

*Faculty Electrical Engineering, Mathematics, Computer  
Science (EEMCS)*

*Creative Technology, Human Media Interaction*

*Bureau of Educational Services*

To: Members PC CreaTe/HMI

From: Barbara Spikker

Reference: EW112/CreaTe/1386bs Date: 14 January 2013

M:\Create\OLC Create\minutes PC  
CreaTe/HMI 20.doc

**Concerns: Minutes of the PC CreaTe/HMI meeting nr. 20, 8 January 2013**

Committee members present: Dr. E.M.A.G. van Dijk (chair), Dr.ir. C. Salm,  
Dr. M. Poel, Ing. P. van Passel, M. Bruinenberg,  
D.A.F. Mulder, J. Kolkmeier,  
Others present: Dr. G.F. van der Hoeven (director), Dr.ir. E.J. Faber  
(Bachelor coordinator), B. Spikker (support staff,  
minutes)

---

---

### **1. Opening and announcements**

Van Dijk opens the meeting at 15:05 and wishes everyone a happy new year.

#### *Announcements*

Kolkmeier has agreed to be student member of the PC and is welcomed accordingly.

Van der Hoeven reports that 36 preliminary enrolments have been received to date for the academic year 2013/2014. That is 3 less than last year. The number of Dutch registrations is slightly higher. The intention is to make selection agreements with the first group at the end of this month.

### **2. Setting the agenda**

The agenda is approved in its current form.

### **3. Minutes programme committee of 11 December 2012**

The minutes are approved without any amendments.

#### *Action points:*

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| Point 18 | Kolkmeier has agreed to be student member of the PC. Point may be removed from the agenda.                         |
| Point 52 | Emails have been exchanged between Van Dijk and Rensink and the description will be altered. Point may be removed. |
| Point 53 | Van der Hoeven has mailed the link quality committee. Point may be removed.  |
| Point 54 | Will be discussed under item 5 of this agenda. Point may be removed from the agenda.                               |
| Point 55 | Van der Hoeven has mailed link 'Keuzegids Hoger Onderwijs'. Point may be removed from the agenda.                  |

#### 4. Incoming/outgoing mail

##### **Incoming**

*Appointment J. Kolkmeier as student-member*  
Informing letter.

##### **Outgoing**

*Description Research Topics*

Van Dijk briefly explains the exchange of emails between herself and Rensink.

#### 5. Examination of Modules

Van der Hoeven explains. Each module should offer a possibility to repair, but it's not possible to resit an entire module. That means it's possible to fail a module and that the student has to take the entire module again a year later.

The decision-making procedure with regard to resits is the responsibility of the exam committee. Students are not entitled to resits. Van der Hoeven would like to see each module followed by a discussion of the students, specifically to talk about problem cases. This would be a discussion between lecturers whereby the responsible module examiner could decide on behalf of the exam committee whether a student can pass after all. With EE there is already such an arrangement in place which considers whether the student is good enough to pass. A discussion follows.

##### *Question 1 (italics p. 2)*

The PC recommends starting testing early in the block so that action can be taken in time.

##### *Question 2 (italics p. 2)*

Van der Hoeven explains his intention. Each student can do something extra but this does put a lot of pressure on the lecturer. One option is if the student can demonstrate (s)he has acquired the skills through another subject.

Students who have not passed a module owing to illness should be eligible to resit that component or to do a supplementary assignment to pass for that missing component.

##### *Question 3 (italics p. 3)*

Van der Hoeven summarizes. A timeframe has been drawn up so that the student knows in time where (s)he stands. A discussion follows. Although the PC agrees with what is written, it feels that there should be a protocol which the examiner can use to still allow a student to pass. The examiner should also consult with tutors and other lecturers.

Another question is raised about what can be done when a lecturer underachieves as a teacher and this has a knock-on effect on the student(s). In such a case the exam committee could tell the examiner to either allow the disadvantaged student(s) to resit the exam or ask the examiner to apply a correction on the exam results. In TOM, the exam committee will play a large role in the resit procedure.

The decision is made to take a critical look at this document whether this can all be carried out once the modular system is operational.

#### 6. Composition sub-committee Quality care

Poel explains what the intention is of setting up a sub-committee, namely to run through/prepare things beforehand so that the PC does not need to scrutinize the entire document. If possible this sub-committee should be composed of a lecturer, student member and Ten Berge. The decision is made to rotate for the time being.

Block 1	Poel and Mulder
Block 2	Salm and Kolkmeier
Block 3	Van Dijk and Bruinenberg

**7. Questions**

Poel would like to know what the state of affairs is with the curriculum committee and the disciplinary council.

Van der Hoeven reports that he has no current knowledge of the curriculum committee. As for the disciplinary council, 6 of the 12 places are still vacant. The first meeting has been planned for 24 January.

**8. End**

At 16:35 Van Dijk closes the meeting.

## 9. Actions

Action point	Status	Action taker
56. As soon as the modular system is operational, a critical look must be taken at the resit procedure		All members