

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

Meeting minutes Faculty Council BMS September 2017

Present: Wouter Assink, Ciano Aydin, Henk Boer, Evelien Bonte (minutes), Ellen Giebels, Marion Kamp, Henk van der Kolk, Carly Overmars, Mark Tempelman, Theo Toonen, Jacqueline Weppelman, John Winter

Absent: Stéphanie van den Berg, Jörgen Svensson

1. Opening

The chairman opened the meeting. Welcome to the new student members of the Faculty Council BMS and to our recently appointed members of the board.

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

--

4. Agenda of this Faculty Council meeting

The Faculty Council concluded that reading and discussing the many documents sent to us by the board takes much more time than sometimes assumed. We therefore would like to have all documents at least two full weeks before the scheduled FC meeting.

The Faculty Board answered that it is not always possible to provide the documents two weeks before the scheduled meeting, but it was indeed an exceptional amount of documents for this meeting.

5. Concept Annual Plan and budget (50 minutes)

The dean presented the financials 2018-2021.

During the presentation (https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/fc/agenda/2017_2018/12_sept/agp-5d.pdf) the dean mentioned that the language and the character of this draft is a problem that will be solved soon. The Faculty Board clarified that the targets are realistic but we need to grow into the budget. At this moment there is still overcapacity within the faculty and there is a lower number of PhD students compare to the budget. Next to that, the faculty needs to keep in mind that the faculty comes from a large deficit so financial growth is catching up these deficits. Internationalization of the masters is important to survive for the university as a whole.

The dean explained that the upcoming deficit is an investment policy which was planned and earmarked for activities. The dean mentioned that transparent agreements - with which groups will be up to certain tasks for improvement plans within the cluster specifically - would be made with the clusters. This does not mean that the cluster is responsible for the deficit.

The FC-BMS likes to discuss at least the following topics:

Format

1. The format of the document now is structured along rather vague headers like 'developing global citizens' while most readers will interpret the structure as 'education' and 'research' (and valorisation). Why was decided to have these overlapping and unclear headers? Can we change that to something more accessible?
2. Much of the language in the document is 'marketing' oriented (with phrases like 'unique position' and 'optimal mix'). Would it not be wise to be more 'down to earth' in an internal policy document like this?
3. The document is clearly in an early stage, it contains a lot of spelling errors ('witch'). When can we expect a final version? Are we supposed to give a final consent on this version of the document?

Global citizens/ education

According to the long term strategic goals, BMS wants to have more *international* and more *technological oriented*

profile. The international orientation is specified into creating 'international' programs, joint degrees and attracting a balanced group of students. Are these the only two defining strategic goals/characteristics of our programs? To what extent does, for example, the quality of education play a role in the strategic profile of our programs?

The more specific measures do also not all relate to the general strategic goals, which seems to imply that the strategic goals are not covering what we really aim for.

The internationalization (using the English language) is not always helpful in the Dutch context (internships, bachelor- and mastertheses, Dutch language training). To what extent does the dean see opportunities to keep on serving the Dutch market in this respect? And how does the 'internationalization' relate to the desired increase in 'external bachelor theses' and 'internships'?

The quality of teaching is served by both time and training for members of the academic staff. Does the dean see opportunities to include these aspects of "educating global citizens" into the annual plan?

The NSE is an important incentive to improve teaching programs, however, it is well known that student evaluations are only a *somewhat* reliable indicator of actual quality. Which *other* indications are used to prioritize specific topics for improvement?

A pragmatic solution and policy related to the English language in relation to the internships, bachelor- and master theses should be created.

Making a real impact (are there also unreal impacts?) / research

The current strategic goals are related to being 'unique' and 'well connected'. This is very abstract and somewhat obvious: good research creates connections. Why not, for example, select the four main topics from the BMS under Steam (Health, Industry, Learning and Resilience) to formulate the long term strategic research goals of our faculty?

The Faculty Council likes to address the ideas behind the BMS-lab. What is the idea behind this 'lab'? How does it relate to the four identified research themes?

A general advice of the Faculty Council would be that the part of internationalization should be more coherent. Also the quality PDCA cycle including improvement is a strong priority of this faculty but is not mentioned in the annual plan.

The Faculty Board mentioned that T4P was set up to create a broader connection with technology. The BMS-lab derives from T4P to innovate social sciences and is connected to all 4 research programs.

Entrepreneurial approach/Valorisation

Why is the IBA program singled out in the strategic goals related to this topic? To what extent is this attitude relevant for other programs too? And why is this not part of the prioritization of goals related to teaching? To what extent is "Create a vision and strategy on valorisation" a relevant part of the specification of the strategic goals (is the specification of a strategic goal, the creation of strategic goals?).

Experimenting, pioneering & innovating

Can the dean clarify why this topic is in the annual plan? The topics covered under this header relate mainly to the organization of the faculty (HR, planning cycle etc.). Since these activities should support education and research, why not relate these plans to education and research?

Budget

When can we expect to receive the final version of the budget (since this version is preliminary)?

Because of a less than expected growth in the number students, we may run into a deficit. Is this deficit forcing us to have budget cuts ('Although, a slight decrease in staff in comparison to 2016 is probably still necessary)? The projected deficits of specific groups are identified and groups are made responsible for these deficits. How does this relate to the formation of clusters and cluster budgets?

The KPI indicate a substantial increase in the number of master students? Is that correct? Does that have consequences for the budget?

6. Health domain plan including three structure reports

Health domain plan including three structure reports

Format and style

This is the first 'domain plan' (we expect to receive domain plans for learning, industry and resilience later). The format of the plan is still mainly a description of the process in which it was written. Given the emphasis on 'story telling' in the annual plan: this is a story of process, not a story of a vision or plan. To what extent does the dean agree with this observation and (if so) to what extent is he able to stimulate a more visionary document. Is he able to stimulate the writers of the other domain plans to come up with a real 'story'.

Can the dean explain the extent to which the chairs currently related to the various research teams have been involved in the process of writing the structure reports?

Are BACs known for these structure reports and is at least one student included in these BACs?

The Faculty Board mentioned that this is the first discussion of the first draft of the domain plan. The domain plan will be part of the strategic plan that is scheduled for draft around June 2018. The three new positions for full professorships were taken as point of departure and this domain plan was written by the dean. The document is an early draft and the Faculty Council will receive a revised and updated version later.

The Faculty Council recommend to include what they're going to study and what knowledge they want to enquire at the university instead of the reference to high rated journals and unique positions.

Members of the BACs were known and a student member will be included to these BACs. For the structure reports where the BACs were unknown yet, the Faculty Council will receive the information at a later stage.

Content

Most (not the one under point 9) of the **structure reports** were announced in the policy document *BMS under Steam*. To what extent do the current plans deviate from the plans developed in BMS under Steam?

A general point related to the structure and profile reports: to what extent are these positions supposed to also play a central role in the various teaching programs?

Can the dean explain the exact deal with external parties financing (part of) a chair? (Rijnstate)

The Faculty Board answered that there is an agreement between Rijnstate and the University. This agreement would become public and could be provided to the Faculty Council.

7. Advice OLD

Although there is currently no reason to doubt the quality of the suggested program director, the FC thinks that both a positive advise from the OLC and a CV of the suggested candidate are necessary documents in this process. We will only be able to give a positive advice after receiving these documents

8. OER MRM

(no discussion)

Since the OLC was positive and because we did not see additional points, we refer to

https://www.utwente.nl/en/bms/fc/advices/2016_2017/2017_07_18_eers.pdf

We will also give consent to this document.

9. OLC elections

Within the FC-BMS there is no unanimous support for simply having appointed OLCs. The main reasons for having appointments were balanced OLCs (over years and disciplines) and the expectations that elections will be a very inefficient way to fill the various post. The main objection from those opposing appointments was that 'appointments' could easily lead to a 'closed shop', not allowing individuals or groups with deviating points of view to enter the OLCs. We therefore suggest a procedure in which

(a) candidates are invited to suggest themselves as candidate for a specific OLC,

(b) the dean and the current OLCs make a list of candidates, *including all those who put themselves on this list*, and a recommendation to the council which candidates they would like to put in the OLCs

(c) the Faculty Council has a right to approve (or not) the candidates on the list.

This implies there will be NO elections, but candidates NOT selected by the dean or the current OLCs will have a relatively strong position.

Does the dean think this is a workable procedure? If so we will write an advice along these lines. The topic has to be revisited every year, so we need an evaluation of this decision at least showing whether all OLC are able to a sufficient number of candidates and whether individuals are indeed willing to put themselves forward without being asked specifically.

There is some discussion about the role of students in the educational committees. One strategy, not having elections, could be to involve student unions in proposing student members to become part of the committee. The Faculty Board could use the annotated agenda as input to come up with a procedure which will be discussed in the Faculty Council.

10. Round of questions before closure of the meeting

--

11. End of the meeting

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