1. Approval of minutes & action points 🡪 14h00 – 14h15
	1. Minutes from Oct.24.2017
		1. Approved
	2. Minutes from Nov. 07.2017
		1. Not yet approved
	3. Action points
		1. 24 Oct 2017
			1. Patricia no longer adds the matrix to the document, will instead be brought up in talk with Sabine.
			2. Shamyi asked Isha (ASC 2016-17) for clarification of censorship rules, Isha said it was up to us. It is up to our internal agreement.
				1. Thus CC members look into if they agree with the censorship.
			3. Shamyi sent the CC blog to Daan.
			4. The compilation of course evaluations have been done.
			5. Internal rules document has not been finalized yet.
			6. The ASC feedback on the CC vision will be done by Jamie by Wed 22/11.
			7. Shamyi put the formal advice on the blog.
				1. With a headline, not “Advice #1”.
				2. *Shamyi will look into posting the advice as a document vs. as a text.*
				3. With the MTs answer, we can draft the “response” and say it is quasi-done through the publishing of the “governance” document.
			8. Diana, Jamie, Bas and Bettina are going to have a meeting on Thurs 26/11.
			9. Bas was approached by James on a MT-CC topic
				1. *The CC discussed whether such approaches were deemed “official” communication and whether they should be permitted/encouraged.*
				2. *It is unofficial unless it is formally sent to the CC.*
				3. Any conversation outside of direct MT-CC official conversation should not be regarded as official, they are informal and unofficial, but not discouraged as the short-lines of communication are appreciated.
			10. Regarding the Kees-Jan PowerPoint
				1. Diana will ask Annemieke for the PPt
			11. Regarding the CC’s involvement in the Accreditation Report
				1. James said the CC is not involved.
			12. Patrick’s Committee -> Rephrase it is not Patrick’s committee, .

**ACTION POINT: Gaetano and Shamyi** contact the MT to ask for approval of the “MT draft response”.

**ACTION POINT: Diana** sends an e-mail to the CC-MT regarding the informal unofficial and official communication lines.

* + 1. 7 Nov 2017
1. Discussion with the MT (Sabine & Bettina) 🡪 14h30 – 15h00

*The MT did not join, due to personal circumstances.*

*Understanding reaction from the CC members.*

*The following points where still discussed.*

* 1. Assessment Policy Plan
		1. The proposed APP Timeline
			1. The CC does not see the timeline workable, we *discussed the following options:*
				1. We can do it by the 2nd of January, if we get the materials on the 11th of December at noon,
				2. If sent after the 11th of December we will come back to you 12th of January. We are flexible between these two options. This option was discussed but not preferred due to Student CC members and finals week.
				3. We will respond by the 12th of January if the document is sent before the 15th of December.
			2. *The option we will respond by the 12th of January if the document is sent before the 15th of December.*
		2. There is a meeting scheduled to talk with Sabine
	2. Regelement
		1. Jamie and Diana are meeting with Bettina on Thur 23/11 to discuss this.

**ACTION POINT: Diana** will reply to the APP timeline e-mail stating our proposed timeline in which we will feedback by 12th of January if document sent to us before 15th of December

1. Communication and ARR update 🡪 15h00 – 15h15
	1. Ideas on ARR
		1. Gaetano: We would like to research to know more about ARR with other colleges.
			1. The first thing is. We want to compare our ARRs with other UCs ARRs. To gain inspiration.
			2. The second thing is to do a questionnaire/research to understand how the rules works for faculty/teachers/students.
				1. One is the degree of awareness of the ARR, do students know whether their courses apply for a curriculum according to ARR.
			3. The third is to compare our ARR with other pioneers for particularly successful ARRs, i.e. Finland and Sweden.
			4. *More knowledge on our rules and procedures before we take action.*
		2. Shamyi:
			1. We also want to look at the proposed changes of last year, to see their implementation, and use that perspective.
		3. Patrick:
			1. Consider using the model-OER? Why does UCU not comply with the model-OER? It is more extensive, including learning objectives, there are elements that are good for students that could inspire good changes. We are aware the last DoE was concerned about compliance with model-OER would prevent us from catering to our students and our nature.
		4. Gaetano:
			1. For background knowledge it would be good to know that.
	2. Process
		1. Diana: What is the process of changing the ARR?
		2. Gaetano: My proposal is to check this in the second stage, so first in our first stage build-up knowledge on what could be done, and then in the second stage, how to do it.
		3. Diana: I recall that there were two changes that were added in a later draft that did not let everyone feedback the process.
		4. Gaetano: We can discuss with the MT to make an ARR procedure that is transparent.
		5. Patrick: We as CC get to approve, but we should ask the individuals involved in the changes in advance to give feedback.
		6. *Gaetano and Shamyi outlined their first steps, which include looking at other ARRs and the old comments. Then there was a discussion on the procedure, and we considered the idea of collaboratively with the MT and actors discuss and proposal.*
		7. With regards to the ARR, the newest one is the one that is valid unless previous ARRs that are cohort specific are more good for a specific student.
		8. The question of efficiency; how efficient are the rules in achieving our goals? (This assumed the goals are what we want).
		9. An idea:
			1. A list in word of the changes that relate to the cohort, that the students can be benefitted by which ARR.
		10. Gaetano:
			1. A large misconception is that the tutor is responsible for knowing the rules and applying those to the student, the *student* is responsible.
		11. *We also discussed the content of the ARR, but we also discussed who communicated the changes in the ARR and how it is important it is clearly and cohesively done. In order to clear the confusion it is in some ways is the responsibility of the tutor.*
	3. First advice published?
		1. As discussed earlier in the minutes, *yes the 1st advice will be published.*

1. Update by Jamie 🡪 15h15 –15h35
	1. Feedback
		1. ASC did a questionnaire towards the expectations of students, it was a lot of open questions.
			1. Shamyi: Main findings
				1. Feedback was really appreciated and they would like more individual feedback.
				2. Some students also wanted feedback on non-course content aspects such as writing skills.
				3. Students did say they went up to teachers to ask for more feedback.
			2. Gaetano: I find this questionable
				1. I have the feedback in my office
				2. When I give it actively they are happy, but if they have to come to me then they don’t.
			3. Diana: I give active individual meeting feedback, and students really wanted those, but it requires a lot of my hours that I don’t get paid for.
			4. Shamyi: There is a discrepancy between departments in our results.
			5. Gaetano: In two types of feedback, the first is preparatory and the second is after the exam.
			6. Jamie: We don’t want this to replace an exam, but we want it on top of it. We want more than a letter grade.
			7. Shamyi: Incorporating it as a structural system, so there are more points given as to why the grade.
			8. Mirre: A grading rubric.
			9. Patrick: Something needs to give, if feedback is added something needs to be removed to keep the balance of hours.
			10. Charlotte: Example of a teacher who replaces classes for feedback sessions but does not take away from the issue.
			11. Diana: An option, potentially not advisable for UCU, but have an internal rule with an outline /grading criteria (maybe example) sent out, so that there is a coherent format.
		2. Should Feedback be an ASC/CC project?
			1. It should be a MT/CC/BoS project.
		3. Framing?
			1. Do we want more work from teachers or a different distribution?
				1. What would you be willing to miss for feedback?

ACTION POINT: Diana follow-up on feedback.

* 1. Best practices
		1. Skipped it this meeting.
		2. A month ago the MT came into CC meeting and promised that new UU teachers would get a workshop on how to teach at UCU, it would be nice to include existing UU teachers.
	2. Discussion ‘Defining the co-operation between CC and external parties (such as uraad).
		1. Jamie got contacted by two uraad reps, and they want to come visit.

ACTION POINT: Jamie invite Robin and Derek to the MT meeting on 12th December.

ACTION POINT: Jamie send the MT an e-mail stating that Robin and Derek will attend CC meeting Dec 12th.

* 1. CLF
		1. Campus Life Forum used to be under UCSA, a body that deals with all campus life issues, at a UCSA GA it was voted on a CLF re-structuration.
		2. The idea proposed is the creation of a new independent body, it is going to be an elected body with a lot of co-operation, it will have UCSA and ASC advisory members. The new body, named CAR will establish a method of communication and meetings with the MT and with Bettina regarding housing.
		3. The idea now is that the CLF will have a vote at the CC through an ASC CC member.
		4. *Patrick: Why would they need a CC vote? Can there not be lobbying and agreement?*
		5. Jamie: The idea is that CLF will focus on lobbying, but in the case of a bad ASC-CLF relation year they have a distinct vote.
1. ASC’s Teacher Questionnaire
	1. Jamie: Do you have any commentary?
		1. Gaetano: There are templates on how to make good questionnaires, and ask for help next time because we can ask for advice. An appointment to go through us as teachers and give feedback.
		2. *Gaetano: There are no faults, there are points to learn from. When giving options both need to be equally available etc., the approach of “should you” is already quite suggestive and you’re putting in pre-positions.*
		3. *Diana: There were questions on our colleagues that we couldn’t answer, we didn’t. A first question could then be, “ do you know how teachers work”.*
		4. *Gaetano: You don’t want to comment on other’s teaching abilities through the CC.*
		5. Charlotte: In the future we would like to collaborate more with you, because we don’t have the teacher perspective as ASC, we don’t know how it could come across.
		6. Diana: People did appreciate that they were asked, they appreciated the teacher input seemed to be wanted.
		7. Gaetano: My proposal is wait for a moment, because you’d want to ask them more questions and then wait, until the beginning of the next semester. It’s interesting information, but it needs to be done properly. *Diana agrees.*
		8. Shamyi: We were thinking about sending out an e-mail, explaining the purpose as well as an apology and the acknowledgement of mistakes. We can then get more input.
		9. Diana: You can apologise and say you want to send out another in January.
		10. Patrick: Don’t ask them for feedback on the first one, apologize and then tell them you’re sending a new one in a month or two.
		11. Gaetano: You don’t give questionnaires to find something, you use them to test them, what do I want to confirm
		12. Shamyi: We wanted to find new ideas, not test hypothesis.
		13. Gaetano: For those interviews, and focus groups are good.

ACTION POINT: Jamie will talk to Sabine about how to communicate her involvement in the questionnaire.

1. Legal Issues 🡪 15h35 –15h55
	1. Approval of our internal rules (need to be published in our blog asap)
		1. Diana added a mention of the curriculum matter.
		2. Goals Annex
			1. Jamie revises the goals annex
			2. Sends that to the sub-committees who give feedback on the CC goals and their sub-committee goals

ACTION POINT: Diana will send the internal rules to the CC members for approval

ACTION POINT: Shamyi will upload the internal rules after approval

ACTION POINT: Jamie will revise the CC goals annex to the internal rules, and send it to sub-committees.

ACTION POINT: Sub-committees review the goals annex, send in comments as well as their sub-committee goal addition.

* 1. Follow up on first formal advice
		1. Decision of discussion.
			1. *Agenda point not covered*
	2. Bas, update on overzittersoverleg
		+ 1. *Not covered as Bas was not present.*
1. Other matters 🡪15h55 –16h00
	1. Elsa’s requests
		1. Form and points to be discussed with the HoD
			1. *Elsa is requiring feedback as well as input.*
			2. *The CC discussed whether it was structurally possible to do this task within the time we have, considering our agenda for the next month.*
				1. *We have been explicitly encouraged to use our time efficiently.*

ACTION POINT: Diana will inform Elsa we will not have time to feedback the form and points discussed with the HoD.

* + 1. Description of CC struggles & achievements + how we intend to improve our work?
			1. *Elsa is also asking about MT-CC communication improvements*
				1. *We can tell her to look at the Minutes because the suggested improvements are there.*
			2. We can advise her to contact the previous CC and to look at the communications she as the MT secretary received.
			3. *For the two first questions that is beyond the knowledge of the current CC, for the third question the CC has already “outlined” these in our previous minutes.*
				1. Patrick: However, the feedback is for the QAP, and it is important, so it would be good for us to give our input.
				2. Diana: In our answer we can say the communication has improved, and we can say that the advices are now publically available. We now have a platform, and we have a clear and transparent platform.

ACTION POINT: Jamie will write a paragraph for question three of Elsa’s request by Thur 24/11.

ACTION POINT: Diana ask Bas if he wants to take up the two first questions.

* 1. The Social Sciences has a Head of Department Deputy, which does not happen in other departments.
		1. CC wants to inquire into this further, as the Deputy still meets now that the HoD is back.
		2. If it is a good idea, then make it consistent among departments.

ACTION POINT: Diana ask for clarification on the Deputy of the SSC dept.