Minutes 109th meeting Faculty Council FSW, November 23, 2015

Present
Mr. Dr. Jacko van Ast (Chairman)
Dr. Gera Noordzij (GN)
Dr. Huib Tabbers (HT)
Dr. Maartje Luijk (ML)
Suzanne Overbeeke (SO)
Christiaan Tieman (CT)
Enes Yigit (EY)
Evelien Schrijver (ES)
Valmir Xhemaili (VX)
Else Kappenberg (EK)
Adriana Vries (AV)
Puck Schiffers replaces Trude Michels (PS)

Faculty Board
Prof. dr. Henk van der Molen (The Dean)
Dr. Mariette de Jong (MdJ)
Mark Adriaans Msc (MA)
Jessica Dekkers-de Leeuw Msc (JD)
Maxime de Winter (MdW)

1. Opening
The Chairman opens the meeting at 15.05 PM and welcomes everybody. Unfortunately, Trude Michels is ill and is replaced by Puck Schiffers. Since Raquel Dos Santos is absent there is no reason to speak English, and everyone agrees to proceed in Dutch for once.

2. Approval agenda
Approved without changes.

3. Approval minutes meeting 108th dated September 21, 2015
The minutes have been approved with four small changes. Adriana Vries is missing in the attendance list and Dr. Maartje Luijk was spelled incorrectly. ML points out there is some inconsistency in the minutes regarding the way of referring to the Dean/HvdM. The Dean agrees with “Dean” as the vocative case. Furthermore, the Dean refers to page 2, point 5, 3rd line second paragraph and adds that the extra investments in the quality of Education will also be 6 million in 2015, instead of 5 mentioned in the minutes.

4. Announcements
The Chairman tells about the course “Effective meetings in English” which was very successful and useful.

The Dean announces that from the 1st of December two new endowed professors are appointed at BSK-SOC: Menno Fenger (0.2 fte), already associate professor at Public Administration, and Martijn van der Steen (0.3 fte). They are both associated with the “Nederlandse School voor Openbaar Bestuur” (NSOB).
5. **Decisions meeting of Management Faculty Board (FMO)**

The Chairman refers to the decision about the compensation for staff and council members when elected as a member of the FC. MdJ points out there is no EUR-guideline for this type of compensation. The proposal is based on information of other faculties. In the proposal employees will be compensated in hours (30 hours for council members and 40 hours for the chairman) and students by payment. The number of hours is based on 5 or 6 meetings annually. When it comes to support staff council members, their supervisor needs to be informed of the importance of the task and reserve time for this.

6. **Study loan resources (studievoorschotgelden)**

The Chairman notes that the time to react on the expenditure plan was told to be limited but that more time is needed to discuss the plan in more detail. He asks where the stated numbers come from and on which basis the distribution is made.

The Dean responds that the Faculty will receive extra resources from the student loan system resources (SLSR). The approval of the Faculty Council is needed before the expenditure plan can be submitted to the Executive Board to release resources. The sooner the approval the sooner the money can be allocated to benefit the quality of education.

**Timeline:**

- The first proposal from the 23rd of September for the SLSR was comprehensively discussed with and supported by the FMO members.
- Thereafter the systematics were discussed with the Executive Board. FSS had one of the most extensive proposals in relation to the other faculties. The Board asked to prioritize the investment plan for the SLSR in consultation with the FMO, resulting in the Supplementary Memorandum of the 8th of October.
- On the 5th of November the Executive Board submitted the scheme regarding pre-investments in educational quality. The letter of the Executive Board shows that resources for 2015 to 2017 are allocated to the faculties based on the number of students that would have received a student grant. This does not contain to international students. FSS accounts for 13.3% of all EUR students and based on the allocation clause therefore receives one-off 800.000 euros and structural an amount of 530.000 euros.
  - The Executive Board grants a total amount of 6 million for “quick wins” on short term, an amount of 4 million (in the years 2016 and 2017) for structural investments and an annual 2 million for innovations (Innovation Fund). The allocation of these amounts is based on the numbers of students involved in the loan system per faculty.
- On the 20th of November a further specification of spending the SLSR was sent to the Faculty Council.

The Chairman asks why there was chosen for these specific subjects for the study loan resources spending plan?

The Dean points out several reasons:

- Explicit link with the strategic memorandum higher education of the minister.
- Emphasis on “more hands in the classroom”.
- Extra structural formation regarding teaching staff.
GN asks what the deadline is for approval and submitting the proposal. MA answers that there are already students who started with their study without a student grant. Therefore the plans should be submitted as soon as possible to invest the money in educational quality and let the students benefit.

GN wants to know why EUC turned out to be less fortunate. MA explains that this is related to the number of international students and the fact EUC has no Master Studies.

GN asks whether, when making the allocation, the possible growth of EUC is taken into account. The Dean tells that the numbers are based on current numbers of students. We should keep in mind that the number of students can increase in the future. MdJ adds that this plan will be set for the upcoming 2 years (2016 and 2017).

AV states that when the proposal is approved current master students do not benefit from small-scale and intensive education. The planning is short-term, but the effect will become effective only next year.

HT asks how to deal with the fluctuation in student numbers in relation to the restructuring by the direct government funding and the allocation of educational tasks. The Dean explains that the plan and allocation is based on current student numbers and will be made available out of the Executive Boards own resources. In the long-term more resources will be released according to the Strategic Agenda of the minister. To prevent financial issues in case the long-term resources turn out to be lower than expected, we will for now hire new staff on temporary basis/fixed contracts only.

VX and ES state that money put in extra staff and smaller groups can improve the quality of education.

HT asks to what extent students were heard. The Dean explains that it is up to the directors of education to discuss the plan with the Programme Committees. EK states the Programme Committees have only been active since the beginning of this month. The Chairman says the committee in BSKSOC just gathered but did not discuss the topic.

**Proposition:** Submit the SLSR plan to the Programme Committees and afterwards to the Faculty Council.

**Deadline:** The aim is to present the plan around mid-December to the Executive Board.

**Approach:** The Dean will ask the Educational Directors to present the SLSR plan to the Programme Committees. The Directors will forward the feedback of the committees to the Dean who will forward it to the Faculty Council.

### 7. Faculty Regulations
The Dean points out that the Faculty Council has a right of approval when it comes to the Faculty Regulation. The Chairman asks to what extent the previous feedback has been taken into account. MA goes through the comments made by the Faculty Council on the 1st of December 2014 per article:

- Art. 3, sub. 10: advice adopted.
- Art. 4, sub. 2: advice adopted.
- Art. 7, sub. 2: advice adopted.
- Art. 7, sub. 3, under j: we agree that direct communications from the faculty board to staff can be necessary. The formulation of this article gives room for that.
- Art. 8, sub. 5: advice adopted.
Art. 9: we are aware of the special position of the dean EUC but do not see any governmental risks in the way the dean EUC is positioned in the faculty regulations.

Art. 10: the section covering the rights and tasks of professors follows from the law and is in the faculty regulations for reasons of transparency.

Art. 11, sub. 2: the Dean explains that educational directors have the same status as research directors. It is not always easy to find volunteers for the role of educational director, and we have great experiences with associate professors adopting the role of educational director with knowledge, skill and good results.

Art. 11, sub. 3: the Dean is responsible for appointing the research and educational directors. He aligns this decision with the department chair.

Art. 14, sub. 4: this clause can also be applied to other departments and is not limited to EUC.

Art. 15, sub. 2: the interpretation of the Faculty Council seems incorrect; the law states that at least one of the members of the examination committee should be involved with one of the programmes as a teacher. The law does not state that from each programme one teacher should be installed in the examination committee. In practice we do have one teacher representative from every discipline appointed in the examination committee.

Section 6: this section is in the regulations for transparency reasons and because the faculty director has a mandate as follows from the administrative instruction. This text does not pose the suggested risk of inflexibility; major changes in the support structure are difficult regardless of this section because they would need a formal reorganisation.

Art. 24, sub. 3: we do not understand this comment, we do not deem this clause unnecessary.

Art. 25, sub. 2: advice adopted.

Art. 26, sub. 2: advice adopted.

Art. 26, sub. 5: we do not feel for shortening this period. Of course, where possible, the Dean will always respond faster. Sometimes the complexity of an issue or the need for consultation with the council and/or stakeholders require extra time.

Art. 26, sub. 1: in our view this is the article that explicitly states that the Faculty Council is the participatory body when it comes to decisions or proposals of the Dean.

Art. 35: the gender issue is addressed in the text. Considering the composition of our staff, international and ethnic diversity in committees seems unrealistic.

AV has a question about article 27 lid 2: Why does EUC always have a seat? We prefer to have representatives of all departments. None of the current students is from psychology or pedagogy. Is it possible to make it mandatory for every faculty department to have 1 student and 1 staff seat in the Faculty Council? MA explains EUC has a different position for multiple reasons amongst others because of the physical distance from the campus making it harder for EUC staff and students to get elected in the Council. AV adds that when none of the students stands for election that is also fine but there needs to be a possibility. If they want, they can elect one. The Chairman says we have to list all the points and find out what the benefits could be. From a juridical perspective it is possible.

HT says that besides these points which we have discussed last year there were also points which were discussed in the FMO and as part of the reorganization. MA suggests to send a version of the
regulations to the council in which all changes are visible. The Chairman suggests to review the Faculty Regulation once more and go into it during the away day. The Dean emphasizes the importance of the eventual approval of the Faculty Regulations. The Chairman gives the affirmation to approve the Faculty Regulations as soon as possible.

8. Administrative instructions
The Dean points out that he submitted the Administrative instructions to the Faculty Council for information.

MA says the prevailing instruction is from 1998, therefore we were requested by JZ to use the EUR model and revise the instructions.

The Chairman concludes that the FC accepts the administrative instructions on notification.

9. Internationalization
AV tells there is a lot to do among students about internationalization. Many positive comments (regarding allure and ranking) but also some critical feedback. Last Monday (16th of November) the FSO took place with the student members from several Programme Committees. What mainly emerged was the poor level of English of some of the teaching staff. This prevails in the rest of the debate. On the one hand there is a lot of understanding, teachers did not grow up with the language like students did. On the other hand, as a student you expect that the lectures are given at an academic level. There is a difference between teaching in English and teaching well in English. What kind of tools or training is given to the teachers as a preparation of their classes/courses? Furthermore English taught master programmes are not necessarily international. The casuistry often relates to Dutch cases while many international students also expect international cases. Besides that, for some studies, like social studies, students are educated to become professionals in the Netherlands. They mainly want to optimize their Dutch academic language skills. The information material for prospects of public administration focuses on the Dutch dimension of the study. Lectures may be given in English.

When does a Master receive the label “international”? How can we make sure the learning material goes hand in hand with internationalization?

Concluding, the students are not against internationalization but make sure that:

- Informed and transparent choices are made.
- Expectations are managed.
- Courses are made international not only because it is financially attractive. There has to be an actual benefit for the student.

The Dean welcomes the feedback. He will discuss it with the Educational directors.

HT says the results of the feedback forms already confirm the poor level of English. He emphasizes the need for a decent level of English of the scientific personnel. Now there is only a mandatory English test for the support staff and not for the teaching staff. The suggestion is to introduce an English test for both.

ML suggests to include the “English level of teachers” as a regular component of the feedback form.

The Dean notes that the reason for not submitting teaching staff to an English test is because they have to publish scientific papers on a regular basis. Therefore it is assumed they have a certain level of English. CT says there is a clear difference between writing and speaking English. The Dean agrees with this point.
The Faculty Council suggests to invest in English language courses for teachers with the money for student loans.

10. Communication
The Chairman expresses high appreciation for the staff newsletter. Especially the financial part is very useful and clear. There are also some points where communication can be optimized, subjecting:

- **Relocation**
The Chairman says there is much confusion about the relocation. What is the current situation? MdJ tells what is published in the newsletter is all the information available at the moment. It is up to the departments now to make further decisions. As soon as there is a decision made about money, square meters and scenarios, we will let everyone know. HT asks what the background and impact is of the moving. MdJ tells that as a result of the reorganization different collaborations emerged. We need to take action otherwise we will run into high expenses.

CT asks how we are going to deal with potential growth? MdJ tells this depends on the decisions regarding money, square meters and scenarios. In the case of growth a tight fit between those three components can work to our disadvantage. The Dean underlines that we have to be thoughtful with the disposal of rooms. It is preferable to spend as little as possible on office space and more on resources and quality of education for students.

- **Website**
The Chairman says there is quite some old information on the website. MdJ tells the website is under construction. Educational Marketing is currently the leading perspective (e.g. consistency of information, Dutch-English translations, giving vibrant examples that give an insight into the world of the different bachelor and master studies). MdJ agrees the information about the faculty is sometimes outdated. Updating this specific information is included in the planning but does not have the highest priority at the moment.

JD adds that the research part and societal contribution will also be addressed. Preparatory to this a concept of the implementation plan for valorization will be presented to the Faculty Council.

- **OSEA transition**
The Chairman says the communication of the OSEA transition is not optimal. MdJ explains the OSEA transition trajectory is running. According to an earlier agreement the plan would be submitted to the Faculty Council within 6 months (from the 1st of July). Recently the sounding board group came together for the first time. For the sounding board members it is particularly important to keep short lines of communication. They are going to take a closer look on the service provision of OSEA; what are the several divisions offering at this moment and what is OSEA on faculty level going to offer?

The Chairman and HT suggest to communicate the procedure of the OSEA transition timely and introduce the members of the sounding board in the staff newsletter. MdJ says it is not always clear what information has already been communicated within the different departments. The Chairman suggests to take action towards the department boards.
- **Positions**
The Faculty Council would like to alter the sentence: “zoals de faculteitsraad wenst....”. It is the duty of the entire faculty to inform employees about vacancies. MdJ says she will take a critical look at the formulation.

- **Bilingual university**
The Chairman assesses we are not where we want to be yet. The Dean says it is a learning process which takes time.

**11. Other Business**
Nothing to discuss.

**12. Closure**
AV adds that for several programmes the exams contain a lot of language errors. The student delegation of the council will talk about this with the Examination Board.

GN asks what to do with the disappointing score of EUC in the Elsevier. ML adds this also applies for the BSc Psychology (from 1st to 5th position). How do we deal with this?

The Dean says he is discussing with the Dean EUC to make sure we do everything in our power to establish better results. The score is based on student opinions formulated some time ago. During that time improvements have been made but no feedback has been given about that yet. Current outcome would therefore probably be better.

The Chairman thanks everyone for their attendance and closes the meeting at 17.15 PM.