

Faculty Behavioural, Management & Social sciences
Kenmerk: BMS-STePS/2016
Datum: October 2016

Meeting minutes Faculty council BMS September 2016

Present: Stefanie van den Berg (FC), Henk Boer, Evelien Bonte (minutes), Shawn Donnelly (FC), Yann Hengstenberg (FC) Marion Kamp, Henk van der Kolk (FC), Silke Oude Aarninkhof (FC), Carly Overmars (FC), Ivan Remijn (FC), Jurgen Svensson (FC), Mark Tempelman (FC), Theo Toonen, Bernard van Welij (FC), Jacqueline Weppelman

Absent: --

1. Opening

2. Minutes of last meeting

The concept of the minutes 6 September were distributed. Mark stresses the fact the role of the faculty council in the BMS under Steam process is still to be made clearer. We will address this issue under point 5 of the agenda

3. Budget and Annual Plan

The faculty council has to approve of the current budget and 'jaarplan'. Before we can do so, we want discuss four groups of topics. Topics related to **teaching**, to **research**, to the future **organization** of the faculty and to **finances**.

TEACHING

- The first general topic related to teaching we would like to address is the **quality of teaching**. The 'jaarplan' does not mention much about the *quality* of teaching. How does the dean plan to improve to sustain and improve the quality of teaching? (Mark)
- The 'jaarplan' discusses the 'Quality control cycle'. However, many people working with the current system argue it doesn't increase the quality. Effort is put into optimizing the system, but if that system is not sufficiently fed with adequate data (large numbers of students filling out the questionnaires, clear evaluation criteria for teaching, for example, the system itself will not help much in the improvement of the quality of teaching. What are the deans plans to improve these aspects of the teaching quality control cycle? (Stephanie)
- The 'jaarplan' stresses the importance of collaboration between various programs (more specifically: sharing of module (part)s). In other faculties module parts are already shared, but this is not necessarily helping the profile or quality of programs. What does the dean plan to ensure the sharing also implies high quality of teaching? (Ivan)
- BMS plans on investing in English languages skills of teachers. Currently the level aimed for is defined as C1. However, C1 does not include pronunciation and clarity of expression. Some members of the council are worried about the level of English proficiency. How does the dean plan to improve the level of English within the faculty, and what level does he (realistically) aim for. (Ivan)
- The KPI document also includes a presentation of the number of contact hours. Does that number include 'guided self-study' and how does the dean have plans regarding the number of contact hours (which seems to be quite low). (Henk)
- A second topic we would like to bring up is the introduction of a **broad bachelor program**, which is seen as a possible outcome of some future changes in the BMS programs. Given the rather

eclectic way in which the dean seems to plan this program: how do we ensure the quality of this curriculum (not of the various modules)? (Silke)

- Related to this, which specific 'profile' does the dean want to give to this broad program in order to distinguish it from similar programs as ATLAS and broad social science programs in other universities? (Mark)
- The third topic relates to the **honour tracks**. The current system seems to be unclear to students, with at least both 'star programs' and a university honours program. How does the dean plan to organize these programs alongside each other? Should they all exit alongside each other? (Ivan)
- A fourth topic relates to the planned (expected) and actual **numbers of student enrolment**. Is it indeed correct that the faculty accepts a relatively small enrolment for EPA for the next few years (50 students)? (Bernard)
- (factual question) are the historical numbers for IBA including the BK students?
- Is it correct that we expect an increase in the enrolment for the pre-master of over 100%? (p.2 jaarverslag). (Bernard)
- There is at least one interesting new Dutch language master. What are the expected numbers of student enrolments for this and other master programs? (Mark)

RESEARCH

- In the research section of the jaarplan, a summary is given of the BMS under Steam document. However, the faculty council was under the impression that this was a 'discussion document', to be amended and changed, for example with respect to the exact content of the research programs and the organization of the four clusters. It was supposed to grow organically. How does that relate to the idea that a 'jaarplan', which is supposed to have clear goals and is used to evaluate the activities of the faculty afterwards? (Henk)
- (factual question) Is the dean in the section about the T4P plan, proposing to drop the T4P program (with a competition between project proposals) and to use some seed money to stimulate the five suggested 'research areas'? (Mark)

ORGANISATION

- The document is currently using the word 'teaching load' (3 of 9), the council, however, want to emphasize that the problem is 'work load'. Had it been just teaching, the problem would have been much smaller. A large aspect of the problem is the amount of coordination and discussion in the context of teaching. It is not clear whether this aspect is sufficiently covered in the new budget allocation model. Is that correct? (Stephanie)
- (page 6 of 9) Gender, first sentence. Given the extremely low percentage of female staff especially in the higher ranks, the first sentence seems to be a mistake. Does the dean agree? Moreover, the university board aims for 20% women in the professorate by 2020, the percentage is currently much lower. Combined with the plans to reduce the amount of staff, how does the dean plan to fill this gap? What are his plans to change the ratio? (Stephanie)
- (asking for clarification) The section about the Planning and Control Cycle is unclear.

FINANCES

- Most councilmembers are unable to give a meaningful advice on the budget. The budget entries are not clear, a balance is missing (there seems to be a change in the reserves, but that is not extremely clear). We will not ask for another type of budget, because this seems to be to a large extent a consequence of the way the university is organizing this, however, what is the general idea or strategy behind the current budget. How should we interpret the broad decisions made in the document? (Henk)

GENERAL

We will probably give our consent to the set of documents now sent to the council (what is the alternative?). The documents were already sent to the Board of the University. To what extent or in what

way will you actually change the current documents, so we can see that our recommendations are taken into account? (Henk)

4. Position of Faculties and Research Institutes

Discussion, I suggest the dean gets about 10 minutes to present the state of the discussion on this topic and there is 10 minutes for questions. For the first set of questions: see below.

- (preliminary remark) should these documents not have been written in English?
- The most important discussion point seems to be the (non) abolishment of the institutes. Especially because the WD (SD) will have a hierarchical connection with the Board of the University, this creates a confusing type of organization: what will be the distinguishing features of WDs and Vice deans for research and how will it solve the current problems. (Stephanie)
- How will the student member of the faculty management team be selected? (Ivan)

5. BMS under STEαM

We already discussed the document and commented on the document extensively. In this discussion (which is summarized in the minutes) we suggested some additions and changes. Others have suggested changes too. What did the dean do with these changes and can we expect an updated version of the document? (Henk will ask the dean)

6. Leerstoel Socrates

- How will the extra costs for this chair (probably minor, because there is no salary included?) be paid? Is there is contribution from the Stichting Socrates? (Shawn)
- Is there a BAC for this chair? Who will be in that BAC? (Mark)
- The document seems to be outdated. The chair was supposed to start in the beginning of 2016 and there is still a reference to GW. How come? (Stephanie)

7. Announcements from the dean

8. Closure of the meeting

The chairman closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their contribution