

Faculty Behavioural, Management & Social sciences
Kenmerk: CPE-UP-18.012
Datum: July 2019

Meeting minutes Faculty Council BMS 3 July 2018

Present: Stéphanie van den Berg, Shawn Donnelly (arrived at 11:00), Henk van der Kolk (chair),
Marc Tempelman, Remy Gankema, Marijn Horstman, Carly Overmars, Patrick Ruitenbergh,
Henk Boer, Ellen Giebels, Marion Kamp

Absent: Rainer Harms, Steven Wolff, Theo Toonen, Ciano Aydin

1. Opening and Welcome

Meeting opened at 10:55. The chair notes that there are too many documents especially in the context of the EERs to be processed in one meeting. The FB and the FC have to discuss how this issue can be solved for next year.

2. Minutes of previous meetings

a. Concept minutes May 22nd

Marion acknowledges that the statement "secretaries of the soon to be formed clusters..." describes clusters that are already formed. She will send an e-mail about some spelling mistakes and minor details to Jasmine.

b. Concept minutes March 22nd

No comments. Both minutes are approved with proposed changes

3. Announcements FC Chair

FC election for 2018-2019 has been held. Of the current members, only Henk van der Kolk remains in the FC. Names of those elected can be found on the website.

4. Announcements FB

a. FB chose Saskia Boswinkel as the new student assessor

b. The chair asked for a discussion about the organization of non-academic staff. FB suggests a presentation in fall (October) about the organization of the supportive staff.

5. Structure reports and new appointments

a. Report Professor Health Psychology and Persuasive technology

It is discussed whether this chair fits into the long-term plans of BMS, whether the links with educational programs and (expected) research are sufficiently developed, and whether the chair is supported within the faculty. Based on this discussion, the FC supports the report. The FC is looking forward to the outcome of the selection procedure.

b. Report Professor Technology and Human Identity. The discussion was confidential, thus not included in the minutes. The outcome of the discussion was positive and will be formulated in an official advice from the FC.

c. Recruitment of 2 new female professors (Hypatia professorship) in the domain of BMS

The appointment of two female professors is a directive from the board of the university. The FC discusses whether the vacancies are not formulated too broadly and thus misleading at this moment. An applicant may get the feeling of only being accepted because she is female. However, it is also argued that the broad advertisement allows recruitment of the best applicant from a large number of female candidates, so that it can be seen as special. The FB also sees the positions more as an 'award'. It is concluded that the broad recruitment is positive, although the new positions should preferably fit into the new BMS profile as described in BMS under Steam. The FB thus acknowledges that positions discussed under point 5a and 5c can be combined. FB would like to be surprised by new ideas from outside BMS, and is open for great ideas that do not exactly fit into BMS under Steam.

The positions are "full professorships" although we could allow for tenure track positions in some instances. The FC will give a positive advice and is looking forward to filling these positions within the framework of BMS.

6. Response of the FB to the advices given by the Exam Committee

The procedure of an extensive response by the FB to the EC is very much appreciated. The report by the FB, however, has some open ends on some points and concrete actions are missing. The FC advises the FB to make the suggested actions from the FB more specific.

- a. The FB (Henk Boer) will contact the ECs about the efficiency of procedures and the training of staff members.
- b. Regarding cum laude regulations is argued that generally about 10%-15% of the students of a program should be able to get cum laude. However, there may be variations between programs. In general, the programme director sets the rules for cum laude. The FC advises the FB to monitor the way BMS programs handle cum laude regulations and to have an open discussion about this.

The FC advises the FB to stimulate the EC to discuss the outcome of the advices in their next annual report, and to reflect on the way the FB handled the advices given in the response. This also gives the faculty and the FC an opportunity to monitor the process.

7. Appointment of two Program directors

The FC feels the proposed candidates are well-chosen. The FC will send a positive advice about both candidates.

8. OER

The FC received a lot (but not all) of rather incomparable documents in the context of the annual EER cycle. We have to conclude that the FC is not in control of the handling of the EERs; the load of documents is simply too big and the issues to be discussed are not clear. This is something the FB and the FC have to organize better. The FC must be seen as the body to meaningfully legitimize the EERs, based on proper advices from and consent by the PCs and based on a clear educational policy formulated by the FB. Current procedures do not allow for this. Moreover, we do currently NOT have an explicit consent from all EBs (OLCs). The FC will therefore will NOT approve (some of) the EERs. FC postpones giving consent to all EERs before having received an explicit consent from *all* PCs.

In this context the council noted a few omissions and problems which need to be solved before consent can be given.

1. It was unclear whether the (discontinued) bachelor in OWK still has a program committee. It seems that OWK is officially handled by PC of the EST master. This PC needs to give its official consent to the relevant parts of the EER.
2. According to the WHW, the Dutch text is legally binding, The FC was asked to approve the English version. Are there Dutch versions present for the FC right now. How does the FB think about this problem? This needs to be clarified before consent can be given.
3. Consent is withheld by at least one of the PCs and the PC of the MPM master did not give its consent, because the meeting in which they will discuss this, will be on 10th July. The FC will wait for these consents or for information that the PCs keep on withholding their consent.
4. By law the FCs are asked to give their consent to the length of the validity of the exams. Currently this issue has been dealt with in different ways by the various programs. EPA, for example, treats the module components as course parts which remain valid for a long time, while TBK and IBA stick to the 15 EC or nothing policy. The FCs advises the FB to be clear about the meaning of the word 'exam' (= module part or module) and to discuss the different validity rules used by the various programs with the program directors to see whether further harmonization is necessary.

The FC will draft an advice about the procedures to be used in the context of the EERs. In that advice we will *at least* include the following elements:

1. Since the ECs are not a formal part of the procedures in the context of the EERs, we suggest they do not systematically involve the FC in their advice. Advices from the PCs should be given to the program director and the FC?
2. OLCs should be more explicitly and formally asked to give their consent on specified elements of the EER and should also be instructed to officially give this advice. There should be a uniform format for the advices, this will be taken up by Henk Boer.

9. Language policy (implementation plan)

The board of the university decided to have English as main language by 2019. Faculties were asked to make an implementation plan. There are also financial consequences for all faculties. Funding for training and translation is missing, TCP (the language centre at the UT) has too little resources to facilitate enough trainings. Plans are still missing (funding, manpower, courses, time). The FB thinks that translation of documents will be the main issue. The FB (Marion Kamp) will inform FC about specific steps in the fall.

10. Update Monitoring PDCA-cycles in education

The document about the PDCA cycles of modules and programmes, the format of which was discussed with the council last year, was promised to be yearly updated and to be the basis for a gradual improvement of this PDCA cycle process. The current document was only sent to the council after an explicit request from the chair, was clearly made in a rush, includes a rather unrelated discussion about evaluating teachers and does not discuss how the closing of the PDCA cycles (which seems to be extremely weak) can be improved. The FC requests another version of this document from the FB. The FC also explicitly notes that IF this process remains mainly 'passing on papers' it should be abandoned.

11. Questions

- a. *Some months ago, we discussed the "Re: Organisatie communicatie tussen OLCs en FR". What is the status of this project?*

The Board still supports the things discussed in January. In the next meeting of the FC, the board will outline the way in which the FC will be informed about the advises from the various OLCs.

- b. *There seems to have been a proposal for a "training day participation bodies BMS". One OLC advised positively. We received that advise. Can you inform us about the position of the board in this context?*

The FB indicates that there are various initiatives within the university to support the members of the PCs. These initiatives are combined now. Also training of the FC may be included. We will be informed about this issue in September. The chair will discuss the issue of training with the dean of education.

No further questions.