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Introduction

The Programme Committees (PCs, OC’s in Dutch) of the Faculty of Humanities (FGW in Dutch) have an important role in quality assurance of the teaching. Teaching quality assurance means briefly that the Faculty and the study programmes work systematically on improving the quality of teaching. In this context, we ask two elementary questions: 1) Are we doing the right things in our teaching? And: 2) Are we doing those things right?

A PC is a legally required co-participation body. It is established for a single programme or a group of programmes. A PC asks the two aforesaid elementary questions at the programme level, and tries to formulate answers to them. To make this possible, the PC has two important tasks: firstly, evaluating the courses and curricula, and secondly, assessing the implementation of the Course and Examination Regulations (CER, OER in Dutch) and the curricula that they specify. A PC therefore keeps a finger on the pulse and makes recommendations for improvement. If necessary, the PC is also a ‘thorn in the side’. It makes a constructive contribution to improving courses, but also plays a part in developing the broad outlines of the curriculum, both now and in the more distant future.

Quality assurance of teaching is based on the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle. This cycle means that you first plan things (P), then you do them (D), check whether they went well (C) and finally draw conclusions and formulate improvement actions (A). Then you start the cycle again. The PC mainly operates in the Check and Act stages. The FGW Guide to Teaching Quality Assurance gives more information about our Faculty’s system of teaching quality assurance, how this system is structured, the tasks and roles of the various actors, and the instruments for measuring quality and transparently monitoring improvement plans.

This Manual offers information, guidelines, tips and examples that will help your Programme Committee to perform the important tasks correctly. Where relevant, this Manual refers to information, legislation and regulations that are available online elsewhere. It is also coordinated with the content of the Small Private Online Course (SPOC) that is offered by Leiden University to all (new) PC members.

If teaching staff members or student members of a PC have any questions or recommendations concerning the tasks and responsibilities of the Programme Committee, they are welcome to contact the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance Team (O&K): oenkl@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Student members are also welcome to contact our Faculty’s PC trainer if they have general questions or complaints: ocltrainer@hum.leidenuniv.nl

1. Position of the PC in the organisation

1.1 Co-participation body

The PC is primarily a co-participation body at the study programme level. By approving certain plans and regulations and by issuing advice, the PC has an important influence on the quality of the study programme. The right of consent which the programme committee (OC) is granted as of 1 September 2017 on portions of the Course and Examination Regulations (CER) means that the programme committee’s effective consent is required for these parts. Also, the PC’s additional ‘advisory’ right is actually more binding than the term might suggest. Right of prior consultation means that the PC must be consulted about the respective subjects in the CER. After receiving an advice from the PC, the Programme Board must inform the PC within two months what the response to it will be. If the Programme Board decides not to follow the advice, it must ‘give reasons’ for this.
1.2 Organisation structure

To function well as the Programme Committee, it is important to know the organisation structure of the study programme, the Faculty and the University. A brief explanation will now be given of some aspects of the structure.

A PC is a legally required co-participation body, established for a single programme or a group of programmes. The activities of the PC therefore mainly take place at the programme level, and the most important interaction with the administrative organisation takes place with the Programme Board (see also the figure above).

Programme Boards have the scope to take decisions for their programmes about the content and delivery of the teaching. However, a number of matters are decided and adopted at higher levels in the organisation and must also be implemented in the programmes, within the agreed frameworks. For example, there are the Faculty Regulations and a Faculty Teaching Evaluation Framework. Other teaching policy is adopted at a yet higher level, that of the University. This policy applies to all the faculties and all the study programmes; examples of this are the Student Charter and the Binding Study Advice of Leiden University. Finally, the University in turn must implement policy of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW).

The Faculty Council and University Council are important co-participation bodies at the Faculty and University level respectively. To a certain extent, the role they play at those levels is similar to that of the PC at the programme level. However, because Faculty policy can also have important consequences for individual programmes, a PC can also give advice directly to the Faculty Board, and it is important that the Faculty Board and the Faculty Council know what issues are currently relevant within the programmes. The University Council and Faculty Council also have a role in relation to the Course and Examination Regulations (CER), which is described in more detail in 2.1.1.

In addition to Programme Boards and Programme Committees, there are also Boards of Admissions and Boards of Examiners operating at the programme level. Boards of Admissions are responsible for implementing the programme’s admissions policy. They check whether candidates can be admitted to the study programme. Boards of Examiners are the most important of the bodies bearing responsibility for ensuring that all diplomas are awarded represent a sufficient final level of the graduates. For this, the Board of Examiners checks, among other things, whether the programme’s entire assessment system guarantees that the learning outcomes are attained and also, for instance, whether the quality and level of examinations, internships and theses are sufficient. The responsibilities of these Boards are clearly distinct from those of the PC. More information about the relationship between the PC’s work and that of the Board of Examiners is given in 4.4.
1.3 Other co-participation and advisory bodies

Programme Committees are not the only bodies that represent a group of students and/or teaching staff, and provide the programme or Faculty with advice. Contact with other co-participation bodies, study association(s) and the assessor can help the PC to do its work better or to have more influence.

**Assessor**

The assessor is the student member of the Faculty Board, and must ensure that the student perspective is taken into account during the Board’s policy making and decision making. The assessor also acts as the Faculty’s complaints coordinator. The assessor’s tasks include, among other things, the professionalisation of the Programme Committees by organising training courses, in consultation with the PC trainer (see also Chapter 9). The assessor is also the point of contact for the student members of the PC if they want to issue advice to the Dean or the Faculty Board: assessor@hum.leidenuniv.nl

**Faculty Council**

Contact with the Faculty Council can be important, for instance regarding matters for which the Council has the right of consent and the PC has the right of prior consultation (advisory powers), or vice versa. The PCs can help to ensure that the Faculty Council is well-informed and knows what issues are currently relevant within the programmes. The PC has a statutory obligation to inform the Faculty Council about the advice that it issues. This is described in more detail in section 4.7.

**Standing Committee for Education**

The Faculty of Humanities has a Standing Committee for Education, which issues advice to the Faculty Board or Programme Boards about the teaching policy, the policy on teaching quality assurance, the (Faculty part of the) Course and Examination Regulations and curricula in the Faculty. This Committee also functions as the regular Programme Committee for e.g. the Faculty’s core curriculum courses and advises on these to the Faculty Board.

2. **Tasks and responsibilities of the Programme Committee**

2.1 **Statutory tasks**

The formal tasks of the Programme Committee are set down in the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW, Article 9.18). The central task of programme committees is to advise degree programmes on improving and maintaining their quality. Moreover the PC has:

1. Right of consent and right of prior consultation with respect to parts of the programme’s Course and Examination Regulations.
2. The task of annually evaluating the method of implementing the CER.
3. The task of issuing advice and proposals, on its own initiative or on request, to the Programme Board and the Dean about all matters concerning the programme’s teaching.

These statutory tasks will now be explained in more detail.

2.1.1 **Right of consent and right of prior consultation the programme’s CER**

University’s model CER, Faculty part of the CER, and programme-specific part of the CER

Every study programme has Course and Examination Regulations (CER, OER in Dutch). The CERs of Leiden University have been formulated according to a central format adopted by the University Council (the ‘model CER’). Some specific articles in this are adopted in the same way for the whole University. The right of consent of the University Council also applies to these articles. However, because some of these articles also apply to the programme committee’s consultation rights, the committee will also be consulted during the preparation for the university model CER.

For other articles, which are not determined at the university level, text proposals are offered in the model CER for the faculties and study programmes. This means there is scope for individual interpretation of those points.

In our Faculty, the model CER is converted to two parts, namely:

1. A Faculty part, which applies for all the bachelor’s programmes or all the master’s programmes of the Faculty;
2. A programme-specific part, which applies specifically for the programme.
The Faculty part sets down, among other things, general rules for freedom of choice, examination opportunities, period of validity of examination components, judicia and study advice. The programme-specific part contains e.g. the programme’s learning outcomes, its curriculum (via a link to the e-Prospectus) and, in the case of master’s programmes, the admission requirements. Much of the programme information in the e-Prospectus is regarded as an Appendix, and hence also as an integral part of the (programme-specific) CER.

The draft version of the Faculty parts of the bachelor’s and master’s CER are prepared each year by the Faculty Board and are submitted for advice to the PC’s and Standing Committee for Education. Together with the advice of these committees, the Faculty CERs are then submitted to the Faculty Council, which has the right of consent regarding important elements of the Faculty part of the CER. The Faculty Council must first give its consent to those elements, before the CERs can be adopted by the Dean or the Faculty Board.

The draft version of the programme-specific part of the CER is prepared each year by the Programme Board (usually assisted by the study coordinator) and submitted to the Programme Committee. It is helpful if the Programme Board indicates clearly any changes from the previous year’s CER. The PC has the right of consent regarding some elements of the CER, and the right of prior consultation regarding other elements. The PC preferably gives its advice around April about the CER that will come into effect in the September of that year.

For an overview of the statutory right of consent and consultation rights of the Faculty Board and the programme committee, please refer to Appendix 3. The programme committees will exercise their new consent and consultation rights for the first time in the handling of the CERs for the 2018-2019 academic year. In the autumn of 2017, further information will be provided on the slightly modified procedure for consulting the programme committees and Faculty Board in the establishment of the new CERs.

Amendments to the CER

Some elements of the programme-specific CER, such as the learning outcomes (also called achievement levels), should preferably remain unchanged for several years. However, there are sometimes good reasons to change the learning outcomes. In all cases, it is important to ascertain that the programme curriculum is a good reflection of the learning outcomes. In other words, the composition of the curriculum must be such that all students (in all specialisations) are able to achieve those learning outcomes. Specific admission requirements (for master’s and some bachelor’s programmes) should also usually remain unchanged for a longer period.

Changes in the curriculum, on the other hand, occur quite frequently. However, nearly all proposed changes in the CER do not suddenly come ‘out of the blue’. Many proposals for change in the study programme are also previously known to the Programme Board. It is highly recommended that these proposed changes should already be discussed in the PC as soon as they have become crystallised to some extent, which can sometimes be earlier in the year, before the definitive approval or advice on the new CER has been placed on the agenda. By doing this, it is possible to avoid the PC and the PB having insufficient time around April to look carefully at specific matters and attempt to reach further agreement with each other about them. Topics and proposed changes that have been reviewed earlier in the year then only need to be ‘confirmed’ when the advice on the CER is given in the spring. The PC and the PB can therefore agree to put specific topics on the PC’s agenda as soon as possible.

The CERs are in principle valid for one year, until the next CER enters into effect. Sometimes this means that transitional provisions must be included, for example to ensure that students who started the programme earlier are not confronted with regulations that cannot reasonably be declared applicable to them. Advice on such transitional arrangements should also be given by the Standing Committee for Education and the Programme Committee.

The e-Prospectus is an Appendix of the CER. As part of the statutory tasks, the PC can therefore also reflect on the information supplied via the e-Prospectus. The e-prospectus will be fleshed out based on the ‘programme schedule’ for the degree programme. In this programme schedule, the content of the examination programme is established, what the study load of the individual courses is, and what education forms are implemented in the different components. The programme committee is contacted for consent and/or advice on the various components of the programme schedule, regarding which it has consent and consultation rights. The programme committee may then also issue recommendations to further enhance the clarity, accuracy and completeness of the information provided in the e-prospectus.

Written consent and advice

The Programme Committee’s consent and advice on the CER is provided to the Programme Board in writing, as is the advice provided by the Standing Committee for Education to the Faculty Board. In accordance with the Act, such written advice is also made available to the Faculty Council. This is described in more detail in section 4.7.
Further information
More information about the contents of a CER and the status of a CER is given in Leiden University’s Small Private Online Course (SPOC) for PCs. The approach that the PC must take to the CER is also covered in the Faculty training course that is offered to student members of PCs (see also Chapter 9).

2.1.2 Annually evaluating the method of implementing the CER

The second task assigned to the PC by the Act is evaluating the method of implementing the CER. This task can perhaps best be translated into the following sub-tasks:

1. Evaluating whether the regulations of the CER (Faculty part + programme-specific part) have indeed been (correctly) applied in the programme, but also evaluating whether certain regulations perhaps have unintended or undesirable effects on the programme, or on the students or teaching staff.
2. Evaluating whether the programme curriculum is indeed being delivered as set down in the CER (and the e-Prospectus) and evaluating whether the quality of the offered teaching and the learning environment / facilities meet the requirements that may be imposed for them.

An important instrument for obtaining information – and hence reaching an opinion – about the matters listed above is conducting teaching evaluations. In other words, organising e.g. course evaluations or internship evaluations, but also e.g. periodically evaluating the entire curriculum. More information about teaching evaluation in our Faculty is given in section 2.2.

In addition, there are all kinds of other ways in which the PC can keep a finger on the pulse, in order to form a judgement about the ‘ups and downs’ of the programme. Good contact with the represented groups, both students and teaching staff, is essential for this. More details about this are given in Chapter 5.

Evaluating the implementation of the CER and the quality of the teaching is not necessarily restricted to a specific time period of the year. The PC conducts activities in this area throughout the year. However, when a new CER and e-Prospectus become available in spring/summer, it is a good idea to reflect on this statutory task, and to evaluate whether, on the basis of collected information, the PC can formulate further advice for the Programme Board or Faculty Board, or formulate plans for itself to give closer scrutiny to specific topics in the future.

2.1.3 Issuing advice to the Programme Board and/or Faculty Board on the programme’s teaching

The last task of the Programme Committee specified in the Act is to issue advice, on its own initiative or on request, to the Programme Board and the Dean (or the Faculty Board) about all matters concerning the programme’s teaching.

In addition to issuing advice on the content of the CER (2.1.1) and on the method of implementing the CER (2.1.2), the PC is free to issue advice on the basis of its own investigations or serious opinions expressed by the represented groups. If the advice relates to matters specifically concerning the programme, then it is addressed to the Programme Board. If the advice relates to the quality of assessment or grading, it is advisable to also send that advice simultaneously to the responsible Board of Examiners.

If the advice relates to matters above the programme level, it is addressed to the Faculty Board. Where applicable, the Faculty Board will discuss advice that it receives from the PC with any relevant Institute Boards and Programme Boards.

2.2 Teaching evaluation

Teaching evaluation is an important instrument for revealing, monitoring and improving the quality of the teaching. The Programme Committee plays a central role in this. The purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of our teaching on the basis of collected information.

2.2.1 Faculty Teaching Evaluation Framework

Our Faculty has a Teaching Evaluation Framework that is applicable to all the Faculty’s programmes. This Framework includes attention to teaching evaluation of programme components (e.g. course, internship, thesis) and of programme curricula (e.g. first year, minor, entire curriculum). In addition to the method of evaluation, it also gives attention to the follow-up of evaluations and feedback on this to the students.

The Evaluation Framework serves as a source of information and as guidelines for teaching staff, Programme Boards, Programme Committees and other relevant parties. Methods, procedures and Faculty formats for e.g. questionnaires are given in the appendices of this Evaluation Framework (insofar as knowing or using them is
relevant for different parties). Procedures, formats and examples that are only relevant for the PC are given as an Appendix to this Manual.

The Faculty Evaluation Framework and its appendices form an important basis for the work of the PC and are an integral part of this Manual. Matters that are described in the Evaluation Framework are in principle not repeated in this Manual, so for more information, please see this Faculty Teaching Evaluation Framework.

2.2.2 Analysing evaluation results, reporting and formulating recommendations

Not only the Programme Committee but also e.g. the teaching staff in question and the Programme Board need to work on the results of evaluations, therefore Chapter 4 of the Faculty Teaching Evaluation Framework gives attention to the follow-up of teaching evaluation. This Manual for PCs will discuss it in more detail insofar as this is useful for the PCs’ work.

It is important for the Programme Committee to realise that the benefits of teaching quality assurance are mainly to be found in the follow-up of teaching evaluation. To exaggerate somewhat, you could even say that making a large number of evaluations is not, in itself, particularly useful: the important point is what is then done with those evaluations. The PC plays an important role in this, by giving good advice. ‘Good advice’ is usually also nuanced advice, which takes account of the context in which the teaching and the teaching staff are located. However, it is also important that the PC should check what has been done about PC advice from the past, and should notify the Programme Board if previously observed improvement points have received insufficient attention (especially if these points have been going on for some time and/or work on improvement has repeatedly been absent or insufficient). When planning evaluations, you should therefore be aware that evaluating all courses, or a large number of courses is not necessarily good. You should be particularly careful to also ensure that the PC gives attention to the subsequent trajectory, even if this means that fewer courses are evaluated.

When assessing evaluation results, the PC must always consider whether those results are sufficiently valid and reliable. Have enough students filled in the evaluation to give a reliable picture? Has a specific question elicited unintended specific responses, because of the way it was formulated? And do specific critical expressions not represent the opinion of just one or a few student(s), while the vast majority of students perhaps had a different opinion? It is also worth noting that regular course evaluations (using closed questions) can provide an indication that something is going well or is not going well, but often cannot exactly specify what is or is not going well. If desired, this requires further research, for example in the form of (interim) evaluation interviews.

The Act stipulates that the PC must be given the opportunity to hold a discussion with the Board about a proposed decision, or about a question that is currently relevant and on which the PC wishes to issue advice. Moreover, the PC has the statutory right to inspect all relevant documents relating to teaching evaluation and teaching quality. The Act also stipulates that the Board must inform the PC within two months about how it is going to implement the PC’s advice. If this is not going to be done, then the Board must inform the PC in writing why it is not (yet) going to comply with the PC’s advice.

Reporting and recommendations arising from course evaluations

When formulating advice, it is good to first look in a structural manner at the quality of a course. It is helpful here to use a structured format. A format for reporting advice makes it possible, on the basis of a number of fixed aspects that determine the quality of teaching, to briefly formulate what its strengths and weaknesses are, and what advice the PC gives to make further improvements. The PC fills in a format of this kind partly on the basis of the results of the teaching evaluations (e.g. the EvaSys report) and any additional information that is available. (At a later stage, the Faculty will provide an example of such a format.)

A format for both reporting and advice simultaneously is not only handy for the PC itself, but also quickly gives others (Board, teaching staff, Faculty Council) a clear picture of the PC’s opinion and advice. If the Programme Committee reaches the conclusion, on the basis of a course evaluation, that a specific course is ‘good to excellent’, and no appreciable improvement points and recommendations are to be noted, then the format is also a good way to send positive feedback to the teaching staff from the PC.

When formulating a definitive report + advice, it is desirable that the teaching staff member him/herself is given the opportunity to respond to it, and possibly to give additional interpretation of the results of evaluations and/or the PC’s judgement of them. This can be done in writing or in a personal interview. This feedback from the teaching staff member, via the Programme Board or otherwise, will perhaps not always take place or can take time. The PC can therefore also decide to provisionally issue a report + advice, to which an addendum with feedback from the teaching staff member can be added later, if necessary. In the most ideal case, the definitive version of the evaluation documentation will contain a clear agreement in which the teaching staff and the Programme Board agree what must be retained in the teaching and what will be given further attention.
Reporting and recommendations arising from curriculum and other evaluations
In a similar way to the above-mentioned format for reporting and advice arising from teaching evaluations, it can also be helpful to use a fixed format / structure for reporting and advice arising from curriculum evaluations or other evaluations conducted by the PC (or external parties). (The Faculty will also provide an example of this later.)

The most important external curriculum evaluation is the National Student Survey (NSE in Dutch). The PC therefore discusses the NSE results every year, and formulates advice on the basis of these. The NSE-factsheet that is provided yearly also includes the average scores for the various NSE themes in the country. You can compare the scores of your own programme(s) with these to gain a clearer picture of the satisfaction level of your students compared with those averages. For a few (small) FGW programmes, however, the number of respondents is too low to use the NSE as a valid and reliable information source. In that case, the programme’s own curriculum evaluations and/or exit evaluations provide the most important information source for the PC.

Some tips for writing advice can be found in Chapter 4 of the OC-Wijzer (PC Guide) of the Dutch Student Union (LSVb).

2.3 Annual Programme Report

All programmes write an Annual Programme Report (Opleidingsjaarverslag) each year. This is a report of an academic year, which is written in November / December. The report falls under the responsibility of the Programme Board, which produces the report in conjunction with the Programme Committee. The Annual Report gives information about the activities of the Programme Board and the PC, and reflects on the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum (partly on the basis of teaching evaluations and the data on the Annual Programme Card), the delivered teaching and the effects of recent changes in the programme. It also describes intended improvements. Every Annual Programme Report gives attention not only to new evaluation results but also to the (follow-up of) action points and intentions from the previous Annual Report.

The Annual Programme Reports also form an important starting point for the programme’s self-evaluation in preparation for the programme visitation and midterm review (see section 2.4).

2.4 Programme visitation and midterm review

Programme visitation

Every six years, our programmes are assessed in terms of their quality and content by an independent visitation committee (visitatiecommissie / ‘assessment panel’). On the basis of this committee’s advisory report, the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO), on behalf of the government, extends the accreditation of the programme for six years. This accreditation is required for issuing recognised diplomas and is a condition for student grants to be awarded to students.

Before the visit of the visitation committee, an information dossier is sent to it, including the self-evaluation report, in which the programme describes the current situation, strengths and weaknesses, and its ambitions. A chapter and/or advice provided by the PC itself is included as an appendix to this self-evaluation report. In this appendix, students can say how they experience the programme and what they see as possible development points and opportunities for the programme’s future. Use must be made here, if possible, of valid and representative student evaluations (e.g. the NSE, curriculum evaluations, etc.). The student members of the PC coordinate the production of this chapter. In addition, input and feedback is requested from the Programme Committee as a whole for the other chapters of the self-evaluation report.

During the visit, the visitation committee will speak separately with the Programme Committee about the content and quality of the programme, the way in which the quality assurance is organised and the role played by the PC in the programme’s improvement policy. In talking about these topics, the visitation committee will also try to form an opinion about the PC’s functioning, and how far and in what way the PC is involved with both courses / programme components and the broad outlines of the curriculum. Visitations committees also judge whether the PC is sufficiently proactive and – to a certain extent – independent and therefore also conducts investigations and gives advice on its own initiative. The PC’s most important preparation for a programme visitation is therefore actually that it should function properly over the years and constantly monitor the programme’s content, quality and quality assurance.

After the visitation, the programme writes an action plan based on the visitation committee’s recommendations, placing the emphasis on what improvements and developments will be continued or introduced. The PC’s input and advice is also required for producing this action plan.
Midterm review

Three years after the visitation, the programme is again visited by a committee of experts, for a midterm review. On this occasion, the programme is assessed again by the experts, although in less depth than for the visitation. A midterm review is not required by law, but is conducted as standard by many universities as part of the internal quality assurance cycle. The purpose of the midterm review is partly to see how and to what extent the programme is complying with the recommendations made three years earlier by the visitation committee. In addition, it can involve discussion of other, e.g. more current, topics.

The preparations of the midterm review committee include reading Annual Programme Reports, Annual Reports of the Board of Examiners, CERs and numerical data on intake, success rate and student satisfaction. The review committee also takes a random sample of theses from recent years, grades them and then compares this grade with the one given earlier by the programme itself. Finally, the programme also submits a number of specific questions to the review committee. Therefore no separate self-evaluation is written in advance, and the PC does not have any specific tasks in relation to preparing for the midterm review. However, the midterm review committee will speak separately with the Programme Committee during its visit.

After the midterm review, another action plan is written, or the existing action plan is supplemented and updated. This again requires the PC’s advice and input.

Further information about the programme visitation and midterm reviews can also be found in the Guide to Teaching Quality Assurance.

2.5 Contact point

Apart from the organised teaching evaluations, a Programme Committee also functions as a contact point for students. It must be possible for students to report any complaints, suggestions and problems about courses, examinations and staff members to the student members of the PC. You should therefore inform students very clearly about how you can be contacted for this purpose (consultation hours, Blackboard, email address, etc.).

However, you should also be aware that there can be better routes for many complaints or objections. The FGW assessor also acts as the complaints coordinator for the whole Faculty. If necessary, the assessor will refer students to another desk, contact point or e.g. the Examination Appeals Board. The University website explains clearly what route must be taken for the various kinds of complaints or objections.

3. Composition and functions

3.1 Composition

A Programme Committee always has an equal number of students and teaching staff from the programme(s) for which it is responsible. The number of members of a PC is at least four and no more than ten. An appendix of the Implementing Regulations for Administrative Bodies of Study Programmes (Uitvoeringsregeling bestuurlijke gremia opleidingen) states how many members are in each PC.

3.2 Functions and their associated tasks and responsibilities

The PC elects a chair and secretary from among its members. The chair is elected from among the staff members. In electing the secretary, preference should be given to one of the student members, so that shared responsibility and co-participation can also be manifested in this form.

An example will be given below of how the tasks and responsibilities of the various functions within a PC can be divided. This is just an example, therefore your PC can make different agreements about the division of tasks. The agreements are laid down in the Rules of Procedure of your PC.

3.2.1 Chair

The chair:

- is responsible for ensuring that the Programme Committee functions well;
- monitors the appointment of members by the Faculty Board;
- encourages the knowledge and training of the members;
- holds preparatory discussions with the secretary and members;
- prepares the content of the meeting and produces an agenda;
- chairs the meetings (asks people to speak, repeats actions and decisions, and can have the deciding vote in a decision of the PC);
- holds periodic discussions with the Programme Board and, if necessary, occasional discussions with the Board of Examiners and other co-participation and advisory bodies of the Faculty about teaching matters.

It is recommended that a deputy chair should also be appointed within the PC, who will take over the chair’s tasks and responsibilities in the event of his/her absence.

### 3.2.2 Secretary

The secretary:
- monitors and deals with incoming post / e-mail;
- schedules the meetings and reserves the meeting room;
- prepares meetings, together with the chair, and sends out the agenda in good time;
- takes minutes of every meeting, or at least records a list of actions and decisions, and sends this out soon after the meeting;
- promotes efficient discussion and ensures that information is supplied to the PC members;
- draws attention to relevant frameworks and regulations;
- coordinates the production of an Annual Plan (and a PC Annual Report, if applicable);
- sends the advice on behalf of the Programme Committee.

### 3.2.3 Other members

The other members:
- ensure that they are aware of the PC’s vision of the programme, the CER, the curriculum, the teaching quality;
- analyse teaching evaluations and other information and, on the basis of this, contribute to the formulation of advice;
- contribute to the practical organisation of teaching evaluations;
- implement and report on project-based activities of the PC;
- provide input for the Annual Plan; the Annual Programme Report; action plans and other relevant (quality assurance) documents.

### 3.3 Recruitment of student members

Before the election and appointment of student members of the Programme Committee, it is important to recruit as many students as possible who wish to stand for election. The current Programme Committee can play an important role in this each year. The more visible the PC is to students during the year, the more new students will stand as candidates each year. Experience shows that recruitment by e-mail is not effective. Recruitment during lectures (by the chair of the Programme Board, a student ambassador and/or current student members of the PC) is usually much more effective, preferably in the first or second week of lectures in September.

### 3.4 Election and appointment of members

**Teaching staff members**
The PC teaching staff members are appointed by the Faculty Board for three years from among the staff who deliver the teaching of the relevant programme(s). The Faculty Board appoints teaching staff members on the recommendation of the chair of the authorised Programme Board.

**Student members**
Student members are elected by and from among the students of the relevant programme(s), and on the basis of this are appointed for one year by the Faculty Board. The Programme Board concerned organises the elections for this. Elections usually take place in the month of September and the term of office normally starts on 15 October.
The appointment and election of teaching staff members and student members respectively are regulated by the Faculty Regulations (Article 29) and the Implementing Regulations for Administrative Bodies of Study Programmes (Articles 1 and 4). Therefore for more information on this, please see these documents.

4. Cooperation, meetings and reporting

4.1 Rules of Procedure of the Programme Committee

From 1 September 2017 onwards Programme Committees must have established Rules of Procedure. The Rules of Procedure are statutorily prescribed regulations for matters of a procedural nature. The PC describes its internal agreements with respect to e.g. the division of tasks within the PC, meetings, and reporting. The Faculty has developed a format for these Rules of Procedure. All programme committees implement this format in their own ways, establish the rules and send it to the responsible programme boards and the Faculty board (email address of faculty board: bestuurondersteuning@hum.leidenuniv.nl). If a programme committee decides to change its Rules of Procedure in the meantime, the new version will be forwarded to the respective boards once again.

4.2 Annual Plan, Annual Calendar and Evaluation Timetable

Annual Plan / Annual Calendar
It is important to produce an Annual Plan or work schedule at the start of an academic year. This can take the form of an Annual Calendar, as attached in Appendix 3. An Annual Plan is handy for a variety of reasons:

- the PC sets down concisely but clearly in advance what it explicitly wants to work on and what it wants to achieve;
- it is clear to every member what will be worked on when, and how the tasks will be divided;
- the Annual Plan can help to spread the workload over the year, or to make choices for what will and will not be done;
- the Annual Plan makes clear when specific topics, quality assurance documents, or survey results can be expected to appear on the PC’s agenda. The PC can therefore also notify relevant parties if it does not receive specific information or documents (in time), in order to give advice on them;
- the Annual Plan helps with handover or induction of new PC members;
- the Annual Plan can be published, so that everyone knows what the PC is working on.

Evaluation Timetable
The Evaluation Timetable is part of the Annual Plan. At the start of each academic year (before 1 October), the PC formulates an Evaluation Timetable. This Timetable states which courses / lectures will be evaluated and when. The Evaluation Timetable helps not only the PC, but also the other parties involved in teaching evaluation (including e.g. the teaching administration), to ensure that the process runs as smoothly as possible. N.B. the teaching administration wants to know in good time which courses will be evaluated, because forms need to be produced by ICLON, not only stating e.g. the name of the course, but also being able to take account of including e.g. the names of various teaching staff in the questionnaire. Blank forms (without the course name) run the risk of being lost.

4.3 Meetings and their preparation

Holding meetings is an art in itself, and many books have been written about it. Just a few tips are given here:

Preparation

- Produce an Annual Plan and follow it, unless there are good reasons to diverge from it (see also section 4.2);
- You should preferably choose a fixed time to hold meetings and/or schedule several meetings a long time in advance;
- You could consider having certain topics thoroughly prepared by just a few members of the Committee. This can save a lot of time for the Committee as a whole.
• Ask people to submit agenda items in advance, so that an invitation and the relevant documents can be sent in good time.
• Ensure that topics of importance for students are at the top of the agenda.
• If relevant, organise a preliminary meeting for only the student members. It often helps with creating good understanding and opinion formation if students have already discussed something in advance among themselves. Moreover, the student group in the Committee can take up a clearer position during the meeting if they have together prepared and agreed on important topics in advance.

**During the meeting**

• A good decision stands or falls with a good discussion. This does not necessarily have to be a long discussion, but it has to be thorough. A good method is the 3-phase model of decision-making: Definition, Judgement, Decision (in Dutch, ‘BOB’: Beeldvorming, Oordeelsvorming, Besluitvorming). The first phase involves brainstorming, and collecting as much information as possible. In the second phase, the various standpoints are inventorised, and connections are made between them. Finally, a decision is made.
• The chair should ensure that everyone has the opportunity to speak, and that repetitions are avoided.
• Consensus decision-making (the ‘polder model’) is part of Dutch culture, but sometimes (if necessary) allow a decision to be made by voting, instead of too readily assuming that consensus has already been reached and hence a decision has been made.

The PC must be able to collectively give sufficient attention to the results and follow-up of the different types of evaluations that it has organised itself. In addition, it must also give attention to the results of ‘external’ surveys (e.g. the NSE), to evaluating the method of implementing the CER, and to advising on Annual Programme Reports, action plans, and so on. This means that a PC will hold regular meetings. On average, PCs in the Netherlands have seven meetings a year.

### 4.4 Cooperation within and outside the PC

**One single committee**

Although the Programme Committee consists of student members and teaching staff members, it is primarily one single committee with a shared goal: to improve the teaching. Interests of students and teaching staff are certainly not always conflicting, and there is no reason to unnecessarily cultivate the distinction between teaching staff members on the one hand and student members on the other. The strength of the PC depends mainly on the extent to which both groups of members cooperate constructively with each other. Good cooperation also makes the PC’s work more informative, enjoyable, efficient and effective.

Some topics that must be considered by Programme Committees should first be thoroughly researched, and the results of this research analysed, before they can usefully and efficiently be discussed in a meeting. It is advisable to take a somewhat project-based approach to these activities. For example, two members can be designed to carry out a project together, and the topic can be put on the agenda of the whole PC later. These pairs could, for example, consist of one teaching staff member and one student member.

**Programme Board, Board of Examiners, Board of Admissions**

The Programme Board (PB) has the final responsibility for what happens in the programme. In this, it is assisted and checked by, among others, the Programme Committee, the Board of Examiners and, if applicable, the Board of Admissions. It is important that the Programme Board and these other bodies know what one another are doing, and that they coordinate their activities, where necessary. A periodic ‘triangular meeting’ between the PB, PC and Board of Examiners offers good opportunities for that coordination. This meeting does not need to be attended by all the members of the bodies, but by at least one or a few representatives of each.

To supplement the formal meetings with the Programme Board, the student members of the PC can choose to have quite regular informal discussions with the student member of the Programme Board. This can also help to further improve the coordination between the PC and PB.

The Faculty Board and the programme board are required to provide information. They must provide timely information that the programme committee needs for the performance of its task and/or any information the programme committee may request to fulfil its task, for the sake of reasonableness and fairness. The Programme Committee is authorised to invite the Programme Board (respectively the Dean/Faculty Board) at least twice a year to discuss the proposed policy, following an agenda prepared by the Programme Committee.
The responsibilities of Boards of Examiners and PCs are strictly separate, but nonetheless Programme Committees can assist Boards of Examiners in their tasks, for instance by passing on complaints and/or evaluation results with regard to (setting of) examinations and final examinations to the Board of Examiners. If PC advice relates to the quality of assessment or grading, it is advisable to also send that advice simultaneously to the responsible Board of Examiners.

In practice, the Programme Committee will have little if any interaction with a Board of Admissions.

**Study coordinator**
The work of the study coordinator includes tasks in the area of the programme’s organisation and information supply. The study coordinator is also the study advisor for individual students. Study coordinators can therefore be an important source of information for the Programme Committee, not only about how the programme is organised but also about e.g. the problems encountered by individual students or groups of students. The study coordinator is therefore regarded as a permanent advisor of the PC. In this capacity, he/she can attend meetings of the PC either as standard practice or only when the PC requests this. However, the study coordinator does not perform any tasks that are included in the PC’s designated tasks.

**Study association(s)**
A study association is affiliated with a specific programme and organises various study-related activities. Given that the study associations represent many members, it is important that the student members of the PC are in close contact with the board of the relevant study association. This will make it possible for complaints, questions or comments to be passed on immediately to the PC. In addition, close cooperation increases the visibility of the PC.

**Faculty advisors**
Within the Faculty, staff have been appointed with expertise in the area of education studies, training studies, assessment, teaching evaluation, ICT & teaching, student recruitment, internship and career guidance, and so on. You should not hesitate to ask their advice for important topics on which the PC works and issues advice. The assessor or the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance Team (O&K) can refer you to the appropriate section or staff member.

**Other PCs**
PCs will sometimes need to have contact with each other, or give each other information, for instance regarding evaluation of courses that are included in different programmes. For this, see also section 2.3.2 of the Faculty Evaluation Framework. Evaluation reports can be requested from the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance Team, or from the responsible PC.

In addition, PCs can learn from each other and adopt each other’s ‘good practices’ in order to do their own work better or more efficiently. At the time of writing this Manual, the exchange between PCs by means of meetings has not yet been organised by the Faculty. However, Leiden University organises an annual themed meeting in which PC members from the whole University can exchange ideas with each other. Meanwhile, of course, any PC is free to contact another PC of our Faculty for advice about a specific topic.

**Email address**
The members who comprise Programme Committees change regularly. Moreover, it is often not clear for students or staff or board of the Faculty who is a member of the PC and what function they fulfil within the PC. For them, it is important to be able to communicate with the PC via a permanent email address, i.e. the functional mailbox of the Programme Committee. The PC is therefore emphatically recommended, where possible, to make use of the Programme Committee’s functional mailbox and to ensure that it is also properly managed for 12 months of the year.

### 4.5 Minutes, reports and other communication

It is important that minutes are taken of PC meetings, or that reporting takes place in another way, stating the most important topics discussed and the decisions or advice arising from the meetings. Minutes or reports are not only important for the functioning of the PC itself, but can also be requested by e.g. visitation committees, in order to gain a picture of the PC’s functioning. In general, it is advised: minutes or reports should not be longer than is strictly necessary.

In programmes where the lines are very short, and coordination and feedback are easy to arrange informally ‘in the corridors’, there is a risk that certain PC matters will not be written down, but settled orally. However, it is emphatically recommended that the PC’s decisions or advice should always be concisely recorded in writing and then archived. This can perhaps be in the form of a short email message, confirming an oral discussion or otherwise, which is sent later to e.g. a teaching staff member or the Programme Board chair.
4.6 Annual Report

There is no obligation for the PC to write an Annual Report of its own, but it is always involved in, and makes a contribution to the Annual Programme Report (opleidingsjaarverslag) (see 2.3). Nonetheless, it is recommended that a separate PC Annual Report is written. A concise Annual Report, containing an outline description of what activities the PC has performed and what its intentions are for the coming year, is helpful with e.g. the induction of new (student) members and in general offers the whole Committee more guidance for continuing to function well. A PC Annual Report is not so much a reflection on the current situation or quality of the programme (this is the function of the Annual Programme Report) but more a reflection on the work of the PC and the functioning of quality assurance and teaching evaluation, and it offers e.g. the basis for formulating a plan for the following year(s). In addition, a PC Annual Report can be used in the feedback to your represented group(s) (the students in the programme(s)) and for demonstrating to e.g. a midterm review committee how the PC functions. It can be handy to write not only a confidential version (which remains internal and is used in the handover) but also a (summarised) public version to publish (e.g. on Blackboard).

4.7 Reporting to Faculty Council and archiving

The Act (WHW, Art. 9.18) stipulates that the PC sends the advice on the CER, and advice issued to the Programme Board or the Dean on matters relating to the programme, to the Faculty Council for perusal. The Faculty Council of FGW likes to have access to the PCs’ advice, so that this can be included in its opinions and advice, where necessary. For this purpose, when the PC sends the advice to the Programme Board, it must include the following email address of the Management Support Department (Afdeling Bestuursondersteuning) in the cc: Bestuursondersteuning@hum.leidenuniv.nl. The secretary of the Faculty Council will then upload the PC advice to a Sharepoint, to which the members of the Faculty Council have access.

Further information on and frameworks for archiving the most important documents from the teaching quality assurance and of the Programme Committee can be found in the Faculty Evaluation Framework.

4.8 Good functioning of the PC

A survey was conducted among PCs and programme managers to find out the preconditions for good functioning of Programme Committees in Dutch higher education. The participants were also asked about possible measures to improve the functioning. For information, a few results from this survey are presented briefly below:

**Five essential preconditions for good functioning**

1. Communication / argumentation of decisions based on the Committee’s advice
2. Composition and membership of the Committee
3. Good cooperation between teaching staff and students in the Committee
4. Good attendance at meetings
5. Knowledge and understanding of the Committee members

**Five measures that can improve the functioning**

1. The programme management must respond more adequately to the Committee’s advice
2. More structured, better prepared and more frequent meetings
3. Better coordination with other consultative bodies, by e.g. specifying its own tasks more precisely
4. Better induction of new members and more training
5. Better publicity for the content and importance of the Programme Committee’s tasks

The above preconditions and measures can also serve well as self-evaluation criteria on which the PC can base the periodic evaluation of its own functioning.

A national online platform provides information, news and best practices for Programme Committees. Programme Committees are invited to share their valuable knowledge and best practices with each other on this web platform. You should therefore regularly take a look at: www.opleidingscommissies.nl
5. Visibility of the PC and contact with the represented groups

The PC must be well informed about what is currently happening in the programme(s), which means that you must maintain good contact with the represented groups. This is naturally done to a large extent via teaching evaluations, but it can also be achieved by e.g. actively contacting people. In addition, the PC must especially be visible and approachable, so that students and teaching staff know where to find the PC when necessary.

Presented below are a number of ‘good practices’ that primarily can help to increase the visibility and approachability of the PC, and can also contribute to the PC’s good functioning and sometimes to better communication, quality and satisfaction within the programme in general.

Blackboard
Create a Blackboard page for which all students (and teaching staff) in the programme can register. On Blackboard you can not only make announcements and requests but also, for instance, present the results of the National Student Survey, publish short reports of the PC’s activities, or give feedback on what has been done with the results of evaluations.

Programme webpage
Make sure that a webpage of the programme gives concise information about, for instance, what a PC is and what its work entails. Also list the members of the PC and explain how students can keep informed in other ways (e.g. give references to the means of communication listed below) and how they can contact the PC, if they wish.

Mailing
Consider sending out an email in the first semester via the study coordinator to students in the programme, in which the PC student members introduce themselves, and you give references to more detailed online information and share any other relevant information.

Walk-in consultation hours / discussion meeting
Walk-in consultation hours, whether or not combined with a pre-announced discussion meeting, can allow students to give their opinion on specific themes or issues that are currently relevant in the programme.

Facebook (and possibly other social media)
If the PC has its own Facebook group, this gives the PC direct contact with students (and teaching staff) for collecting feedback, giving feedback on teaching evaluations and providing information about the PC’s work in general.

Presentation during lectures / meetings
PC members can personally introduce themselves, e.g. at the beginning of each academic year, to the students of the various cohorts within the programme. You can take this opportunity to briefly explain what the tasks and responsibilities of the PC are, what the PC’s main points for attention will be during the coming year, and say that the PC is accessible and open for different forms of feedback. This PC presentation will preferably be planned as a part of, or following a lecture that a large number of students are expected to attend.

Administering teaching evaluations
PC members can (occasionally) be involved in administering teaching evaluations (hanging out and/or collecting paper evaluation forms). If possible, the students can also ask the PC a few questions, or the PC can make short announcements or requests.

Evaluation discussions
When students and teaching staff attend evaluation discussions organised by the PC (e.g. in the context of a curriculum evaluation), this makes a direct contribution to (personal) contact between the represented groups and the PC, and to familiarity with the agenda / work of the PC.

Year representatives
The PC can consider designating one or a few students in each year of the programme, who will act as the primary contact person for the PC to give information about the most important issues that are currently relevant in a specific cohort.

Letterbox
A physical letterbox or complaints box can give students the opportunity to also bring specific topics to the attention of the PC anonymously.

Collecting and also supplying information
It is important to realise that the good contact with the represented groups consists not only of the PC collecting sufficient information on which to base its advice, but also of the PC giving sufficient attention to providing
students (and teaching staff) with information about e.g. the results and follow-up of teaching evaluations and about the activities of the PC in general.

More information about supplying the represented groups with documents relating to teaching evaluation or the PC’s work in general can be found in Chapter 2 of this Manual (Annual Plan / Calendar, Annual Report) and in Chapter 4.6 of the Faculty Evaluation Framework.

6. Official language

In principle, Programme Committees that are responsible for a programme in which a language other than Dutch is the language of instruction should be accessible for both Dutch and international students. The University realises that the language of its administrative communication – which is predominantly Dutch – can form an obstacle in this context. If this is the case, a solution should be found at the correct level. This can be e.g. holding meetings in two languages, adding an English summary to documents, offering Dutch or English language courses or, in the most extreme case, switching completely to documents and information in English. International staff and students who wish to participate in a PC are encouraged and facilitated to obtain at least passive skills in the Dutch language.

In the Rules of Procedure the PC lays down which language is used for communication within the PC (in meetings, email correspondence, minutes).

If your PC encounters problems regarding the University’s use of two languages, or you would like advice on how best to handle this, please contact the assessor or the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance Team (O&K). The Faculty can unfortunately not promise that all administrative communication (some of which can also come from e.g. the Ministry) can be translated into English for PCs.

7. Disputes

If there is a profound disagreement between the Programme Committee and the Programme Board or the Faculty Board regarding a subject for which legal consent or consultation rights apply, the board will ensure that the programme committee is given ample opportunity to conduct further consultation.

Issues related to right of consent

If, after extensive consultation, the Programme Committee does not give its consent, the board may opt to adjust its plan so that it can count on the PC’s consent. The board may also withdraw its plan or ask for mediation with a higher body within the faculty/institution, for instance the Executive Board of Leiden University. If the mediation fails to resolve the difference and the board still wishes to implement its plan, the board may file a petition with the National Committee for Disputes in Higher Education (Landelijke Commissie Geschillen Hoger Onderwijs). This committee will first attempt to settle the dispute between the two parties in an amicable manner. If this fails, the committee will issue a binding decision. In so doing, the committee will determine whether the law has been followed and whether considerations and actions were reasoned and measured.

Issues related right of prior consultation

If the profound difference concerns a matter for which the Programme Committee’s consultation right applies, the PC may decide, after extensive consultation and mediation, to file a petition with the National Committee if the board refrains from following the Programme Committee’s proposal or recommendation.

Recourse to the National Committee for disputes should preferably be avoided by both the boards and the programme committees. If a concrete dispute arises in your Programme Committee, you may seek legal advice elsewhere (outside university). In consultation with the PC the Faculty Board will provide financial means for legal support.

8. Facilities, support and training

The PC has legal rights to facilities, support and training. The PCs of our Faculty are provided with at least the following facilities and support:

- their own email address;
- a pigeonhole in (the teaching administration of) the programme;
• space on the programme page (via the programme’s web editor) and possibly also in the e-Prospectus;
• a Blackboard page in the name of the PC or access to a programme page on Blackboard for posting messages;
• meeting space, to be reserved via the teaching administration;
• training via a University SPOC and (for the student members) via two additional Faculty training sessions (see Chapter 9);
• this written Manual;
• committee membership grant for students (see Chapter 10).
• support from the Administrative Support department, including in the selection and appointment of programme committee members and providing relevant documents and manuals to newly appointed programme committee members;
• the assessor and programme committee trainer from our faculty, function as facilitators for student members of programme committees;
• the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance Team (O&K) are available for general questions and advice regarding the operations of programme committees, education evaluations and whatever else. O&K can also serve as a service desk for forwarding questions to, for example, Legal Affairs, Administrative Support or a programme committee trainer/assessor;
• whenever needed, the university’s Legal Affairs department advises and supports the programme committees in legal questions and procedures.

For further information and the contact details of faculty support, please refer to Appendix 5C.

9. Promoting expertise

Leiden University offers a SPOC (Small Private Online Course) for PC members. The purpose of this SPOC is to enable PC members to acquire basic knowledge and expertise regarding the tasks and responsibilities of a PC. Every new PC member (student member and teaching staff member) is emphatically recommended to follow this SPOC. Invitations to follow the SPOC are sent out each Autumn.

After following the SPOC, student members are offered two more Faculty training sessions, which cover e.g. case studies and further discussion of the responsibilities with respect to the CER, and in which questions can be asked. The PC trainer will inform the student members about these training sessions in good time each year.

Some time ago, Leiden University started to organise annual themed meetings for PCs, and it is expected to continue them. Invitations to these will be sent out in good time.

Finally, reading and using this Manual will hopefully help you to perform your tasks within the PC as effectively as possible.

Teaching staff members of the Programme Committee are permitted to follow PC training in working time and with full pay. Any costs incurred for this will be paid by the Faculty.

10. Time investment and remuneration

Students receive a committee membership grant for their work as a PC-member. This remuneration is based on the duration of the appointment. For a student member who is appointed for one year, the remuneration is €300 (€150 in case of an appointment for half a year). Application for payment of the committee membership grant should be made to the Faculty’s assessor, using the form ‘Financial Support – Board Membership (Financiële ondersteuning bestuursplaats)’ (FOB). When submitting the application, you must also prove that you were registered with Leiden University in the year of your PC membership. In June, the assessor informs the student members on the application procedure and deadline.

It is difficult to give an indication of the number of hours that student members will spend on PC work. On average, one should think of around 5-6 hours per month. However, the actual time investment can greatly depend on e.g. the number of programmes / tracks that are covered by the PC, and on the division of tasks within the PC.

Teaching staff do not receive financial compensation for their work as a PC member. Nevertheless, the Faculty Board considers it important that teaching staff members of Programme Committees have enough time to perform their tasks well. Therefore at the end of 2015 the Faculty Board, in consultation with the institutes,
formulated principles for quantifying the time required for tasks of teaching staff members of administrative bodies. In 2017-18, the following hours are applicable for teaching staff members of Programme Committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>hours per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above principles are intended as an indication of the amount of time involved in performing the tasks. The institutes have promised to use these principles when allocating staff to the curricula. The principles are explicitly not intended as a fixed norm. The institutes will take account of the entire interplay of tasks (teaching and administrative tasks) when determining the workload. These principles will be evaluated, to see whether they need to be adjusted.
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Appendix 4. Format for Annual Calendar of FGW Programme Committees
Appendix 5. eMail addresses of student administrations, PC’s, etc.

Appendix 1 - Hyperlinks to relevant laws, regulations and policies

- WHW (Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek/ Higher Education and Research Act): especially art.7.13 en art. 9.18 (in Dutch)
- Regulations of the Faculty of Humanities (Faculteitsreglement)
- Implementing Regulations for administrative bodies of study programmes (Uitvoeringsregeling bestuurlijke gremia opleidingen)
- FGW Teaching Evaluation Framework [still in preparation]
- Gids Kwaliteitszorg FGW (in Dutch)
- Course and examination regulations FGW 2017-18 (in Dutch and English)

Appendix 2 - Hyperlinks to relevant information/websites

- National online platform for Programme Committees Opleidingscommissies – Best Practices (partly in English)
- Research report of the Education Inspectorate (‘Degree programme committees 2016’, in English)
- National Student Survey (NSE) (also in English)
- Dutch Student Union (LSVb, also in English) and LSVb’s QC-wijzer
- National Committee for Disputes in co-participation in Higher Education (in Dutch)
- Database commissies FGW (members and supporting staff of teaching boards and committees)
- Qualtrics web-based survey software to design and use questionnaires.
### Appendix 3 - Rights of the Faculty Council and Programme Committee regarding the Course and examination regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHW, Artikel 7.13, lid 2 (in Dutch)</th>
<th>Rights of the Faculty Council</th>
<th>Rights of the PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>In de onderwijs- en examenregeling worden, onverminderd het overigens in deze wet terzake bepaalde, per opleiding of groep van opleidingen de geldende procedures en rechten en plichten vastgelegd met betrekking tot het onderwijs en de examens. Daaronder worden ten minste begrepen:</em></td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. de inhoud van de opleiding en van de daaraan verbonden examens,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a1. de wijze waarop het onderwijs in de desbetreffende opleiding wordt geëvalueerd,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. de inhoud van de afstudeerrichtingen binnen een opleiding,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. de kwaliteiten op het gebied van kennis, inzicht en vaardigheden die een student zich bij beëindiging van de opleiding moet hebben verworven,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. waar nodig, de inrichting van praktische oefeningen,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. de studielast van de opleiding en van elk van de daarvan deel uitmakende onderwijsonderwijsen,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. de nadere regels, bedoeld in de artikelen 7.8b, zesde lid, en 7.9, vijfde lid,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. ten aanzien van welke masteropleidingen toepassing is gegeven aan artikel 7.4a, achtste lid,</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. het aantal en de volgtijdelijkheid van de tentamens alsmede de momenten waarop deze afgelegd kunnen worden,</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. de voltijdse, deeltijdse of duale inrichting van de opleiding,</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. waar nodig, de volgorde waarin, de tijdvakken waarbinnen en het aantal malen per studiejaar dat de gelegenheid wordt geboden tot het afleggen van de tentamens en examens,</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. de nadere regels bedoeld in artikel 7.10, vierde lid,</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. of de tentamens mondeling, schriftelijk of op een andere wijze worden afgelegd, behoudens de bevoegdheid van de examencommissie in bijzondere gevallen anders te bepalen,</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. de wijze waarop studenten met een handicap of chronische ziekte redelijkerwijs in de gelegenheid worden gesteld de tentamens af te leggen,</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. de openbaarheid van mondeling al te nemen tentamens, behoudens de bevoegdheid van de examencommissie in bijzondere gevallen anders te bepalen,</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. de termijn waarbinnen de uitslag van een tentamen bekend wordt gemaakt alsmede of</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to</td>
<td>Right of prior consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>de wijze waarop en de termijn gedurende welke degene die een schriftelijk tentamen heeft afgelegd, inzage verkrijgt in zijn beoordeelde werk,</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to the Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q.</td>
<td>de wijze waarop en de termijn gedurende welke kennis genomen kan worden van vragen en opdrachten, gesteld of gegeven in het kader van een schriftelijk afgenomen tentamen en van de normen aan de hand waarvan de beoordeling heeft plaatsgevonden,</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to the Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.</td>
<td>de gronden waarop de examencommissie voor eerder met goed gevolg afgelegde tentamens of examens in het hoger onderwijs, dan wel voor buiten het hoger onderwijs opgedane kennis of vaardigheden, vrijstelling kan verlenen van het afleggen van een of meer tentamens,</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to the Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.</td>
<td>waar nodig, dat het met goed gevolg afgelegd hebben van tentamens voorwaarde is voor de toelating tot het afleggen van andere tentamens,</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to the Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>waar nodig, de verplichting tot het deelnemen aan praktische oefeningen met het oog op de toelating tot het afleggen van het desbetreffende tentamen, behoudens de bevoegdheid van de examencommissie vrijstelling van die verplichting te verlenen, al dan niet onder oplegging van vervangende eisen,</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u.</td>
<td>de bewaking van studievoortgang en de individuele studiebegeleiding</td>
<td>Right of consent (without prejudice to the Right of consent of the University Council regarding the model-CER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>indien van toepassing: de wijze waarop de selectie van studenten voor een speciaal traject binnen een opleiding, bedoeld in artikel 7.9b, plaatsvindt, en [betreft een speciaal traject dat is gericht op het behalen van een hoger kennisniveau van studenten]</td>
<td>Advice may be given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>de feitelijke vormgeving van het onderwijs.</td>
<td>Right of consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Advice may be given: means that the board is not legally obliged to ask for advice, but the Faculty Council may still give advice.
2. Right of prior consultation: means that the board must consult the co-participation body.
## Appendix 4 - Format for Annual Calendar of FGW Programme Committees

The Annual Calendar is intended as a guideline, not as a mandatory template. The calendar can not only serve as a checklist, but can also be helpful when scheduling meetings and/or issuing advice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Action holders</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September/October</td>
<td>Moved to</td>
<td>Tasks, responsibilities and procedures of PC</td>
<td>For discussion (for benefit of new members)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings schedule for the upcoming semester / academic year</td>
<td>For adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy goals of PC – current academic year (partly on basis of Annual Calendar)</td>
<td>For discussion and adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Plan for the academic year</td>
<td>Formulate (no later than 1 October)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rules &amp; Regulations for examinations – current academic year</td>
<td>For information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course and Examination Regulations – current academic year</td>
<td>For information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of courses and learning pathways – remainder of previous academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points, (if necessary) advice to PB and feedback to students and teaching staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of courses and/or learning pathways – upcoming evaluations of 1st semester of current academic year</td>
<td>For (preliminary) discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting on BSA and success rate of 1st (and 2nd) year – previous academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Election / selection of student members</td>
<td>(appointment by Faculty Board around 15 October)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation of PC’s regarding model CER</td>
<td>For discussion and advice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November/December</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting of National Student Survey</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points, advice to PB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range of minors offered in Leiden Register* - next academic year</td>
<td>PC advice on range of minors to PB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range of programmes offered (incl. specialisations) in Leiden Register – year after next academic year</td>
<td>If necessary, PC advice on new programme or new specialisation, or discontinuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If applicable, desired curriculum changes – next academic year</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Plan – previous academic year</td>
<td>Discuss implementation of Assessment Plan, advice to PB / Board of Examiners, if necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Programme Report(s) + Programme Card(s)</td>
<td>Formulate improvement points, advice on Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme curriculum / curriculum changes – next academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, (if necessary) formulate advice on changes for new CER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January/February</td>
<td>Learning outcomes of programme</td>
<td>For discussion/evaluation, (if necessary) changes for new CER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admission requirements of programme</td>
<td>For discussion/evaluation, (if necessary) changes for new CER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course and Examination Regulations – current academic year</td>
<td>Evaluation of implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
<td>Advice on adjustments in line with planned curriculum changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of courses and/or learning pathways – results of 1st semester of current academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact hours of first bachelor’s year – next academic year</td>
<td>For discussion &gt; advice to PB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March/April</td>
<td>Course and Examination Regulations + Assessment Plan – next academic year</td>
<td>Definitive advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report of Board(s) of Examiners – previous academic year</td>
<td>For information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of courses and/or learning pathways – upcoming evaluations of 2nd semester of current academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June</td>
<td>Report of success rate (drop-out, change of programme, re-enrolment rate, excellence) – previous academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Track Report of Honours College</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan relating to visitation / midterm review</td>
<td>For discussion: <em>current situation; (re-)formulate action points / timeline</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominations for Faculty teaching prize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Calendar of PC – next academic year</td>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/August</td>
<td>Evaluation of courses and/or learning pathways – results of 2nd semester of current academic year</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report of National Student Survey</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points, advice to PB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum evaluation (not every year)</td>
<td>For discussion, formulate improvement points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archive all advice</td>
<td>Archive, insolar as not yet done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All the courses offered at Leiden University (study programmes, specialisations, minors) are set down in the Leiden Register. The Executive Board adopts the offered study programmes and specialisations each year at the beginning of June, and the minors at the beginning of March. The Leiden Register is always one year in advance of the current academic year. The Register has the function of recording the courses, and also forms the basis for checking the offered courses against Leiden University’s quality standards and the quality assurance requirements.
## Appendix 5 - Email addresses of student administrations, PCs, and others

### A. Functional mailboxes of student administrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional mailbox</th>
<th>Bachelor’s programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| osz oa-vrieshof@hum.leidenuniv.nl | Chinastudies  
Religiewetenschappen  
Japanstudies  
Koreastudies  
Midden-Oostenstudies  
Oude culturen van de mediterrane wereld  
South and Southeast Asian Studies  
Wijsbegeerte |
| osz oa-wijkplaats@hum.leidenuniv.nl | Afrikaanse talen en culturen  
Film- en literatuurwetenschap  
Franse taal en cultuur  
Italiaanse taal en cultuur  
Latijns-Amerikastudies  
Russische studies  
Taalwetenschap |
| osz oa-eyckhof@hum.leidenuniv.nl | Duitse taal en cultuur  
Dutch Studies  
Engelse taal en cultuur  
Nederlandse taal en cultuur |
| osz oa-huizinga@hum.leidenuniv.nl | Geschiedenis  
Griekse en Latijnse taal en cultuur  
Kunstgeschiedenis |
| Bsis.info@leiden.edu | International Studies |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional mailbox</th>
<th>Master’s programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| osz oa-vrieshof@hum.leidenuniv.nl | Asian Studies (60 EC)  
Asian Studies (120 EC)  
Asian Studies (ResMA)  
Middle Eastern Studies  
Middle Eastern Studies (ResMA)  
Philosophy (60 EC)  
Philosophy (120 EC)  
Theology and Religious Studies |
| osz oa-wijkplaats@hum.leidenuniv.nl | African Studies  
African Studies (ResMA)  
International Relations  
Latin American Studies  
Latin American Studies (ResMA)  
Linguistics (ResMA)  
Russian and Eurasian Studies  
Literary Studies  
Literary Studies (ResMA) |
| osz oa-eyckhof@hum.leidenuniv.nl | Linguistics  
Media Studies  
Neerlandistiek |
B. Email addresses of Programme Committees

The current membership of the various committees and boards relating to teaching within the Faculty is maintained in a database that can be accessed online. This database also contains the (functional) email addresses of the Programme Committees and other committees and boards: https://fgw-commissies.leidenuniv.nl/

C. Email addresses of Faculty support bodies

Management Support Department (Bestuursondersteuning, BO): for questions or comments about e.g. election and appointment of PC members, the Faculty Regulations and the Implementing Regulations for Administrative Bodies, contact with the Standing Committee for Education and the Faculty Council, and management of the online Database of Committees and Boards of the Faculty of Humanities: bestuursondersteuning@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Educational Advice and Quality Assurance Team (Onderwijs- en Studentzaken, O&K): for questions and comments about e.g. this Manual, issues relating to advice on teaching evaluation in general, the Faculty Evaluation Framework, etc.: oen@hum.leidenuniv.nl

PC trainer: for e.g. training of new student members and for questions or comments arising from the SPOC or the Faculty training sessions: olctrainer@hum.leidenuniv.nl