

# NEWSLETTER

# UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

[All documents discussed can be downloaded here](#)

[Reorganisation Marketing & Communication function](#)

## Introduction

The reorganisation of the Marketing and Communication function, the extension of the pilot BSA and the accommodation memorandum were the most notable items of the consultative meeting with the Executive Board of 15 December 2010 and gave rise to lively debate and the deferment of decisions. But there were other important items on the agenda. The outcome of these discussions is reported to you below by the spokesperson in question. We welcome your response!

In the meeting the Executive Board made an important announcement on the tightening of the strategic policy (RoUTE 14+). This has also been announced in a recent email from the Executive Board to all staff members. Obviously the University Council will closely monitor these plans, both as to procedures and content. We will begin with an additional internal meeting of the University Council on 5 January next.

Also in connection with these developments we would like to hear your input, to enable us to put forward your views (the expectation is that the proposals will be presented to the Council for approval in the spring). You can send an email to a council member you know, a party or to [info@uraad.utwente.nl](mailto:info@uraad.utwente.nl). Consult all the documents or see for more information our website: [www.utwente.nl/uraad/](http://www.utwente.nl/uraad/)

The next consultative meeting with the Executive Board will take place on Wednesday 26 January 2011 at 9.00 am in Horsttoren 1300. Council meetings are public meetings; interested parties are invited to attend the meeting.

## The University Council

The University Council (University Council) is the central participation body of the UT and holds regular meetings with the Executive Board. The council has 18 members; nine staff members and nine students. The University Council has a say in UT policy at the central level.

Five parties are represented on the council: Campus Coalition and UReka, Pro-UT, Lijst Chairman and PvdUT. At the moment the members of the University Council are Op: Frits Lagendijk, Jann van Benthem, Björn Harink, Dick Meijer, Sjef van der Steen, Frank van den Berg, Jan de Goeijen, Jan Schut, Herbert Wormeester, Eva Kunst, Ellen Langerwerf, Pieter Willems, George Ndungu, Miranda Schraa, Beer Sijpesteijn, Sjoerd van den Bedem, Anne Benneker and David Smits.

Once again the subject of a reorganisation of the marketing and communication function was placed on the agenda for discussion in the consultative meeting. This time the University Council was asked for its approval. As was the case in the consultative process in the September cycle, there was much discussion in the committee meeting SI, the internal meeting and in the party consultation sessions.

Like in the above cycle the centralisation of the Communication function was a major source of lively discussion, partly because of messages from the faculties. The University Council did not take a decision on this consultation round for the following reasons:

The University Council (again) raised objections against the set-up and contents of the reorganisation plan.

In the first place it criticised the lack of a sufficient analysis: where does the communication-marketing function operate below par, why is this the case and what is the most suitable solution? Nor is there an analysis of the personnel deployment (in particular in the faculties) (who does what?), thus the logical basis for the reorganisation plans is lacking.

In the second place the (lack of) commitment of both the management and administration of the faculties (from the top) and the staff (from the bottom) was considered.

The result of the above is that the University Council has enforced the Executive Board to make administrative agreements in advance between the Executive Board and the faculty deans, in which context based on an analysis of the current problems mutual agreements will be made on the need, the functioning and the personnel deployment within the proposed framework.

Only after the presentation of the results is the University Council prepared to reconsider its present negative draft decision. The Executive Board is to respond to this within 30 days.

This means that the faculty deans will have to (again) show whether - and in particular in what way - they defer to the proposals of the Executive Board (from the top) in January. From a dean it may be expected that he asks the advice of the faculty council in advance (from the bottom). In our view it is not a bad thing if the faculty council acts proactively in this context.

To respond, send an email to: [steen@itc.nl](mailto:steen@itc.nl)



## Binding study advice

In the November cycle the extension of the pilot Binding Study Advice was discussed. During the consultative meeting it was decided to postpone the discussion of the BSA until the December cycle, in order to provide more information to the University Council. When it was decided to postpone this item on the agenda the Council stated that this postponement implies that extension of the pilot is no longer possible for the academic year of 2011 – 2012, because in that case the provision of information to the students on the BSA will not have been comprehensive.

During the December cycle the BSA decision was divided into two components. Part 1 (information) consisted of the extension of the pilot BSA. In this context it was agreed with the rector magnificus that the interested faculties are allowed to participate in the pilot provided they meet all conditions for introducing the BSA such as adequate student guidance and sufficient study facilities. In February the University Council will receive an overview of the faculties that wish to participate in the extension of the pilot. The second part of the decision, being allowed to introduce a p-in-2 scheme, was presented to the University Council for its approval. The draft decision of the University Council was negative. According to the Council introducing the p-in-2 scheme at this moment is still insufficiently worked out and the alternative performance



enhancing measures have insufficiently been examined. The rector magnificus promised to shortly draw up an analysis of various performance enhancing measures that can be used in year 2 and 3. The University Council is satisfied with this promise and looks forward to receiving the analysis.

**To respond, send an email to:**  
[eva@ureka.utwente.nl](mailto:eva@ureka.utwente.nl)

## Real-Estate Plan '14, version 2011

The University Council has agreed to the 2011 version of the Real-Estate Plan running up to and including 2014. The Council agrees with the planned projects, but is, however, of the opinion that the use and necessity of investments in real estate need to be closely examined. The Council has clearly indicated that it is vital that the projects which refer to the



primary process have a higher priority than the other projects. For this reason the University Council awaits the prioritisation of all the projects with interest. It was also pointed out that sufficient bicycle sheds should be provided around the O&O square for staff members and students.

**To respond, send an email to:**  
[ellen@ureka.utwente.nl](mailto:ellen@ureka.utwente.nl)

## Incentives Fund

The agenda of this cycle also featured a proposal for giving shape to the Incentives Fund (Profileringsfonds). The proposal described, for example, how the level of the graduation support is determined, what conditions apply for making an application for graduation support and which foreign students are eligible to grants from the UTS fund.

With the present government developments it is difficult to decide on how to give shape to the Incentives Fund with respect to voluntary activism; for, it is not inconceivable that within several months there may be new legislation on perpetual students in place in several months. Because the UT has many perpetual students, also due to activism, the Council was unable to take a definitive decision during this cycle. Therefore the Council has asked the Executive Board to provide a response to (any) new legislation as soon as this is announced. At that time the Council will review the proposal and decide. As far as the non-voluntary delays are concerned, the way in which the Incentives Fund has been given shape is clear and well-formulated; therefore this was accepted without any amendments.

At the moment UTS is also part of the Incentives Fund. However, the Council did note in this context that the formulation of the UTS component was such that for a group of students who start a pre-master in February, it is not possible to be eligible for a grant, because the condition for being eligible for a grant was a completed pre-master and the application periods are January and April; this obviously results



in problems when a student arrives at the UT to start a pre-master as from 1 February. As a result of this a proposal was made to provide provisional grants to this group of students, the grant then only becomes definitive when the pre-master has been completed successfully.

**To respond, send an email to:**  
[miranda@ureka.nl](mailto:miranda@ureka.nl)

## [Plan of Approach Staff Satisfaction Survey](#)

In two rounds the University Council discussed the memorandum Plan of Approach Staff satisfaction Survey (MTO). This a proposal for taking measures in response to the results of the MTO in the autumn of 2009. The Executive Board made clear that on several points policy is currently being implemented (such as leadership, communication), so that no additional measures are proposed in this context. Because a certain degree of improvement is indeed noticeable on these points compared with the previous MTO, the University Council was able to agree to this. A primary issue for the Executive Board is preventing and dealing with undesirable behaviour. For this purpose a code of conduct will be drawn up in cooperation with the Student Union, and at the request of the University Council also with students and staff from various faculties.

In addition, the University Council asked for an overview of the specific agreements made with respect to the provision of services by the various service departments, which the



Executive Board will present to the University Council before 1 July. The Executive Board promised that concrete targets with respect to the points for improvement will be drawn up immediately after the next MTO (late 2011). With the promises the University Council was able to agree to the Plan of Approach MTO.

**To respond, send an email to:**  
[f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl](mailto:f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl)

## [Memorandum Assessment Policy](#)

A second component of Institutional Quality Care System is the memorandum Assessment Policy. In this memorandum the Executive Board has outlined a plan of approach for arriving at a university-wide framework for Assessment Policy. The framework is to provide degree programmes/faculties with points of reference to drawing up an assessment policy of their own or for reviewing the existing assessment policy. The Executive Board promised to present the definitive Assessment Framework including a proposal for funding the implementation of this policy to University Council before 1 May 2011. Because assessment policy and assessing will be a more important criterion in the new accreditations, the University Council asked to ensure that all teachers acting as examiners will have completed the component 'Assessing' of the BKO by 1 September 2011. The Executive Board stated that it considered this infeasible, because some 600 teachers are involved. However, the Executive Board did promise to present a plan before the summer of 2011 which explains which requirements each examiner is to meet, including a planning for when this is to be realised. With these promises the University Council was able to agree to the memorandum Assessment Policy.

**To respond, send an email to:**  
[f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl](mailto:f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl)

## [Memorandum Professional Development for Teaching Staff](#)

A component of the plan Institutional Quality Care System is the memorandum Professional Development for Teaching Staff. In the memorandum the Executive Board clearly states its wish to encourage the professionalisation of the teaching staff, because it sees the didactic qualities of the teaching staff as a condition for excellent education. The University Council agreed to the proposal to make a BKO (certificate Basic Qualification Education) obligatory for all teaching staff with up to 20 years of experience, and wishes to have more information on whether this requirement also applies to part-time staff or teachers with a temporary appointment. The Executive Board promised to provide more clarity on this before 1 March 2011.

In addition, the University Council stated that it considered it very desirable to also introduce an SKO (Senior Qualification Education) for very highly experienced teachers. The Executive Board promised to present proposals in this context before the summer of 2011, after consultation in 3TU context. Around that time the Executive Board also wishes to present an initial outline of new possibilities for teaching staff to get ahead in the education sector. In due course this will be incorporated into the HR policy. The University Council strongly welcomes this.

Lastly, the University Council drew attention to the current financing of the didactic courses at Educational Services, which is presently a clear bottleneck. The Executive Board explicitly stated that a solution is to be sought for this. "We are thinking about the central funding of (obligatory) activities as well as the corresponding provision of services resulting in a level of competence as required by the management of the institution (BKO/SKO)". The Executive Board explicitly stated that the teaching staff itself is to determine which courses and counselling it wishes in order to professionalise, and that "the funding of this may not be an impediment for participation! Other learning and developmental activities are for the account of the faculty/degree programme."

With this explanation and these promises the University Council was subsequently able to agree with the memorandum Professional Development for Teaching Staff.

**To respond, send an email to:**  
[f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl](mailto:f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl)

For more information, visit our website:

[www.utwente.nl/uraad/](http://www.utwente.nl/uraad/)

To receive, or cancel, this newsletter, send an email to:

[info@uraad.utwente.nl](mailto:info@uraad.utwente.nl)