Meeting minutes Faculty council BMS October 2016

Present: Stéphanie van den Berg, Evelien Bonte (minutes), Yann Hengstenberg, Marion Kamp,
                    Henk van der Kolk, Carly Overmars, Ivan Remijn, Jörgen Svensson, Mark Tempelman,
                    Theo Toonen, Bernard van Welij, Jacqueline Weppelman

Absent: Henk Boer, Shawn Donnelly, Silke Oude Aarninkhof,

1. **Opening**
   The chairman opened the meeting.
   Monique Davids, coördinator internationalisering BMS, suddenly passed away. All participants take a
   moment to commemorate the life of Monique.

2. **Agenda**
   The MT asked whether to address the advices.
   The FC answered that the advice will be discussed at agenda item 8. For future agenda's the item
   'advices' will be added.

3. **Announcements by the dean**
   --

4. **Minutes of last meeting**
   Page 1: Currently the MT does not have more specific plans beyond what we already have found in the
   Jaarplan, **apart from trying to figure out what is the problem or what is behind low evaluations.**

   Page 2: The MT answered a growth to 100 should be realised within 2 years will be changed into: **The
   MT answered that sufficient progress should be made within 3 years.**

   Page 2: The MT answered that indeed things work different than in the past and that a change is needed
   in the way we look at what teaching is.

   Page 3: The MT summarised that they are still negotiating will be changed into: **The board of the
   university is still discussing with the University Council.**

   View comments on the basis of the minutes for clarification:
   Jacqueline Weppelman will give a presentation on the budget which will take place in January 2017
   UT 2020 and the new organisation, are documents already available in English? This will be asked during
   the meeting with the University Council.
   Some points in the minutes will come back during the year, the FC will take care of these topics.

   Minutes were approved.

5. **Progress BMS under steam**

The Faculty Council would like to ask the following questions about the current state of affairs with regard to BMS under Steam:

- The structure of the faculty is changing; we would like to hear about the current status of the four or five departments and the chairs to be located in these departments (clusters).
- There seem to be several budgets within a cluster. Is this temporarily? What is the long term plan regarding the allocation of money to either chairs or clusters?.
- The research institutes will disappear, what will be the consequences for the people currently ONLY working for an institute?
- To what extent are departments informing personnel about the upcoming changes, do you have a clear view in this?
- Wat were the outcomes of the budget/BMS under steam discussions with the board of the university? Do we now have a budget to hire extra people, if so where and when is the dean making more definite plans as a specification of the plans outlined in BMS under Steam?

The MT replied that they aligned the BMS under Steam budgetary strategy with the budget. Cluster meetings are taking place and during these meetings the next steps will be discussed.
Other next steps are figuring carry out the strategy at the Ba, Ma and PhD Levels, which means continue to work on the initiatives that were taken for PA for CS and for EPA separate. Prepare 4 to 5 set proof research programs and foresee a BMS summer research summit. Most important issue for the next 6 months is that we work jointly with the faculty on the new research programmes, which are roughly outlined but now need to be detailed and perhaps changed. In Jan/Feb 4 to 5 roundtables with clusters/IGS will take place followed by discussions with other faculties in Mar/Apr. At that time also the discussion at UT level about themes, profile and the role of the institutions is become a little bit more clear. Roughly early summer there should be a broad conference of rounding of this procedure.
Another step is to set up an international PhD platform, since we don't fit completely with the graduate school regulations.
Other steps to be taken: 2021 Hooglerarenplan. strategic HR plan 2020, develop educational capacity model, repositioning professional learning and development (PLD) and by the end of next year a mid-term evaluation of the strategy 2015-2020.
As far as the dean is concerned, the research institutes won't disappear but integrated within the faculty.

6. **UT2020 plans**

We would like to discuss the following points:

- According to current ideas, we will change the organization from deans to faculty boards. We are interested in the plans regarding the future relationship between the dean of education, the educational director (Henk Boer) and the Directors of Education. The faculty likes to be informed about the ideas and maybe about choices still to be made.
- We expect the dean to stay for a few more years, are the current portfolio holders of research and education expected to become members of the faculty board?
- Student members will become member of the faculty board too. Which role is the FC to play in the recruitment process.

The MT answered that with the start of the new situation the dean will be the new (temporarily) portfolio holder. The long term plan is to hire an external portfolio holder education for the BMS faculty.
The MT mentioned that for the student membership in the faculty board, probably students in the council will be asked to come up with a nomination.

7. **Regulations of the faculty council**

Although the faculty council regulations sent by the dean is a good starting point, the FC is not convinced this regulation should be adopted in this state. Art 6 (2) is unclear. For example, article 6 (6) and article 7 (4) are identical, 'private discussion meeting' is probably referring to a confidential council meeting (many

members of the FC are of the opinion that the English in the regulation should be improved), article 9 (1) and the first sentence of 9 (2) overlap, article 10 (second sentence) should probably read 'the Act or these regulation' (in addition 'law' is probably a better word than 'Act', something to be changed in article 1 (1)a too), what should be done with minutes of the confidential parts of the FC meetings is left unclear (article 8 (3)), whether a policy plan and the annual plan are the same thing (article 11 (2)a and article 11 (3)a is not clear. These examples show that the faculty council regulations should be improved before we discuss them on a detailed basis.

Some specific points to be included in the revision:

- The council may function well without '**executive committee'** (article 3 (4)) although it may be wise to require that of the chair and the deputy chair one should be a student. The functions now given to the executive committee can be given to the chair and deputy chair in consultation.
- Although the functioning of the council and the relationship between the council and the dean requires some flexibility, we think that at some point we need to have **some clear and formal deadlines**, especially when it is about sending documents for discussion to the council.
- **The order in which the articles are presented does not make this into a very accessible document**. For example, article 10 about additional rules is placed before the rules in the regulation, article 22 (about convening a meeting) is overlapping article 7. Article 26 is about the annual report, but it is unclear how this relates to the annual plan and the policy plan.
- We would like to discuss how to proceed in making an accessible Regulation for the Faculty Council.

The FC mentioned that the only question related to the regulations is how to proceed.
The MT answered that they would like to receive suggestions from the FC on how to proceed, since this is the last version of what was available at the University Council of 2012.
The FC will optimize the English version and hopes that the UC could provide their support.

8. Education and TEM

In the context of education the faculty council liked to address three points:

- The quality of the student evaluations (not the *outcome* of these evaluations, but the quality of the student evaluation itself) is dubious: response rates are low and many data are presented for all students (giving IBA and PSY a far greater weight that CW and EPA). The faculty council likes to discuss **how we can improve the quality of the system of student evaluation and student evaluation reports for the faculty**.
- In addition, we would like to highlight that the fact that the grades given to the various modules are improving, **grades are still quite low**: in some modules, almost half the number of students evaluate the modules below 6. So, student evaluations seem to be not THAT good. Does the dean agree with this point?
- In addition to student evaluations, we would like to address the topic of the **quality of curricula**. There is currently a strong focus on improving modules, but from several programs we have heard that students are (still) unable to meet the requirements of the bachelor thesis, because they are not well trained at that stage. What can we do to improve programs? Related to this point is the issue of learning objectives. Is there a faculty policy of taking these learning objectives seriously, to align program and module objectives?
- A last, more general point, relates to **the (future) position of the FC** in the process of monitoring and improving education at this faculty. In this context the council would like to discuss the idea of making a **regular policy brief** discussing the most important issues related to education at the faculty.

Advice annual budget and jaarplan:
The MT mentioned that we first need to know what the evaluations really tell us and what is going on. After that clarification, we could try to improve the system of evaluation. There is also still a lot of conservatism of people doing it the old way, who still believe in the old model.
The FC clarified that no one in the council preferred to return to the old-fashioned teaching model and we are all thinking about how to improve teaching within TOM. We can debate for terms but teachers like to teach and see coordination of teaching as a necessary burden to teach, they like to teach. A lot of time is

now consumed by coordination and they don't see that fair into quality teaching which is a feeling which is broadly shared.

The MT answered that we need to realise things in a different way under TOM, but it requires a different way of working which means indeed that you're standing less hours for the classroom. The MT asked the FC to let them know what to do about it.

The FC answered that their first priority is improving the evaluation system with a clear fed back to the teachers. Get an idea why the student evaluation national level do not match the evaluation at module level. And take the current situation as a starting point

The MT asked the FC to think how to see that coordination is not seen as a load but actually being used for the better.

The FC replied that what could help in some modules at least, is clarification of who is doing what, before we start doing something. At this moment there are a lot of debates without clear responsibilities within a module. This could reduce the negative aspect of the workload.

The chair summarised the discussion: In the future OLC's will have a stronger role than they used to have in coordination of teaching of the various modules. This discussion shows that there is still a role for the FC to improve teaching. This agenda point will be brought up in our next meeting again to see what we can do to improve teaching, to support the dean in developing plans. If you would be able to come up with suggestions before the meeting, we can steer the debate.

9. Additional questions

The FC wondered if there were many students at the Bachelor Open Days.
The MT answered that there is an evaluation which will be distributed.

The FC asked the MT how the university was doing on external funding compare to other universities.
The MT answered that this was discussed at UT level and could be asked to the University Council.

The FC mentioned that a lot of people complain about spoiled lunches and asked the MT to come up with a solution.
The MT will think about a solution.

10. Closure of the meeting

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