MINUTES 158TH FC MEETING ±5 JUNE 2014

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Jan Sirks	Carla Dirks-van den Broek	Abe de Jong	
Chandro Kandiah	Anne van de Graaf	Eric Waarts	
Jelle de Vries	Finn Wynstra		
Miruna Carlugea	Bas Louwman (STAR)		
Jules Maitrepierre	Klaas Wassens		

1. Opening

Jan opens the 158th meeting at 10.35 am.

2. Agenda

The MT is wondering why the PC issue is missing from the agenda. As already asked in January, the FC is waiting for a concrete proposal, but so far only the white paper has been provided. The FC feels that their requests regarding the PCs have been formulated and have been clearly stated already a year ago. MT states that Model 1 from the white paper is their concrete proposal as it is indicated in the cover letter; however, from the standpoint of the FC, Model 1 should not be the proposal. As direct representation was seen as the most important issue during other meetings, Anne indicates that Model 1 will solve the issue.

The FC feels that discussions will make things more complicated. As Model 1 now only represents a point in the white paper, a clear proposal should be provided so that the council can vote on it. Anne suggests rephrasing the letter, so that the white paper is not considered anymore, but that Model 1 will be introduced as the concrete proposal. A PC that has 12 masters in one representative body will be too big for proper representation, and this is how Model 1 is designed. Eric finds this structure feasible and the board checked with the chair of the PC and he is in favour of having all masters structured like this as they all have the same curriculum. As all programmes are available to discuss issues together, this arrangement can be regarded as efficient.

The FC concludes that the PC issue cannot be further discussed during this meeting. Anne proposes that the board can reach a compromise by offering Model I as the concrete proposal including the new text of the Faculty Regulations (the original text provided by the FC was kept, but small adjustments were made).

3. Minutes

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

One of the action points concerned the scientific integrity policy. Finn Wynstra, present during this meeting, offers more information about this. In the fall of last year, the signing of a pledge by a university-wide working group was recommended, a proposal which was eventually accepted. The integrity declaration (as it is called now) is a capstone for a training and awareness process. It has been agreed that the recommendations would be implemented by different schools. For example, within ERIM, the intention is that 80% of the researchers will sign the declaration by the end of December. This code also applies to non-researchers: discussions with the Dean at RSM and also ESE will be conducted in order to find ways to have these people sign the pledge.

Within RSM, the idea is to have a training and awareness session on integrity, for instance, by using the Dilemma Game. This will be part of the new faculty orientation programme. There is a standard text which all schools are