

## MINUTES 138<sup>TH</sup> FC MEETING – 14 JUNE 2012

### Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Dominique Campman	Eric Waarts	Joy Kearney
Jan-Joost Liebrecht	Jan Willem Huising		
Marlies Koolhaas	Anne van de Graaf		
Shiko Ben Menahem			
Jan Sirks			
Sharmayne Schneiderberg			
Eefke van der Meer			

### 1. Opening

Juup opens the 138<sup>th</sup> FC meeting at 10:30 am.

### 2. Agenda

There are no questions or further points to be added to the agenda.

### 3. Minutes

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

### 4. Announcements

The FC makes two announcements:

1. The FC didn't hear anything about the budget for 2013 yet;
2. The FC is concerned about the staffing and the capacity of the exam committee. We have asked for information in advance, but not received it or received it too late.

### 5. Teaching and Examination Regulations (TERs)

The FC received the TERs for the Master programmes 2012-2013. The FC requests to receive the documents earlier next year to ensure the FC could discuss the documents properly. The documents were received too shortly before this meeting, so this topic will be discussed in the FC meeting next 10 July.

### 6. Update ICT reorganisation

Jan Willem explains that the operation for the ICT is rather impactful. Dominique says that they are now in the second phase; the preparation phase. Next, the plans will be written, like for example the reorganisation plan. Quartermasters were appointed to oversee project. Phase 2 should be completed in October. It is going deeper into the material (e.g. SLAs). After October they are ready for the reorganisation. There is a transition plan in place per faculty, because there are different needs for different faculties. We will look at this model in October. Where is the organisation and innovation? This was a question about this project.

Juup mentions BIT and the lack of communication. How is this organised with regard to the reorganisation? Dominique answers that they call this the function follower ('functievolver'); each person will be informed of the changes in a letter what their new duties will be. Jan Willem adds that it will be discussed with the individual employees regarding how they feel and what they want. Juup claims that we don't want people to feel they are reapplying for their own job. Jan Willem ensures that they pay attention to the communication.

Marlies asks if there is any news about the move and the accommodation. What is the sequence for the move? RSM first, last or else? Jan Willem answers that there is no preference. Marlies asks what the present feeling is among staff. Jan Willem explains that they are concentrating on communication to them. Dominique adds that they want to communicate faster, but CvB still needs to send the formal contract. The formal reorganisation is coming in October.

### **7. Nominal = Normal (N=N)**

The official reaction on N=N is still to come from the Dean. Juup doubts whether we represent the school sufficiently. Eefke wonders where the broad support is Steef mentions. Marlies asks what will happen now. Jan says we have given negative advice. Juup answers the Dean has indicated that he is not going to follow our advice, but he must now explain why. Juup feels we have not been listened to. The collective hardship clause (60/60 rule) is not desirable. Students have to submit an individual study plan; this is a lot of work. Juup says we will not say we are going to an arbitration committee. Jan thinks we need to say this cannot be done in the same way next time.

### **8. Taskforce Master Redesign**

Juup asks Anne to shortly introduce the topic. Anne explains that what is accessible and achievable has been examined to find the best model. At the moment, we have a low output. Eric adds that we may achieve our objective next year, but we are not sure. In the past forty years it is never been a problem. A bit of delay is no problem, but a serious delay costs 3,000 euros per student. Redesign is needed because a slight repair is not possible. Anne says that the process of coaching is now being used. Juup expresses his concern about how the extra workload would be handled. Anne confirms that the grade cap is off. The 15 August deadline will be fixed and not flexible. Eric says that they maybe we will ask for accreditation for a longer trajectory. Juup says if it is a pass/fail deadline, then we should grade on 15 August. Exceptional circumstances can only be maximum 5% to 10%. Eric spoke to Finance and they are satisfied. Juup asks if cases of a fail should begin again with a new subject.

The process of coaching will be organised by departments. Anne explains that it is organised to ensure group processes and students give a presentation to their group, which is good for presentation skills. Marlies asks what about international students in autumn trajectory. Anne replies that this group will be more incidental students at that time; it is a more process-driven trajectory. They have to just be here. Eefke thinks it is strange that those who fail and miss the second deadline have to wait for 6 months before beginning again. Anne explains that better planning is encouraged so as to avoid this. Fine is in third year and not in the first instance. Eric states that if you want to do a work placement, you should decide it in advance so you can do the second year trajectory. Anne says they want to give students the chance to do the Master and also enjoy themselves at the same time (e.g. by doing extracurricular activities, internship). Shiko asks why you don't introduce an Excellence trajectory. Eric and Anne state they have that in mind. Eric explains that an honours programme already exists in some Master programmes. The Master theses that take longer are not generally better than those submitted earlier. Jan thinks finances play an important role as some departments provide financial rewards. Anne says that the motive of teachers to stimulate talented students is high. 5% of the students per year are considered to be talented.

Eric says that the co-reader is sometimes more the coach than the real coach is. Anne explains that they are looking at role of an assessor towards the end of the trajectory. Eefke thinks it is good to still have co-reader to act as second or alternative coach. Shiko feels that if there is only an assessor, then it is too late to change anything. Eefke asks what happens if the thesis is rejected, simply due to not having a co-reader. Juup states that it has happened that co-readers were found too late and this had a major impact; e.g. data was found to be incorrectly

processed. It is difficult to find good co-readers. Teachers are so specialised, they could be distracted by one particular result; there is a lack of expertise. Anne states that this is not definitively decided yet, it is just a proposal. A cluster that is not too narrow is what we need. Eefke asks what about the availability of coaches during the summer. Anne answers that they have taken this into account and that they are made aware of it. Internet is always available under normal circumstances. Juup says that there are also conferences, courses etc. which teachers attend during the summer. The primary objective is to raise the 25% figure. What about information meetings? Anne replies that the departments will now be individually informed about these changes so we will be informing everyone by September. Juup thinks we have to be careful it is not one-way traffic to the students. Reparative after September is now being dealt with. Jan feels it is a whole different story to what we originally thought. It is clearly communicated and not yet implemented. Why scrap co-readers? Juup thinks Finance has an enormous capacity problem. Marlies asks why not a system of five times coach five times co-reader. It trickles down to the AIOs eventually. Juup states that we need to talk to other groups in September/October to see what the results are of their opinions on this. Shiko thinks we just need to check that everyone knows enough. Jan Joost states that we should plan in a new meeting with Anne and Eric in September to check the status. The FC requests a timeline for the Master Redesign en Master thesis trajectory.

#### **9. Any other business**

No further topics for discussion.

#### **10. Closure**

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

**Next FC meeting 10 July 2012 10.30 am in T03-42.**

#### **To do before the next meeting**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
Training FC	Contact TAQT and communicate dates	Joy
July meeting	Plan FC meeting begin of July, invite Carla Dirks and Teun Hardjono	Joy
Exam committee	Contact Teun Hardjono	Jan-Joost
Procedures	Write a procedural letter to the Dean and cc to the University Council	Shiko, Juup
Master Redesign	Send the FC a timeline of the processes	Anne