

## MINUTES 146<sup>TH</sup> FC MEETING – 4 APRIL 2013

### Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Ad Scheepers	Frank van der Kruk	Joy Kearney
Niall Deasy		Steef van de Velde	
Jan Sirks			
Marlies Koolhaas			
Thomas Eichentopf			
Pascal Redaoui			
Scharmayne Schneiderberg			

### 1. Opening

Juup opens the 146<sup>th</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

Steef makes three announcements:

1. We are busy rolling out the strategic review. We would like to discuss it with the FC during the next meeting.
2. PwC makes a scan of the research culture which mapped out the ideal research culture. Several management interventions will be suggested and we get the opportunity to change some facts. This will happen in next couple of weeks.
3. The number of non-BEA students is higher than expected, so we have a windfall.

Juup makes two announcements:

1. We invited the Examination Board, but they will have a meeting to discuss our letter first and attend on our meeting next 6 May. Pursey Heugens should be involved and he is extremely busy.
2. Juup spoke to Carla about the quality issue in the N=N. The Examination Board is worried about the quality control as well.

### 5. BIC reorganization

The BIC reorganization is taken care of. Juup states the letter of advice on the reorganisation of BIC has been approved and will be sent today.

### 6. Merger departments 1 and 6

Frank explains that the merger of department 1 and 6 has been talked about for a long time. The reorganization plan will be presented next time. The CvB has a lot to do with EUROPA, so it may be necessary to include them. It is more a reorganization in name only, because cooperation is already taking place. Juup spoke to both chairs and generally people are in favour. As an FC we want to open communication lines to all members of the departments. With respect to EUROPA it will be hard to pass them, but this can occur in a parallel fashion so that the process

can be shortened. Marlies asks what the timing is. Frank replies they have a vision of timeline. Steef says the members of the departments were only briefed early this week. Juup says Jan Dul has been approached.

## **7. Update N=N**

Ad asks what the FC wants to know. He already sent some articles for information. The performance of students is better than last year, only Operations Management is less good in IBA. The results include second year students. Juup asks what kind of negative signs we see. Ad has seen other results of stress levels outside EUR, but does not indicate that it is negative. That is a difficult discussion, but there should be more attention to support and counsel. Quality is going up instead of down.

Juup states there is a deafening silence in the report regarding the quality issue. Ad thinks enrolment and figures need to be looked at, but the predictions are positive. International programmes predicted that performance may decrease, but not for Dutch programmes. The formula is not quite correct for international programmes. We need to wait and compare performance after two years. Juup asks if we can expect changes in the examination regulations, programmes etc. Ad says most programmes have been improved and the ones who have less improvement have less success as well. Bonus measures do not always work well and these will be improved. Many students have had problems with Operations Management in IBA. Niall retook it and saw no major changes. The exam was easier. Ad doesn't expect so many problems in third term. No major problems were encountered. We have a sharp focus on the courses.

In a few weeks there will be evaluation of the second term and the quality issues. A new evaluation moment will take place in about two weeks. There will be a new binding study advice for students. Niall asks if there are plans for small group teaching. Ad answers it is difficult for such large groups, but we are looking at this and other measures.

## **8. Update Faculty Regulations**

Marlies would like to have the documentation in advance of the FC meetings. The FC is concerned about the Faculty Regulations. It feels like we are stagnating on the Master redesign. The Faculty Regulations were updated and approved by the CvB last in 2011, so it is not that urgent anymore. Juup wonders if they are really up to date. It needs to reflect the present situation. It is a shame they are not published. The October proposal was based on what we thought was a draft version. Basically we had this discussion mid-February ended in stalemate. Marlies adds that the FC suggested five PCs. Juup states that Anne or Eric suggested that if we worried about a too great dominance of any departments, we could increase the seats by one. Frank thinks Anne and Eric should decide on this. Juup claims it's basically the board who decides. There are some worries, but this doesn't directly concern the Faculty Regulations.

Thomas states that apparently one PhD student got the 30% tax ruling granted, but it was told this does not apply. We need more information on why certain people and not others pay less income tax. It applies to PhDs from abroad. They would now earn enough to apply for this. Universities themselves can decide whether they allow this or not. Steef says this is an ongoing discussion, and it used to be if people had years of work experience. We don't have the mandate, because the tax office has the final say in this. If you are right, it would improve our position on the market. Juup asks what we think about the letter. Pascal feels Frank is too relaxed. There is no rush on updating until October or November. Juup asks if we can be forced to recognize the PACs on action while we do not in principle. Juup adds if we recognize the Faculty Regulations, what grounds do we have to oppose the PACs? Marlies feels we should approve the Faculty Regulations with the amendment of the PACs. It's a formal way of proceeding. Thomas feels for the time being we don't need the PCs. Juup disagrees; we do, we need them within

two months already. Thomas thinks we just need information or formal advice from the PCs. Juup answers the School needs formal advice from PCs before it can proceed with decision-making. We have the right to file proceedings on behalf of a PC. Thomas thinks we should express beforehand that we have objections with regard to the law. Juup states we are not lame as FC, we must have a say. Marlies thinks they are not doing anything illegal. Juup answers formally not, but they want to avoid that we exercise our veto right. Marlies says we want PACs and they must be in the Faculty Regulations. Then we can discuss the master redesign. Pascal wants the process to move because he feels it will be postponed again. Pascal wants to have a plan of action about the way to proceed. Two in bachelor and five in master for example. Marlies feels this concerns timetables. Will we go via the old way or the new way? Jan feels we are not responsible for the time running out. Juup thinks they are waiting and have had time to take action. Marlies asks what will happen if we continue to disagree. Juup replies that if board doesn't budge, then we will go to the 'geschillen'-procedure. How would an arbitration committee rule on this? Marlies mentions the PACs are not the way they want them right now. Juup spoke to Rob van Tulder. He thinks the master redesign is disastrous for quality of thesis, but we can't do anything about it. Master redesign is most profitable for big master programmes. Rob wants his voice heard through a programme committee.

Marlies mentions the FC is not happy with the current situation, but we need a picture of our plan. Juup feels an amendment does not make a big difference. We have the power anyway. The Faculty Regulations of 2011 specify two PACs, but that is not the current situation. There are two options. We could judge it on its own merits. The PC is not valid, because it is not included in the Faculty Regulations. Juup prepared to say no to master redesign and TER, but there is too much at stake.

Sharmayne mentions that the initial warning of the NVAO is coming our way. It is questioning the success rate of master programmes. Marlies adds that reaccreditation is coming up in next six months. Juup says that it is the reaccreditation of the university as a whole. Marlies says the mercy of Six Sigma will be examined. Juup feels this will cause problems. Marlies asks if the amendment is not in there in the new version, don't we have to go back to 90s version? Juup states that the previous council thought the director of ERIM had too much power; this is clear in letter from Guido. Thomas may abstain. Niall thinks it is hard to judge when we don't know the effect on individual courses. So we need proper PCs. There is no movement in it any more. Thomas says that if it is not valid, it is still not valid. Jan is concerned about a lot of things. You cannot just compromise, because then you have nothing in the end. Marlies asks why they would play this kind of game. Jan thinks if we give in, they will go one step further.

### **9. Any other business**

No further topics for discussion.

### **10. Closure**

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

**Next FC meeting 6 May at 9.30 am in T03-42.**

### **To do before the next meeting**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Progress</b>
Invite Pursey Heugens for the meeting on 6 May	Joy	Done