



minutes

Meeting Faculty Council

Date and time

11 December 2018, 9:30-11:00

Reference

final

Eliza van der Ploeg-Bout

T +31 (0)50 36 33898

e.s.van.der.ploeg-bout@rug.nl

Present

FC: Gerd Weitkamp (chair), Welmoed Claus, Joram Wijnstra, Jeppe de Vries, Jim Klooster, Charissa Andringa, Roberta Rutigliano, Xiaolong Liu

FB: Oscar Couwenberg, Marga Hids, Tialda Haartsen, Sasha Verhulst

Landleven 1

9747 AD Groningen

The Netherlands

Absent

FC: Claudia Yamu, Anne-Marel Hilbers

Minutes taken by

Eliza van der Ploeg-Bout

Last minutes (9 October 2018) approved

Yes

1. Actions

Number	Who?	What?	When?	Subject on agenda
04-06, nr 18-15	Couwenberg/ ProGeo	Visibility ProGeo on Nestor. Discuss with DoE again.		
20181211-1	V/d Ploeg	Mail documents about Accreditation to FC for information.		
20181211-2	Rutigliano	Mail memo about ISB to board.		
20181211-3	Board	Finalize memo career perspectives		

2. Finished actions:

26-03, nr 18-05: Staff has been informed about the three new members of the FC.

26-03, nr 18-08: The Education Office has made an employability year calendar, which is on the website of the Career Company. Theme Employability has been put on year calendar of the FC.

20181009-1: Weitkamp has sent the invitation link for registration of visit Ban Ki-moon on 17-10.

20181009-2: Weitkamp has sent the invitations for the round table discussions about the quality agreements (studievoorschotmiddelen).

20181009-3: Memo about Career Perspectives has been put on agenda of 11 December 2018.

20181009-4: Weitkamp made a statement for the University Board about consent with the proposed budget 2019-2022 with the exception of the expense of the quality agreements.

20181009-5: Weitkamp made a statement/memo with comments on the Arbo report for Hids in the overall meeting.

20181009-6: An extra meeting about the Quality Agreements (focus points) has taken place on 20 November 2018.

3. Decisions/Advice

3.1 Quality Agreements

Decision: The Faculty Council unanimously agrees upon the proposal Intensifying supervision and study success of the Faculty Board for the Quality Agreements with the following comments:

- Last paragraph of Global description of activities (about fourth item) will be put in memo about ranking the six themes of the 'Kader 10 % van de middelen'.
- In-between evaluation: f) should be e).

Action

- The Faculty Council request the Faculty Board to monitor/give a (short) yearly update of the effect of the Quality Agreements for making clear to the Faculty employees and students that the measures for relieving work pressure and improving the education quality are taken seriously.

3.2 Ranking six themes ‘Kader 10% van de middelen’

Advice: the Faculty Council advises the Faculty Board to rank all themes equally. Other comments:

- a) From the proposal about the Quality Agreements the fourth item that is mentioned (to offer English language support and training in intercultural competences to our students as both skills are important for students to be active learners and be successful in their studies) will be put into the memo about the ranking.
- b) Furthermore, the Faculty Council suggests an increase of the capacity of the Language Center for the theme Anders.
- c) One suggestion about more teaching time for PhD's for increasing feedback to students is difficult to implement because of strict regulations and scholarship requirements. Therefore, this cannot be done with the Quality Agreements but may be financed separately via faculty funds.

3.3 Draft policy document “Staff development and career perspectives”

Decision: the FC agrees upon the document with the following comments:

- In the memo nothing is said about the career perspectives of employees with a part time employment. Add one line about discussing with the manager where part timers will focus on.
- Add one line that this policy does not include Post Doc's.

The board will finalize the policy document.

4. For information

4.1 International Student Barometer

Only students from abroad were questioned. The FC has several comments/questions about this survey and Rutigliano has made a short memo for the board about this.

One reason why FSS scores so low might be the dissatisfaction among international EIP-students about the workload in the master EIP. These issues have been solved, so hopefully next year the score will be better.

To balance this low score: FSS scored high in the NSO and the Elsevier survey.