

## Minutes

### UCUC and UCU Board meeting

13<sup>th</sup> of November 2018 (11/13/2018)

13:00 – 14:00 | Conference Room, College Hall

#### Present (UCUC side):

Laurens Triesscheijn, Jonathan Sendker, Marco Minoni, Janneke Boonstra, Soomin Chung, Diana Odier-Contreras Garduno, Patrick Wijchers, Bas Defize, Gerda van Rossum.

#### Present (Board side)

James Kennedy, Sabine Uijl, Bettina Nelemans, Wil Pansters, Arjen Vredenberg, Patricia Post-Nivelstein, Elsa van Straaten, Cassius Fraser

---

#### Long term goals

Setting up a common agenda

Intertwining between the two boards, individual members, awareness

Evaluating governance structure

Each body's concrete action points and time lines resulted from the workshop with Erik Dolman

Report from Erik is not in yet. We will therefore discuss this in the next meeting, which will be next semester. (Do in smaller committee?)

#### BoS Evaluation

Diana: When and how the BoS' work will be evaluated?

Sabine: BoS is doing a self-evaluation. A report from that will go to the board.

Final call (by the board): December or January (Suggested by Sabine, favourable reception from James)

Diana: What format, rubrics?

Self-evaluation follows the existing format of self-evaluations of other boards.

Diana: We would like to propose that a Council member (as opleidingscommissie) becomes part in the BoS?

The Council is invited to comment on this issue after self-evaluation.

## APP

When and how the APP will be revised? (Who is responsible for providing guidance on these questions?)

Arjen: The BoS should be in charge of the process, but it falls into the broader context of the evaluation of the BoS and the overall governance structure.

➤ Will have to wait until January then

UCUC: Confusion amongst teachers regarding the APP. What is happening with this?

The APP was jumpstarted because of accreditation but will take time to work out. That is why it is there now, and that publication preceded implementation.

Wil: The teachers should approach the fellow with any questions about the APP.

Who informs teachers who to approach on these issues?

Arjen: The fellow, principally, has the task of informing the track staff.

Patrick: Should there not be a faculty meeting where the APP is presented, along with explanations? Some decisions in it cause either confusion or controversy on the work floor.

Agenda point proposed by Council for the faculty meeting: Creating clarity with the non-fellow teachers about the APP.

Patricia: Perhaps it would be good to bring back the faculty handbook, as a first guideline for both UCU and UU teaching staff as to where to start with questions.

Elsa, James: Similar document exists. But is not used, found. We could, however, freshen this up and canonize it, so that it will be a known document.

Marco, Cassius: Clarity for students? How to communicate changes to the students?

The main problem: Information like this is communicated via multiple ways to the students, but how do we make sure that everyone knows?

Could tutors convey the most important changes to the students?

Problem: Diffusion. Dependency on tutors regarding other important information.

Should the Dean, director of education, send out an email?

- The communication adviser already has this issue on the list. Note is taken.

## Teaching performance & teaching evaluation

Need to improve the way in which the teaching quality is monitored

What is the experience of this situation of the Council?

Professional development: We are constantly busy improving people as professionals. However, typically those staff members most interested in this path are not very interested or excited about the concept of student evaluations. The MT values most of all the development of teaching staff.

While not stating that the current system should go, does the UCUC have any ideas as to how to add or substitute the current system of evaluations?

Council: Open to ideas, is already discussing changes, be it small (changing questions), or larger.

Peer evaluations: Is it useful? What format should it have? Evaluation, consultation?

Professional development vs. Teacher evaluation: Taking the broad look rather than narrow vision.

Interim teacher blind spot.

- The Board would like to hear an idea from the Council on how to provide feedback to teachers, for their own development.

[Action point \(Council\)](#): Form ideas regarding teacher development and feedback

## Curriculum

Need to define a policy regarding courses that are essential in each track

Has been on the UCUC agenda for a while, as an overall overview method on what courses there are, what kind of courses can be added. Wants to categorize in must have, nice to have, etc.

This relates back to the Physiology track issue, as well as similar issues involving courses that have few students, but are to those students of great importance.

Board: Preferably, no course would be non-essential at UCU. The fellows and the heads already make sure that they evaluate how courses fit into their track.

Council: Give the BoS the mandate to evaluate overall. Do the fellows not now have to large a mandate?

Arjen: BoS is still doing a curriculum renovation. Before we are at a certain stage in this process, we cannot yet evaluate every existing course, because the bigger picture is still worked on.

Wil: This is in the very nature of the fellows. In my mind, the only essential course is an intro course. After that, the fellows, as specialists within their different fields, should have the mandate to evaluate the content of their track.

Marco: Watch the student role in this issue.