schaafstal notes that it is currently being explored how more AI can be included in CreaTe. The UT wants to have a stronger AI bachelor program, and CreaTe seems to be the best fit as it is the most open. CreaTe would be put in the laundry, taking out the stuff that has 'become gray' over the years, and replacing it with AI aspects. Create in Amsterdam will have to be taken along as well. It's not that the bachelor will be overhauled completely, as the core will stay the same. The uniqueness of Create, the tinkering, physical domain, combination between EE and TCS, should be kept. A new positioning of CreaTe is also being discussed, as the numbers for CreaTe are not growing, and even fewer students are expected in the coming years. Existing AI programs will be investigated to assess the possibilities. However, there are still a lot of uncertainties. As soon as more is known, Schaafstal will share this with the PC.
      i. Dertien asks who is currently 'doing the laundry'. Schaafstal notes that there have been discussions with multiple staff members, marketing, and Boudewijn Haverkort (dean of EEMCS).
      ii. Burema asks what the timeline is for these plans. Schaafstal answers that, if there will be any changes, they will be implemented at the earliest during the academic year 2026-2027. A name change might also be in place, which takes time.
      iii. Burema asks if Amsterdam also has an AI program. Schaafstal answers that they have a very successful AI program. However, that program is full-blown AI, while CreaTe would position itself differently.
   e. Buser mentions the previous CEO meeting where they talked about the Erasmus college. A couple of Universities across Europe are connected, from where students can follow courses or partake in hackathons online or in person, for which you will be paid. There are also discussions to make it a possibility to earn ECs through this. These options are not well-known at the UT right now. Buser thinks this might be a nice option for CreaTe as well. She does not have the full information yet but will share it when possible.
   f. Van Delden notes that the I-Tech pubquiz was well-visited and a lot of fun.

2. **Fixing the agenda**
   a. Agenda point 5 (Overall evaluation CreaTe) is moved to the end of the meeting.
   b. Zalewska would like to discuss the summer resits (agenda point 7).

3. **Minutes PC of Feb 11, 2025**
   a. Regarding:
      i. Page 1:
         1. Burema asks if 17 students is a lot for I-Tech to start with. Klaassen answers yes, and that they are happy with these numbers. The number has even increased to 19.
         2. Van Delden asks how the faculty-wide meeting (Townhall meeting) on the 13th of February went. Schaafstal answers that during this meeting, the faculty board shares information on and discusses how things are currently going within the faculty. The discussions were interesting and informal. There will be another session on March 18th for everyone who works within the faculty. It's not open to all students, but PC members are welcome. Staff members have already received information from the faculty, and Klein Brinke will forward the information to the rest of the PC.
      ii. Page 2
         1. Van Delden notes that there was a discussion yesterday about making the EDI course fall under the storytelling pillar. The conclusion was that it would require too many changes, so they will refrain from this idea. If students struggle with filling their storytelling pillar in the coming time, they will rethink this idea.
      iii. Page 3
         1. Burema wonders whether including SONA points was discussed. Van Delden answers that this was discussed, but that it was decided to refrain from implementing the points due to ethical considerations and the question if the effort it takes is worth it. The first step they want to try is to up the visibility of the user study Canvas page, showing the page to students at multiple moments. Other platforms, in and outside the university, also arrange user study participants, from which can be learned.
   b. Action points:
      i. **511:** Done, there is a plan. It is on the agenda.
      ii. **530:** There will be a meeting on this tomorrow.
      iii. **540:** There are some ideas in the previous minutes. Van Delden would like to keep this AP as a reminder.
      iv. **541:** Done, but the meeting is not arranged yet. It was unclear to the PC what came out of this AP. Burema still believes that a training could be valuable. However, it is not urgent.--> Added to the end of the agenda.
      v. **546:** Not done yet. Burema checked the agenda for the APs, but there seems to be a discrepancy between the APs in the minutes and the agenda.
      vi. **549:** No update.
      vii. **550:** Klein Brinke contacted Belinda, but the system is very difficult to work with. It is not clear who is responsible for it. Belinda does not seem to have access to published files.
         1. Zalewska does seem to have access! So she will make sure the minutes are published publicly.
      viii. **551:** Done, at the end of the agenda.
      ix. **556:** Will be done on the 16th of April.

4. **Incoming/outgoing mail**
   a. No mail that needs to be discussed.

5. **Master EER Part A (M-EER 25-26 Part A-draft-v1-track-changes)**
   a. This file was not shared before the meeting, but is still discussed due to time sensitivity.
   b. Page 12 - Formula for calculating the minimum study load when combining programmes
      i. There is a new formula that can be used to determine the amount of ECs that should be included in the final Master's project(s) when combining programmes. In the previous EER, the maximum amount of overlapping ECs was 40. However, this is problematic for students who want to combine a one-year and two-year program.

1. Klein Brinke asks if there is a limit on the amount of programs someone can combine. Van Houweline-Snippe answers there is no limit.
2. Blom asks if any overlap between programmes is still allowed. Van Houwelinge-Snippe answers that the amount is not specified at the moment. The examination board will have to look at it case-by-case.
   ii. Conclusion: The formula is quite unclear at the moment. The PC would like the formula to be more understandable and have a cap on the number of Master programmes that a student can follow at one time.
  c. Page 18 - Validity of grades
   i. Van Delden asks if it is allowed to have different rules for the Bachelor and Master. Klaassen answers that it was discussed to first try out new rules in the Bachelor, then change it for the Master.
   ii. Dertien asks if this rephrasing leads to a fundamental change. This is not the case. However, Van Delden still believes it is questionable to have different rules for the Bachelor and Master programmes, even if it is just for a year.
     1. Klaassen notes that there are courses in other Master programmes where the assessment includes an assignment and a review of another assignment. This can lead to problems for students who pass one part but not the other.
   iii. Burema agrees with Van Delden and asks if Part B of the EER should be aligned with the rules defined for the Bachelor programmes. Klaassen answers that examiners already have the freedom to follow the Bachelor ruling.
   iv. It's difficult to find a balance between flexibility and making sure actions are within the law.
   v. Conclusion: The sentence should be flipped around: "Unless the assessment criteria in the course specification have changed, test results are valid indefinitely."
  d. The PC agrees with the changes, with the advice to incorporate the comments. The PC would like to hear valid reasoning if the comments are not incorporated.

6. **Bachelor EER (file 7a-7f)**
  a. 7b, Page 5, Article 1.1
   i. Burema asks why the word Bachelor has been removed from multiple places. Zalewska thinks it is clearer to read this way, as it is already clear this EER is about the Bachelor.
  b. 7b, Page 8. Article 2.2, section 2
   i. Englebienne wonders what is meant by 'education', as it can entail different things (e.g. lectures, study materials, exams, etc.). The PC would like more clarity on what is meant with this to avoid misunderstandings.
  c. 7b, Page 9, footnotes
   i. In footnote 9, article 8.2 should be article 7.2.
  d. 7b, Page 11, Article 3.10, section 5
   i. Englebienne notes that this point addresses assessed work, and wonders whether there should also be a rule on how long assessment materials such as exams and rubrics should be kept. Van Delden agrees that it would be a good idea to have a rule for this as well.
     1. Additionally, Englebienne and Van Delden believe that 12 months is too short to be able to use assessed work for evaluations and improvements of a program. They would prefer around 16 months.
     2. Lastly, a student's right to be forgotten should be included in the EER. If students want their results to be removed at an earlier time, they should have the right to request this.

7. **Summer resits**
  a. Zalewska explains that quite a lot of students, especially older year students for math courses, are to partake in a summer resit. However, many of them do not participate or end up failing the resit. They are not proactive. Zalewska has noticed many students, even first years, talking about the summer resits as if they are a given. Zalewska believes this is not the right approach, as it can also give students false hope. She would like to discuss whether summer resits should be removed altogether. Other programs within EEMCS also do not offer summer resits.
  b. Burema asks if sanctions should be handed out to people who do not show up for their summer resit. Zalewska answers that it is still the question if summer resits should be kept at all. There are quite a few students who did not pass math courses in any of their modules, for whom the chance of passing a summer resit is quite slim.

   c.   Burema notes that it was discussed last year that students should prioritize trying to pass courses from previous years, rather than courses from their current module. Buser feels like students do not generally do this or know about this advice. Zalewska notes that students who have received a postponed BSA should know. Van Delden adds that this is also mentioned to other students. Buser still feels like a lot of students do not know this.

   d.   Buser notes that she also knows students who had a positive experience with summer resits. For some students, there was quite a lot of overlap between math tutorials and other courses, making it difficult to pass math courses. For them, a summer resit was a nice alternative.

      i.   Zalewska understands, but also has seen multiple examples of students who could not graduate due to math and still did not show up for the tutorials and/or summer resits. Especially older years tend to not show up. There was not enough proactiveness from the students for the summer resits to be worthwhile, especially since Eddy will soon retire. Van Delden agrees.

   e.   Dertien suggests making it required to be more proactive by students having to come to a teacher themselves when they want a summer resit.

   f.   Klein Brinke thinks that the summer resits treat a symptom, not the problem. Around 60% of the people in M02 failed math, and some did not even show up for the resit. Some students already decided to redo the course in M06. Zalewska would like to get rid of the attitude that all students can always just go to a summer resit instead of trying to pass a course.

   g.   The PC would like to discuss this further during a next meeting.

8. **Next meeting**
   a. **The following points were not discussed (completely) during this meeting due to a lack of time:**
      i. Summer resits (continued)
      ii. SEQ
      iii. Overall evaluation CreaTe
      iv. PC training

9. **PC meeting schedule 2025 (2nd Tuesday of every month 9.00- 11.00 hrs)**
   a. Next meetings: **April 8,** May 13, June 10, July 8

10. **Questions**
    a. Burema asks if the PC has received any CRITEEC minutes recently. This is not the case
       i. **AP 557 Buser:** Ask Reinier if there are any recent CRITEEC minutes he can share with the PC

11. **End**
    a. Van Delden closes the meeting at 11:20.

Action points

Action point	Status	Responsible
511: Discuss the plan for and the budget of the proposed focus group on evaluating CreaTe as a whole	Open	Burema & van Delden & Buser
530: Figure out what the situation with Discord is with LISA	Ongoing	Van Delden, Zalweska
540: Think about ways to increase the visibility of the PC	Ongoing	Everyone
541: Respond to the email on PC trainings that the PC is available Feb. 25th and March 4th from 11:00 onwards	Ongoing	Englebienne
546: Ask Cynthia Souren about how voting during PC elections on teachers who are not officially linked to EEMCS would work. Which staff members would be allowed to vote for these teachers?	Open	Burema
549: Send M5 evaluation from travelling students to PC	Open	Van Ierssel
550: ~~Contact Belinda to see how to make Minutes Public~~ → Publish the PC meeting minutes publicly	Ongoing	Zalewska & Leusink
551: Add SEQ to March Agenda	Done	Leusink
556: Go to one of the Foundations lectures to talk about PC	Open	Blom
557: Ask Reinier if there are any recent CRITEEC minutes he can share with the PC	Open	Buser