**CC Minutes Tue, 24 Oct, 2017**

Present CC: Patricia, Charlotte, Jamie, Gaetano, Diana, Bas and Patrick, Shamyi for 2nd Half.

Present Non-CC: Mirre, and Bettina&James for a part of Agenda Point 3

1. **Opening and approval of minutes 14h00-14h10**
	1. Bas was approached by Joni (UCU Communications Officer) and she was surprised by the existence of the new CC blog.
	2. Joni may respond that she wants to put a link to the blog on the UCU website or something else, but giving her the opportunity to have input is appropriate seeing she is UCU communications officer.
	3. Correction to the CC 03-10-17 minutes from Shamyi, 1.b.ii.4 should read MT rather than CC, so it instead reads “Ask the MT how they want our feedback, if they are not happy with the way the Career path document feedback was given.”
	4. Gaetano: Christel also mentioned not wanting all her opinions out there on the minutes, so we should ask her before publishing them on the blog.
	5. Bas recommends to add in the minutes some context as well as the actions the CC has taken outside of the minutes and action points. Such as elaborating on that we sent an e-mail requesting something, and that the knee-jerk reaction was to this. It’s a formal advice. We can remind them of this.
	6. Diana suggests we mention to the MT that we intend to publish the formal advices we write for the MT, if they don’t include names, or privacy-breaching specifics.

**ACTION POINT: Gaetano s**end Joni an e-mail describing how we plan to do the minute communications, she may respond with suggestions.

**ACTION POINT: Gaetano** ask Christel for the censorship with these minutes

**ACTION POINT: Mirre** amend the minutes

1. Review of Actions points (03 Oct) 14h10-14h20
	1. *Ideas for the Board of Studies renaming as requested by the MT*
		1. Board for the Educational Programme
		2. Educational Programme Advisors
		3. Educational Programme Overseeing Committee
	2. Jamie ask for the Uraad internal rules/policy of the opleidingscommissie (program committee)
		1. We still want to ask for these.

**ACTION POINT: Jamie** asks for the internal rules from Uraad

* 1. Define our co-operation with external UCU parties
		1. Jamie: I would like to invite the Uraad representative back, when the CC has discussed and agreed on their presence and interaction with Uraad.

**FUTURE AGENDA POINT:** Define our co-operation with external parties.

1. Points to be discussed with the MT 14h30-15h00
	1. Career Path and Career Development at UCU Document produced by Bettina Nelemans.
		1. Clarification of concerns
			1. *We agreed to tell them they can expect the comments on the QAP (Quality Assessment Plan).*
			2. *Bas: So we can send them the document with comments as well as an additional letter.*
			3. *Patrick: What do we expect from the meeting we intended to have between the CC sub-committee and MT member?*
			4. *Bas: We should expect to try to reach an agreement and reach a final version of the document in the meeting.*
			5. E-mail MT to set up a meeting to develop the document further and from the result of the sub-committee MT meeting further actions will be taken.
			6. *Sending in advance is something the MT wants to do, thus sending the documents and letter. This is always a way to formalize the meeting.*
			7. Diana: What happens if the meeting doesn’t make the changes we want?
			8. Gaetano: Then we don’t approve.
			9. Bas: We have the right to agree, if we don’t agree it’s not an official document.
			10. Charlotte: The meeting is to actually get down to it, and work on changes.
			11. Patricia: In the meeting come up with a final version, which gets sent to the CC for final approval.
		2. Bas: According to Bettina we had a long time to be critical, but didn’t for several months and then in a short time came with a lot of criticisms. However, Bettina thinks most of our questions will be answered in this other document that she is working on. Bettina says there’s no policy on hiring process, which leads to nepotism.
		3. Diana: There is no clarity for the employer’s criteria.
		4. Patricia: We can share what we would like that.
		5. ***MT joins***
			1. The name for the BoS (Board of Studies)
				1. Charlotte: We had some issues with coming up a name, there are some examples Board for the Educational Programme, Educational Programme Advisors and Educational Programme Overseeing Committee. These seem to be a literal translation of OC (opleidingscommissie), which is the task of the CC.
				2. James: We are coming up with a description of all the permanent and temporary bodies on campus, which will pass by the board in Mid-November. Right now the BoS approves all curricular changes, and thus it can be called the curriculum board or the curriculum committee. If we can, we should come up with something that doesn’t include programme to avoid confusion.
			2. Hiring policy & document
				1. James: In anticipation of one of your questions, Sabine and I are working on a hiring policy statement and that will be completed in calendar year 2017. The document will outline “This is what we wanna do with hiring, this is how we hire”. The board is also working on a document on hiring fellows, which is a classified form of hiring, but we want a policy. I.e. fellow needs to have a PhD, the HoD is responsible but people in the track are part of the interviews so that there is vetting etc. We have one for teaching staff as well.
				2. James: There is an issue with hiring teachers from other UU faculties as it’s too expensive. The college is paying far above what we should for these teachers. We want to invest in our community and we are getting a policy document on that. I.e. what kind of new contract we sign with UU faculties for UCU hires.
				3. Bas: Is it comparable to an NL formatie (an allocation or scheme of positions for personnel in an institution, and is based on the budget)? I.e. around 40% of budget, where 20% is for temp and 20% for faculty hiring. Do we have something like that or do we want the liberty of flexibility?
				4. James: I don’t know the answer to that question yet, it depends on the arrangement we can have with the faculty.
				5. James: We based calculations on 2:3, but that’s for teaching only as UCU staff get extra hours it’s more like 5:6 ration. Average hours in the classroom is 48, if you add tutoring it’s 72 out of a hundred +7% research and then 20% for other stuff. We need to think about what the right UU-UCU teacher ratio is. We need to see the best-balance from a student perspective.
				6. Charlotte: You mention this transition to teaching at UCU and going to involvement into the community, if this transition improves then the optimal ratio might be different.
				7. James: Elsa van Straten did an analysis of all course evaluations on teachers, UU teachers average 3.7 and UCU at 4.07.
				8. Jamie: You can tell the difference between a UU and a UCU teacher.
				9. James: We already do some integration, but with the current arrangement we cannot be the best college ever because we’re at the “mercy” of the other faculties. We don’t get bad teachers, we get a lot of teachers with internal motivation. We just need a more effective quality-steering policy to balance this.
			3. The Careers path document
				1. Bettina: I have processed most of your comments.
				2. Bas: Please elaborate on the scale 11 ( A teacher qualification and thus salary options).
				3. James: We can restate that. Using the UFO (Utrecht Functie Ordeningsysteem) we move people to where they are suited. If they are at UD2 (Universiteit docent 2) (i.e. scale 11), then they work there, if we think they are UD1 (i.e. scale 12) then they will be promoted. I am concerned that the scale 11s will be unable to be promoted to scale 12. It’s not about keeping people out of scale 12, but we also want to have an equal and fair path to 12, which is difficult with the research demand. We did not intend to make 11 the default, but we need to work on the movement to scale 12. It needs to be clarified, and done at the right time, because in the past some people have been promoted too early or to late. We need a system where the HoD can look at people and their potential promotions and then they can make a case for it. (Background to comment: only a certain number of teachers at UCU are allowed to be on scale 12 at a time)
				4. Diana: How do you now as a staff when and how you would have security?
				5. Bettina: You would have clearer and stricter criteria be known.
				6. James: That does need to be clarified, we are really working on this with the heads we’re changing our (schouw) our annual review of staff. We are trying to do that intensely, jointly and systematically so that it will be done in a way that is as minimally arbitrary as possible and as fair as possible. We are probably talking about that in the next months. We want people to be as certain as they reasonably can about which way things are going. Formal assessment shouldn’t be full of surprises.
				7. Bas: You say reaching 12 is difficult, but we are all getting researching time, so it should then be simple to convince HR (Human resources) that most teachers are worthy of scale 12. Research is not defined as in lab research.
				8. James: We want criteria that are fair, but also challenging enough. The definition of research time needs to be discussed.
				9. Bettina: Page 3 of the career paths document, with the paragraph on scholarship time, relates to this.
				10. Diana: What is the timeline for further comments, sometime next year?
				11. James: Around then, it’s not in a rush. What is in the rush is the 100,000€ for Scholarship time and looking at where and how this will need to be sent. But these comments are probably for the first few months of 2018.
				12. Bettina: Patrick we can spend 30 minutes for a meeting to discuss and finalize the document with the CC-subcommittee and me as the MT member!
			4. **THE MT DEPARTS**
				1. Gaetano: What is research time? We’ll need to specify.
2. QAP (Quality Assessment Plan) 15h00-15h15
	1. Previous meeting action point: Approve/Agree on the CC comments on the QAP document that was written up by Patricia and will be sent to be discussed with Sabine and a CC- sub committee in a separately scheduled meeting
		1. *Approved!*
			1. *Bas: We have made both remarks and questions in the document for sabine, and we would like reactions to both in an email.*
			2. *Patricia: Will that not be done in the CC-subcommittee meeting we are planning in addition?*
			3. *Bas: Yes, but then just put it in the e-mail that that is what we expect from the meeting.*
		2. *Going through the remarks*
			1. Patrick: The key question is “Which particulare tools are to be used in the Quality assessment process?”, we want this involved and part of the plan. Some tools like having a teacher sit-in for feedback, are mentioned. Another question is how are the assessment curriculum members selected, not whom is in there, but the selection process. Should the tools on selection be in the QAP document?
			2. Diana: Yes
			3. Charlotte: Are they mentioned in there?
			4. Patricia: Is this where the document of a summary of on campus bodies come into play?
			5. Bas: No, that is different.
			6. Patricia: Where is it outlined?
			7. Patrick: In the matrix, which is unclear and up to interpretation.
			8. Diana: That is one of my worries, it needs to be clear and not have 100s of ways of interpreting it.
			9. Patrick: Then people fear bureaucracy.
			10. Diana: This seems like less bureaucracy but when it goes wrong it has more.
			11. Patricia: So in the general comment document that I will send to Sabine, I can add the argumentation for why a clear guideline on how to organize things.

**ACTION POINT: Patricia** add that there is a risk of a lot of different interpretation for the matrix before 31st Oct.

**ACTION POINT: Charlotte** contact Sabine to set-up a meeting on the QAP comments by 31st Oct.

* 1. Setting up the deadline for our course evaluations
		1. SSC hasn’t done it
		2. SCI meets Friday
		3. Charlotte: What is the process?
			1. *By Nov 3rd course evaluations done, and department responsible summarize their departments*
			2. *Everyone reads all the summaries for Nov 7th, then the feedback will be discussed with all CC members and then meetings with comments with the HoDs (Head of Departments) will be organized.*
		4. Bas: For next year should we consider doing the course evaluations in the Fall semester earlier?
		5. *Shamyi: The HoDs* is expecting us to approach them

**ACTION POINT: Everyone** analyse the course evaluations of their assigned department and summarize the findings in a document, send this document to the rest of the CC **by 03/11**

**ACTION POINT:** **Everyone** read all the course evaluation summaries **by 07/11**

**AGENDA POINT 07/11:** Course Evaluations

1. Communication matters 15h15-15h25
	1. Procedure to be approved
		1. Patricia: I like it, but I’d like for there to be an addition on how censorship of minutes works.

**ACTION POINT: Shamyi** will look further into the censorship rules

**AGENDA POINT 07/11:** Communication matters procedure

* 1. Website update?
		1. Bas: Are you going to involve Joni?
		2. *See discussion and action points listed in the opening of the meeting.*
1. Legal issues 15h25-15h40
	1. Internal Rules update
		1. Diana: We modified an existing document a lot.
		2. Bas: It is purely internal.
		3. Patricia: There’s some place-holders for specific topics.
		4. Diana: It’s a working document.
		5. Patricia: Especially regarding the secretary and minute-taking, first because we don’t have a “secretary” and maybe clarify so it doesn’t counteract.
		6. Jamie: I’d like to discuss the objectives that Diana wrote up.
		7. Diana: Those are temporary as they were just from a brainstorm.
		8. Jamie: ASC has input there

**ACTION POINT: Everyone** will feedback the internal rules document by 07/11

**ACTION POINT: ASC** will add objectives for internal rules by 07/11

* 1. Voorzittersoverleg/University Information sharing platform (update by Bas and Mirre)
		1. Bas: In all faculties they’re struggling with the set-up of the OC with regards to medezeggenschap (representative advisory councils that have a right of say). AUC gets 336, UCR get 100 hours paid for their work.
		2. Charlotte: What do you as staff members of the CC get from UCU?
		3. Bas: We used to have 80hrs for Chair and 40 for members, now we have 90hrs for Chair and 60 for members. I suggested 100 for the Chair and 80 for members. A lot of other FRs (faculteitsraad/faculty councils) are discussing the renumerations of hours.
		4. Bas: A lot of other faculties had issues with budget due to last year’s delay with the kaderbrief, a letter that describes how much money each faculty gets. A lot of other faculties have the old council vote, which we also did and I think this is a good thing to adopt.
		5. Bas: In some faculties the budget is clear, but in others it’s not clear.
		6. Gaetano: Could we get insight on the faculties that do well?
		7. Diana: Are hours based on size of the council?
		8. Bas: Bettina used that argument that our CC gets less hours because the size of our representatives is comparably smaller than other faculties, but I do not agree with it.
		9. Mirre: The FSW (Faculty of the Social Sciences) and their process is that they get a lot of insight in the thought process behind the major budget lines, and their agreement is more on this thought process than on the numbers.
		10. Bas: The REBO (Faculty of Economics, Law, Governance and Organizations) is starting a small-scale education programme, and more bachelor’s are in English. This increases the competition for UCU>
		11. Bas: DGK (Diergeneeskunde/Veterinary Sciences) has a BKO-lite
		12. Mirre: BKO (A certificate for Base Qualification for Education) lite the idea is that you do some BKO courses as needed during a temporary function and if you become more permanent you don’t need to re-do these but can “continue” on your BKO.
		13. Bas: The Lokaaloverleg (Collective of the Teacher Work Unions) is made up of the uraad and the unions, and they do a lot of work on work pressure for teachers.
		14. Bas: VSNU (Association for Dutch Universities) has a new chair Peter Duisenberg and there is concern, he is ex-VVD.
		15. Bas: 19th to the 25th is Week van de Medezeggenschap, so maybe consider participating in it.
	2. Info to be sent to Kees-Jan van Klaveren (Accreditation helper to aid the CC and other bodies in understanding how the UCU accreditation will work)
		1. Diana: We need to know when the meeting will be taking place, so we are waiting on response from CH but we are unsure on what to send.

**ACTION POINT: Diana** will follow up and ask what is expected of the CC for the meeting with Kees-Jan van Klaveren, what do we send and when is the meeting.

1. Discussion of ‘Improving teaching @ UCU’ 15h40-16h00
	1. UCU teachers – non UCU teachers
		1. Diana: Do we wait on the outcome of the course evaluations?
		2. Patricia: A goal of ASC is to create a “goals of teaching and the best practices” document.
		3. Bas: How do you see if these tips are followed up?
		4. Shamyi: I had an interesting conversation with someone at Liberal Arts and Science BLASTER (Best in Liberal Arts Teaching Expanded and Reinforced) Event in The Hague regarding this, they have a lot of workshops on best practices and teaching workshops.
		5. Gaetano: UCU isn’t an atmosphere where you have enough time for a workshop. It should be a dialogue.
		6. Charlotte: A good way of tackling this dialogue could be through course evaluations, by changing the questions asked and making them more representative.
		7. *The CC wants to continue the changing of course evaluations, it is a future agenda point as further discussion was deemed necessary.*
2. **AOBs**
	1. Yearly Planning – Charlotte
		1. What should we be doing when, add this timeline to internal procedures so everyone is aware of expectations.
	2. Retreat Classes – Charlotte
		1. At the Faculty Retreat the idea of not having set buildings for set departments, as it already works with regards to offices. We will look into it.
	3. Reply to UCGs E-mail
		1. Bas sent an e-mail response, if anyone has any further additions feel free to also respond.