

NEWSLETTER

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

All documents can be downloaded by clicking here

The agenda for the consultative meeting of March of the Executive Board and the University Council was relatively short.

The main discussion was about the new educational model, in this newsletter an image of the discussion and the opinions will be given. Next to this the concept Guideline Education and Examination Regulations (OER) was discussed. Finally in this newsletter attention will be given to the coming student-elections of the UCouncil.

Reorganizing, yes or no?

In September the Board requested an advice whether the planned organizational changes at the Operational Audit department should be considered a reorganization. This change of the organization would mean the dismissal of five employees. The Board thought that this is not a reorganization, since it only affected few employees and a reorganization procedure would take a long time. In the newsletter of September 2012 we remarked that the UCouncil advised to mark this as a reorganization for the following four reasons:

1) The difference in social support for the concerned employees is large. When considered a reorganization they can get active counseling when reassigned, and can get access to re-schooling or professional development including mediation to a new job outside the UT. 2) The procedure for reorganization provides a frame in which changes in tasks can be described transparently. 3) This reasoning of the Board makes it possible to implement multiple small changes without considering it a reorganization. This greatly decreases the legal position of the personnel concerned. 4) The motivation to reduce the personnel at OA is motivated by the agreements with the ministry about the total overhead. The Board stated that they didn't want to follow this advice, steering towards a potential dispute.

In the past half a year the difference in view hasn't changed. For the UCouncil this meant that it was time to speak out loud that here lies a dispute with the Board. This opens the way for a independent dispute-committee to provide a binding statement. In the past meeting the Board however stated that they wouldn't change Operational Audit in the previously proposed way anymore. With this statement the Board withdrew her plans and the dispute is thus gone. This means that a normal reorganizational procedure including Operational Audit could still be an option in the future.

The New Educational Model

The new education model has been a hot topic for quite some time at the UT. During the last meeting between Executive Board and University Council this led to refusal of the proposed plans, to the disappointment of the Board. The UCouncil had and still has some clear arguments for this refusal which have been expressed multiple times now. Arguments with which the Board did to little according to the UCouncil.

To get a good idea of the current state of affairs it is wise to look back at the past cycle. In the cycle of February the UCouncil received the Note *Future Structure of Education* of 7 January for consent. Important aspects of this note were the formal organization of education using clusters and the creation of the new function of Educational Director per cluster, which would stand next to the Study Director per study. In the past newsletter we concluded the following:

"The University Council started the meeting with the Executive Board with the position that the council would reject the plan. In this meeting the Board couldn't convince the UCouncil, afterwards the Board asked not to give their final statement yet, but to give the Board the opportunity to discuss this further. The Council answered that they were willing to provide this option, but that it would need to be a new note with a clearly different approach."

The objections of the UCouncil were (and still are!) about five main topics:

The proposed structure of education has an unwanted splitting in the (management) responsibilities as a consequence. For the studies of GZW (Health Sciences), BIT and TBK (Technical Business Administration) this structure results in a complex situation: the dean from MG (Management and Governance) cannot fulfill his legal responsibility for the study since another dean makes the decisions; the participation has decreased power since the FC (Faculty Council) of another faculty will be making the decisions about these studies, which means the students and employees are no longer represented in the council that decides about them. Furthermore, the governance of the complete UT is currently being debated, it is still uncertain how this fits the total picture.

The proposed organization is meant for the bachelor-studies within the TOM framework. It is unclear in what way the Masters will be managed and how the management of the current Bachelor studies (with a curriculum that will exist for at least two more years) will be done.

Looking at the responses from the faculty councils and the educational committees this plan lacks sufficient support in the organization.

The Board thus withdrew her appeal for consent and stated that they would create a changed proposal. The UCouncil responded that this needed to be a fundamentally different proposal.

During the last consultative meeting of March 27th that new proposal has been discussed several times (starting February 20st) with a delegation of the UCouncil. The final conclusion was that this piece was insufficient, since there were no real changes that took away the concerns mentioned above.

Since there were little fundamental differences between the pieces of January 7th and March 12th this was to be expected.

The Board however responded that they were "heavily disappointed" in the negative attitude of the UCouncil for this proposal, and thought it "shameful" in what way the UCouncil acted in the prior meetings. The council explicitly distances itself from these labels. At the first informative meeting late 2012 the council clearly stated they wouldn't support these plans. As described above in earlier formal meetings (the cycle of February 2013) the council already stated they were unanimously opposed to the proposal. In the meetings that followed however, the Board used the old, rejected piece as a base for further meetings. The final document that the Board handed to the UCouncil has been changed to a certain extent, but not fundamentally. Also the Board stated that the alternative to "organize education by faculties" was not considered. This while the UCouncil clearly asked to look for alternatives. That the Board furthermore thinks that the constructive position of the UCouncil in the meetings and suggestions for the future as a "attained compromise" is far from the truth. The UCouncil stated

from the beginning that they didn't like the note and that the Board was clearly asked to come with a fundamentally different plan. That the Board afterwards didn't follow this clear advice is her choice, and her wrong explanation is her responsibility.

The UCouncil concludes that the discussion on a new educational organization has stranded on fundamental differences of view. This is not because of differences in the goals, since the UCouncil also sees the need for a effective and efficient educational organization, certainly in these times of large changes in the (Bachelor) education. The UCouncil however thinks that there are other ways to attain these goals, without creating a complex second matrix-organization, a cubic-structure so to say, with all its inherent problems. Furthermore a more transparent organization, fitting the faculty structures and study-management/Educational Directors that follows the WHW more clearly is of importance as well. An organization without a complex split between (management) responsibilities for bachelor-studies/croho positions. The Council is open to discuss these alternatives with the Board.

Want to comment? Mail to info@uraad.utwente.nl



Elections students UCouncil

Soon there will be new elections for the students of the University Council. Currently two parties have subscribed: PvdUT and UReka.

The elections will take place on the 27th till 31st of May.



About the University Council

The University Council is the central participation body of the UT and discusses regularly with the Executive Board. The University Council contains of 18 members; nine staff-members and nine students. The University Council has a say in the policy of the UT at the central level. In the council currently three parties are present: Campus Coalitie, UReka and PvdUT.

The current members in council are:

Herbert Wormeester (chairman), Gert Brinkman, Frank van den Berg, Victor de Graaff, Jörgen Svensson, Winnie Gerbens-Leenes, Jeroen Tijhuis, Anton Stoorvogel, Niek Tax, Jelmer Boter, Marc Hulsebosch, Roy Stroek, Barend Köbben, Robin Buijs, Rien Lagerwerf, Henno Wolswinkel, Luuk de Vries and Geert Olthuis.

Visit our website for more information:

<http://www.utwente.nl/uraad/>

To receive or cancel this newsletter, send an email to:

info@uraad.utwente.nl