

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

Meeting minutes Faculty Council BMS July 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, Ivan Remijn, Jacqueline Weppelman

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

The MT announced that the Board of the university – with consent of the University Council – started the reorganization of the faculties. The most important part at this moment is the change to the new faculty board model.

All research institutes will be abolished and replaced by new ones. In the abolishment of the old institutes, the budget and the personnel have to be re-allocated. Personnel should be replaced and the budget is moving towards the faculties. The position of institute personnel is secure, and is already discussed with the people involved. BMS will first contribute in the institutes MESA, MIRA and the Institute of Digital Society. The IGS council will be abolished as of the 1 January 2018.

The MT announced the appointment of 2 Tenure Track Full Professors: Bernard Veldkamp and Gerben Westerhof.

4. Agenda of this Faculty Council meeting

The agenda of this Faculty Council meeting has been confirmed.

5. Kwaliteitszorg Onderwijs (Monitoring PDCA Cyclus)

The Faculty Council (FC) received an overview of PDCA cycles in the context of the quality of education. We strongly suggest the dean (and the future faculty board) to send documents for information and documents for advice and consent, preferably accompanied with a short cover letter indicating the desired action from the council, on behalf of the dean (and or the faculty board) only: the Faculty Council likes to have a clear, transparent channel of communication with the faculty board.

The MT answered that this will be the first instruction to the portfolio holder education.

According to BMS policies the PDCA cycle is aimed at improving educational quality. Closing the PDCA cycle is one of the possible means to accomplish this. The FC observes that the cycles are currently not closed. We would like to shortly discuss the causes of this omission, the extent to which this process increases the administrative burden and the extent to which this process is indeed felt to improve the quality of teaching.

The MT mentioned that regularly the quality management team do ask teachers or module coordinators to mention the improvements on the internet which would close the cycle. Unfortunately, it seems to be difficult to receive these improvements. A reason could be the culture and the transparency of the improvements. This could mean that there are improvements, but not publicly communicated or publicly made. In the future, the Quality Coordinator will inform Program Management to instruct the Module Coordinators to close PDCA Cyclus. With the new Board of the Faculty, this should be the moment to start organizing the process. Still, we need to go thru the cycles ones or twice to let the process work correctly.

The FC advised the board to pay attention on the organization and to keep in mind that evaluations should be finished within a quarter.

6. EER

With regard to the process, the FC liked to discuss ways to improve the involvement of the FC and the communication about the EER between the Program Committees (PCs), the Program Directors, the Board of the Faculty and the FC.

In addition, we would like to address the following **six more general points**:

1. Diverging rules (and lack of clarity) of the extended validity of tests (not exams) between programs;
The Faculty Board doesn't have the right to coordinate this change between the programs within our faculty.
2. Diverging rules about the BSA between the various programs
The FC mentioned that different prog spec EER's have different rules regarding BSA's. Does that produce problems in the organization or not and does the board think that we should aim for having an identical set of rules with regard to the BSA?
The MT answered that 2 new rules were introduced in the new EER. It does not create problems between the programs, it creates problems within the programs because it is a large administrative burden. Coordination between the BSA rules of the various programs does not make sense because of the differences of the programs.
3. The quality of the examination rules (appendices)
The FC mentioned that the quality of the EER's and the prog spec appendices was terrible. The text is unclear in terms of Dutch and about the rights that students have.
The MT replied that articles in the EER are basic. The basic rules should show behaviour and integrity. They will propose to set up a procedure that the Dutch version will be established.
4. Ways to address the various topics brought up by the Program Committees (procedural)
The FC asked to receive a letter from the Program Managers explaining to what extent they dealt with the advices given by the Program Committees. Are all advices, given by our Program Committees, taken over by Program Management, or are there advices rejected?
The MT answered that they think that the advices were taken over by the Program Managers.
5. Positioning (footnote general EER) and content of 'second opportunities' for students who passed.
The FC mentioned that content related to 'second opportunities' was written in the general part of the EER. Does this not belong to the program specific part and does the board have position about not allowing students to improve their grade?
The MT replied that it is type of perception. In PSY and CS, for instance, this is not seen as a proper behaviour and to give students too much changes to improve. It is up to the programs to decide whether second opportunities are allowed.
6. Overall quality (language, lack of terminological consistency, differences between translations, strange allocation of topics between general EER and program specific parts etc...) of the EERs and ways to improve this set of important rules in the future.
The MT replied that a good basic EER should be provided. The core EER should be formulated in Dutch and properly translated.
The MT as well as the FC will urge that EER's have to be available at an earlier stage.

7. Faculteitsbestuur

The FC mentioned that there were no questions related to the procedure.

8. Kwartaalrapportage

There is currently no reason to doubt positive prospects for the financial status of the faculty and there are currently no reasons to doubt the integrity of the financial system at BMS. However, the FC wants to discuss ways to have a clearer 'policy and control' view on BMS finances. The FC prefer to see the core elements of the budget and that there is the need to identify these core elements in the upcoming years.

The MT mentioned that transparent information will be available with regard to capacity planning, multi-year budgets at the level of clusters and at the level of the sections. Sense of overview will be increasing the next year. Before summer the FC will receive more detailed information about where the faculty is standing. The MT reports to the board on an annual level, but from next time onwards, also with a 5 year look ahead, to know the deficits.

9. Round of questions before closure of the meeting

--

10. End of the meeting

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