

MINUTES 136TH FC MEETING – 29 MARCH 2012

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Anne van de Graaf		Joy Kearney
Marlies Koolhaas	Ad Scheepers		
Kerren Radvany	Lindemarie Jongste (EM)		
Shiko Ben Menahem	Thomas Snuverink (STAR)		
Jan Sirks			
Sharmayne Schneiderberg			
Eefke van der Meer			
Jan-Joost Liebregt			

1. Opening

Juup opens the 136th FC meeting at 10:30 am.

2. Agenda

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

3. Minutes

Marlies asks if departments are compensated for employees who are active in the Faculty Council. Juup confirms, but only in hours.

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

4. Announcements

The FC makes three announcements:

1. Sharmayne explains that the reorganisation of BIT has been discussed in the University Council and that they took into account our advice. We should deal with this issue anonymously.
2. TER is not very far with teaching regulations etc., because Anne and Hans are waiting for the finalisation of N=N. Marlies states that they can already start with the TERs for the master programmes. Juup suggests giving a signal to the Examination Board about this, because we would like to review the regulations at an earlier stage.
3. There are fifteen student candidates for the student positions for the academic year 2012/2013. The efforts to publish made a huge difference. There is only one current FC member for re-election; we offer support for this candidate.

5. FC Organisation

Juup thinks that the enthusiasm could be frustrated by the lack of promptness and therefore the internal communication should be improved. This needs further discussed during the internal meeting held on next April 10th.

The website has changed and we now have good exposure. Also, we have editing rights. Marlies questions if there will be participation from surfers passing by. Juup claims that the FC will have more exposure than ever before. Participation bodies are very important, but they tend to have a negative reputation because of their critical character.

Sharmayne asks if there are candidates for staff. Juup replies that he contacted Peter Elsing for a list and that he will contact them directly. They can be contacted specifically for certain issues. Shiko will leave in October, but he has a proposed candidate.

6. Employee survey

Department specific results have been sent to all department chairs. Marlies and Shiko have not heard anything back from them. The Dean wants to discuss it in the next MC meeting. Juup thinks that the results were worrying from his own department. Sharmayne asks if the workload was specified. Juup confirms that it was specified on the form. Some schools have too high work pressure. In conclusion there was no mention of this as a serious problem. The participation councils score rather low in satisfaction. Therefore it is important to increase our visibility. Marlies asks what the employees think about the term participation councils. Juup says that the representation level was 4.3 out of 10. However, the response rate was much lower for these questions in the opinion poll as they had no specific opinion.

The overall results of RSM compared to other schools of EUR should be discussed during the next internal meeting. As an FC, we did not receive any specific information. Marlies asks if it isn't up to Dean to react to this instead of the FC to initiate it. The Dean should be concerned by this, right? Juup replies that the survey tends to be generalised and it is seen as absolute. Jan adds that it's not one direction. Juup says that we need more information from the Dean and then we can further discuss this agenda point. Jan states that we need information from the departments as well to get to know what they think. Marlies claims that we can already use the results that are online.

Juup suggests discussing the employee survey again in May/June when there is more information available and the members of the MT are present as well.

7. Update Nominal is Normal

The FC received a letter from the Dean two weeks ago with various measures. The letter from the University Board caused some confusion. Ad says that there has been decided not to implement N=N university wide, but leave it to individual schools. There will be an extension of the pilot to other schools. Shiko asks if it does have implications for implementing it in September. Juup says we could go ahead, but not with what the rector has in mind. Ad claims that RSM doesn't want to implement it in a different period than ESE does. We will probably get a lot of students switching. ESE will definitely implement it in 2012. Juup wonders if that isn't undue pressure. Can't they wait till RSM is ready for it? Ad answers that the FC should ask the Dean on this point. Marlies asks if he doesn't have the same concern as us. Ad thinks we are ready. Jan states that N=N should go hand in hand with small group teaching, but we don't do that. Ad says that we do intensify and activate study behaviour, just a means to reach that end. We know it works. Ad says that we already do small scale teaching with study groups, mentor groups etc. We can also take other measures. The statistics course has extra measures implemented and the results are very good. The resit limitation has been implemented already. And now we want to structure the courses in such a manner that study behaviour is optimised. Some courses have no necessary changes. The goal is to restructure courses to optimise the success rate.

The FC received a letter from the Dean including a proposal about the grade points information. The Examination Board also looked at this. Eefke asks if there isn't a minimum level of knowledge required for students (referring to the compensatoir regulation). Ad answers they should score at least a 4.5. Eefke says that it is currently a 5.5. This allows students to compensate. Juup claims that the Examination Board is not keen on this. Jan proposes extra tests so that students could get bonus points, but the problem is that they copy the answers from each other. Jan

doubts if this will increase the quality of courses and grades. Jan says that Hugo is not pleased with the free bonus points students can get. Ad does not agree with Jan and he prefers to hear this from Hugo directly. Jan explains that the bonus tests entail a lot of extra work and they have to be very accurate in grading. Ad answers that there are possibilities created in a lot of courses for exercises and tests. We want to implement a lot of digital systems for this. Someone in department 1 is specialised in these systems.

The letter from the University Board announced there is money for the N=N initiative: € 800,000. We can get part of this to finance the extra capacity. Juup says that it should be tied into a grading system to get students to work, because it could have an inflation effect, artificial raising of graduation numbers. Jan acknowledges Juup's concerns: my experience is that most students are copying from each other. Ad thinks we can limit this by getting students to be more active earlier in the programme. Not all courses have bonus points. More active early means more successful, though some students will still procrastinate. These measure will work best if implemented in first year. We don't want to send students away who have missed one course. Shiko thinks RSM is lowering the bar significantly. On three courses you can score a five, so you lower the standard. Jan claims that students scoring a five are not seen as serious students. *Students are shaking their heads and are smiling.* Eefke wonders what future employers will say if students score fives; it lowers their performance. As students raise his/her average grade, the number of resits is limited. Ad feels that is why all these interim activities are so important. Juup says we can be confident these regulations are clear in the teaching and exam regulations and faculty regulations. Ad thinks this should be in rules and regulations and not the TER. If you allow a limited number of fives it is compensated. Shiko says it is not important to master the content we think is important; a five does not reflect this. Ad replies it only applies to individual parts of the course. All courses contribute to the learning outcomes. Jan-Joost thinks students will pass the easy subjects and fail the difficult ones. Ad does not agree. Jan-Joost is confident that will happen. Eefke thinks it will not be the easy courses that are compensated. Juup says that the bar is lowered for individual courses. We both increase the standard and lower the bar. Eefke feels it makes no difference if you have a 4.4 or a 4.5. Juup says that if you do not have the 5, you will not make it. Marlies asks if there are any interim results. Ad says that students who are very good are using this rule. This concerns fact that there is high correlation in grades on courses. Only students who are just on the verge can use this compensation rule. Marlies wonders what this has to do with N=N; if you have 55 ECTS in first year, but you still have to do an exam again next year. Juup says the FC will have a document ready by April 11th. Ad thinks the Dean and the others would appreciate this. It is a clear way of assessing the overall performance of students without strong constraints. Jan-Joost thinks we need to be critical. Sharmayne asks if we have veto on compensation. Juup confirms.

Eefke asks what happens to the students who need an extra year of study. Ad answers that we might offer them the opportunity to repeat the first year to enter second year. Anne adds that the compensation rule is the safety net. Juup thinks re-doing a course and repeating the year sounds like a paradox. Marlies asks if it would be possible to have an overview of the changes to be implemented, some done, some not done, some questionable etc. Shiko says if the working group prefers these measures (in letter) but is this every measure? Ad answers that this has to be viewed and approved by several bodies. Sharmayne claims that the proposal is too vague to make a decision; it is not concrete and clear what measures are planned. Juup states that the FC would like to receive a clear overview. Marlies adds that it is good to know what things we can approve. Juup says we have some sources regarding legal measures. Eefke requests if there can be a communication plan for new students. Ad says that we have to agree within a few weeks on final points, so that we can tell the prospective students in summer. Sharmayne wonders what information will be communicated on the Open Day next April 14th. Ad answers that we do want to implement N=N and how to be take measures to make sure we are right. Juup states that Add could expect a reply in two weeks. Marlies and Sharmayne say that this is not feasible with information we have now.

8. Master thesis changes

Anne states that they are urgently awaiting the FC opinion on the task force proposal. The FC is still in discussion with Supply Chain Management. There is only one option: if they want to keep the internship, then we have to move to a longer programme. 80% of students take 1.5 years. Most students choose to do an internship. A four-month internship in order to write a thesis would mean that a one-year programme is not necessary. Juup claims that the FC has some concerns about the master thesis changes.

9. Programme Advisory Committees (PACs)

Juup asks what the status is of the PACs. Anne answers that everyone is in favour according to all received guidelines. All programmes have meetings with students. There is some form of interaction with students, but it doesn't quite have the body it could have. René de Koster would welcome details about issues and points of attention for programmes. Wariness of more bureaucracy, like the FC, they want to stay away from this. We don't have the feeling we miss important signals, but it needs to be more formalised including a feedback report once a year. Anne would like to hear the thoughts of the FC members. Shiko asks how this is triggered by the fact that we have separate programmes, what is changing apart from more formalised bodies? Anne answers that programmes have more profile and they can have an independent development trajectory. It is less easy to monitor and follow PC was always a distance from the programmes. Shiko asks if it's a system of checks and balances. These will be removed at programme level. The executive body will be same as the one checking programme is following TER etc. Juup agrees and supports this point too. By law it has to have this participative function, this defeats the purpose of participation because it has no part in the programme. This is strange. Participation organs need to be as close as possible to programme. The Programme Committee is not bound by any advisory committee. They have no legal standing. If the academic director and programme advisor is part of it, then they are not independent. Anne claims we want to maintain efficiency. The PC discusses subjects valid for all master programmes. We do not have fourteen PCs, each with their own regulations. Shiko asks if that could happen now. Anne- replies no it won't. Juup thinks you should provide them with this authority. For a small master programme you cannot have so much bureaucracy. Juup claims there are too great differences between PCs and the programmes. Anne states that the PC would not brush off PAC advice. Shiko thinks that the question is whether the control you want to have is at department level. Anne says that criticism of lecturers and such issues cannot really be independently dealt with. Juup objects; there are only certain ways in which programme management can check if something is wrong. Anne thinks that's not a fool proof method either. The management of a programme can have different interests in how a programme is performed and set up. Participation is to address that. You can have forms of conflict of interest that are not addressed properly. Juup thinks these arrangements should be made in a governance charter, not yet in existence. You want master programmes aligned with each other. Now is the time to look at this. Anne says that the FC should put something on paper and Anne will ensure she does the same. Anne asks when we can expect something on paper. Juup answers within two weeks.

10. Any other business

No further topics for discussion.

11. Closure

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

Next FC meeting 26 April 2012 10.30 am in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Topic	Task	Person Responsible
Earning targets of academic staff	Inform the FC	Peter Elsing
Double-sided printing	Request Hans Heger to do a pilot	Juup
Master thesis	Write letter of advice	Eefke, Juup, Jan
PAC	Write letter of advice	Shiko, Juup
N=N	Write letter of advice	Eefke, Marlies, Sharmayne, Jan, Jan-Joost
Curriculum investigation	Request for information	Sharmayne, Kerren, Juup
BIT	Follow-up on the reorganisation plans	Shiko
Lectures B1	Send an email	Marlies, Shiko