

**Attendees:** Horstman (chairman), Römer, Sanchez, Van de Belt, Visser (minutes secretary), Daggenvoorde, Kommerkamp, Ten Bloemendaal

**Absent:** Damgrave, Versteijlen

## 1, 2 Opening, approval of the agenda & selection minutes secretary

Agenda:

1. Opening
2. Adoption of the agenda & minutes secretary
3. Correspondence
4. Announcements
5. Approval minutes internal meeting
6. Approval minutes external meeting
7. Strategy UT Documents:
  - FRCTW-219 - 7 - Mail Ellen Hamerlers about Vision 2020.pdf
  - FRCTW-219 - 7 - Referentiedocumentfinal22april.pdf
8. Education
  - a. Video lectures Documents:
    - FRCTW-219 - 8a - 401 667 Brief aan decanen en OWDs inz Videlectures op de UT incl bijlagen.pdf
    - FRCTW-219 - 8a - mail about video colleges.pdf
    - FRCTW-219 - 8a - Video diensten ICTS 2014-04-15 updated.pdf
    - FRCTW-219 - 8b - 400.345 Brief benoeming onderwijsorganisatie mei 2013 aan decanen.pdf
  - b. Organisation of the faculty / educational director Documents:
    - FRCTW-219 - 8b - Email UCouncil president - onderwijsorganisatie faculteit.pdf
    - FRCTW-219 - 8b - Reaction EWI - email Gijs Kant.pdf
    - FRCTW-219 - 8b - Reaction MB-GW - Antwoorden van de FR MBGW over onderwijsorganisatie-1.pdf
9. Research
10. Any other business (AOB)
11. Question round
12. Closure

Minutes secretary of the day: Visser

## 3. Correspondence

-

## 4. Announcements

Versteijlen is abroad, Damgrave recovers from a inguinal rupture

## 5. Approval minutes internal meeting

The minutes are approved after the following adaptations:

- 1 Horst should be Horstman
- 10 There was no change in FR candidates for the election in comparison with the previous meeting. The group of candidates does differ from the current FR.
- 13 Skip the remark on institutional visitation
- 14 Logistical problems should be "work load will increase"

Action points: The card to Damgrave has been sent by Horstman

## 6. Approval minutes external meeting

Approved

## 7. Strategy UT Documents:

- FRCTW-219 - 7 - Mail Ellen Hamerlers about Vision 2020.pdf

Questions is this document:

- *Hebben jullie het bijgevoegde stuk reeds gehad? En zo ja, van wie?*

45 Not officially, Horstman has send a link after the previous meeting (the 218<sup>th</sup>).

- *Welke input hebben jullie tot nu toe kunnen leveren? Was dit ook voldoende in jullie ogen?*

50 Create Tomorrow and the meeting in C101 with university board. But those opportunities were on individual basis; the council did not have an official request to have a look/comment on the document. WE could consider this to be insufficient, but on the other hand officially the council does not have a vote in the strategy of the university as a whole (only on the parts that will be translated within the faculty).

- *Wat is jullie mening over het stuk dat er nu ligt?*

See below

Horstman will respond to Hamerlers based on the minutes of the meeting.

• **FRCTW-219 - 7 - Referentiedocumentfinal22april.pdf**

55 General comments: The strategy described in the document is very ambitious. The ambitions are generally supported by the faculty council, although we miss a proper analyses of the current situation and what has to be done to reach the goals outlined in the document. This makes, especially the first part of the document, too general. Some of the more concrete goals either need a lot of funding or are unrealistic (for example the goal to oblige the bachelor students to follow 15 EC abroad). One of the worries is that  
60 this strategy document now just seems like a strategy, but will later be used as the base for new policies with the use of the argument: "everybody already agreed on this". Although this should not be possible, the fact that the university board does put effort in getting input from staff and students, feeds this fear.

Some detailed remarks:

65 Page 1: "Onze campus ontwikkelt zich tot inspirerende ontmoetingsplaats voor wetenschappers en studenten." We are of the opinion the campus is already just that, the goal should be to improve this and get even more out the unique setup of our campus.

Page 1: It is unclear what is meant here with a niche and whether is conflicts with an undesired development of having small research groups.

70 Page 4: The goal to have a more flexible research program and staff might conflict with the current way research proposal are scored for national grants; this is mostly based on the proven track record.

75 Page 7: It is striking that the word "can" is used instead of "will" in the goal "Het gehele undergraduate onderwijs kan in het Engels worden gevolgd." IT leaves open the option of also having a Dutch bachelor in parallel. The opinion of the council is divided on this matter. The ones in favour point out that it will increase the amount of students and will make the bachelor more international. On the other hand the question remains whether this increase is significant enough to request yet another time investment of the staff to translate all study material.

Page 9: Iconic projects just happen and cannot be appointed

## 8. Education

### a. Video lectures Documents:

- 80
- **FRCTW-219 - 8a - 401 667 Brief aan decanen en OWDs inz Videolectures op de UT incl bijlagen.pdf**
  - **FRCTW-219 - 8a - mail about video colleges.pdf**
  - **FRCTW-219 - 8a - Video diensten ICTS 2014-04-15 updated.pdf**
  - **FRCTW-219 - 8b - 400.345 Brief benoeming onderwijsorganisatie mei 2013 aan decanen.pdf**

85 The question seems to be whether the faculty should also stimulate the staff to take part in video lecturing. For students it would be a great service to have a possibility to be able to view a lecture again, or have missed. Some negative effects that can possibly result from video lecturing are identified: a drop in attendance or the students might pay less attention (“I can always watch the lecture again”). Furthermore, research has pointed out that students spend double the time watching the lecture when compared to attending the lecture.

90 The staff can also have objections against being videoed; everything that is said during a lecture is suddenly “cast in stone”.

The question remains whether the educational staff will be forced to take part in the development in video lectures.

#### **b. Organisation of the faculty / educational director Documents:**

- 95
- FRCTW-219 - 8b - Email UCouncil president - onderwijsorganisatie faculteit.pdf
  - FRCTW-219 - 8b - Reaction EWI - email Gijs Kant.pdf
  - FRCTW-219 - 8b - Reaction MB-GW - Antwoorden van de FR MBGW over onderwijsorganisatie-1.pdf

100 There has been some discussion between the Uraad and the university board on the function of educational director. Currently it is not clear what the role is and how it is implemented in each of the faculties.

At CTW Dohmen Janssen was appointed to be “OWD”. Here role is no different than the other OLD’s (the function she also still carries out) except for the part that she represents the other OLD’s at OWD dedicated meetings.

Answer to the questions raised in the e-mail of the president of the University Council:

105 1) *Is uw faculteitsraad bekend met bijgevoegde brief en de bijlagen?*

No we did not get the letter.

2) *Is er een beschrijving van de onderwijsorganisatie in uw faculteit?*

Officially not, but probably in the documents made up for visitations has a descriptions of it.

3) *Is er onduidelijkheid over de onderwijsorganisatie in uw faculteit?*

110 Our current organisation structure is clear for the council.

4) *Is de werking van de onderwijsorganisatie in uw faculteit in lijn met bijgevoegde brief?*

115 Now the OWD is an OLD, so up to May 2015 this is allowed. Apparently, the current situation should change after that date, if the faculty wants to comply to the rules. For conflict of interest it might be sensible to keep the two functions separated, if the function OWD really has to be filled in (for which the faculty council of CTW is not in favour).

5) *Op welke wijze is de huidige beschrijving van de onderwijsorganisatie duidelijk voor de faculteit aangezien deze niet in de faculteitsreglementen te vinden is?*

No the role of the OWD remains unclear.

Horstman will prepare a writeup of the above to the president of the university council.

120 **9. Research**

125 The research visitation of ME has taken place previous week. The committee revealed only little of their conclusions to DeWulff and van der Meer (visitation coordinator). One of the points was that the faculty lacks an institute, which makes the organisation of the research unclear. A positive point note on the scientific output: it has significantly increased since the previous period. Sanchez was present during the lunch and was questioned on the efficiency (and clarity) of the organization and the educational loads for PhD-students.

**10. Any other business (AOB)**

Horstman invites the new FR members for 2 future meetings of the FR.

**11. Question round**

130 -

**12. Closure**

At 14:00 o'clock

**Action items:**

Nr	Subject	Date	Who	Progress
1314-10	Respond to Hamerlers on strategy document	20-05-2014	Horstman	
1314-11	Respond to president university council on OWD	20-05-2014	Horstman	
1314-12	Invite the new FR members to 2 future FR meetings	20-05-2014	Horstman	

135