Presence:

 Scheduled time: 15:00-17:00

 Patrick: 16:00-end

 Bas and Janneke left for faculty meeting at 15:30

 Other members: Start-end

1. Approval of last minutes & action points

Minutes approved

Action points:

Anton van den Hoeven meeting:

 As far as we know, there are no more red rules, except the 45ECTS rule, that need further clarification.

* The “hidden” rule regarding staying enrolled
	+ Should ask Sabine what she will do with this

Action point: Diana will ask Sabine about what she is going to do with this rule of staying enrolled. Some council members feel there is a weird duality in having excemptions but not telling the students

* The rules regarding retakes

These issue

The ECTS question

 This becomes an agenda point for next meeting

1. Discussion on Course Evaluations
	1. All subcommittees have arranged a meeting with their respective HoD?

Social Sciences has not yet arranged a meeting, they contacted the HoD, but he declined. Diana thinks she should ask again, with a more nuanced approach.

Similar situation for Acedemic Core team.

Science has arranged a meeting at 9 on the 29th of October

Humanities has arranged a meeting at 11.30 on the 31st of October

Action point (SSC team and ACC team): Set up a meeting as soon as possible with HoD. Let us know when you do.

* 1. Main trends?

First: Style.

Addressing the names of instructors. We used to mention them, now we do not anymore, given the new privacy attitude.

Mentioned is that it may present a problem, as there may be significant differences between teachers for the same course.

It is Diana’s opinion that we should keep the names of teachers known (if necessary), names will be blocked before distribution.

*Team ACC*

Exchange students:

 Exchange procedure:

Some complaints about the exchange procedure. A lack of information about things such as housing. Exchange students would like there to be more exchange student activities.

Marco would like to share this information with CAR and UCSA.

 Noted a lack of responses. About 40%.

 If this was homogenously distributed, 10 class groups would only have 4 respondents.

 Best rated courses for ACC

 China

 Creative writing

 MET Kirsten

 Dean’s course (however, also complaints about the workloads)

 Action point: The goal of the ACC team should be building a base for continuation on the course evaluations, as the Academic Core has neither an AAO nor the same structure as a department

 *Humanities team*

 Scores for Humanities are generally high

 Response rates for highest rated courses?

 Generally good marks for the teachers.

 A reworked course, incl. involvement from the Track Fellow, improved much

 Performance studies 100 however, had significant organization problems, efforts however are already being made to improve

 There are significant discrepancies between the two Intro to Philosophy courses. One of the teachers is appreciated significantly less, especially on assessment, feedback and organization.

 Lit26 scored very low (2.6). Jonathan is working on it.

 Because of a rookie mistake noted with a UU teacher regarding small scale learning (laptops during presentations), Patrick and Jonathan would like to ask; *how does the department prepare UU teachers? Whose responsibility is this?*

 Agenda point: For the meeting on the 6th of November, we should dive into the questions regarding this topic. MT? Action point: Marco will enquire.

 Humanities courses have been receiving higher scores for years.

 Equal pattern that the workload seems to be lower.

 Q: Can Jonathan use the CE documents in his ASC work?

 A: Without the names, yes.

*Team SSC*

 Courses that have had high improvements have had generally a low response rates or small class size.

 (Little note: Teams should note their appreciation for courses that do very well)

 Human Geo track has not been evaluated as well as other tracks. Course regarded as not very engaging.

 One human geo course got a huge drop in rating (-1.8).

 Specific question scores analysis?

 The teacher who has volunteered (Marco van Leeuwen) to help struggling teachers in the track adapt to UCU is not necessarily regarded by Marco (ASC chair Marco) as a high-quality teacher.

 Fennema’s departure: How will the transition phase work out? Especially regarding theses and thesis supervisors?

 Diana would like to make a course evaluation-like thing for the specific issue. Main problems: No contact with the fellow, no supervisor.

Action point: We should create a form to monitor these theses and propose a way to send these to the heads. (We do not want to become the coordinators, we just want the information central).

Agenda point: Further discuss this issue in later meetings.

 *Team SCI*

 Improvements:

 MAT11, from 3.0 to 4.1. Huge improvement for Viktor.

 BIO11 improved hugely as well (Yay, Patrick)

 Problematic:

 EAR 31: Two completely different levels for the two teachers

 BIO21: 4.2 to 3.5 (big drop)

 CHE21: 4.4 to 3.8 drop (lower response?)

 Persistent issues:

 Organization:

 Course manual uploaded late, readings late

 Low response rate from instructors of Lab courses.

 Send reminder? How to motivate teachers more to respond?

 Action point: Send reminder to instructors to respond to course evaluations.

 Lab courses: Very low response from both students and teachers

 *Deadline* !!! for changes to team documents (in Google documents): Friday 12th of October

1. Discussion of our meetings
	1. Everyone availability

Availability is registered in the meeting overview

Meeting on 13th of October is moved from starting at 3 to starting at 2

Meeting on the 27th of November is cancelled.

Meeting instead on the 20th of November, 3 to 4 (invitation follows).

* 1. Main issues to be addressed per meeting
	2. EQAP (any issue with the latest version?)
1. Other matters?
	1. Marco and Diana will update the council re. last cozy meeting (thesis procedure)
2. Regelement
3. Status of the board of studies

Agenda point: Highlighted items above become agenda points for next meeting