

To: Members of PC CreaTe/HMI

From: Barbara Spikker

Reference: EWI15/CreaTe/3916bs      Date: 3 June 2015

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

**Concerns: Minutes of the extra PC CreaTe/HMI meeting, 28 May 2015**

Committee members present: dr. M. Poel (chair), dr. ir. H.J.A. op den Akker,  
F. Lammers, V. Nibbelke

Others present: dr. G.F. van der Hoeven, dr. ir. E.J. Faber,  
B. Spikker (support staff, minutes)

---

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

Poel opens the meeting at 11.07.

#### **Announcements**

Van der Hoeven expects that approximately 100 students will flow in. It is remarkable that there have been many registrations from far abroad. Registrations by Germans are few. 2 large intake sessions will still take place. Otherwise, the intake is proceeding well. An intake is mandatory for every student. However, the recommendation does not need to be honoured. Approximately 10/20% gets a negative recommendation following the intake meeting.

Van der Hoeven also states that a successor has been found. He expects that the successor (a woman) will take over the OLD position as of 1-9-2015. The exact start of her time is not yet known.

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

The agenda is approved in its current form.

### **3. OER HMI**

Poel sent his response by mail. Partly in response to the mail, Van der Hoeven and Heylen decided together not to conduct the intended meaning. OER HMI will be much the same as last year. Something that has, indeed, changed is the admissions regulation in the sense that one must now speak in terms of modules. Van der Hoeven will complete the OER HMI and distribute this by mail. The OLC decides to approve the proposed OER HMI for 2015-2016. Dean Apers will be informed (action: Lammers)

Van den Akker also had a question, namely:

- does the Trento double degree still exist or has this been subsumed in the EIT? Van der Hoeven will check with Heylen about this. (action: Van der Hoeven)

#### 4. OER CreaTe

Faber had included a number of comments in the OER. These are discussed one by one. (action: Van der Hoeven)

- page 4 comment 1* is not included on purpose.  
*comment 2* that's right - this will be corrected.  
*comment 3* you may deviate in certain cases. 'Has to' is confusing. This will be changed.
- page 5 comment 4* will be corrected.  
*comment 5* Van der Hoeven explains what extension means. A notification of an extension has never appeared in the OER. Nor will this be stated in the future in this OER.  
*comment 6* will be corrected.
- page 10 comment 7* correct - and this will be formulated better.  
*comment 8* will be corrected.  
*comment 9* Van der Hoeven does not wish to refer to educational units. So this item will not be changed.
- page 11 comment 10* there is no transition regulation yet. One hopes this will be ready on time.
- page 12 comment 11* there is a hardship clause that can be deployed should such circumstances be the case for a student.
- page 16 comment 12* will be corrected.  
*comment 13* will be corrected.  
*comment 14* see comment 5.
- page 17 comment 15* see comment 14.  
*comment 16* Formally, reparation means that the student gets a maximum score of 6, but in some cases (especially where possible compensation is concerned), this rule is not complied with. The ruling must be brought to the attention of the module coordinators. Cannot be implemented in Osiris.  
*comment 17* the structure will be looked at.
- page 19 comment 18* has yet to be looked at.
- page 20 comment 19* has yet to be looked at.  
*comment 20* has yet to be looked at.  
*comment 21* has yet to be looked at.
- page 21 comment 22* check on this.

The OLC wants to know whether some notification must still be made about the extra opportunity during the summer period. Van der Hoeven does not want to include this. This concerns individual cases almost submit requests to the ex. cie. No collective ruling will be drawn up for this.

Van den Akker states that research methodology is missing on page 10 of the Intelligent Interaction module. This will be changed (action: Van der Hoeven).

Commentary from Salm

*Graduation* Van der Hoeven notes that this must be 8 modules from years 1 and 2.

*Language* There is a UT-wide agreement for foreign students.

Considering the aforementioned, the OER CreaTe is approved (action: Lammers).

#### 5. Questions

-

**6. End**

The meeting adjourned at 12.20.

## Actions

Action point	Status	Action taker
159. Check the module dossiers at the end of the modules	Faber and Spikker will meet and discuss this. Faber will propose a time to meet	Spikker, Faber
179. Change flowchart	Pending	De Haan
181. Make a notice of module evaluation assessments in the log file		Everyone
183. Propose HMI curriculum with Heylen and submit to OLC		Van der Hoeven
189. Update the follow-up matrix, mail it and place it on webdav	Is a continuous document. Leav on the agenda until June.	Faber
190. Mail module 1 results to other members for critical appraisal, then inform OLD		Salm, all members
192. Draw up a recommendation concerning module 1 after item 190.		Salm
193. Module 5b Discuss new media in the next OLC	Put this on the agenda for May	Spikker
194. Ask CreaTe students about the method of evaluating Sketching		De Haan
195. Check with IO about interest in participating in OLC in conjunction with Van Passel's taking over IO tasks		Van Passel
196. Doodle for an extra OLC concerning OERs for 4 June	Doodle is sent.	Spikker
197. Combine the June OLC with an extra OLC. Is that possible in terms of time?	At some point, check with and ask Poel and Van der Hoeven	Spikker
198. Plan a meeting about filling in module dossiers (see item 159)	Meeting - Spikker and Faber	Faber
199. Subcommittee meetings about the OERs		All members
200. OER CreaTe and HMI sign approval letters	Signed and sent	Lammers
201. Adjust OER CreaTe	Has been done	Van der Hoeven