

Faculty Behavioural, Management & Social sciences  
Kenmerk: BMS-StePS/2017  
Datum: 7 March 2017

## Meeting minutes Faculty council BMS March 2017

---

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

*Absent:* Stéphanie van den Berg, Jörgen Svensson, Jacqueline Weppelman

### 1. Opening

The chairman opened the meeting.

### 2. Minutes of the last meeting

After the change of date and some spelling errors the minutes were approved.

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

The dean mentioned that it becomes a little bit clear on how the university wants to deal with the refunding financing of the institutes and faculties. The decision has been taken as part of UT2020 that the research institutes will no longer be "beheersinstituten". The money that was run through the research institutes, will now go directly through the faculty budget. All the money that is currently at the research institutes (IGS, MIRA, CTIT, MESA+) will go as neutral as possible to the faculties. Over the time the promotiepremie will decrease (from 90K to 60K) which will stay at the university level, earmarked for profiling. By the transfer from the institutes to the faculties, there is more income to the faculty than we have now.

The FC asked how important the brand IGS is for external profiling.

The dean answered that it is too early to have more clear information related to IGS, profiling and future.

### 4. Agenda of this Faculty Council meeting

The agenda for this meeting is confirmed.

### 5. Progress report by the dean on BMS under Steam and UT2020, including the formation of clusters and progress of the 'capacity planning'

The FC is very curious about developments in the context of BMS under Steam and UT2020. Already mentioned the shift of IGS to the faculty but there are more things going on. We've heard that some people discussing moving away from this university in the context of HR policies. What could be shared in this context.

The MT mentioned that the influx of students is a very important point this year. Next to that also a lot of individual talks with employees are taken place. The discussions on the clusters themselves are postponed till the end of this year. On the agenda is the research reprogramming which is a joint activity between IGS and BMS. The decision has been taken to regroup all the research programs (12 research programs, 8 spearheads) and that these will be merged into 5 as part of a 5 year process. 5 new programs will be developed and should be outlined in 2020. Related to the capacity planning, which is very important for staff, there are no developments to be mentioned.

An educational capacity was planned. We are moving towards a direction of fair distribution of educational money. Together with the OLD's a first model is prepared. As soon as the document is discussed with all the OLD's, the model will be send to the FC for sharing and discussion.

### 6. Loopbaancommissie/promotieregels

Currently the plan for the allocation of chairs needs consent from the Faculty Council. The university is currently considering changing the way personnel is hired and promoted, including changing the way academic chairs are allocated. These changes thus need to be made in close consultation with the council.

In addition, the regime governing the (non-)promotion of both tenure track and non-tenure track members of the staff (based on the UFO profiles) differed between GW and MB. The regime has never been formalized after the merger. In June 2016, the council was promised to be involved in the formulation of a new regime and a first draft has now

been sent to the council.

The council likes to express its concerns related to the transparency of the promotion process. There is always a trade-off between autonomy of the dean (based on strategy and opportunities) and a set of transparent rules on the basis of which (new) people are hired and promoted. The council thinks at least some rules are needed in order to avoid arbitrary (non)promotions. In addition, there is always a tradeoff between having an adequate set of professors responsible for the teaching programs and professors focusing on research. *The council likes to discuss with the dean how he thinks about these tradeoffs, and how we can avoid arbitrary rule in this context.*

The MT first would like to apologies that only the Dutch version is available, time was limited to deliver an English translation. De Dutch file is an improved version of the file that was produced last year. Till 2,5 years ago, all faculties had their own specified list of criteria per category for promotion, BMS is now using the UFO profiles. Since the profiles are quiet broad and the academic field is changing, BMS installed a special TT committee and a career committee to cover the fields within BMS.

The FC raised the question how staff do find out what is expected to get promoted.

The MT answered that it is difficult to say since this has to do with the new course of the faculty, the new clusters and the fields that has to be strengthen. The MT wants to express that compared to 2011 there are major changes in the academic especially within this faculty.

The FC would like to see an extended document outlining the new plans and discuss that plan.

The MT mentioned it is the planning to install an advisory board advising the MT on this matter. 2 Members of the council will be asked to participate in this workgroup. The first results should be available before summer, the final policy document should be available in autumn, before the annual reviews.

## 7. Quality of education

We were sent a set of documents related to de Educational Quality Control Cycle. The council thinks that a well-designed EQCC is of vital importance. The council, however, has four points of concern:

(1) the dominance of student opinions in the system of evaluation (while it is well known that student opinions are not a very valid indication of the quality of teaching),

(2) the complexity of the proposed QCC and the burden it will place on the organization as a whole,

(3) the total length of the questionnaires used in module evaluations in relation to their actual usage in the QCC process (increasing inconvenience for students, decreasing response).

(4) the issue of individual evaluations of members of staff (which can have very negative repercussions for staff motivation and collaboration in module teams, has privacy issues etc, while not being a very valid or helpful indicator of actual teacher performance). *The council likes to discuss how the dean plans on contributing to a less complex and smaller, yet more comprehensive system, with a sufficient amount of flexibility (room for the various stakeholders to include questions).*

The MT mentioned that the closing of the PDCA cycle is a burden within the faculty. A proposal procedure was made to be able to close the cycle. The main problem is how to provide the valid information to teachers and program directors to think about improvements and communication these with the students.

The FC raised the question how the progress reports for monitoring the implementation will look like.

Every year, the FC will receive an overview on how the PDCA works in the various programs.. This will avoid that the council will receive all the evaluations from the programs. Issues per program could be added to the overview.

The FC mentioned that all PDCA documents starts at the faculty level, maybe it should start at module level. When modules are monitored and checked, what can be added at the program level and continue to the faculty and university level.

The MT will take that into account.

The FC asked if it is correct that in the evaluation there is one question, which is an open question, what would you suggest as improvement for your teacher.

The MT answered that in the actual proposal individual teacher questions will be added to identify areas of improvement.

The FC can expect that all questions in the evaluations about individual teachers will be formulated in such a way that the quality of teaching will be improved.

The council stress the potentially negative effects on the academic staff and recommends to use personalized evaluations sparingly and carefully.

**8. Education/OER IEM**

The FC will send their advise.

**9. Round of questions**

The FC asked what the faculty is going to do about the poor participation in the Faculty Council election. Does the MT have additional plans apart from organizing the elections?

The MT mentioned that a promotion plan will be prepared.

**10. End of meeting**

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