Meeting minutes Faculty Council BMS 22 March 2018

Present: Ciano Aydin, Stéphanie van den Berg, Henk Boer, Tanja Bondarouk, Evelien Bonte, Shawn
                  Donnelly, Remy Gankema, Marijn Horstman, Henk van der Kolk, Carly Overmars, Patrick
                  Ruitenberg, Mark Tempelman, Theo Toonen, Jacqueline Weppelman, Steven Wolff

Absent: Ellen Giebels, Marion Kamp, John Winter

1. **Opening and welcome**
   Opening

2. **Minutes of the last meeting**
   Attachment – agp 2a – concept fc 19 December

   EDUCATION

3. **Annual report exam committee**
   The FC is happy to able to discuss the very informative annual report by the exam committees about the study year 2016-2017, although the FC is wondering why the report is so late. Is it possible to schedule the annual discussion about this report to, say December?
   In addition to the many things mentioned in the report, we would like know whether it is possible to get some insight in the waiting time between filing a request and getting a response, especially because this was a problematic item last year.
   What does the board plan to do with the recommendations? Which priorities does the board see and which things will (not) be implemented.
   It seems that the examination board needs a lot of expertise and training. Does the board think this is most efficiently and best done with four separate examination board? May it be wise to integrate the activities of examination board more, to ensure quality and within faculty equality?
   Since work for the examination boards seem to cost quite some time: how will the work for the examination board be included in the discussion about capacity planning?
   (BKO)

   The Faculty Board showed 1 final report for the 4 committees with several programs, which is new. All priorities for the upcoming year are published on page 3 and 21. Legally wise, there must be 4 examination committees, 1 for each program. Quality of the examination committees is the focus for the examination board. More harmony and stability are important, when that is reached, centralization can be a next step.

   The examination board explained how it was possible to reach the long waiting times. A figure shows that 13 steps must be taken, before an answer could be created. Structural solutions will be arranged to make the whole process leaner. Still waiting times can increase because of the complexity of the case.

   The examination board will bring the upcoming report on the agenda in March 2019. In the upcoming report waiting times will be announced. If you can't deliver what was promised, when a goal is not reached, it should be in the report to learn. If there are problems meanwhile, please mentioned this in an earlier stage.

4. **Uitgangspunten kwaliteitsplannen onderwijs**
   At the faculty BMS there are various 'cycles' to ensure the quality of education in which the FC plays a substantial role; (1) the PDCA cycle (our advice 2017 03 13) as discussed in the meeting in July 2017 (we expect to have another report in June 2018), (2) the annual report about the functioning of the Program Committees at BMS (given the yearly decision about the elections or appointment of Program Committees it is best to have such a report around November) and (3) the annual report of the exam committees (on the agenda today and to be discussed in December/January on an annual basis).

In this context, the FC would like to discuss the specific observed *problems* and associated *goals* with regard to improving education at this faculty in the context of the rather abstract and general letter sent by the board.

The FB stated that they need to explain and show how teaching is approved over the last years, while they have not allocated the 600K. In the whole process and budget, this amount is/was already in the budget and the whole process has already been started 2 years ago. Every faculty of the UT must come up with ideas.
The report that has to be prepared could contain information for instance about the PDCA cycle, investment in the capacity model, the NSC scores that were improved.

The report will be send to the ministry by the end of the year. The FC was asked to send input where they would like to see the money going to. A first overview of the 600K will be available in the MARAP.

RESEARCH

5. **Structure report Institutional aspects of Education**
    The FC notes that the student assessor was asked for the BAC. Is that a general policy decision (to include the assessor in this committee)?

    The Faculty Board announced that the position is not only in context with CHEPS but also related to the Health domain plan. The position was already mentioned in the STEAM document. It is not general that the Student Assessor will standard be a member of the BAC.

6. **Domain plan Health**
    The FC notes that this version of the domain plan is far better developed that the previous version (discussed in the meeting of 2017 09 12) and that clearly more people within BMS were involved in formulating relevant research areas.
    Since a lot of the money at BMS is generated by education, the FC like to discuss the extent to which the chairs are involved in larger teaching programs. We would also like to discuss the extent to which the board thinks these chairs are expected to generate a sufficient amount of money (either through teaching or through research) for being viable.

    The revised version is still a 'work in progress' document, changes will appear every day. Faculties will cooperate more and more especially with the upcoming Technohal. HTSR will move and will become our important bridge to collaborate more with this new Technohal.

    The 5 professorship positions are still in the document and it is important to know each chair must teach and has to attract money for research. These goals should fit in a timeframe which will be added to the profiles. When they do not generate enough money, they do not fulfill. A budgetary test will follow, if there is no money, the position cannot be opened.

    This domain plan is also the basis for the other domain plans. By the end of this year, each group will have created broader documents. You will definitely see relationships between all domains, various categories will return in different domains.

GENERAL POLICY

7. **Annual report BMS 2017**
    The FC is happy to see that we will now discuss the budget of last year and that we will be able to start the discussion about the general principles underlying the budget of next year. Since March seems to be a good time to discuss this, we will put this on the FC year-cycle too.
    The year 2017 seems to show a substantial budget deficit, which is mainly caused by 'incidental events'. The FC like to discuss the topic of 'overige lasten uitbesteed werk' (what is meant by this aspect of the budget, since it is much higher than expected). In addition we would like to highlight the assumed 'dekkingsbijdrage' once again. We clearly understand that lowering the 'dekkingsbijdrage' will have implications for the number of people employed at this faculty, but how realistic are the assumed 'dekkingsbijdragen.

    It was explained that the highest deficit was because of a higher expectation of new incoming students. Also the dekkingsbijdrage from central level, is not enough to cover all the costs. This deficit was approved by the board of the University.

    If we lower the contribution margin, we also need to fire people. The policy to define the contribution margin is defined based on the past years. This is also connected to the income of the first money stream.

To the BMS future, we need to grow into our budget and that also means repositioning and reducing staff (natural outflow) and have to balance the budget by 2020-2021. If the faculty stays in control, the time and budget is tight, but is in a good direction. Within BMS we should be aware of the fact that we are still structurally underfunded.

8. **Faculty Regulations**
   The FC would like to know why, according to the faculty regulations, the call for prospective student-members of the Program Committees should be open, whereas such a requirement is not set for staff-members.

   The FB answered that it will be changed in the regulations and both documents will become open to make it more transparent. A formal advice will be written by the chair of the FC.

9. **Stavaza BMS under Steam (Mid-term review strategy)**
   The dean presented an overview related to BMS under Steam.

   The reorientation of BMS towards technology and society work is generally accepted. It seems to be paying off in terms of student interests and external funding.
   All groups are still there, but now integrated in the clusters (4 departments and 1 lab). It is clear that support and the services organization takes much more time and energy than anticipated.
   Still to discuss is the awareness of our staff and their teaching effort and programs should maybe change. Some programs will change soon. PA and CS should grow to 120 students. Next to that, the faculty should create a plan for the small programs and how to deal with these small programs. Transforming should make it grow.

10. **Round of questions before closure of the meeting**
    Henk van der Kolk: how is the transition to English implemented and how is the non-academic staff involved in this transition?

    Stéphanie van den Berg received the letter from the BMS faculty board and is now one of the associates who is IOS promovendi.

    Henk van der Kolk thanked Evelien Bonte, who is leaving BMS, for being secretary of the BMS Faculty Council for 5 years.

11. **End of meeting**