UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

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

Advisory members:
dr. A.M. Schaafstal (director CreaTe), dr.ir. R. Klaassen (director I-Tech), 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. 150

Date: **Tuesday, November 12 2024**
Time: **09.00 – 11.00 hr**
Location: **Citadel H211**

M I N U T E S   P R O G R A M M E   C O M M I T T E E

1. **Opening and announcements**
   a. The meeting is opened at 09:06 by Englebienne.
   b. Dertien is not present.
   c. Schaafstal and Zalewska will join later.
   d. There are some announcements for I-Tech.
      i. Klaassen noticed that the new setup of the CRITEECs for I-Tech works well. Two courses were evaluated: Foundations of I-Tech and Concepts, Measures and Methods, of which quite a few students attended the panels.
      ii. In general, there is a lot of activism within I-Tech (InteracCie for example) and a nice atmosphere.
      iii. The WSV project proposal for the Interaction Lab, with a link to education, has been approved!
      iv. During the last Foundation lecture, an alumnus was present, which was also the start of the alumni board. Klaassen wants to continue involving alumni more to show more about possible work fields after I-tech, also in collaboration with Proto.
      v. For the storytelling pillar: external hiring has been arranged for Q3. For Q4, it's more difficult, meaning that Documentary Practice most likely will not continue this year. For Popular Science Writing the possibilities are still unsure. Contact will be had with the new Communication Science master to see if collaboration is possible.
   e. Schaafstal joins at 9:12.
      i. She mentions the big protest against budget cuts within higher education this Thursday. Quite a lot of staff members, including deans, and students are going.
      ii. There is more news about the Wet Internationalisering In Balans.
         1. The government wants to reduce the number of international students in higher education. Every bachelor programme is now required to deliver a Toets Anderstalig Onderwijs (TAO), most likely somewhere in the spring (between January - July/August). The TAO has become stricter than was announced before: passing the TAO should be an exception. (Preliminary) clusters of education that go for the TAOs have been discussed. A certain number of programmes within those clusters will have to become Dutch. The preliminary cluster of CreaTe seems weird, as it is not content-based, but includes several design programmes (ME, IDE, Aerospace Engineering). Right now, being part of this cluster is seen as good news, but the clustering is still undecided. Once in the clusters, the Domeinraden will decide which programs will have to switch to Dutch. The deans come in to play here. There was a discussion with all programme directors and other faculty board members, so there is a better overview now of the situation for all parties.
            a. Current students will for sure not be affected by the TAO, as changes will be made in 2027-2028 earliest. Students will always have the right to complete the program in the language they started with.
         2. Bachelor programmes need around 60-80 students to be cost-effective. Currently, CreaTe almost gets there in Twente but not yet in Amsterdam. However, if international students are left out of the student total, CreaTe will become sub-critical. This is true for almost all programmes within EEMCS, except Computer Science. Together with Snel and Felix van Urk, possible arguments to pass the TAO that fit CreaTe best have been discussed. This information will be delivered around Christmas.

Schaafstal wants to discuss those arguments with the PC as well and will share it as soon as she receives it.

 iii. The University is still doing okay, but the situation feels threatening. The future is unsure. In EEMCS, the reduction of TAs (35%) is better compared to what other faculties have to do, but it is still hard on everyone. The focus right now is to deliver good quality education. The open days went well, and the End of Module days were great (even though there were no sponsored drinks), and a lot of fun.

 iv. Schaafstal would like students to mention if they have any questions or are concerned, as she believes students are not in the loop enough and need better information provision. She discussed this with Marketing & Communication as well, so hopefully, more efforts will be put into this.

  1. Van Delden urges that within communication from the board, it should be stated that the quality of education will have to go down, as there is less money and the number of contact hours and amount of feedback will need to go down. Schaafstal answers that it is not a given that quality will go down, as these reductions can also help students. For example, students tend to take a long time to finish their I-Tech master's at the moment, and reducing this time is beneficial for both staff and students. Saying goodbye to practices from the past is not easy, but it will have to be done.

   a. Englebienne notes that in Robotics there is a strict rule to cap a grade if a student takes too long, which does help with speeding up the process. This could be considered. Klein Brinke is scared that this will demotivate very motivated students, who can use the extra time to refine their work and publish it for example. Englebienne notes that it depends on how you implement the rules, and exceptions should be possible. Schaafstal notes that best practices from other programs will be considered for future decisions. Making the problem explicit is already a good step.

 v. Englebienne remarks that, from his point of view, the TAO is based on an ideological and non-rational position. Our response is to be rational and not ideological about it. Englebienne is worried that this will turn out to be the wrong approach, leading to a fight for being the exception within a cluster. He wonders whether more should be done to prevent this. Schaafstal notes that it is very complicated and out of our hands, as few people can actually make a difference. It is a political debate that we do not have much insight or influence in. The best we can do is inform those who are at the table and provide well-thought-out arguments so they can fight for the programs. Englebienne asks whether we should gather information within the clusters rather than only internally. Schaafstal notes that this is difficult as the clusters are still uncertain. Merijn adds that the clusters are meant to lead to a decrease in EER students, which is contradictory to the Beethoven initiative, which is an initiative from ASML, which needs a lot of talent from studies like EE, TCS, and AT. The government sponsors this initiative as ASML might otherwise leave the Netherlands. So, more technical graduates are needed, which will be hard to do without EER students. Additionally, it is not known what the impact of being in a cluster is. The impact on the goals of the government has been calculated for two scenarios: keeping one programme within a cluster English, and keeping half, but nothing is certain yet. Before any decisions can be made, more needs to be known about where we stand.

 vi. M05 Humane By Design finished for the first time. Snel notes that it was festive and that the programme is very proud. Results showed the thinking out-of-the-box mentality and was fitting for what the specialization should be.

2. Fixing the agenda
 a. Point 10: Task should be Tracks
 b. Klein Brinke should be mentioned as a committee member and with his dr. ir. title.

3. Minutes
 a. **PC meeting 146 - 08 October**
  i. **Content-wise:**
   1. Page 1: Similarly, Klein Brinke should be mentioned as a committee member and with his dr. ir. title.
   2. Page 2: BSV should be WSV.
   3. Page 4: The first sentence of 5.k.iv could be written down more clearly.
   4. Page 5:
    a. 6.c: The second sentence is not complete and should be rephrased
    b. 7: Agenda is misspelled.
  ii. **Regarding:**
   1. Page 2:
    a. Van Delden wonders how the automatic transcription works and how much time it saves. He will ask Soham about this.
     i. **AP 533 Van Delden:** Ask Soham how automatic transcription would work and discuss how much time it would save

b. Englebienne asks what the expectations regarding the growth of the amount of VU students are. Schaafstal notes that Amsterdam has grown a bit. There has been a lot of marketing going on within Noord Holland, the main area that attracts VU students. However, against expectations, the number of people on open days has not been increasing. Snel should evaluate this with marketing in Amsterdam.

iii. **Action points**
　　1. **487:** The report is on the agenda.
　　2. **505:** Done for the previous meeting. Van Houwelingen-Snippe notes that she is leaving. Simone Oolhorst will be the next contact person for the EER.
　　3. **508:** Done for the previous meeting.
　　4. **510:** Done for the previous meeting.
　　5. **511:** No update.
　　6. **515:** Done for the previous meeting. What we are doing right now is within a grey area, so this should be discussed next meeting.
　　7. **519:** No update. Schaafstal notes that there is a new teacher for Internet Technology, Roland van Rijswijk.
　　8. **529:** Done.
　　9. **530:** Not done yet. Klein Brinke notes that students seem to have little interest in the platform ever since there is physical education again, so he wonders about the need for this AP. Englebienne thinks it is still handy to have a platform available if needed. Schaafstal notes that a WSV proposal regarding a platform similar to Discord has been approved. Van Delden will take over the AP, as he is part of the WSV proposal.
　　10. **531:** Done.
　　11. **532:** Done.

Klaassen leaves the meeting at 10:00.

b. **CRITEEC M01**
　i. Burema notes that the feedback generally seems good. As there is a comment about TAs, she wonders whether M01 already had fewer TAs compared to previous years. Schaafstal notes that Q1 was not impacted yet, but for Q2 there has been a reduction. Next year, there will be even fewer TAs (also for Q1), so this could have an impact.
　　1. Klein Brinke asks if there should be a long-term AP to check the impact of the reduction of TAs and see if the balance of TAs within a module should be improved. Burema notes that there should be a history of CRITEEC minutes, but that the PC does not have access to this. Ottenschot remarks that there used to be a website with CRITEEC minutes, but that it was disbanded as it was not being used. The minutes are still stored by the CRITEEC, however, so they could be used in the future.
　　2. Burema suggests adding more information about the CRITEEC agenda point 'teacher' and the amount of TAs per course, as it can be difficult based on the minutes to understand the feedback.
　　　a. **AP Burema 534:** Discuss with the CRITEEC chair to make it more clear in the panel minutes which teachers are being discussed and how many TAs a course has
　　3. Buser heard that some TAs are struggling with doing their job within the assigned hours, so she has set up a feedback form to see where people are struggling most.
c. **CRTEEC M05 (Interactive Media)**
　i. Burema notes that there were 11 deadlines for one of the subjects. This sounds interesting, as there are only 10 weeks within the module. Van Delden notes that this is true, as in previous years there were a lot of students who did all the work at the end of the module. Not all assignments were big, so they should still be doable within the assigned time. The minutes do note that the workload was still a bit too much. However, Van Delden still thinks it is more important to make sure students do their work during the module instead of at the end.
d. **Other**
　i. Burema asks if there has been an evaluation session for Humane by Design. Snel is not sure, she will check in with the module coordinator. Van Delden agrees that there should be structural feedback. Klein Brinke notes that an evaluation session for M01 is being planned with Van Ierssel. Additionally, a student panel has been put together to gather feedback for M02 in Amsterdam on a biweekly basis.
　ii. Additionally, there were no minutes for Smart Technology and I-Tech. Burema will contact the CRITEEC chair about this.
　　1. **AP 535 Burema:** Ask the CRIITEEC chair to send the minutes for the Smart Technology and I-Tech panels
　　2. Buser adds that two I-Tech students in the EducaCie of Proto are interested in making sure I-Tech students can give feedback about courses.

4. **Annual Report 2023-2024**
   a. Page 1
      i. The title mentions 2022 - 2023, which should be 2023 - 2024.
      ii. Klein Brinke should be under employees and have the title ir. as well.
      iii. Burema is mentioned as an I-Tech representative but is still studying CreaTe.
      iv. Only Burema is mentioned under New Members, but Blok and Klein Brinke are missing in this section.
      v. Proto is mentioned as a 'study union', but should be 'study association'.
   b. Page 2
      i. For the meeting of 14-11-2023, spelling mistake for 'improvements'.
   c. Other than that, there are no remarks.
      i. **AP Englebienne 536:** Implement the feedback on the annual report of 2023-2024

5. **Incoming/outgoing mail**
   a. **Incoming**: Simone Oolhorst - invitation training for new members of the PC
      i. Klein Brinke notes that he did not receive this email, which is frustrating. He found out about the training when reading the agenda, and is unavailable available now. Other members did receive the email, but some would have liked to receive the invitation earlier since they are not available either.
      ii. Van Delden notes that, right now, only Belinda has access to the PC email, so whether these emails are forwarded is dependent on her availability. Van Delden will ask if the chairs can be added to the email.
         1. **AP 537 Van Delden:** Ask Leusink-Bokxem if more people (at least the chairs) can be added to the PC email
      iii. Burema believes there is also an online training system, as she followed online training last year. Schaafstal adds that CELT also shared that they can create tailor-made training based on the wishes of a PC. Van Delden asks if the PC should prepare what they want to learn during such training. Burema would like to join the training and has ideas on what would be beneficial to discuss during the training. Klein Brinke would also like to join.
   b. **Outgoing**: Letter to Celine Heijnen - text suggestions EER
      i. Burema thanks Van Delden for sending it.

6. **Critical review on possible reduction on the number of meetings through the use of smart EER/evaluation-aligned moments**
   a. Van Delden thinks there are possibilities to reduce the number of meetings of the PC, as other PCs have also done, at least for next year. This is necessary since it was stated that minute takers should be let go due to budget cuts. Burema and Englebienne think it might be hard to reduce the number of meetings looking at previous years, but that the meetings themselves could be more efficient in some cases.

7. **International Identity of Create**
   a. Van Delden notes that the internationalization quality mark (keurmerk) that CreaTe received deserves attention due to the TAO. There was a workshop on internationalization in M1 again, which is great. Schaafstal had a discussion with Zalewska about the next accreditation, for which the international identity is also important. It is unsure whether CreaTe will try to receive the quality mark (and other awards) again. For the first time, CreaTe and I-Tech will be accredited together, as they very much build on the same foundation.

   Van Delden leaves at 10:37.

8. **Online vs. on-paper testing preference**
   a. Klein Brinke suggests pushing this point to the next meeting to save time for the following agenda points.

9. **CRITEEC Panel and Course Design**
   a. Blom was wondering about the I-Tech CRITEEC panels, as there were no minutes. He would've liked to see a panel about Intro to HCI, as there was a lot of feedback last year. Burema believes the CRITEEC tried to organize a panel However, nobody showed up, and it was very poorly communicated. Van Houwelinge-Snippe explains that there are a few I-Tech CRITEEC panels per module, as it is not feasible to organize a panel for each course.

10. I-Tech Course Communication and Tracks
 a. Blom notes that he is happy with the course planner. He would like to see a filter for certain Masters as this is also possible on Osiris. Additionally, some courses do not clearly state which pillars they (can) fall under (capita selecta, I-Tech project, Research Topics). He would like to see this communicated more clearly. Van Houwelinge-Snippe does mention this during the Kick-In and it is mentioned by Dirk at the end of the Foundations course, but the information still does not reach all students. Blom suggests adding this information to the course planner so the information will reach more students.
   i. Schaafstal notes that there are not a lot of UT students who go to the UT master's open days. Proto could promote the open days as well.
 b. Blom also wonders whether I-Tech has considered implementing tracks, so a pathway of predefined courses that tie into certain types of jobs. Some other masters, like IDE, do this. Van Houwelinge-Snippe answers that it has been discussed. It was decided not to implement tracks, but suggesting courses that fall within a certain cluster is still an option. No concrete actions have been taken yet, however.

 Zalewska joins at 10:50.

11. Student Representations and Contact Points
 a. Blom notes that the PC is not really known at the moment. For at least I-Tech, it could be mentioned during a lecture. Burema agrees but also notes that students get a lot of information during lectures, especially the first one(s). Mentioning it later in the module could be an option, for example at the end of Q1. Additionally, the CRITEEC could also be promoted during this time. Zalewska notes that the PC should also be promoted at the VU.
   i. Burema notes that she also has thought about creating merchandise clothing to make the PC more known.
 b. Klein Brinke adds that there is also little transparency about what happens during the PC to teachers. Having the minutes available online could help. Zalewska notes that transparency towards teachers is important, but privacy laws also need to be considered. Schaafstal suggests looking into the legality before publishing minutes online. Burema suggests that Buser also asks the CEO how other PCs deal with transparency.
   i. **AP 538 Klein Brinke:** Look into the possibilities regarding (the legality of) publishing PC minutes to improve transparency
   ii. **AP 539 Buser:** Ask during a CEO meeting how other PCs deal with transparency towards non-members (e.g. publishing minutes online)

12. PC meeting schedule 2024/2025 (2nd Tuesday of the month, 15:00 - 17:00)
 a. 2024: December 10
 b. 2025: January 14, February 11, March 11, April 8, May 13, June 10, July 8
 c. **Coming meetings will be from 15:00 - 17:00 again.**

13. Any other business
 a. Klein Brinke asks if the SEQ has been updated, as students were finished with it very quickly. Schaafstal notes that this is the case. She hopes this will lead to a better response rate. Zalewska adds that only the SEQ for M01 is in a pilot right now.

14. End
 a. Englebienne closes the meeting at 10:58.

Action points

Number	Action point	Status	Responsible
487	Start constructing the annual report for 2023	Done	Englebienne
511	Discuss the plan for and the budget of the proposed focus group on evaluating CreaTe as a whole	Open	Burema & van Delden & Buser
515	Check the legality of voting on the re-election of a PC member and how many members can/should be part of the PC	Still needs to be discussed	Burema
519	Share ideas for improvement from students for the Internet Technology course with Zalewska and Schaafstal	Open	Burema
529	Add to the agenda discussion on preference for on paper or online testing whether we prefer to use online testing or not	Done	Leusink-Bokxem
530	~~Figure out what the situation with Discord is with LISA~~ → Keep track of updates surrounding a platform similar to Discord for which a WSV proposal has been approved	Open	Van Delden (taken over from Klein Brinke)
532	Add to the agenda: 1) Critical review on possible reduction on the number of meetings through the use of smart EER/evaluation aligned moments and 2) International Identity of CreaTe.	Done	Leusink-Bokxem
533	Ask Soham how automatic transcription would work and discuss how much time it would save	Open	Van Delden
534	Discuss with the CRITEEC chair to make it more clear in the panel minutes which teachers are being discussed and how many TAs a course has	Open	Burema
535	Ask the CRIITEEC chair to send the minutes for the Smart Technology and I-Tech panels	Open	Burema
536	Implement the feedback on the annual report of 2023-2024	Open	Englebienne
537	Ask Leusink-Bokxem if more people (at least the PC chairs) can be added to the PC email	Open	Van Delden
538	Look into the possibilities regarding (the legality of) publishing PC minutes to improve transparency	Open	Klein Brinke
539	Ask during a CEO meeting how other PCs deal with transparency towards non-members (e.g. publishing minutes online)	Open	Buser