

Meeting minutes Faculty Council BMS 22 May 2018 (Concept)

Present: Ciano Aydin, Henk Boer, Remy Gankema, Rainer Harms, Marijn Horstman, Marion Kamp, Henk van der Kolk, Carly Overmars, Patrick Ruitenbergh, Merel Simmelink (minutes), Mark Tempelman, John Winter

Absent: Stéphanie van den Berg, Shawn Donnelly, Steven Wolff

1. Welcome and opening

Opening

2. Minutes of the last meeting

Still not available, recordings are available.

3. Announcements by the FC chair

- a. Changes in the OERs (which will be discussed in the meeting of July 3rd) will probably be relatively small. The portions that have been changed should be highlighted. Henk Boer agrees.
- b. There is no official written response by the FB to the suggestions made by the Exam committee yet. Ciano Aydin promises to share the response of the FB to the recommendations made by the Examination Committee. The response will be discussed in the next meeting.
- c. The follow up plans for the quality of education need to be approved by the FC. The plans will be discussed in September 2018.
- d. The yearly update about the Quality Assurance Cycle (PCDA) will be made available in June.

4. Announcements FB / questions for the Board

- a. STAVAZA cluster formation and secretaries.

The secretaries of the soon to be formed clusters are currently discussing the consequences of the cluster formation. There are differences between clusters in the frequency of meetings, so it depends on the cluster how much progress still needs to be made. The secretaries started preparing in the autumn of 2017. This preparation consists of two types of components. The first type is about training and building professionalism. They are visiting Thales and attending two presentations this month about office management and competences. These are a pre-process for the training programme in September. The second component relates to ways to share work in the clusters and taking over each other's work.

- b. STAVAZA privacy protocols and regulations. The changing law will have extensive consequences for research and for education and communication with the staff. Can the FB explain the policies of BMS to inform staff about the changes in this context?

An extensive status report has been written by Lyan, which clearly clarified the policies of the faculty. There is, however, a question about how it is made sure that everyone complies with the new protocols. A lot of information has been sent out and all departments have already gotten a presentation and information about the new privacy laws. It is however not certain whether everyone can grasp this information. There is a FAQ page about the privacy protocols (university level), but this needs to be revised because it is badly written and contains some strange information.

The FB agrees that it needs to be checked more thoroughly whether the new law is being carried out correctly and where problems arise. This check will lead to measures at the program level, the faculty level and the university level. The FB will report with an updated version of the report written by Lyan. This report will be discussed in the next meeting. This document should contain more specific information.

5. Plan van aanpak werkdruk BMS

Firstly, it was noted that the document should be written in English. Secondly, at this stage the FC cannot give consent to the advice, because the document is not sufficiently specific. The FB indicates that this document is only the start for BMS, from which more information and discussion can be built up.

The FC recommends that the document should contain a clear definition of the problems in the context of excessive workload in the context of BMS. Which problems will be addressed with the suggested policies? In general, people feel the workload has risen and the sickness percentage has risen compared to 3 to 5 years ago. These problems are however not sky high. A new employee survey will be organised at the end of this year with workload as a very important topic.

The balance between teaching and research for individual teachers in the groups and clusters is suboptimal. Many employees feel it is not clear what is expected of them in terms of the time they should invest in teaching and research. There is a need for an indication of how many hours should be invested. The FC advised that the workload within the groups should be established using the ideas related to capacity planning. This also applies to PhD supervision. PhDs have a right to be substantially supervised, supervisors need to have time to read and supervise PhDs. According to the FC, this should definitely be part of capacity planning at the group level. This should be the basis for discussions within the groups and for a discussion between the FB and the various groups. The FC also recommends that the 'plan van aanpak' should contain a clear timeline outlining the implementation and evaluation of these measures and plans.

The new ARBO service gives a good first impression. They keep a closer watch on employees and people reporting sick. It is still an on-going process but more frequent communication between HR and supervisors was established. The FC advises to make clearer what the new ARBO service will do to reduce the percentage of people reporting sick.

The FC will discuss (and hopefully give its consent to) an updated version of the “plan van aanpak” later this year.

6. Round of questions before closure of the meeting

Henk: is it correct that recruitment for a new manager educational support has started? FB: this is correct.

7. End of meeting