

MINUTES 132ND FC MEETING – 20 SEPTEMBER 2011

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Ad Scheepers		Joy Kearney
Marlies Koolhaas			
Sharmayne Schneiderberg			
Jan Sirks			
Shiko Ben Menahem			
Fatih Kaya			
Wieger Verberne			

1. Opening

Juup opens the 132nd 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

Juup makes two announcements:

1. Juup opens the meeting formally, establishes a majority is present and thanks the members for their confidence in choosing him as chair. Via email it was decided that Eefke would be vice-chair. Juup states his hope for constructive cooperation the coming year to be the FC back on the map and having a more disciplined manner in order to push decisions through.
2. Topic 2a: Examination Regulations: Juup clarifies that the motion of order and build-up of the agenda makes clear what we are deciding. No decision has officially been made yet. The two letters can be altered for information purposes as well.

Now we have all material and are familiar with all aspects of the matter regarding resits. Marlies asks if this is a continuation of previous meeting with Ad Scheepers. Do we want to focus on research Ad has done for basing our decision? Juup states that the student body has specific reservations regarding timing (why do this now, why not later etc.). Sharmayne wonders why the TER says four resits and not five. The effects need to be measured on students. Furthermore, Sharmayne thinks RSM cannot implement it this year as some first years are already in student associations. The exams of IBA1 and BA1 take place beginning of November. Jan questions why not all students take the first sitting of exams. This should be required to sit the first possible exam as a lot of students won't work for exam if this is not implemented. Overload is not solved by this rule. Juup acknowledges the argument of Jan; there could be a relation to laziness, but it could also be structural. Marlies asks if it is a good idea to have things put in place gradually, because students are probably not happy with this. Fatih confirms that, also because outcomes may not be measurable.

5. Motion of order

Juup explains that the decision of last meeting was overturned because the old FC was already discharged and question arose about the legitimacy of the voting process. Marlies thinks we should make a decision

today. Juup agrees with this, stating we should not leave this room without a decision for the good of the school. Shiko asks what exactly the timing was of the events. Fatih replies that we got the material at the end of July. Shiko replies that it is easy to play around with the time to manipulate decisions. Juup says that we are gently asserting ourselves as FC. Shiko asks if it wouldn't be better to postpone the decision to next year, as it's now too late (referring to the rule that last result counts).

Juup requests that the meeting reverts into Dutch as all present speak Dutch. He comments that no members of the MT could be present; therefore Steef wants an informal meeting. Juup remarks that according to the motion of order we must claim our rights back. The old FC was discharged from duty and the manner of voting was unofficial, so now the new FC should vote on this motion. The motion is unanimously accepted.

Marlies comments that the clarification of points should be maintained and we should not constantly refer to regulations, but Juup points out that this is sometimes necessary. Formalities should exist when needed. Wieger thinks every agenda point should be checked with the official regulations. Juup comments that the last meeting (1 September) was an eye-opener, he does not agree with this method but prefers to consult the rules only when necessary.

Timing is very important here; do we have time to inform students? Are we equipped to handle the reactions on the hardship clause etc.? Shiko asks if there is a question to Ad about this. Juup replies that Ad must show how this can be implemented without damage to students. Jan adds that this matter goes back to April, to the Programme Committee. Marlies concludes that if timing is not good, then it does not proceed regardless of the four exam rules. Juup agrees that other issues are also important. He adds that 80% of students miss the first exam sitting; this is certainly not by accident. Shiko agrees with Marlies that the only real question for today is whether the timing is acceptable. Four or five resits is not well based. He is prepared to approve the experiment in which timing plays a role. Marlies adds that we need the research on time; we are now too late for this. Juup agrees to a pilot for one year, a planning cycle and an evaluation cycle have to be implemented. Four or five exam rules; Ad Scheepers says that the Education Committee believes that strict rules work, currently students are abusing the delay rule (2nd chance).

Shiko remarks that we are better off agreeing with conditions. Juup claims you can say it did not work because of the lack of strict enforcement. Marlies comments that Ad is already strict with four or five; it is already high pressure. Shiko claims he is not always in agreement that it is not the fault of student behaviour. Too much lenience is not good. Jan asks which student group we do want to impact. Unsuitable students should be weeded out if they cannot keep up with tempo. The programme is too easy or too hard, the total population is composed of various types, so it is probably better to look at why certain groups of students do not sit the exam. Shiko remarks that if more students do the exam the result of the survey is more interesting.

[Ad Scheepers joins the meeting] Juup announces motion of order has been passed as old FC members were discharged. There are questions from FC members. Ad provides a short summary. He makes the point that the success rate is not high so we need to take action. 50% of the students abandon their study, but selection at entry level is not allowed. Ad reiterates that in the first exam round many students do not even try doing the exam, and resits are much less successful. A maximum of two or three resits are passed. In the regular exams the success rate is much higher and there are several reasons for this. We want to stimulate students to sit the regular exams. Only 10% tries to get all twelve exams in the first round. Limiting resits is

the only way to force students to do regular exams; it is basically an activation rule. The ESL showed that the limitation of resits work well to improve result.

6. Teaching and Examination Regulations (TERs)

Shiko asks which kinds of students have a difficulty. Is it another approach to study? Are they the good students? Ad replies that there is a large number of students who can sit the first exam but don't, but if they adjust their behaviour they can do so. Juup asks if Ad wants a structural change to students doing eight or more exams. Ad replies affirmatively: we want them to sit regular exams as chance of getting them is much higher. There is no evidence of a group who get all exams and a group who do all, but get very few. Ad continues that psychology has problem based and other measures. Jan asks if there is insight into why they delay exams. Ad replies that many surveys have been done on this and in every round there are students who skip exams. Juup wonders how many of the students can be saved. Four out of five students allow two exams to go by, we need to bring these back into the picture to raise results. He comments that a large percentage of students study from the social perspective and not because they want to study, they should not get through. Ad continues that there has been a study on this (also part of his PhD), reasons for delay and result is limiting of resits and better spread of exams helps the success rate. Ad claims that despite improving spread of exams many students just won't do it. They think they'll get it second time round but that is actually false hope, because of too many exams in a short time.

Juup says that there may be students who delay but it is not universal. If there are other reasons, the resit rule will not work. Sharmayne adds that many students focus on three out of four exams, and doing the fourth exam in resits. A research study (Schouwburg) showed the more freedom you give, the more the behaviour continues, the less regular exams are done. RISBO did a survey which discovered students do three hours study per day instead of eight. This is significant; the less time you spend the more likelihood of resits being done instead of regular exams. Jan asks why there are not more interim exams to prevent this. Ad replies that this is one of the measures being considered. Self-testing, not just by teachers, and if students commit to these they get a bonus at exam-time, producing much better scores. Juup adds that FC members also have questions about the process. The old FC only got to deal with this at the end of July. Therefore it can be questioned if it is wise and desirable to implement this decision now. How can the hardship clause and complaints be handled now for example? Ad continues that information must be distributed in September or as soon as possible via SIN-Online and mentors.

Marlies asks if this is not changing the rules while the game is already on. Sharmayne adds that members of committees will not know the rule has changed, it's too late for them and maybe they would have decided otherwise if they knew beforehand. You create other expectations. Ad replies that it is a fulltime study, students can expect this, and it has nothing to do with creating expectations. Juup asks what expectations do students have and how can we anticipate this. Is there information regarding exams and expectations included in faculty literature? Ad replies that the division of the year into three semesters is clear. Marlies asks if VWO students ask about how many exam opportunities they have in advance. Juup insists that if we agree to it, all students should be informed by 1 October. We need to know how great the risk is that students realise it too late. Ad insists that the experience of other faculties is positive. Marlies asks if they did it on time. Ad answers yes: they have only just done it this year. It is a TER rule and students don't read these normally. Marlies adds that if it's a one year pilot, then statistics will be available in summer and repeats in September/October. What kind of result is expected? Ad replies that they expect less delay in exam sitting. Marlies asks what the attitude is towards gradual introduction of measures or all at once. Ad replies that they have to look at how to approach this and look at the 'nominal is normal' package; we have to look at which

measure or combination of measures is best. This will be looked at very carefully. Juup asks what is considered to be normal; is it the mean/average result. Ad replies that using a couple of measures can achieve the desired result. Juup expresses concern that higher measures in studying are demanded, but he questions if it will become an unnecessary rule when other measures are introduced. Ad insists that the measures will work together effectively. Juup asks if it is desired before other measures, because it is expected to be more effective. Ad replies that since it has been seen to work it is desirable to implement it soon to ensure early results.

On the basis of the discussion Juup calls for a quick vote. The most extreme proposal is to scrap limitation of resits. A pilot is proposed, for one year with research into success rate, to maintain resit limitation, to be communicated as soon as possible and sent to Steef and Eric. All vote in favour, no votes against.

7. Discussion of FC meeting plan for the coming year

Meetings should be preferably held on the last Thursday of the month where possible. Juup states that it is preferable to have a majority of students as student arguments are strong.

8. Any other business

No other business.

9. Closure

The meeting is closed at 12:00 pm.

Next FC meeting 25 October 2011 10.30 am in T06-49.

To do before the next meeting

Topic	Task	Person Responsible
	None	