**Minutes Education Committee meeting 14-09-2022 10:00-11:00**

**Present:** Quentin Bourgeois (chair), Aris Politopoulos, Laura Llorente Rodriguez, Ian Simpson (joined at 10:30), Zoë van Litsenburg (Minutes)

***Discussion points***

*Chairperson of the committee*

**Quentin will remain the chair of the committee**.

*Proposal for changes in course evaluations*

This point was brought up by the director of education, with a document provided by the faculty’s education quality manager. The chair starts the discussion point off with the note that he was happy with the proposal, highlighted important problems with the evaluations. Section 9 is most important for the education committee.

One member agrees that not all courses need an evaluation, because students do not fill in the evaluations which are actually important for the quality evaluation cycle if there are too many possibly irrelevant evaluations to fill in. If they receive less, potentially they'll reply to more.

Another member notes that evaluation fatigue also becomes visible in NSE. He notes that it is unfortunate that the evaluation format will stay the same, as it is made by ICLON and they are mandatory by the central university.

Another notes that you can ask ICLON to add or change questions in the evaluations for certain courses.

During the evaluations of a course, the lecturer of that course should be involved. If they are aware of these evaluations beforehand, they can signal that they would like specific questions to be added by ICLON. In this way it would be easier to integrate the input of staff into these evaluations.

Choosing which course should be evaluated should also concern the this co-participation body, because it picks up concerns across the faculty due to the nature of its activities.

It is important to define what would constitute 'disappointing results’. It is usually the students who are on the ‘extreme’ sides of the spectrum that fill in that the evaluations, which skews the results.

* Need to define what is considered a 'bad’ result from an evaluation, because of the skewed results.

As long as we don’t have a good definition of a disappointing result on a course, we should not attach a value judgement to a low score.

It is important to acknowledge that the reasons for choosing which course to evaluate are subjective, but a course of action and ‘chain of command’ should be clear. If the education committee wants to have a conversation the lecturers received a poor review.

***Ian joined the meeting around 10:30***

If the education committee is going to be involved with this cycle they can be a discussion between the lecturer and the OD/DV. In that sense the committee can summarize the evaluation results and put them in the context of what has been happening with that course in the past. This because the committee has a good overview of the evaluation of courses and the curriculum in total. This way it would be easier to see if the scores make sense depending on whether it is a new course, or if there would be any other reason why there are signals for improvement. The committee can then offer advice in terms of the improvements for the course.

The education committee wants to stay away from the numbered score (1-5) given to a class. Instead it wants to focus on the substantive content.

In line with the accreditation each course should be evaluated at least once in an accreditation cycle. With that a course should be evaluated once every two or three years.

If the students are incited to reflect on their effort on the course that they put in, they will perhaps nuance their reviews.

The 'workload’ that is evaluated is too generic, specifying how many hours they spent interacting with the course and the

* *Look for examples of these reflective questions and forward them to the Teams environment.*

Another point of struggle is communication towards students about these evaluations. This improvement plan can be communicated to them when it is finalized. After each block the education committee can write a general summary of the evaluations and what is being focused on with the lecturers and the OD following the evaluations.

Idea to create a video by students to promote towards the students about the changes in this evaluation process to stimulate them to fill in the questionnaires.

Reconsider whether this process should be done by email, because that is not incentivizing to students.

Consider having it a requirement for filling it in, ‘to see your grade, you must evaluate’.

*Meeting dates for the coming academic year*

The members of staff will send around their schedule for the first semester and on the basis of that the schedule for meeting dates of the first semester of the academic year 2022-2023 will be made.

*Student numbers and impact on quality of teaching*

One member brought up the continuously rising student numbers that have put a burden on teachers and also on teaching assistants.

All of this creates a huge problem in terms of capacity for staff, student assistants (RMA), and the fact that students do not fit in the lecture rooms in the van Steenis anymore.

All of this leads, in the opinion of the committee, to the conclusion that the faculty can no longer guarantee the end qualifications of the education programs anymore. The student to staff ratio seems to be getting out of hand. For the teaching assistants the faculty relies n research masters to fill up the spots that the three paid PhD teaching assistants cannot fill, but this year there were only 4 new research master students, leading to a capacity problem.

* Write a memo towards the board that highlights the foreseen problems.
	+ Thesis level has dropped.
	+ Losing quality and not being able to make the end qualifications
	+ Staff experiencing extreme work stress (especially among young staff and in the science department).
	+ Lack of contact hours will dramatically decrease the employability of our students

If the goal is to maintain this number of students, the faculty needs to change. Either by changing the way we teach, or by hiring more staff.