

Faculty      Behavioural, Management & Social sciences  
Kenmerk:      BMS-STePS/2018  
Datum:          January 2017

## Meeting minutes Pre-Faculty Council BMS 19 December 2017

---

*Present:*              Ciano Aydin, Henk Boer, Shawn Donnelly, , Ellen Giebels, Marijn Horstman, Marion Kamp, Henk van der Kolk, Carly Overmars, Wouter Rietveld, Jörgen Svensson, Mark Tempelman, Theo Toonen, Stefan Wolf

*Absent:*              Stéphanie van den Berg, Evelien Bonte, Remy Gankema, Jacqueline Weppelman

### 1. Opening and welcome

Opening

### 2. Minutes of the last meeting

Attachment – agp 2a – concept fc 12 September  
Attachment – agp 2b – concept pre-fc 31 October  
Attachment – agp 2c – concept pre-fc 21 November

The minutes of the last Faculty Council meeting - agp 2a – concept fc 12 September - were approved.

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

Jean-Louis van Gelder will be appointed as Professor Innovative Matter in Public Safety research and will start on the first of January 2018.

### 4. Faculty Regulations

The faculty regulations will change (at least) three things:

- the introduction of a board (something already approved by the University Board/and the University Council)
- the introduction of clusters (next to or on top of departments) and
- the appointment/election of OLCs. We will receive a response with regard to the latter point by the end of this week (we advised the board about this topic two weeks ago).

Despite the absence of the draft faculty regulations, the Faculty Council like to be informed about the introduction of the clusters: *How will departments end up in the new faculty regulations? Are clusters or departments funded? Will there be a controller for each cluster? When will the mid-term evaluation of cluster formation take place?*

All decisions have been made at the UT-level. The Faculty BMS will take this year 2018 to grow into this new model. The most important topic for the Faculty Board is how to organize the internal governance. The coming year the departments will still remain in the clusters. In the budget, the departments will be addressed/informed what will happen at a cluster level.

The Faculty Council asked how the relation between cluster board and the department board will be organized, if this is already formalized or if is this up to the clusters? Could the dean explain the relationship between the head of the cluster and the heads of departments?

For day-to-day arrangements, the Faculty Board will communicate largely with the heads of the clusters. The heads of clusters should communicate with their governing board. At this moment, the Faculty Board will leave this to the heads of clusters.

Next to that, also a start has been made related to capacity planning. For continuity, things will roughly be the same as last year. The mid-term evaluation of the STEAM strategy will take place in spring.

The Faculty Council mentioned that they also look forward to the new faculty regulations, expected in January 2018.

## 5. Informing the FC about the OLC's

Because of their increasing importance, the FC needs to be informed about the work in the Educational program committees (OLCs). We asked the dean/board to tell us how they plan to do that. In his letter (dated 11 December 2017, see FC website) he suggested that JOIN would be the best source of information for the faculty council. He also asked for additional suggestions. The council has a few questions and suggestions:

- can students FC members get access to JOIN?
- because JOIN is not generally available and not easy to use, we strongly suggest the board to ask all OLCs to put relevant agenda's, decisions and documents on a dedicated Canvas/Blackboard/intranet page, making all information transparent for students and staff involved in a particular program. We are aware of existing pages (<https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/education/programme-committee-opsomming/psy-mps-opsomming/>) but not all these pages are not extensively used by the OLCs.
- the FC is not planning to redo or supervise the work of the OLCs. However, we would like to have a general monitor to see (a) how OLC are functioning and (b) which general topics are discussed in the OLCs. We therefore ask the dean to send an annual report to the FC with about 1 page per OLC including topics like (a) the composition of the OLCs (and the changes in that composition), (b) the number of meetings and (c), for example, the five most relevant topics discussed in the OLCs. The last topic will make the more general (faculty wide) discussion points more transparent.

Ciano explained that Join is a tool to archive, not a tool to communicate with each other.

An option could be to put the documents on the intranet but the question is how to organize that. There is a way to automatize it in the Join archive by adding a flag and upload the data to intranet. This solution will come with 25K.

The Faculty Council mentioned that they just want two things. One is create transparency within the program so others can check what is going on and maybe stimulate some discussion. This requires that the board takes an action and makes it very accessible what OLC's are doing. Having updated Blackboard, Canvas or intranet with at least the agenda and the minutes, and also easily find on the intranet. That is good to organize.

Second, what is the role of the Faculty Council in addition to that?

The dean mentioned that format for an annual report of the examination committee is available. This format could be used for the OLC annual report in order to inform the FC.

The Faculty Council already made some suggestions for additional information in the annotated agenda and mentioned that this could be developed over the years to come.

**Annual report of the examination committee would be discussed. Tanja and Theo will discuss next meeting Informing the Faculty Council about the examination board.**

## 6. Exam Committees

We received some information about the fact that some exam committees are slow in answering questions from students. We asked the dean/board to explain how exam committees are monitored and whether there is information available about the functioning of the exam committees. (no discussion during the prep meeting, unless we can clarify this issue. Is it really problematic?).

In his letter of December 11, the dean already explained that there were indeed some problems in the context of one exam committee, but that these problems were now solved. The FC was happy to hear this, but still likes to discuss a few issues related to examination committees: *how often are exam committees at BMS facing problems because of changes in personnel. How often did that happen in the last two years? How does the board deal with these changes and are they always informed about these changes? How is the board monitoring the functioning of the exam committees? At a more procedural level: the examination boards are sending an annual report to the board. Last year this report was not discussed in the council. Can we put this on the agenda as an annual point for discussion in March (given the annual planning of the examination boards)?*

The MT mentioned that due to understaffing there was a problem. Hopefully the problem will be solved from January onwards. Moment of entry of a document is one of the problems. Is that the moment when a document is fully complete? And a misperception is at what moment the process start. In some cases, some requests are late, but still the committee needs time for preparation, responses etc. With the recent changes in personnel, they hope that the griffie will be able to manage.

**The annual report of the examination board will be discussed in the meeting of March**

## 7. Workload

Many staff members are active in various committees (including exam committees and OLCs etc.). In his letter of December 11, the dean clearly explained the financial compensation for each of the groups. *However, since this topic is raised in the context of 'workload', would it not be wiser to communicate to staff involved in the various committees in terms of 'time': financial compensation is not easily transformed into 'time'.*

The MT mentioned that in the new capacity allocation planning within the faculty every individual will receive a certain amount of time to participate.

If you do not have research time you have 80% of your time to devote to education.

## 8. Upcoming elections

We asked the board to explain how they plan to promote the upcoming elections among staff members and students. In his letter of December 11, he promised to deliver a plan soon (we will discuss this topic in January).

The FC clarified that they prefer a representative from each cluster, supporting staff and studies to have a good representative body for the faculty as a whole. From the FC, a letter will be drawn with internal information which could be distributed via the portal.

## 9. Budget

With hindsight and without blaming the board, the FC was not very happy with the way the FC was involved in the discussions about the budget. We appreciated being involved in the preliminary discussions, but immediately concluded that the budget was not very accessible and definitely not well developed yet. We now see that a budget is approved at the UT level (including faculty specific appendices) which is debated as if the FCs were involved in discussions about the money related, for example, to the "wet studievoorschot". We never heard about these specific budgets. We think that a better procedure would help to FC to be better involved in the budget process. We would like to start a discussion about this topic.

The dean mentioned that there is not so much changed in the budget as the FC saw it. The "wet studievoorschot" was also a surprise for the MT. A suggestion is to discuss the budget before summer in combination with the capacity planning and the multi-year budget.

**This means that the FC will discuss the principles underlined the budget 2018-2019 in spring 2018 (May the latest).**

After a short discussion, it was decided that teaching quality and the PDCA cycle will be discussed regularly.

## 10. Round of questions before closure of the meeting

The Faculty Council asked if there were signs related to the #metoo discussion and BMS.

The MT mentioned that #metoo can always take place and that they try to avoid this. Not only in student perspective, but also for staff in for instance hierarchical issues. Awareness is most important at this point, we should address it and do not look away.

## 11. End of meeting

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