5 Meeting Minutes plenary meeting of 25 September 2019

Ref.nr. UR 19-172 Minutes by L. Tijink

Date 16 October 2019

Present UC Campus Coalitie: H. Wormeester (vz.), E. Hondebrink, W. Klieverik, I. Bijker, H. Becht

ET: D. Schipper

UReka: T. Hazewindus, P. Kemper, H. Riaz, G.B. Damian, L. Veldman

DAS: T. van der Meer, L. Harks, W. Bolhuis

PvdUT: G. Brinkman, D. Meijer

CvB V. van der Chijs, T. Palstra, M. Bult-Spiering, S. Wichman

15 Griffie I. Olde Engberink Absent J. Ferwerda (CC)

1. Opening and setting of the agenda

The chairman opens the meeting and gives a warm welcome to the attendees, after which he sets the agenda.

2. Announcements

10

35

55

60

A new member of the Supervisory Board has to be appointed by the Minister of Education. That member has to be proposed by the University Council. In his internal meeting on September 18th the profile has been set therefore the search for this new member is going to start.

3. Minutes meeting June 12 and 19, 2019, UR 19 - 112/115

These minutes of the consultation meetings between the UC and the Board are adopted as they stand.

30 4. Investmentplan regarding central budget from student loan fund. UR 19 – 140/149

The University Council has examined and debated this Investment plan in several meetings. The Council is pleased to note that the input of the Programme Committees and the Faculty Councils are incorporated in these plans which ensures that the multiple levels within the university are heard. Eventually, this will smoothen the implementation. Taken in consideration that the proposed timeline safeguards the execution and the developed plans for the central investments benefit the entire university and will improve the quality of education. The University Council approves on the investment plan central budget from the student loan fund.

405. Fine-tuning education development cycles, UR 19 – 116/148

The University Council has formulated two advices regarding the new proposal for Education Development Cycles. In the opinion of the Council it's important to keep a close eye on the proposed cycle to ensure the continued development of our education so that it will not be stalled by bureaucracy. The main priority in education development should be maintaining the current high quality of education.

For Mr. Palstra the first advice is quite clear. He states that we should not focus on the process itself but also on the content. The process should help us to make sure that we doing the right things and that we have education development quite high on the agenda. The process ensures that we taking all the right steps. All the players in the field are aware of which steps they ought to take. The positive decision is then adopted by Executive Board with the approval of the University Council.

6. Privacy policy, UR 19 - 118 / 150

The University Council decides to give his consent to the Privacy Policy of the University of Twente (version 1.4) after having heard the commitments of the board that instead of the word 'companion' the word 'UT-companion' will be used. In addition to this, the culture associations will be added to the non-exhaustive list of third parties to which the UT provides personal details.

7. Research Ethics Policy, UR 19 - 120 / 154

The introduction of this policy is considered to be a valuable step towards forming responsible and conscious students. With this policy in place, the Council thinks that it will be easier for students to learn and develop the critical ethical thinking required to perform researches at a *people-first* University. The Council advises positively to the Research Ethics Policy taken in consideration the state which values are

used for the ethics policy or provide a link to their source, the assurance that the implementation of the policy is thoroughly prepared and facilitates the procedures and requirements by digitalizing the process as much as possible.

65

70

8. Adjustments in the regulations regarding the 'WNRA', UR 19-144/162

In the formal decision the University Council agrees on the following regulations included in the WNRA-document under reference UR 19-120: the Code of (undesirable) behavior, the Code of Ethics / University of Twente Code of Conduct, the Intellectual Property Rights Implementation Regulations - regulations concerning inventions and copyright-protected works of UT employees, the Aggression protocol for UT employees and the Regulation Irregularities at the University of Twente (later added). The Dutch-language versions are 'leading' and that the English-language versions of these regulations will available be soon.

759. Convenant and Strategic Plan Student Union 2020 - 2023, UR 19 - 130/160/161

The University Council gives his approval on the Strategic Plan which is consistent about the ambition of the UT, the themes chosen highlight relevant concerns of the student population.

10. Vision Sports incl. report indoor sport facilities, UR 19 - 126/163

- 80 First of all, the Council expresses his appreciation for the efforts that have been made for this vision. This document takes into account the influence of TOM on sports, the changing demand due to diversity of students and housing concerns for indoor facilities. The renewed vision aims to resolve these issues and in addition to this, ensures greater financial stability for the sports sector. Council member Riaz wonders whether there are concrete plans to update certain facilities considering the current situation in which the UT has more students interested in Sports. Palstra reports that this discussion ought to be about the 85 Vision on sports and not about the implementation. At the same time this subject is high on the agenda and will get attention. The vision is the guideline to get to a strategy for how to implement this. It gives building blocks on which the strategy and implementation will be made. As formulated in the written decision, the previous vision was more concrete about sports coordination 90 with explicit attention to the operational situation which lacks in this version. Palstra states, that the vision should not deal about the operational situation which belongs to the strategy and the implementation. In terms of an English translation, the vision has been translated and it has already circulated within the
- organization. Also the competitive spaces have been clarified, as they are now being mentioned. Palstra quotes, along with recreational sports there is room for competitive sport with performance elements. In some cases the more competitive sporting level is included into recreational sports. Competitional Sports is also desperately needed to maintain activism within their association. For example, competitive sports and certain presence of student trainers within the association. After all, student trainers are desperately needed for solidarity within the association and the affordability of sports. Competition Sport can also be an instigator to increase the offer of sports. This has now been included in order to give clarity on this point. With this response, the Board complies with the recommendations of the University Council. Therefore the formal decision is adopted as such.

11. Year report UT 2018, UR 19 - 129/158

- Certain numbers within the year report, have led to questions that require some clarification. Council member Bolhuis refers to the report of the LSVB (Landelijke studentenvakbond) that has been published in March 2018 titled 'De verantwoording over het Profileringsfonds'. The question is, to what extent do Dutch Higher Education institutions meet the requirements that are set in the Rjo, to report certain key figures in their year report regarding this topic? In this report the UT scored below the average with just 40% of key figures recorded in their yearly report, compared to the nationwide average of 47%. Based on this report the yearly reports of 2018 the same twelve universities were compared with one another again. The average of these universities (in March 2018 46%) has risen to an average of 70%. However, the score of the UT is with 50% still below this average.

 Mrs. Bult explains that the UT has to apply to the regulations concerning annual reporting as this is a
- legal framework for annual reporting. However, this specific adjustment in the Rjo was made as from the 27th of April 2019 which means that these figures will have to be adjusted in the year report of 2019. As always the UT will be compliant with the Rjo regulations.

12. Well-being of UT staff - follow-up recommendation, UR 19-064

- The formal advice on wellbeing of the Council was already issued in June 2019 in response to the report of the employee survey and the request of the Executive Board for an additional advice on social safety of employees, which also emerged from the survey, as an important point of attention. The Council then looked at the perceived workload in order to reduce it in one way or another. A number of aspects is important in this respect, job clarity and career prospects. Clarity of tasks to one person is not sufficient, because he or she has to work in a group that has a very clear mandate. What is important is a balance
- in the number of tasks that each member of such a working group does. The same applies to a faculty or a department that has common task. It should be clear how this task is divided up. This is also due to the fact that it has been decided that the faculties have an integral management. This means that there must be a good balance between teaching and research tasks. There is no current research strategy within the faculties, which is necessary in order to provide a clear picture of the tasks involved. Another point is that
- it has been decided to switch to capacity funding, which means that you must be able to quantify the tasks you perform in the field of research and education. In the Services these are different types of tasks, but they are always linked to the capacity that is needed. There must be a link between the funding and the number of tasks one has to perform. In fact, all these instruments have not yet been developed or are insufficiently developed. This means that the distribution of tasks among the staff often leads to
- discussions. You also need to look at the total number of tasks, if that is too much for the group of people you have or the funding you have. This means that the policy must also pay attention to the intensity of education. Many substantive choices have been made in the past, for example with regard to the TOM model. And it was only afterwards, that it was found that certain tasks take a great deal of time on the part of teachers and teaching staff that it is hard to find the capacity to do things of this kind. Therefore, the
- policy within the faculties has to pay attention to the workability of the policy. In order to deal with the workload properly, it is important that there is clarity of tasks for a person, a group or a faculty. In addition to this, the consequences of the policy for workload has to be taken into account.

 With regard to a safe working environment, which is a difficult issue to tackle, although there are several
- activities organized, the council is of the opinion that it is mainly a cultural problem. That people react insufficiently in case there is a situation where undesirable behavior takes place. Serious complaints will eventually be reported. However, looking at the results of the employee survey closely, only a small number of complaints were reported. That requires a different attitude on the part of many people. The
- The introduction of the Ombuds Officer, that has an independent position in the organization in order to advise people and refer them further, should be used to make the aid structure of the UT clear to the community. By emphasizing once again that the people should be addressed for undesirable behavior. Mrs. Bult will take the first advice certainly into account concerning the clarity on tasks. With regard to the second advice, she states that the introduction of the Ombuds Officer can help create the required cultural awareness and cultural behaviour that is necessary to make sure that disrespectful behaviour will
- be addressed. The pilot phase of this Ombuds Officer has recently started, specific issues that arise from the wellbeing research will be taken into account. Together with all the advices that will follow from the consultation round with the faculties and the Service Departments. Finally, a word of thanks is expressed by Bult for the formal advises that have been giving and the efforts made.

16013. Consolidation decentralized UT-participation, UR 19 -139/153

ones who don't behave, have to be addressed to their behavior.

The chairman states that a working group will soon be set up and a clear assignment will be given. This specific assignment will be formulated addressing the priorities of the Service Councils and Faculty Council as well as the one the Executive Board has and making sure the assignment is very clear for the working group. They will look for ways to strengthen the decentralized participation bodies, in order to

- facilitate them more effectively. The University Council has been requested by the Board to propose council members that could be part of this group. The Board will do the same from the university organization perspective. Wormeester is willing to be part of this working group.
 - Also a Managing Director of a Faculty Board, a member of a Faculty Council and a Service Council will be engaged to be part of the working group.
- Bult emphasizes that it's important that student members also take place in the working group for the sake of the students perspective. Therefore a student member of the UC, the Program Committees and the FC's will be appointed.

Meijer refers to a new initiative of the Faculty Board, offering Faculty Councilmembers all together, some kind of training this autumn. The Council decides to give its approval to the memorandum 'Strengthening decentralized participation'.

175

14. UC memorandum Budget process 2020 based on UC 19-111 multi annual ambitions. UR 19-152 In the committee meeting FPB, the letters from the Executive Board to the faculties, dated 4 July and 3 September were discussed, in which the Board announced the distribution of additional resources for 180 2019 and described the method of distribution for 2020. The Council thought it would be wise not to postpone these choices but to address them immediately, before the discussion about the decision making of the budget discussion in December. At the committee meeting, the Board appeared to share the same opinion. As a result, the Council must be formally asked by the Board to agree to these changes in the distribution model. In terms of content, this boils down to two matters that have been 185 mentioned, including the sector plan for resources. The Framework takes into account the fact that these resources go directly to the faculties, but that the central overhead is allocated into these resources, at the expense of the other research activities. In this sense, these resources also contributes to the overhead funding. In addition, the Executive Board has decided (in draft form) to add 30%. This is not an obligation but an option. This leads to the question whether this is a necessary measure, because the 190 funding of the research positions (UD, UHD and HL's) is reasonably inappropriate. After all, the resources are immediately transferred to the faculties, and this is more than the semi-integrated funding. There is also money for facilities (lab facilities, etc.). In addition, UDs', UHDs' and HLs' will also obtain funds by providing education. This concerns 30% of their time. An addition to the educational capacity is very welcome at the faculties EWI and ET. This funding concerns not only research but also education. Now it's administered under the heading 195 'research'. Educational activities should automatically be paid in line with the distribution model (EC funding in the master's programme or the funding module). Some of these positions are funded by their educational activities. Then there is the expectation that people will win projects to finance their positions. So there is double funding apart from the start-up period. The idea of the Board adding 30% more from 200 central resources does not seem logical, in the opinion of the Council. It is also strange that the stimulus budget (2.5 million) will be fixed for a period of 6 years knowing that you are developing plans that will undoubtedly entail costs. In addition to this, it is not clear how the sector plans are administered. Only as research resources or also as educational resources? The Board is requested to indicate whether the 30% addition was a 205 obligation when the sector plan means have been assigned. With regard to the financing of the gamma and beta programs, Meijer reports, that it's known that the 'Van Rijn Commission' has proposed a shift. This will be budget neutral for the Gamma and Alpha programs for the next few years, but after that there will be a real shift, as can be seen from the overviews. The beta programs will receive 11 million euros extra funding and the gamma programs will eventually receive 3 million euros less funding. The Board 210 has announced that they will deviate from this, by making an additional 8.5 million available for technical programs. The gamma programs on the other hand, are not subject to any cut back. The Council wonders whether this is reasonable. The difference in funding between these programmes has already been implemented in the bachelors' phase, with equal funding for education for all programmes. The national ratio 1:1.5 is followed. This didn't happen for the masters' programme, where there is a kind of 215 grant from the technical study programmes towards the range of alpha study programmes. In addition, the beta programs have the advantage that there are no budget cuts. Whereas in the external model this should be the case. The Council would like to pass on this point so that the right compromise can be chosen. It can't be the case that a range of programs are financed differently without the cost structure giving. Even though de UT can freely choose to do, there must be reasonable grounds for doing so. 220 The Board wanted that the UT engineering faculties get their fair share of the Sector Plan means available for the Dutch beta technology sector. There were formal frameworks written down by the Minister and there was also a negotiation process in which the board wanted to make sure that the engineering programs get their fair share as one of the motives. The second motive was to provide faculties with clarity about financial means available as soon as possible considering we are in a growth situation. The third motive is that the board wants to respect the multi disciplines of this UT and the High-225 Tech Human Touch Profile. At the same time making sure that the education at the beta and technology domain is sufficiently funded. In addition to this, that all the suggestions made as adjustments in our

'distribution model' are based on these three starting points. The 'Sector Plan means' are administrated as research means.

- With regard to the second question Bult states, that there is no formal framework which can be used to show that it was necessary to make the additional budget (30%) available for the faculties. It was part of negotiation and it would have cost the UT a lot more money if the Board had not taken this decision. The Council has been asked whether he can agree on the adjustments of the distribution model 2020' in order to make sure that the faculties can do their work in a good way and accommodate their growth that they are facing. The Board is keen on giving clarity to the faculties because it is necessary.
- The Council is also in favor of giving clarity instead of leaving the money in the central budget shelf.

 Therefore there should be clarity and they should use the money available but not along the lines of the sector plans.
- The reason for them to receive the money is not because of the Sector plans, but using the money for the time being as we near the point of implementing the UT strategy. Next year will be a transitional year. The Board did not have a say in the funding nor in the formulation of the Sector plans. Not a preferable situation. However, the faculties should not be confronted with the problems caused by that fact. These Sector Plans means are a welcome budget especially for the engineering faculties.
- The proposal of the Board is that the Council gives his approval on the outlines of the 2020 budget and then to assess the situation for the following years. The Council agrees on this, but not related to the Sector Plans in order to have a freely discussion on how to use the Sector Plans after 2020. Meijer finds it perfectly justified that the faculties of BMS and ITC are being compensated for the fact that the central overhead, which is assigned to the Sector Plans, is contributed by the other activities on research that is also part of the research by these faculties.
- The Board is in a state that she cannot do much about the budget of 2020. Therefore these means will be incorporated into the budget of 2020 which will be presented to the Council in the December meeting assuming that the council will give its consent on the budget. Another point is that we have to reconsider the distribution model that is required to calculate the UT budget for 2020 2021 that will be available in May 2020. That means that the discussion between the Board and the Council about the distribution
- model should take place in the February cycle of 2020. A that time the Council hopes to have more clarity about the 'Van Rijn means' in order to incorporate those means in the distribution model. The council agrees on this and Bult states that this will be a retaught distribution model in research and education. The University Council needs a formal request of the Board in order to give its consent on the starting point of distributing the money. Bult agrees to this. Meijer has no objection that the money is distributed in this way for next year, as he is also in favor of clarity, therefore it should be perfectly clear that it is only for 2020. Having said that, the discussion is closed by the Chairman.

15. Drienerburght, renovation of ATLAS, UR 19 – 127/166

- The Council has a number of issues and remarks that require clarification. Most of them concern housing and also the exploitation. Foremost the Council wishes that the situation of housing, in terms of exploitation gets resolved quite soon to prevent financial risks for the UT. The council would like to see that a policy is being written on how the student housing is being dealt with. In the formal advice of the council there are a number of things summarized that should be in the policy which should for example indicate what will be done when more students enroll than the available number of rooms or less
- students, considering the 59 rooms that are available. As Atlas is an residential concept where students live at the same place where the education is organized. In case there a more students than the available rooms, they have to be housed somewhere else. This raises questions like, where will they be housed and what will the consequences be? Apart from that, the policy should also give clarity on who will carry the financial risks. And it should include what measures will be taken in case rooms are not occupied.
- On top of that, the council has heard signals that students are not comfortable with the situation as it is, having lectures in the same building where they are housed. It becomes like a bubble situation in which they basically would not have to leave the building. Which is not a good example on how to communicate with the rest of the UT-community because it's too isolated from the rest. The policy should also give clarity on housing accommodation in terms of the responsibilities how they are divided. Are they for instance with Atlas or ITC? The student population must also be involved in drawing up the policy
- document. After all, students have to deal with the consequences of the policy.

 First of all, the Board wants to thank the Council for the advices and the effort that has been made, because housing has a great impact on wellbeing of students. As we are trying to improve housing, this is

- the actual situation because Atlas has already a residential educational concept. First year students of
 Atlas are already living on the campus and all of the campus is the definition of a residential concept. With
 this new housing for students as well as Atlas education, the board tries to improve the strength of the
 Atlas concept. The current situation is that the Atlas students are living in different buildings. A good thing
 from the perspective of Atlas and the community of Atlas. From the perspective of the UT-community to
 make sure that the Atlas community is integrated in the UT-community, this new situation is actually a
- step forward in the development of Atlas. At the same time it's making sure that Atlas is not a separate community. The education spaces in Drienerburght will also be available for other educational programs. If the spaces have specific advantages for other educational programs, they can be used by them. Atlas will be writing down the policy in close cooperation with ITC Faculty Board. There is still a discussion going on about who will take the financial risks. What will be done with student rooms that are not occupied and who will take the financial risk for that?
- Under discussion is also who is the one that is going to be involved in this policy? FC of UC?

 We must wait for the outcome of this discussion in order to determine which participation body is going to assess the policy.
- Meijer states that he does not agree with this advice as student housing is not part of the primary tasks of the UT. We are investing in student housing and on top of that, we are also responsible for renting them and taking risks in that perspective as well. It would be better if a partner is going to do this for the UT, the partner does the investment and makes perhaps some profit out of it. Meijer is of the opinion that student housing should be provided by a professional company in housing for students. An investor should be the one to invest in student housing. Furthermore, such a separate location like Atlas is not helping in
- integrating the Atlas population in for example ITC. Therefore Atlas should share housing with ITC. It has also advantages, sharing facilities. An assignment that was given to the ITC is also to diminish facility costs of Atlas. Studying and living in the same building is an unhealthy situation, in the opinion of Meijer. But states that ITC and Atlas rethought several scenarios and they preferred this one.
- Finally, the chairman ends the discussion and puts the unsolicited opinion to the vote, which was adopted by 14 votes in favor, 2 against and 1 abstention.

16. Enrolment regulation UT 2020 -2021, UR 19 - 138/169

- The council has received the document 'the Enrolment Regulation UT 2020-202' together with the addendum for a pilot with application fee at EEMCS at a later stage. The Boards explains brief the reason for this. They could not foresee whether the UT could accommodate a request by EEMCS to start the pilot with an application fee. In terms of accommodating, it was not clear whether the UT can develop the software or financial system to implement it in a certain proper way, so that the master students EEMCS would have to pay for their application. Only last Friday, it became clear that it was possible. Of course there were some checks and balances and just last Monday, the Board took a decision on this matter.
- The number of students enrolling is growing substantially. All kinds of measures taken to make sure that the application process is going smoothly as possible, especially reducing the work pressure, have not been effective enough. Although the time that has been spent on every individual applicant has been reduced. In the end since the absolute number of applicants is rising so fast, the time that has been spent by different faculties has grown substantially. Already at an earlier stage there have been discussions on
- whether we should introduce an application fee. Van der Chijs emphasized that it's only a pilot at one faculty at this moment. All the other universities have already introduced an application fee. As we speak, it's being considered at the University of Wageningen. At least we are on the level playing field with other universities. One of the desired effects is that students who are not qualified but still want to study in the Netherlands, direct their attention to the UT. Although they are serious students, they may not be qualified as serious candidates.
 - At the same time, the Board does not wish to create unnecessary obstacles. If the pilot leads to the desired results, this does not mean that the application fee will be introduced for all students at the UT. This only concerns master students, precisely because of the considerable increase in masters' students EEMCS. For example, the faculty of ITC, which by nature has another typology of student, who also apply
- in a different way, will never ask for an application fee. Basically what we do is use the application fee to compensate for the work that has to be done processing files that need to be taken care of. Council member Riaz does not want to rush into a decision. First he wants to gather some responses for example the opinion of the Faculty Council of EEMCS.

- Brinkman agrees with Riaz. At least have the feeling that we have made a decision well informed. UReka, DAS and CC share the same opinion on this matter.
 - This leads to the conclusion of the chairman, that the council needs more information like the formal opinion of the Faculty Council preferable by next Monday. Therefore the decision-making will be mandated to the Presidium.
- As a member of the Faculty Council EEMCS, Meijer reports that this point was discussed last Friday with the dean of EEMCS. It turned out that most of the faculty council members were positive. Van der Chijs indicates that, if it turns out that this pilot does not have a significant impact, it will not be continued. It has been agreed en that the Executive Board will ask the dean for a formal advice from the Faculty Council.

350 17. Strategic Business Plan investment, UR 19 – 125/147

The Council has raised a number of issues and concerns that need to be discussed in this meeting. The fact that the Council didn't formulate a decision shows that these issues need clarification. After the initial remarks of the council, the Board has sent a clarifying letter in order to explain her position. The Board will formulate an implementation plan for the years to come which is specifically tight

- to the Shaping 2030 strategy document. Since this is a move that can't longer wait to be implemented, the Board feels that it's necessary to ask the consent of the Council to start expanding SBD by hiring people. For clarity sake, people were hired through SBD, because those are people who work on several projects (Regiodeal) and who have specific tasks in the faculties. So they are not assigned by SBD directly, as was assumed. It was requested by the faculties that SBD would take the central role there and
- that the right people are selected. Also because sometimes, you can combine tasks and positions to make sure that you get the best coordination possible. The bottom-line of the proposal: the UT lacks severely in attracting second and third money streams. One way or another, it is difficult for the UT to focus and especially coordinate certain activities. That was the reason, a few years ago, why SBD was installed by the Board. Last year during the evaluation of UT 2020, during the reorganization process,
- there was one conclusion: so far this has not developed yet due to a couple of issues. First of all, there was discussion on what the role of SBD should actually be, next to the fact that, the managing director of SBD has left to work at another university. We haven't been able to hire another manager director with the right credentials. Also it was for the outside world insufficiently clear what precisely SBD would or could do. The report of the Strategic Council has shown that there is a very broad support for reinforcing
- SBD and bringing together a number of people who now work independently, but do not necessary work coordinated on the same project. Especially those to work on a project whereas the UT has a trouble to organize it. Be it setting up large collaborations with corporate Stakeholders Office, be it chipping insufficiently in the 'Top Sectoren beleid', be it present at those place (Den Haag or Brussels) where decisions are being formulated. The UT just lacks the power to do so and the strengthening of SBD must solve those issues, in the opinion of Van der Chiis.
- Meijer refers to the reorganization plan in which the whole package of tasks for SBD was shared with the Business Directors of the Institutes. They will still be in the institutes and partly in SBD. For the larger projects (EU) the Scientific Directors and the Business Directors of the 'old institutes' were very much involved. Now, they still are but from different positions in the organization. Which raises the question,
- what is the reason that this hybrid organization of business developments in all its aspects was not that successful and needs such a larger capacity expansion?

 Van der Chijs explains that we indeed have institutes with scientific directors and a business director, but
- they are very much focused on the content. In terms of execution, we are really going for the long haul, therefore we have to invest, to follow up, to make collaboration with all kinds of stakeholders. In terms of execution the power is just not there. One of the developments that we have seen is that the faculties are adding additional staff to basically compensate for that. These people work more or less independently not informing each other sufficiently which has nothing to do with good will, but it is just too complicated to organize. On the request of the faculties, we are trying to bring those people together. Also given the fact that there is a lot of additional work coming from the 'Regiodeal' but also from the "missie gedreven-
- beleid" of the government. We try to combine those two in letting those people work together. The general feeling is that we should make it one entity. Obviously those people will stand with one leg in their faculty and one leg in SBD to precisely coordinate activity that needs to be coordinated. Next to the fact that we need to step up to make a difference.

Meijer notes in that respect, that these are not new positions but just transferred positions from faculties to SBD.

Van der Chijs explains that there is also a need to reinforce SBD as those people are necessary. In the second stage, we also want to transfer people who are already working at a faculties to SBD. That is an independent reorganization, not the question that the Board is asking from the Council now. Now we are next to organizing activities in a better less invidious way, really reinforcing SBD as it is needed to organize the activities.

The right order in doing this reorganization, according to Meijer, is to discuss the best way of working and then change the organization and then expand the capacity. The Board could hire some temporary staff if there is not sufficient guidance for the projects as a temporary measure. That is what we did last year, but did not make a difference, Van der Chijs concludes.

- According to Meijer there has been too much focus in the UT policy on education, in recent years, therefore there was less attention paid to attracting second and third money flow projects.

 Without any reservation, the boards finds it necessary to invest in SBD. This proposal is also fully supported by the Deans, the Strategic Council as well as the Business Directors.
- Riaz refers to the support of Strategic Board on this proposal. In his opinion the general idea is positive which is also close to the Shaping 2030 strategic document. He finds the measure necessary and important, increasing the capacity of SBD. However, the Council has to have the implementation plan regarding the procedure to the next stage.
 - Becht raises the question for what reason the UT was not able to attract sufficient external funding? In order to write creative ideas one has to have time and space, she has not been able to write anything lately as a result of workload.
 - Palstra sees it as a complex problem, in addition to changing our priorities, it is also that the way funding is being organized, is drastically changing. The emphasis is on larger strategic programs which require a force and coordinated efforts for an extended period of time. People work on this on a continuous basis, forming networks, making sure that alliances are being crafted, deadlines are being met when creating proposals. So the process has been changed from an individual pursuit to an common pursuit in the funding landscape worldwide. It requires coordination of efforts.
 - There are more than enough plans but it requires maintaining this on a continuous basis. Coordination in a proper way is essential. The intention is that it should decrease the work pressure. On a combined basis we can go for larger consortia, lager grants etc. so that the individual contribution of a member
- 425 could be reduced. Decrease the workload for staff by approaching it in an organized way which has the full support of the Strategic Board.
 - Brinkman recognizes that there are two parallel discussions going on, as we are talking about attracting second and third flow money projects and finance. He raises the question what kind of actor does the UT want to be in this whole complex of society? As long as the industry is driven by profit maximization, we should ask ourselves the question how are we in that game? Do we want to compete with the industry
- should ask ourselves the question how are we in that game? Do we want to compete with the industry that is profit driven? He is not quite sure if this supports the sustainability thought of Shaping 2030 because the real question is, what kind of actor does the UT want to be.

 The Board is convinced that you can make an impact as an independent university. Therefore you always
- need your partners. The Board and the Council agreed upon the fact that for the time being the capacity problem has to be solved as indicated in the document. Next to that the Council requests an organization plan that elaborate how the tasks of SBD are being organized. We have to start with this process. Meijer would also like to see a good analyses of the problem, as part of the organization plan. As the Board has agreed on these two commitments, the Council decides to give his approval to the future development plan of SBD.

18. Any other business

395

400

415

420

440

445

Riaz raises the question whether the Board would consider a Dutch minor in the curriculum. Palstra explains that non-Dutch speakers have the possibility to learn Dutch at the UT as there are sufficient facilities available. He has not considered a minor Dutch before. However, students are being emerged to remain active in learning the Dutch language not only as students but in the community. A minor has to be based on the usual criteria for new minors. Although it is a bit late, Palstra welcomes the idea. This might be the right time to intensify this, although it will be difficult to implement – also because of ILO's which concern all students at the UT. For students who already struggle with the English language, this will be a problem. According to the chairman the culture context is also important.

450

460

19. Written Questions Software Systems UR 19 - 167

The Board reports in regard to the failure of an important IT systems, that the UT has an IT emergency procedure that starts right away when an emergency takes place. A team of IT specialists address the problem as it occurs and also performs an evaluation if the situation takes place. The focus is to repair 455 the problem in a more structural way if needed. So, there is a procedure and a team of specialists that repair the damage or the cause of the deficit and we evaluate the failure in the system, to make sure that structural improvements are being made. There is also a specific plan for digital testing where solutions are described regarding malfunctioning. LISA also pre-thinks what could happen when certain situations occurs, procedures are in place. The IT-department has standard procedures for cancellation or moving of an exam due to unforeseen circumstances. There are rules of regulations of the Board of Examiners during written tests and exams. In which uniform rules are laid down for how to act in case of an emergency during an exam. These rules do apply for all Examination Boards.

20. Closure

The chairman closes the meeting at 11:30 am. 465