

MINUTES 144TH FC MEETING – 10 JANUARY 2013

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Rik Hendriks (STAR)	Frank van der Kruk	Joy Kearney
Lizzy Veldt	Marna Bakker		Umit Duman
Marnix de Kool	Ad Scheepers		
Marlies Koolhaas			
Niall Deasy			
Jan Sirks			
Pascal Redaoui			
Sharmayne Schneiderberg			
Thomas Eichentopf			

1. Opening

Juup opens the 144th FC meeting at 10:30 am.

2. Agenda

Agenda point 7 moves up to point 5 on the agenda. There are no questions or further points to be added to the agenda.

3. Minutes

The minutes are approved with Thomas's point to be amended.

4. Announcements

Frank has two announcements about the integration of the library BIC and UB and the start of the reorganization procedure. The plan was made by Lilian and Gert Hogers. The reorganization involves two people. The plan is that it stays as it is with more student workplaces. It will be finished next year or the year after and then we will consider it again. Marlies asks what will happen to the theses and documents at BIC. Frank does not know yet whether it will involve digitization or what will happen to Marianne, who works for BIT, but a place may be suitable at UB for her. When Frank has the plan, he will discuss it with the FC.

By the end of 2012, Frank received a new ICT reorganization plan which will be discussed with Jan Willem Huising. On 17 January, a meeting with BV2013, involving all faculties, will take place. After this meeting, if the plan is approved by CvB, it will go to all FCs. Hopefully it will be available by the FC meeting on 7 February, but if time is too short it will be March. Frank does not think BIT has received all formal letters, but then they have been informally informed instead. There are chances for people to develop themselves. Marlies says there was uncertainty at BIT and they were waiting for a formal chat. Frank replies that if there is uncertainty then he wants to know about it. This uncertainty is perhaps more a case of dissatisfaction that it took so long.

5. Bachelor curriculum N=N update

The FC thinks there are impressive figures stated in the report. Ad Scheepers hopes everyone read the document thoroughly. N=N did not drop out of thin air; it is in addition to other measures introduced. The measures of last year have had their effect. Procrastination in regular exams has been decreased significantly and the performance of students has been improved a lot. The group of students likely to complete in one year is about 65%, which will have completed all courses or all but one course. The IBA group performed very well in the last year, which meets

our criteria. We monitor the progress very closely and we have regular contact with lecturers. Additionally, student advisors keep close tabs on the groups and especially the risk group.

Jan says the report is mainly about numbers and he misses quality. It is mainly based on bonus points; a colleague was ashamed about the bonus points. Why is it not in the report? Students also said they are not impressed; they see it as a cosmetic test. The impression is that it is just about the numbers, students with calculation behaviour are not improving. Ad confirms these criticisms are not in the report; next 21 January there will be a meeting with teachers to get a clearer view of this. The FC thinks Ad should really look at this. Ad explains what we tried to do was making students more active in study and attendance. It's not just cosmetic.

Jan claims the grades are inflating. Some students under the limit could still pass due to the inflation. I know these numbers are not correct. Ad replies we have no information on other courses, only 'inleiding bedrijfskunde'. We have to look at it if it has a negative effect, and if so we should change it next year. Juup asks if it is possible to analyse these figures to see how the students scored. Jan feels quality is what is important for the image and not quantity. Ad says these are only quantitative figures yet, we have not had time to get formal result on qualitative results. Marna mentions that lecturers from mathematics want to analyse it together with the students. It is not complete yet and therefore not in the report. Juup mentions that the pass rate of the organisational behaviour 'gedrag en organisatie' has dropped, in other courses there were no significant changes.

Ad explains that these figures are for the first trimester and students are reaching the 40 ECTS. The reason we introduced N=N is because a lot of students think 40 ECTS is enough. The procrastination occurs in term two and three usually. Thomas thinks if students now have an ECTS load, the problem is just postponed until after the summer break. Ad feels there is concern about a possible dip. Ad says that procrastination in the first year is very important, because those who are faster in first year will continue to go faster in the second and third year. Juup says the general idea is clear, but specific information on why there is a drop in certain courses still lacks. Marna explains there is a new lecturer on this course, which could have an impact. We are happy to see in mathematics that it went down a lot. Ad states that the mathematics scores are predictive of the overall performance.

Pascal says that our meeting with Programme Management we said maths is a good measurement and numbers now show it's a success, but for IBA it is not the same. Ad thinks it is really important to look at the quality, because we don't want this to decrease. Juup states the FC has to wait till 21 January for results. Marlies states this is a pilot but what is the pilot all about? Ad explains it is a pilot but if we don't meet our targets it will be changed and if it works it will be continued. Thomas states let's assume we find there will be a dip in year two or three, will the reaction then be to stop or continue the pilot to the second and third year? By repeating it, you are just continuing an ineffective measure. Ad answers that all students who complete the first year almost always complete the programme. Pascal feels it must be rated on qualitative basis and it is important to have both targets in mind.

6. Making MSc Finance & Investments selective for internal students 2014-2015

-

7. Status Faculty Regulations

Frank explains that the Faculty Regulations are composed of three parts. The 'beheerinstructie' arranges mandates to directors in organization, faculty regulations and department regulations including mandates and regulation for department chairs. The first draft will be ready by the end of this month or beginning of next month. The formal process will be put in place after Steef and Gerrit have approved. Juup claims we have a veto right on

the faculty regulations. Frank wants to see if there will be any changes necessary. Juup explains we want to concentrate on the part regarding the function of programme committees. Frank doesn't want to stop the updating of regulations, because it would be very disappointing if there was a veto as is now. Frank wants it to be formalized in a professional way regarding the way things are working now. Marlies asks when it will be ready. Frank replies beginning of February. Juup asks Frank if he wants the FC to accept the status quo as it is. Frank answers that they can only be formalized when the discussion is finished. If we constantly develop and update, then it will never be complete. Juup says yes, it is normal to keep developing it and if the FC does not approve then we have to veto it if it does not satisfy the needs. It is a normative instrument. Frank says we want to get to an updated version now and then the discussions will lead to delays in approving them. Juup wants to ensure participation means students and the staff have a say in the decisions being made. We, the FC, were not satisfied with the PACs had enough power. Frank asks if he should stop now, not update it and wait until the discussion about PACs is finished. This is unprofessional, Frank thinks. Marlies states that the TER is set up in this way: it is updated from academic year to academic year as well. Is this not how it should be? Juup confirms; you implement new points and implement them in the Faculty Regulations and by doing so you are bypassing the approval of the FC instead of asking before implementing those new points. It is being shoved down our throats. We already indicated that we were not satisfied with the situation indicated in the existing regulations. Thomas asks if it is possible to accept them with the point on the PACs being still under discussion. Juup states there will be a permanent delay on it pending our approval. Thomas thinks you can combine it with a deadline for consent. Pascal feels it is just postponing the problem. Juup claims that the law requires clarity in the mandate on students and staff. Thomas adds if we don't have them updated, things will still be set up with or without our consent. Juup thinks it's a package deal; it is approved in total or not at all. Thomas asks if it isn't the same if we still have the regulations, but with a part of it pending decision. Juup states it is essential that the school has faculty regulations in order to operate. Frank tries to professionalise the processes, so it doesn't feel good if the regulations cannot be approved or updated. Frank thinks it is blocking improvements. Marlies also does not agree and feels Thomas's suggestion is a good one. Juup thinks the regulations should not describe a future situation; the reality should be in line with the rules, not the other way around.

Pascal asks what the problem is to finish the discussion first. Juup states that Frank simply can't stop because he doesn't agree. Rules have to be there and that is the law. We are already in conflict with the law. Pascal adds that it is also a legal requirement that students have a say in the educational programmes. Jan feels an adjustment of regulations should be standard every year. We only can agree if we have honest discussions. Not a good way, does not agree with Frank's suggestion. Frank states we don't have any faculty regulations at the moment and that is the problem. Juup asks what is changing in the regulations apart from participation. Frank replies lots of mandates and sub-mandates.

Juup states that the 2010 regulations by Guido Berens were not approved and stamped. Our amendments were only related to participation. Juup says that changes to the master thesis etc. must be commented on by valid programme committees and this needs to happen well before the new academic year in September. A programme committee without students would be contrary to the law. Pascal adds that programme management appointed students to the committee for IBA. Thomas mentions there is not a lot of time left to think about it. So do we have an internal deadline? Juup asks if they are in place or if there are not PACs for all Master programmes. We should be able to know who the members are of these committees. If it is not clear, then the conclusion is that they are not in place. There were three PACs in place now from January 1st. We have a bachelor PAC and a master PAC, but who are the members? Are the old ones still functioning? Frank replies that Eric is the one to answer this. Juup thinks the FC should ask the Dean who the members are. Frank thinks the FC should meet with Anne and Eric, otherwise the discussion will go on forever. Marlies asks if we aren't still waiting for response. Juup says that the

Dean replied that he would provide a new regulation. Lizzy asks why we can't get the newest draft version and just discuss it and make amendments. Juup replies that the ball is not in the court of the FC but in the court of the Board. Frank feels this school is not served by delaying processes. If there is no reply, you have to come back to the party involved. Jan asks why the Dean is not here, because he should be involved in this discussion. Frank says he wants to ensure Steef is here next for this discussion.

Marlies feels we need to make it clear for the new PACs that students are needed in it, because of the new thesis trajectory. Juup says there is no time to leave this point hanging. Frank believes in small committee meetings, a few FC members with Steef, Anne etc. Marlies asks who is willing to participate. Juup, Sharmayne, Jan and Niall will.

There are some minor concerns and some serious concerns concerning the master thesis change. Some programmes cannot miss the number of students. Juup thinks it would be good to have broader discussion with the school, waiting for further replies and waiting for further figures from Anne and Ad. Marlies says the new report will be available soon. Niall feels passing rates were higher before, in 2008-9, but has dropped since then.

8. Any other business

No further topics for discussion.

9. Closure

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

Next FC meeting 7 February 2013 10.30 am in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Topic	Task	Person Responsible
Faculty regulations	Schedule meeting asap with the Dean, Eric, Anne, Juup, Sharmayne, Jan and Niall	Joy