

To: Members PC CreaTe/HMI

From: Barbara Spikker

Reference: EWI14/CreaTe/3239bs Date: 6 September 2014

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

**Concerns Minutes of the PC CreaTe/HMI meeting, 27 August 2014**

Committee members present: M. Poel, PhD (chair), F. Lammers, J. Kolkmeier,  
M. Bruinenberg, V. Nibbelke  
Others present: G.F. van der Hoeven, PhD (director), E.J. Faber, PhD  
(bachelor coordinator) B. Spikker (support staff,  
minutes)

---

## **1. Opening and announcements**

The meeting is opened at 10.10 by Poel.

### *Announcements*

#### **1<sup>st</sup> year students**

Van der Hoeven reports that 89 students have enrolled for the new year. 115 students took part in the matching procedure. With a view to the 89 enrolments, this falls short of expectations. Van der Hoeven believes fewer than 100 new students will enrol.

It is impossible to enrol without taking part in the matching procedure. In view of the introduction, four groups were formed. If fewer than 100 students enrol, this will have to change to three groups.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> year students**

Last year, 77 students continued to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the programme. Ten students dropped out before 1-2-2014, two of them dropping out early so as not to have to undergo their student progress evaluation. Formally, 67 students were following the programme through to August. They all underwent a student progress evaluation. Eleven were negatively evaluated. This year, 56 students started their 2<sup>nd</sup> year. One student is in the process of transferring to ID. Six out of these 56 students had their final student progress evaluation postponed. 30 out of the remaining 50 students completed 4 modules. 20 of them are yet to repeat 1 module.

In principle, the six students who had their evaluation postponed are to repeat the entire module. However, an arrangement is in place that students with a disability can have partial results remain in force.

#### **HMI intake**

The intake of new HMI students was disappointing these past few years. We don't expect this to change this year. Few students graduating from the CreaTe bachelor's programme continue to the HMI programme.

Faber reports that the ST/NM distribution is about 50/50. Faber will submit the overview to Spikker for processing in Osiris **(action by Faber)**  
Van der Hoeven will submit the overview of tutors to Spikker, so the tutors, too, can be processed in Osiris. **(action by van der Hoeven)**

Sophie de Haan will become a programme committee member as per 1-9-2014. Spikker will ensure she will receive her letter of appointment and access to webdav. **(action by Spikker)**

## **2. Setting the agenda**

The agenda is approved in its current form.

## **3. Minutes programme committee of 10 June 2014**

With reference to:

Page 3 Evaluation results not yet retrievable on webdav. Faber will look into this (Creec). UT-wide is yet to be implemented. **(action by Faber)**

Without further comments, the minutes of 10 June 2014 are approved.

Faber comments that Oosterhuis also performed a small-scale evaluation. The members believe that the evaluations need to become more public. The question of how to realize this remains. The matter will be placed on the next agenda. **(action by Spikker)**

### *Action points:*

- 87. will be discussed in due time.
- 115. kept on the agenda.
- 121. has been performed and may be struck from the agenda.
- 123. on the agenda. May be struck.
- 126. kept on the agenda for now.
- 127. has been performed and may be struck from the agenda.
- 128. kept for now.
- 129. has been done. May be struck from the agenda.
- 130. has been done. Van der Hoeven will mail the final EER **(action by van der Hoeven)**
- 131. mailed. Item can be deleted.

## **4. Incoming/outgoing mail**

All letters sent with respect to the approval of the EER are to be stored here. Will be placed on webdav. Letters have been sent, including the comments by the committee. **(action by Spikker)**

## **5. Module 5 Smart Technology**

Faber takes the floor and explains matters. Nibbelke states he discovered some typos in both modules and will mail them to Poel. **(action by Nibbelke)**

The comment is also made that item 9, Evaluation plan, does not state the time, frequency and topic of evaluation.

Apart from these considerations, the committee approves the manual.

## **6. Module 5 New Media**

The members comment that there is yet work to be done on this manual, including:

- Work schedule;
- Research project text is copied verbatim from ST module;
- Submarks are to be stated with one decimal place;

Poel will survey the issues and report the emendations to be made to Zwiets. **(action by Poel)**

The comment is made that Oosterhuis has written a short Research guide. This is meant to complement the modules.

The members would like to know whether reports will also be drawn up of individual projects. Faber reports that the interviews have been placed on webdav.

The programme committee approves the manual, provided the above has been implemented.

## **7. Accreditation / visitation CreaTe**

The members believe the report as it is now looks good. Van der Hoeven states that the report will be submitted to the printer on 22 September. It will be sent to the visitation committee in mid October. Deadlines are tight.

The composition of the visitation committee is not completely known. It is known that Ben Kröse will be the chair. Van der Hoeven states that he possesses a wealth of knowledge in the matter.

Industrial Design at Eindhoven is looking for a student member.

The SAR is to be completed by late September.

Van der Hoeven was provided with the following comments by committee members:

- At the end of each chapter, strong and weak points are listed. These are to receive an explanation. Please mail the explanations to van der Hoeven. **(action by van der Hoeven, all members)**
- Go over this piece (assessment table) with a number of students. Preferably from the 2012 cohort. Lammers and Bruinenberg agree to take this on. **(action by Lammers, Bruinenberg and van der Hoeven)**

Van der Hoeven succinctly explains what a visitation committee does. Points of concern include the student to staff ratio and the number of teachers with Basic Teaching Qualification.

## **8. Questions**

Spikker is requested to plan a meeting for 22 September to discuss the final SAR. **(action by Spikker)**

Evaluations are to be included on the next agenda. Need to be more structured, be made more public, and possibly a small curriculum committee is to be formed. **(action by Spikker)**

## **9. End**

At 11.30 the meeting is closed.

## 10. Actions

Action point	Status	Action taker
87. national student survey questions are finalized. Van der Hoeven will draw up a draft version and come back on the matter in December.		Van der Hoeven/Spikker
115. contact vd Boogaard re free assignment presentation	Not done yet.	Van der Hoeven
126. have accreditation reappear on the monthly agenda	monthly	Spikker
128. take into account that the committee is to appear at the accreditation.		All members
132. provide overview distribution NM/ST specialization to Spikker for examination programme allotment		Faber
133. provide overview tutor group division to Spikker for Osiris entry		Van der Hoeven
134. Sophie de Haan take care of letter of appointment, webdav, fee.	all has been forwarded and is in process	Spikker
135. place assessment results on webdav		Faber
136. discuss evaluations in next meeting (make more public, structure, etc.) small curr. committee	Will be put on the agenda	Spikker
137. mail final EER		Van der Hoeven
138. place letters re approval EER on webdav	Has been done. Among the 27-8-2014 documents	Spikker
139. forward typos for both modules to Poel		Nibbelke
140. forward amendments/errors to Zwiers		Poel
141. mail SAR comments to van der Hoeven		All members
142. go over assessment table with students Lammers and Bruinenberg.		Lammers, Bruinenberg and van der Hoeven
143. plan extra meeting on SAR	Planned for 11-9-2014	Spikker