

Minutes of the Faculty Council BMS of 19 January 2015

Present: Jakob Martin (Student), Janneke Hendriks, Marion Kamp, Shawn Donnelly, Yann Hengstenberg, Rainer Mensing, Ellen Giebels, Henk Boer, Mark Tempelman, Jeroen Meijerink, Peter-Paul Verbeek, Theo Toonen, John Winter, Evelien Rietberg

Absent: Noor Godijk, Bernard van Welij, Jacqueline Weppelman (MT), Rainer Harms, Alexander van Deursen

1. Opening

The chairman opened the meeting.
Agenda item 4 was changed in OER and publication of thesis

2. Minutes of last meeting FC 1 December 2015

The name Hanneke was changed correctly to Janneke.

3. TT Functional/Hierarchical supervisor

The Tenure Track commission came together and discussed how it should work and operate.

The MT mentioned that we need to make clear for what we use the Tenure Track. In most universities, you're going from a temporary contract to a tenured position. Within our university it seems that the Tenure Track was geared towards a Full Professorship. It is either to get people tenured or it is a procedure to a potential full professorship. The university evaluation committee has decided that a Tenure Track position can lead – in principle – into a full professorship. That means, that we should use the Tenure Track system for that.

It is not about stopping the Tenure Track, but it is using the Tenure Track for which it is actually meant and doing a better job on guiding, supervising and hiring the new employees.

The MT mentioned that in the future both – hierarchical- and daily supervisors – should be more involved in talks and agreements with staff and also chairs.

4. OER and Publication of thesis

The FC was surprised that one article was suddenly in the OER related to a public thesis. Departments agreed upon the idea that a thesis should be public but there are still some concerns about how this is organized. For instance, are there guidelines for a confidential thesis?

Another issue, how can an OER be changed - or an article be added - without informing the OLC's and FC after approval of the specific OER?

The MT mentioned that this is probably a matter of misunderstanding/miscommunication. The MT also made clear that after approval of the OER no changes could be made without informing the OLC's and FC.

The case of a public thesis is another issue. Any thesis should be written in such way, that it could be published in its full version. We have to make clear to our students that they are operating in a public domain.

The FC replied that at the moment this is unclear and we should take further steps to get all teaching staff informed.

The MT answered that this indeed should be done and will come on this topic during the meeting in March.

5. Update 2016

The MT mentioned a couple of months ago that they would use spring 2016 to organize a faculty broad discussion about the future developments. This was only possible when there is more known about the financials on the long term. The board of the university has promised to calculate this multi budget. It is still very complicated to put together the 2 administrations that we basically had into 1 administration.

There is still the plan to organize the faculty broad discussion before the summer so the MT will stick to the idea that they will come up with more guidance and plans for the multi-year budget.

The most important thing that will be discussed is where is BMS going to in terms of the divisions of the faculty and how to arrange that.

Only the research groups who have a research capacity of 10fte among the program staff will be reviewed. If BMS takes that as an average, BMS only have 30% research within the faculty. That means that any tenured group that you put in advance for a review has to consist out of 40fte. Hardly any of the consisting conglomeration of the different departments reach that criteria.

6. Result Employee survey BMS

The MT suggests to discuss the survey to have some points of attention to take into consideration. Some issues were already taken away.

The topic workload is clear and this is not only BMS related but for the whole university.

The FC made clear that this seems indeed the biggest gap, but still the questions is why? What does this workload consist of? Next to the workload, also the general satisfaction is fairly low.

The MT mentioned that each faculty/unit should provide an action plan towards the CvB. BMS will collect all points of attention from all groups. Also, of course, BMS issues will be mentioned.

The MT will come back with a plan within the next months.

7. Announcements from the dean

--

8. Other business

The MT gave an overview regarding the new T4P proposals. In total 67 proposals were received with a good balance between PhD and PD proposals instead of last year when there were much more PhD proposals. Progress of the proposals of last year is available via the website.

Research Portfolio IGS:

We should balance the program of IGS a little bit better and for that reason a research portfolio for the faculty is created. The research institutes should be more representative for what the faculty stands for and how it links up with the rest of the university. Since this is part of a university discussion – with personnel consequences – the MT decided to keep it analytically apart.

9. Closure of the meeting

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