

## 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. 151

Date: **Tuesday December 10th 2024**  
Time: **15.00 – 17.00 hr**  
Location: **Citadel H211**

### MINUTES PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

#### 1. Opening

- a. The meeting is opened at 15:06 by Englebienne.
- b. Buser, Zalewska, Van Ierssel, Snel are not present.
- c. Burema will join later.

#### Announcements

- d. Schaafstal has some remarks regarding the TAO. There won't be many programs at the UT that are still sustainable if they fail the TAO (assuming all international students are lost). CreaTe would also get in a critical situation (but not as bad as other studies), aside from that the whole narrative of the program would change. The TAOs are scheduled to be developed in spring. In general, the situation has not changed much since last time. It's waiting for more information before much can be done.
- e. Additionally, Schaafstal notes that the budget cuts currently on the table from the government side dictate that educational programs are now supposed to be self-sufficient. Previously, it was tolerated if programs required extra budget to function. It is not completely clear how much programs cost to keep running. The task for the coming years is to understand what the costs are of running academic programs. Models are being developed to gain insight into this. There are some remarks about the model Central has developed, so there is a plan to have the program itself calculate the costs as well and compare the outcomes. From next year (January) onwards, more attention will be paid to making sure education is cost-efficient.
  - i. Englebienne remarks that he thinks education should not be self-sufficient. It should be supported by society. Schaafstal completely agrees, but this is outside of the program's hands. It does not seem like the cuts in higher education are off the table, but nothing is sure yet.
  - ii. Englebienne asks about the possibility of small Bachelor programs having to stop. Schaafstal answers that this is indeed being investigated (also for Master programs), along with the possibility of merging existing programs. Englebienne asks if this is something that the PC should also look at. Schaafstal answers that it is still too early to say anything. Student numbers seem to be going down in general across the country, but it is unclear whether this will also be the case for (all) programs at technical universities.
- f. Schaafstal notes that there is resistance within the faculty council against students keeping grades, as it could increase the workload for teachers. Currently, this is taken up in the general part of the Bachelor EER. However, Schaafstal is quite surprised by this resistance and disagrees, as she believes it saves time for both teachers and students. Van Delden also wonders why people think this, especially since teachers can still decide on a case-to-case basis. In CreaTe, this has worked for quite a long time and there is no desire to change this.
- g. Klaassen notes that he tried to save Popular Science Writing (for the storytelling pillar of ITech), but this seems to be impossible to arrange for this year. There are discussions with Communication Science to try and arrange it for next academic year.
- h. The open days of ITech had more students showing up than expected, which was nice!

- i. Van Delden remarks that the SEQ scores of all M05s are pretty good. Interactive Media received a point higher than last year. For Smart Technology, the hackathon was split into 2, with some parts at the beginning and some at the end, which was received well.
- j. Additionally, M06 is going. The CRITEEC showed no big issues.
- k. Klein Brinke notes that M02 at VU is going well, with only some mentions of high workload. Contact between UT and VU is going well. This week, there was a self-study session as no teacher could be found, but they're looking for a solution. Schaafstal notes that it is generally easier to arrange a replacement teacher at UT, as most people are based here, and there's a wider community of people to choose from.
- l. Dertien notes that M02 at UT is also going well.

## 2. Fixing the agenda

- a. No changes were made to the agenda.

## 3. Minutes PC meeting 150 - November 12th

- a. Content-wise:
  - i. Page 4, point 9: CRITEEC is misspelled.
- b. Regarding:
  - i. Page 5: Van Delden notes there are only very few courses for the Storytelling pillar this year. He asked whether it would be a good idea to assign all 5EC of the Experience Design For Interaction course to storytelling, as this is already the idea for next year. Klaassen thinks it is a good suggestion and would like to discuss it.
  - ii. Englebienne notes some ideas were discussed about the visibility of the PC, but no APs were handed out. What are the concrete next steps? Klein Brinke notes that it is good to first check the legality regarding new members, which is later on the agenda.
    - 1. Klaassen asks Blom about the PC being introduced during one of the Foundation lectures. Blom replies that a lecture at the end of the module would be suitable, as students will have settled a bit. Blom has a presentation ready for this.
    - 2. Englebienne suggests adding a recurring attention point to keep an eye on the visibility of the PC.
      - a. **AP 540 Everyone (recurring):** Think about ways to increase the visibility of the PC

*Burema joins at 15:36.*

- iii. Action points:
  - 1. **511:** Van Delden is planning to take this up in February.
  - 2. **515:** Will be discussed during agenda point 6.
  - 3. **519:** Not done yet.
  - 4. **530:** A first meeting with Maro and Erik was held.
  - 5. **533:** Van Delden asked, but no update yet.
  - 6. **534:** Burema was not sure what was meant by this AP. Englebienne notes that the minutes of the CRITEEC could benefit from more information on who is talked about during the CRITEEC panels, as this will give more context to the PC. Van Delden adds that the PC wants to keep track of the effect of the decrease of TAs, so it's good if the CRITEEC keeps track of this. Burema will take this up for the next meeting.
  - 7. **535:** Burema has received the minutes, but cannot upload the document. She will send it to Leusink-Boksem.
  - 8. **536:** Done. The updated version was sent to Leusink-Boksem this morning.
  - 9. **537:** Van Delden and Englebienne now have access. Van Delden asked what should be done in case the PC wants to add more people, should this be necessary.
  - 10. **538:** Klein Brinke went over what other PCs at the UT do. Some programs publish nothing, and some publish the full version (most common), including agendas. Other programs have other approaches, such as availability on request or publishing letters to the program director with advice.
    - a. This means **AP 539** can also be removed as the information about other programs is already known.

#### 4. Incoming/outgoing mail

##### a. Incoming:

##### i. **PC trainings 2024 or 2025**

1. Schaafstal would like to emphasize that it is important that the PC stands strong, especially in current times.
2. Moneta asks if this training will be online or at the UT. Burema believes the trainings are normally in person at the UT. Schaafstal recommends doing such training in person, as it is beneficial for the training outcome.
3. Englebienne suggests finding two dates in 2025 during this meeting. Tuesday, Feb 25th. and March 4th in the morning (11:00), PC members are available.
  - a. **AP 541 Englebienne:** Respond to the email on PC trainings that the PC is available Feb. 25th and March 4th from 11:00 onwards
    - i. The PC will await their response, and if needed pick a second date during the next PC meeting.

##### ii. **Shortened SEQ**

1. The new SEQ is very short.
2. Klein Brinke notes that the new SEQ does not allow feedback on separate courses. Moneta agrees that this would be nice, and notes that quite some VU students have complained about not being able to differentiate between courses when giving feedback. Van Delden also thinks that the SEQ would be worse than the previous one if this is not possible.
  - a. Van Delden would at least like to see the courses of the module mentioned in the instructions of the questionnaire.
  - b. Klein Brinke suggests adding a text box underneath questions where students can optionally note if there are big differences between courses. Burema agrees but does think that this would increase the (perceived) length of the SEQ. Englebienne suggests making it a checkbox, so students can click on it to make a new text box appear. Van Delden would also like this but doubts it being technically possible.
  - c. Van Delden notes that an open textbox specifically on differences between courses could also be added at the end. Englebienne notes that this might be clearer, but also might lead to friction and not improve the results. He would like to see the option to give feedback as part of the overall remarks.
3. Conclusion: preferably, optional/foldable boxes for questions 2.1 to 2.9 are added so students can indicate themselves if they had significantly different experiences per course. If that is not possible, the PC would like to add to questions 3.1 and 3.2 that students can talk about experienced differences.
  - a. **AP 542 Klein Brinke:** Send the feedback on the new SEQ to Zalewska

#### 5. Discuss: on paper or online testing whether we prefer to use online testing or not

- a. Klein Brinke notes that the main issue was that the VU did not do online testing, while the UT did. However, this has changed now. Still, this topic can be discussed in general, for example on sustainability and keeping grades more easily for a longer time, to have recommendations ready for teachers. PC members can share the ideas mentioned in this meeting with other staff members they are involved with.
- b. Klein Brinke notes that online testing tends to be quicker, especially for multiple-choice tests.
- c. Burema notes that mainly mathematical formulas are nicer to write on paper. Englebienne agrees that paper is nicer in those cases, and would recommend teachers handing out scratch paper for that. Van Delden notes that Eddie hands out scratch paper with numbers on them, so they are linked to certain students. In this way, teachers can check if any scratch paper has been taken home (which has gone wrong in the past).
- d. Burema also notes that the network can be overloaded, meaning that online tests do not work anymore. Dertien adds that additional hiccups tend to happen, such as mistakes in assignments or assessments or machines not being charged.
- e. Klaassen notes that there is a logistical challenge with online testing, as more rooms and TAs are needed, so he often prefers paper tests. Dertien agrees and notes that he prefers paper testing after having calculated the CO2 impact. Dertien also notes that there are costs associated with Remindo, which has sparked some discussion among teachers. Klein Brinke was not aware of this, which impacts his opinion of online testing.
- f. Van Delden notes there was an issue with online testing at the VU. Some students could not start on time as they were not registered yet, which is a downside. Not every teacher can register students or has been informed on how to do this, which is an issue.
  - i. Englebienne thinks an FAQ for Remindo could be beneficial.

**6. The legality of voting on the re-election of a PC member and how many members can/should be part of the PC**

- a. Burema notes that something went wrong with the appointment of Buser, as she is now appointed as an advisory member, not a student member (and thus is not getting paid). This means that the PC has a student member too little at the moment. She is not sure if this went wrong on the PC or the secretariat side. Burema will talk to Buser about this and try to make sure she is appointed correctly.
  - i. **AP 543 Burema:** Discuss with Buser the issue of her not being appointed correctly within the PC
- b. Burema remarks that officially, there need to be elections for PC positions for both student and staff members. If this is not done, approval of the FC is needed for the appointment of new members.
  - i. Blom wonders how re-elections work. Burema is not sure and will look into this.
    - 1. **AP 544 Burema:** Look into how the legality surrounding the re-election of PC members
    - 2. Englebienne believes that every member needs to be re-elected every year.
- c. Blom notes that the PC needs more visibility to have successful elections, so the PC should work on that.
- d. Klein Brinke would like to know when appointments usually start and end, as his appointment ends in November, in the middle of the next academic year. If other appointments end at other times, arranging elections at one certain time could be difficult. Burema thinks that doing one election per year would be best, around the same time as the elections of the FC and UC, and would like to discuss this during next meeting.
  - i. **AP 545 Leusink-Bokxem:** Add the re-election of PC members to next meeting's agenda
- e. Klaassen wonders how voting works for staff members who are not officially linked to EEMCS, such as Klein Brinke. Schaafstal thinks Cynthia Souren knows.
  - i. **AP 546 Burema:** 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?

**7. The desirability for having public minutes - Emails Arend Rensink and Frank van den Berg**

- a. Van Delden emailed Arend and Frank about the necessity of full names being present in published minutes.
- b. Klein Brinke notes that currently, Leusink-Bokxem does upload the minutes to the web drive, but that they are not publicly available. Englebienne notes that this was a deliberate choice due to GDPR reasons. What preference does the PC have in regards to anonymity?
  - i. Englebienne believes that PC members are part of the PC by choice, which for him means it is okay to have names publicly known. The rest of the PC agrees with this.
  - ii. Schaafstal notes that, if minutes are to be public, it is very important that PC members explicitly mention when they want to discuss off-the-record topics. Burema notes that off-the-record topics would be a problem if minutes were made using AI. Currently, this is not a problem, as the PC wants to refrain from using unsupervised AI as long as this is possible.
- c. Conclusion: the PC does think the minutes should be public going forward, except for off-the-record topics that should be left out (so the same approach as before).
- d. Blom already needs to contact Leusink-Bokxem about his access to the P-drive, so he will mention this decision to her.
  - i. **AP 547 Blom:** Discuss with Leusink-Bokxem the decision of making minutes public going forward
- e. Schaafstal notes that there is little connection between the PC and the Faculty Council. There are layers of medezeggenschap (participation) that should be taken seriously, but she thinks that a better connection between those parties would be beneficial for both. More direct contact means less information lost. The PC agrees.

**8. PC meeting schedule 2024/2025**

- a. **2025 (15:00 - 17:00):** January 14, February 11, March 11, April 8, May 13, June 10, July 8
  - i. Burema and Dertien are not available on Tuesdays from 15:00-17:00. Englebienne suggests moving the meeting to 10:00 - 12:00, but Van Houwelingen-Snippe notes that the examination board meeting starts at 11:00. → The PC meeting times are moved (back) to 9:00 - 11:00. Schaafstal will join later due to travel times.
  - ii. Schaafstal would like to emphasize that members who are paid should be present during meetings, unless really not able to. Englebienne also adds that the people who are present online should also make sure to add their opinions during the meetings. Schaafstal emphasizes that the opinions from Amsterdam are especially important.

## 9. Questions

- a. Van Delden notes that there were only 5 students at the VU for a lecture on Monday, which meant that the teacher had to travel to Amsterdam for very little attendance. Klein Brinke notes that this is in general a huge issue for CreaTe@VU. Moneta also notices this, especially within her year. Multiple staff members note that this happens during many lectures and tutorials at the UT as well.
  - i. The PC would like to discuss this in more detail during the next meeting → **Added to AP 545.**

## 10. End

- a. Englebienne closes the meeting at 16:47.

# Action points

Action point	Status	Responsible
<b>511:</b> Discuss the plan for and the budget of the proposed focus group on evaluating CreaTe as a whole	Postponed to February	Burema & van Delden & Buser
<b>519:</b> Share ideas for improvement from students for the Internet Technology course with Zalewska and Schaafstal	Open	Burema
<b>530:</b> Keep track of updates surrounding a platform similar to Discord for which a WSV proposal has been approved	Ongoing	Van Delden
<b>533:</b> Ask Soham how automatic transcription would work and discuss how much time it would save	Ongoing	Van Delden
<b>534:</b> 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
<b>535:</b> <del>Ask the CRITEEC chair to send the minutes for the Smart Technology and I Tech panels</del> → Send the minutes of the ST CRITEEC panel to Leusink-Boksem to be uploaded to the PC drive	Open	Burema
<b>536:</b> Implement the feedback on the annual report of 2023-2024	Done	Englebienne
<b>538:</b> Look into the possibilities regarding (the legality of) publishing PC minutes to improve transparency	Done	Klein-Brinke
<b>540:</b> Think about ways to increase the visibility of the PC	Recurring	Everyone
<b>541:</b> Respond to the email on PC trainings that the PC is available Feb. 25th and March 4th from 11:00 onwards	Open	Englebienne
<b>542:</b> Send the feedback on the new SEQ to Zalewska	Open	Klein Brinke
<b>543:</b> Discuss with Buser the issue of her not being appointed correctly within the PC	Open	Burema
<b>544:</b> Look into how the legality surrounding the re-election of PC members	Open	Burema
<b>545:</b> Add two items to the agenda of next meeting: the legality of re-election of PC members, and low student attendance during lectures/tutorials	Open	Leusink-Boksem
<b>546:</b> 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
<b>547:</b> Discuss with Leusink-Boksem the decision of making minutes public going forward	Open	Blom