

## MINUTES 143<sup>RD</sup> FC MEETING – 6 DECEMBER 2012

### Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Rik Hendriks (STAR)	Frank van der Kruk	Joy Kearney
Lizzy Veldt	Anne van de Graaf		
Marnix de Kool	Peter Roosenboom		
Marlies Koolhaas			
Niall Deasy			
Jan Sirks			
Pascal Redaoui			

### 1. Opening

Juup opens the 143<sup>rd</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

There are no announcements.

### 5. Update Master redesign

Anne explains that the intake in masters is growing in external students, internal is stable. We do not want to grow in quantity but in quality. We look at where we can select. Legislation is changing which results in new opportunities. The GPA obligation may cease to exist. We want to get a feeling for how this works. It is still a soft form of selection; GMAT of 600 or GPA of 7.0. Externals need a minimum GPA of 7.0 plus GMAT. Finance is a logical choice. It is the programme that draws very well externally. Peter Rosenboom adds that it improves the quality of our programme too. Thomas asks what happens if not all places are filled. Would they stay open or be filled by internals who do not meet requirements? Anne replies that they would allow in more externals. We usually close admissions in March. Fewer than 300 applications for the Finance Master is unlikely to happen. Thomas asks if we introduce criteria that tell our internals they are not up to standard, are there measures we can take? Anne refers to N=N; there will be a number of students that will get rejected. Thomas states that the study time in the statistics course increased markedly in 2011 and he wonders if bad performing students also increase in quality. Anne replies that we don't know this. Thomas feels a better distinction is needed between internal and external students. Anne answers we are looking at internal vs. external students in general, not only for Finance. Pascal asks if there are specific grades finance courses looked at on programme level. Anne replies that the general GPA was just as good an indicator.

Juup claims that prof. Peek said they are not very happy with the pilot and he thinks it might imply that the student intake are a little less motivated. Anne replies that Frank Hartmann has these concerns as well. We need to make sure it is correctly communicated to students. Groningen and Tilburg also have suitable Masters if students are not accepted. Juup feels that the worries accounting has are realistic; they will be more affected than other RSM programmes. Anne claims accounting is in agreement, despite what Eric Peek says. To make a programme

selective when there are not enough students would be ridiculous. Juup thinks this could incur a drop in quality too. The government is not very reliable on education legislation yet. What will it mean for policies here if Finance remains a selective programme and you get a split between Master programmes that are selective and those that are not? Anne thinks many people would be very unhappy about this, but then a whole new situation arises. Juup asks if they you considered alternatives such as Honours Masters. Anne answers that such plans are being discussed, but it is quite an undertaking. Duisenberg has very close ties with employers and could attract young high flyers. A GPA of 8.5 is required as well as GMATs of above 700. It is too niche in terms of talent. Peter hopes to increase self-selection among students, but this was not the case.

Juup asks what the criteria would be to abort the pilot. Anne answers if a very large number fail to qualify. That would be problematic, because we don't want to disappoint our Bachelors students. Juup asks what the set of criteria would be. Peter replies to shorten time it takes to finish a programme, which puts burden on the departments to improve the quality of the programmes. Anne adds that time is of essence in Finance. Higher satisfaction of students is the aim. Juup asks not the GPA itself? Anne replies it will be tricky to figure out if the requirements would rise in a programme. If the GPA is dropped, it would be a reason to conclude a pilot failed. Niall worries about internal Bachelors are being not successful and this having implications for the Bachelor programme. Maybe this is a larger problem than just the GPA. Marlies asks if this is the idea to implement selective master in 2014. Anne confirms; this is why we require FC advice.

Thomas thinks this might be against European law. You need to go for a 70% rule across the board. Juup suggests to poll among masters to find out how they feel about it. Lizzy asks if it is a pilot in terms of if it succeeds it will be implemented for other programmes too. Juup thinks it needs to be put on paper. Marlies feels smaller programmes are concerned that if it is implemented, they will be too small to survive. Don't set absolute standard but set a relative standard. Niall claims that in Austria there has to be at least one 'doorstroom' master. Juup claims you don't want first and second tier masters. Jan mentions that the pressure on lecturers to grade higher increases too. Marlies thinks there is a really high chance it will change in future. Jan feels that students' performance improves with N=N and they have that GPA, but there are still students who are not fit for the master. Juup asks FC members what arguments should be included in letter of advice. Pascal suggests everyone send small points and then he will send it to him for the completion of the letter. What is plan B if the pilot doesn't work? Marlies thinks all points of concern discussed today should be included in the letter of advice.

## **6. Update BIT reorganisation**

Juup asks Jan Willem and Frank if they need support from the FC. Thomas asks what the implications would be. Frank replies that all people working at BIT are not feeling more insecure but they have to wait. The formal reorganisation plan has to be discussed with the faculties and then it goes to the CvB and the faculty councils. Economics has given very relevant comments, some with too much detail. They interfered with salary scales and positions at SSC. Frank is discussing this with responsible parties in all faculties. The economics ICT person does not see any problems and thinks we can move forward quite quickly. Juup asks if it isn't too late now to discuss what is/isn't ICT costs. Frank says yes, but we needed extra costs to improve the ICT processes and CRM. For information management processes to work well, we need to professionalize the ICT process. It will cost some money, but we will earn it back later on. It is mainly transition costs and one-time costs. If the budget goes over, people will still do the same work as before. Frank trusts Wouter Drinkwaard on this, but other parties are not so reliable. We have to keep the service going. Marlies asks what the next steps are. Frank hopes to have a new update on the reorganisation in January 2013. He doesn't know about formal lines of communication to the faculty councils and employees, but he is transparent on it and willing to share on informal basis. Juup says we talked about it in October and things were running smoothly and now its stalling. Frank acknowledges Juup's concerns;

that is also his concern. Frank is getting quite impatient. He did not hear much from the reorganisation team, suggested getting it going in order to speed up the process and they agreed but are not proactive in this. Juup thinks we will need to be a little more patient.

Jan asks what kind of new processes in ICT Frank is talking about. Frank explains that we all make a year plan but it never runs smoothly; people with the biggest mouth get most capacity normally. We should give priority to people who need it. Therefore it is important to define proper escalation agreements. Professional procedures of information management will be implemented. Jan is afraid the discussion will lead to lowering quality in support. Frank replies it is very important to specify the level of support. Standardization of service means some people may see it as lowering quality. Jan thinks the survey in BB is running gives potential in teaching, but nobody knows how it works. They say don't do it because it costs more. Frank says concerns in BB will be discussed, but all services now will be offered in the new situation. Jan says if you have a problem now and need support you have to go to central. Don't fix the level now, because it will change. Juup thinks no new distinctions should be made between customized services which will burden us with extra costs. Frank says all services by BIT are included in the report and all will be given after the reorganization. Juup wonders if it should not be that BIT was hampered by the restrictions in terms of customized services. Processes may change for BB, but not from one day to another. There will be a discussion beforehand. Juup feels coordination costs due to the transition should not affect RSM's budget.

## **7. Any other business**

- *The MT meeting structure has changed*

Frank explains that was needed because it was not as effective as they wanted. The new structure entails the Executive Board consisting of Steef, Gerrit and Frank, and the Board of Directors who are department chairs and deans of research and education, CARS. FC meetings clash with the Strategic Platform meetings. The regulations are actualised at the moment, including a new BBR and department regulations which should be judged by the FC. Juup asks if the faculty regulations include department regulations and if we have the right of consent to that. Frank will discuss that in the first quarter of 2013. Juup feels some pressure, because the PACs are part of the Faculty Regulations. We have some demands with respect to these. It would be advisable to get these processes aligned. Frank states that a formal governance structure should be implemented as soon as possible. The new regulations will not be in place for the next five years. If there are new committees, the regulations need to be adjusted. Juup says it should be the other way around; last official regulations are from 1999. Frank will ensure it happens every year.

- *BIC will be integrated into the UB: Lilian is integrating this with UB*
- *Historical split between BV and Faculty*

They are going to integrate some of the departments. The goal is to be more one school; it is not for efficiency only. There should be one CRM, because alumni sometimes are in separate systems. Juup suggests that these are not considerations resulting from financial situation at the BV. Marlies asks if this has to do with the CIS project of BV 2013 issues. Frank replies that one integrated CRM is desirable. Marlies mentions that Arnout Monster has a really good CRM system. Frank answers we need to balance all the systems in the school; there are other good systems being used.

- Pascal says Sharmayne wants someone to take over writing a response to Dean.

## **8. Closure**

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

Next FC meeting 10 January 2013 10.30 am in T03-42.

**To do before the next meeting**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
Finance selective master	Write a letter of advice on making MSc. F&I a selective master	Juup, Pascal