

Faculty Behavioural, Management & Social sciences
Kenmerk: BMS-STePS/2017
Datum: April 2017

Meeting minutes Faculty council BMS April 2017

Present: Henk Boer, Evelien Bonte (minutes), Yann Hengstenberg, Marion Kamp, Henk van der Kolk, Silke Oude Aarninkhof, Carly Overmars, Ivan Remijn, Jörgen Svensson, Mark Tempelman, Theo Toonen, Bernard van Welij, Jacqueline Weppelman, John Winter

Absent: Stéphanie van den Berg, Shawn Donnelly

1. Opening

The chairman opened the meeting.

2. Minutes of the last meeting and comments on the advises

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

3. Announcements and short comments by the dean about topics not in the agenda

There are no announcements or short comments.

4. Agenda of this Faculty Council meeting

The agenda of this faculty Council meeting has been confirmed.

5. Progress report by the dean

The dean presented the progress on BMS under Steam (https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/fc/agenda/18_apr/)
The Steam analysis is from spring last year and in the meantime a lot was done.

The faculty will concentrate all research programmes into 4 major programmes. An external review will take place in 2020 which means that a mid-term review will take place in spring 2018 and the preparation will be this year.

Reorientation Research Programmes themes: Health, Learning, Resilience, Industry, Emerging Technologies.
At this moment BMS is growing into the presented model which is pre-financed by our reserves. After that BMS will potentially grow in a healthy matter if the university targets of the master enrollment will be realized.

The Faculty Council raised the question if it is necessary to fire people when they do not fit the programme, even there is money to hire personnel.

The MT answered that they cannot say that nothing will happen. There is a strong policy needed that the people in the organization have to reorient themselves in case they do not fit the programme.

The FC mentioned that various documents seem to contradict each other with respect to cluster composition. Some documents suggest this is definite, other that decision making will take place by the end of 2017. The FC asked to which extent this proposal is 'final'?

The MT answered that this is the final proposal but since more people get involved, changes were and can be made. The proposal is not definite until the UT has accepted it.

The FC asked to what extent the 'members' of the proposed clusters have been in contact with each other and do they indeed see opportunities for future collaboration?

The MT answered that they are still aiming for the 4 proposed clusters. If colleagues would like to come with an alternative, it should be an alternative for the faculty as a whole.

The FC mentioned that the clusters seem to get shaped and current departments will be abolished. To what extent does this decision have consequences for:

- The supporting staff of the current departments
- The location of the various groups
- The hierarchical relationships between members of staff and higher hierarchical levels

The MT answered that they prefer 1 secretariat for the whole cluster but with the modern technology it is not necessary located in one area. Related to the relationships, leerstoelen will disappear. The chair of the cluster will become hierarchical and there can be a day-to-day coordinator for each individual.

6. Domeinplan

The Faculty Council asked if the Status Quo numbers in the plan (and the decline in the number of professors) are including or excluding the four new chairs.

The MT answered that this is excluding the four new chairs.

The FC mentioned that they were used to have a Hooglerarenplan. It seems that the structure reports will become more important. Related to the budget there is money to hire 4 new positions in the context of BMS under Steam. The MT mentioned that also the 4 to 5 TT-ers could be hired as well as the new positions. But the TT-ers are not announced as full professors. Another set of structure reports related to BMS under Steam will be created. Clusters will assist in writing profiles related to Finance, Health and Learning.

The FC suggested that towards the Domeinplan document it should be clear that structure reports are supported by policies and clusters. Otherwise it becomes too vague to the FC to judge if the structure report is acceptable or not.

7. Name change of the Bsc Programme “European Public Administration”

The Faculty Council asked to what extent a replacement of the CROHO code was considered as compared to a change in the CROHO code? The change (as compared to a replacement) has important consequences for current students.

The MT answered that the name change will be realized within the CROHO code. There is a substantial change which is within the margins allowed.

The FC asked to what extent the word ‘management’ (which is argued to be a secondary addition to the main ‘catchwords’ society and technology) was properly placed at the beginning of the new name. Does the name thus distinguish sufficiently from Business Administration curricula?

The MT answered that management will be a part of the curriculum. The FC answered that it is important to share the report depending on the new name. The aspect is that ‘management’ is not seen as which is related to Business Administration. If the report could make that clear, the fear that is broadly shared in the council now, could be taken away.

The FC mentioned that the technology component (towards a beta orientation, page 3) is currently not clearly connected to a change in the contents of the program. Which ‘technologies’ will become part of the curriculum? Is academic staff from technological faculties involved in the organization and teaching of the new program?

The MT answered that it is indeed the idea to hire expertise from other faculties.

8. Advice OLD’s

The FC mentioned that there were no objections raised to the candidates and the council is grateful that the candidates are willing to take over the jobs. In a later stage, the council would like to discuss the position of OLD’s in the context of the organization (FP’s-Non FP’s).

9. Round of questions before closure of the meeting

Student elections

The MT received the message that at this moment nobody applies for a position in the council.

The Faculty Council answered that there should be at least two candidates and that they would like to receive the latest update via email.

The FC received a number of signals of people being worried, angry and even talk about the culture of fear within a department. Is there a kind of attention for these kind of signals?

The MT answered that they didn’t received these signals. If colleagues feel that it is on a personal level, they should address their point to the dean. Also HR and confidential advisors can be contacted.

10. End of the meeting

The chairman closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their contribution.