

MINUTES 134TH FC MEETING – 17 NOVEMBER 2011

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Ad Scheepers	Frank van der Kruk	Joy Kearney
Marlies Koolhaas	Jan Willem Huising		
Sharmayne Schneiderberg	Thessa Lageman (EM)		
Jan Joost Liebrecht			
Jan Sirks			
Eefke van der Meer			

1. Opening

Juup opens the 134th 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 ICT organisation

Juup says that the FC will draw up advice as soon as possible. We invited BIT members to communicate about this and gather information. Juup attended a meeting with BIT. He received only one email from a BIT member advising that demand should be managed. Sometimes there are clashes with customer intimacy which could affect their position as they have pride in the close ties with RSM community. There are some negative memories of the IT department of RSM BV merger, which proves that SSC is not always up to beat. Jan asks what happens if faculty wants something that's not supplied and where do we go for this then (referring to page 6 of the document on the purchase contract for supplied service). Jan Willem replies that we specified our wishes for content management systems for RSM and they are looking into it, but if you want something special, you have to pay for it. Frank says that this situation is not acceptable; otherwise we can't do our business and we may have to look outside for a solution. Jan Willem replies that we should share commodities. Application Management has specific things for RSM so they stay on our payroll. Juup thinks you're outsourcing one of your critical resources and that you become dependent in ways you don't want to. Frank states that the dean has to ensure good results for the school so no worries about this. Operational excellence and customer intimacy have to be maintained. Juup wonders how this is organized and thinks that it needs to be focused. Jan Willem says that he will be coordinating this process in the coming months. Eefke thinks that the jobs at BIT may become too boring if they become specialized. Jan Willem says that we will match jobs to people. Some jobs will change, but I will have a say in this and so will they. Frank adds that people will have to express their ambition and we take note, otherwise we will lose good people. Juup suggests that we should go for this when it is improving services. We will make our written decision. Frank replies that Jan Willem will draw up its advice which will be signed by Steef.

6. Discussion Stapel affair

Juup mentions the FC received the interim report about mr. Stapel. The FC needs more information on this topic.

7. MSc. curriculum change

-

8. New member election for vacant chair FC

Juup has spoken to the members of the University Council regarding looking for a new candidate. Eefke asks how long this will take, and Juup answers that we will have someone by the end of January. Sharmayne suggests posting a message on Intranet. Jan Joost suggests making a clear proposition about what the position entails, why it is so interesting and fun, maybe make an FC photo as well.

9. Update 'Nominal is normal'

Ad Scheepers joins the meeting to update the FC on the status of N=N. He states N=N as a project at EUR is to ensure the Deans take measures in their own projects. This project is about enhancing performance, which is nothing new. Most EUR programmes have been working on enhancing performance rates and reducing dropout rates. It is an attempt to speed up the rate at which students pass the Bachelor programme. Many measures have been taken (e.g. "Boost the Bachelor programme" in 2008). The sheet shows performance rates are rising.

Juup asks what the present level is and Marlies asks for an example. Ad replies that one of the main issues is the rate at which students pass Bachelor exams. We need to stimulate study activity and reduce procrastination. When you activate the students, the performance levels improve. RSM is a large school with a high lecture attendance. Interim exams show success rates higher than just lectures and an exam at the end. If we want students to pass all courses in one year, we need the courses to have success rates of 80% or 90%. The bonus system has helped on some courses. Some courses are still low (40-45%), if only based on lectures. A few conditions are formulated, e.g. the minimum success rate of 60% in the first year (in BA it is already good).

Jan Joost asks why it is 60%. Ad replies that the students who score 40 ECTS or higher are successful students, those with less do not get their diploma. The success rate has been a measure since 1999 and this percentage of students varies between 50-55% since then.

Sharmayne asks what is going to happen with the 60/60 rule. Ad replies that we have to take some measures to achieve this. The second condition is that you need a course success rate of about 75% to achieve this. We do not want to reduce quality of courses and exams. We now look at B1 specifically. Juup asks what the concrete risk is of losing quality. Ad answers that if you achieve an increase in success rate by reducing quality, you lose out. Juup and Jan Joost agree there is too much focus on the success rate and not on quality. Educational goals and learning outcomes combined show the quality of the course.

Eefke asks how Ad wants to achieve this. Ad replies that we have to do something extra: more teaching staff, funding etc. We have measures in place and we don't want to stop now. We are now in a flow and are considering a whole package of measures. We can't stop now and see what happens after a year, we have a working group of teachers, programme managers, student advisers etc. Sharmayne asks if there are students involved in this working group. Ad replies not yet because we haven't decided anything yet. Students should do as much of the regular exams as possible. Talking to teachers who teach in the first year to see what measures can be implemented. Marlies asks if this is for 2012/2013. Ad confirms: if we can meet all these conditions. Jan Joost asks if teachers have to agree. Ad says that we are not forcing them. Jan Joost says that teachers have to think of their own courses and it may need to be made compulsory. Ad replies that some teachers have 800 students in a course. A lot of courses are doing this already and it works.

Marlies asks what happened to the initial plans as presented during the meeting with the Rector Magnificus in June about the 60/60 rule, because it has changed a lot since then. Ad replies that it was presented too much as if it was decided already. We want to have students pass the first year. The compensation rule will also be in second and third year of the Bachelor. The students are not aware of it. Marlies asks if that means that we do not implement the 60/60 rule by 2012. Ad says that he decided to do it, but we have to see if we do this because we may do something different. The brochures contain a leaflet stating the correct state of affairs. Sharmayne thinks it is good that you're talking to teachers about it. Juup confirms; high quality and fast results.

10. Goals students/employees of FC for the coming year

- More power sockets for laptops in restaurant;
- Longer opening hours of the BIC;
- Improve educational quality, more choice options, provide previous exams;
- Improve the visibility of the FC;
- More contact with the representatives of the Bachelor programmes;
- Sustainability is very important.

11. Presence of education committee representatives at FC meetings

The FC would like to express their appreciation if there are representatives of the educational committee attending each FC meeting for discussions.

12. Catering issue on campus

-

13. Any other business

Jan says that the quality of exams is a point of concern, because it involves extra workload of employees; people sometimes take off courses without having a proper discussion. Jan Joost wonders how we can test the quality of exams and if we can invite someone to discuss this topic with.

14. Closure

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

Next FC meeting 23 February 2012 10.30 am in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Topic	Task	Person Responsible
	None	