

## Minutes of the Faculty Council BMS of 1 December 2015

---

*Present:* Henk Boer, Alexander van Deursen, Shawn Donnelly (Chair), Rainer Harms, Yann Hengstenberg, Marion Kamp (MT), Jeroen Meijerink, Rainer Mensing, Evelien Rietberg (Minutes), Mark Tempelman, Theo Toonen (MT), John Winter

*Absent:* Noor Godijk, Hanneke Hendriks, Bernard van Welij, Jacqueline Weppelman (MT)

### 1. Opening

The chairman opened the meeting.

### 2. A. Minutes of last meeting FC 20 October 2015

Agenda item 6 was not only about Psychology but also Communication Science. This will be added to the minutes.

### 3. TT Evaluation Survey

During the FC pre-meeting the council captured some key points which they will bring forward to open the discussion.

If there was a real support system for staff members it would be more manageable for them to handle the procedures. Employees are worried about their work/life balance, or being handled like a machine for 10 years, but the most we heard was that a support system could be helpful. The other question that raised was, how to finance this.

The MT answered that if we can't afford it, we should not do it since resources are going down and we need to stabilize first. We could start to think about recruiting some full professors that need to be replaced (perhaps with some pre-financing from the board of this university). We need to respect the obligations, commitments and talks that have been had with the people who are in the TT now.

The FC heard that employees who are in the system mentioned that they do not get enough support.

The MT answered that at this moment there is not a real problem, some individual cases will be discussed. It could be that some TT-ers will leave the TT-system.

During the last TT Committee meeting was discussed that new TT-ers should have a PhD student. Next to that, the MT will use the TT-system to recruit potential full professors.

The FC mentioned that for TT-ers who are currently in the system it is unclear what the difference is, since the same goal could also be reached without the system.

The MT answered that the TT-system is a structured fast track with specific moments of evaluation.

First there is the need for a good plan towards the future (domain structures and try to think 4-5 years ahead). A clear vision for the faculty is needed.

The FC mentioned that it seems that Social Sciences is a bit unrepresented in the composition of the committee.

The MT answered that criteria should be developed and that there is no standard. What should be usual in Social Sciences versus Mathematics? We need to develop our own brand of BMS which is also a subject for discussion for our future.

This committee is a good team to go forward with to our new faculty and is appointed for 2016 as well. After consultation the committee the dean will take decisions. Next to the TT committee, the dean has chosen for a BMS career commission for non TT promotions. Also for this committee, the dean is decision taking.

We need to keep in mind that in the future we will have 4 departments. Reviews of staff could take place in a different setting with various professors or functional- and formal supervisors. This could make it more clear to go for promotions based on an annual review or assessment. We need to be aware that departments do not create their own internal criteria. If only one person is supervising and evaluating the person below, that does not fit a professional assessment.

#### **4. Open discussion toward the new faculty (role of FC and dean)**

Since this is the last meeting of 2015, we should discuss what should be addressed the next half year. At the moment the MT makes an inventory and after finishing we cannot wait too long to start the processes towards the new faculty. The MT mentioned that issues cannot be solved by the dean himself. In the second half of January, a kick off meeting will take place. The most important part is to formulate the criteria for ambitions of that process. The MT asked the FC what kind of things should be seen resolved. What should the MT address that the FC is concerned about. Of course it is clear that when approval or advice is required, the council would be asked via the official procedures.

The FC replied that it is known that there is a team of people involved to take portfolios forward. In that case it would be appreciated to be kept in the loop and being involved and informed in the process.

The MT respects the procedures, so if a reorganization will take place it is clear that this will be done according the official guidelines. If an organizational change (preferred) will take place, the FC will be consulted as well.

Peter-Paul Verbeek was appointed as Vice-Dean, Ellen Giebels is working on the research portfolio. Both are also sparring partners. The MT is now recruiting a temporary support group from central level to do some analysis in the field of educational support and the organization of the faculty. Ellen Giebels and Peter-Paul Verbeek are invited to the next meeting.

The FC asked if the strategic profile for this faculty that was discussed at spring this year still stays? The MT answered that there is still a lot of convincing ongoing but the profile still stays.

At UT level is spoken about the connections between the institutions and the faculties. For the short term, the dean is appointed as director a.i. of IGS for one year.

What employees underestimate is that in order to do well, the faculty needs to perform better within the programs. Therefore, there is a need to invest upfront. Look at EU2020, top sector, the new way that NWO is going to operate, KNAW. If employees are all there upfront and investing time, is doesn't pay anything. This should be organized in another way. The academic organization should differentiate from a professional organization and governance the faculty. Towards the future of this faculty, it is important to look forward instead of back.

#### **5. Announcements from the dean**

--

#### **6. Other business**

The FC asked why the examination committee has some new rules about the confidentiality of a thesis which was mentioned of the website of the examination board. Referring to the OER's that we received at the beginning of June, it wasn't mentioned.

The MT answered that a thesis should be public. Only a supervisor could make the difference between the thesis to be public and the report of the internship confidential.

Question from the FC is if a transition period on general level could be arranged since there is an ongoing thesis confidentiality (Philips etc.)

The MT will come back on this issue during the next meeting.

#### **7. Closure of the meeting**

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