

# UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social sciences (BMS)

## Members Faculty Council

From	Jasmine Verenjans	Telephone	+31 (0)53 – 489 3611
Our reference	CPE-UP-19.020	e-mail	j.n.verenjans@utwente.nl
Date	October 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2019		

**Subject**            **AGENDA FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING OCTOBER 29<sup>th</sup>**

1. Opening and welcome (10.45)
2. Minutes of previous meeting  
Attachment – agp 2 – concept minutes meeting August 30<sup>th</sup>  
Attachment – agp 2 – concept minutes meeting September 10<sup>th</sup>

In the minutes there is mention of a new version of the document describing the relationship between the study associations and the faculty. Can the FC-BMS receive that document.

3. Announcements Faculty Council Chair  
*As of now, [dr. G. Özerol \(Gül\)](#) is a member of the FC-BMS. She replaces Stephanie Gautier who left to Geneva.*  
The students in the FC-BMS have found a very good student assessor and will propose their candidate to the board very soon.  
Dr. Suzanne Janssen will temporarily step down because of a pregnancy leave. The FC BMS does not know what to do now and will discuss this with the election board of the faculty.
4. Announcements by the Board of BMS / the Dean
  - a. Reorganization follow-up
  - b. Other / misc.

### **Research**

5. Mid-Term Research Evaluation BMS (for your information)  
Attachment – agp 5 – response BMS recommendations to the Midterm Review committee  
Attachment – agp 5 – Letter from Executive Board

*The FC likes to ask several questions and to raise a few points after reading both the action plan of the faculty board (hereafter called the “response”) and the letter from the Executive Board of the University (hereafter called the “letter”)*

1. *In the response, it was suggested to “Allow more time for people to consider and discuss what the new structure implies, what opportunities it brings and how this can best be structured and communicated.” How do the actions mentioned in the response (which is mainly about drawing plans and policies) have that result?*

2. *In the response, you mentioned creating an advisory board and thinking about a new name for the faculty. You also mention the FC-BMS. What are your plans and time schedule here?*
3. *In the response, you mention endorsing a more strict policy regarding external PhD trajectories; and a more strict imposition of tuition fees. Can you explain the background of this plan?*
4. *In the response, the board of the faculty includes many explicit time schedules. The FC-BMS is curious to know whether we are still able to do everything according to plan.*
5. *In the letter, the UT board raises the issue of work load and well-being of faculty members. We will discuss this topic later (point 9 on the agenda), the FC-BMS welcomes attention for this topic very much.*
6. *In the letter, the UT board suggests to also compare our faculty with scientific peers / benchmarking. Up until the Dean was hesitating doing this, because both our research programs and teaching programs are supposed to have a unique flavor and because the 'old fashioned' 'visitations' cost a large amount of energy. How does the board of BMS view this recommendation of the UT board?*
7. *The UT is board is somewhat critical about the 5 "focal research themes". (a) The FC-BMS also hears from within the faculty that some of these themes are relatively well-developed, but other themes are developed less. Can you tell us a bit more about this? (b) Moreover, the UT strongly suggests a stronger connection between BMS master programs and research themes (aligning BMS portfolio of masters), while the dean always stressed the idea clusters, research themes and educational programs should be cross cutting. How does the board respond to this element in the letter by the UT board?*
8. *In the letter it seems that the board of the UT is not properly informed about the background of postponing some Steam investments. The FC-BMS was informed about this. Is the UT board now informed about this too?*
9. *In the letter the UT board is interested in knowing how the other faculties respond? The FC-BMS is also interested in this point.*

*Since these are many points, we would like to note that point 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 are mainly informative and can probably be answered without further discussion point 5 will be discussed under point 9 of this agenda. The FC-BMS likes to put some emphasis on point 6 and 7.*

### **Education**

6. Follow up WSV money discussions – by Ciano Aydin  
*The FC-BMS knows that a lot of PCs were rather critical about the decision-making process regarding the WSV money. How do you plan to strengthen the involvement of the PCs and others in the development of your plans, in order to increase support and legitimacy in this context? The FC-BMS also knows that a lot of work was done around the time of the last meeting we had. We would like to be informed about the current plans.*

### **Finances**

7. Final version of the budget/ annual plans  
*Last week we received the final version of the budget for advice (the FC still does not have a right of consent). The main change compared to the last version of the budget related to the*

*MJR (multi-annual budget). The annual results are now zero. We would like to know whether this decision affected to more detailed budget for 2020 in any way, in what way the planned budgets for 2021 and onwards were affected. At a more technical level, we would like to know why some budget entries (for example for ICT services) were changed.*

### **Organization**

8. New Faculty Council regulations BMS follow-up  
Attachment – agp 8 – Faculty Council regulations BMS  
*In general the FC was content with the regulations but needs to have a bit more advice on a few uncertain topics. The FC-BMS will give some input about these details so they can be communicated to the board.*
9. Well-being study and plan  
*The Board and HR would like to discuss this point with the FC. The FC is asked to give their input / advice for the faculty wide policy and the university wide policy. The FC-BMS, however, cannot discuss the issue without information about the well-being study itself and an initial set of plans.*
10. Student well-being study discussion – by Ciano Aydin  
*The FC-BMS heard about a rather “uncomfortable” study among students, as reported in U-Today. Can the board inform us about this topic and about plans to increase student well-being.*
11. Round of questions
  - *The FC-BMS heard about the discussions related to the implementation of TOM 2.0 in the PCs. It seems PCs are currently drowning in options. The FC-BMS likes to know what the board is doing to help PCs making the right decisions in this context.*
  - *Maybe other topics will come up later ....*
12. End of the meeting (12.30)

Expectations...in the upcoming meetings we expect discussing the following topics:

- TOM 2.0
- MARAPS...

*November:*

- Functioning of the OLCs / annual report about the PDCA cycles in education

*February:*

- Annual report about BMS lab

*March:*

- Annual report of the examination board