



Overleg Vergadering (OV) Report

Date: 17th of January 2017 **Place:** Roeterseiland B2.52, Amsterdam **Time:** 1000 - 1200

Report by: Eline Keemink **Chair of meeting:** Toma Cerniauskaite

Present FSR-FEB 17/18 Members:

Toma Cerniauskaite (Chair), Marcelo Pira Beckerling (Vice-Chair), Christof Bischofberger (Chair E&R), Marcin Muchowicz (Chair O&M), Jelle Turkenburg (E&R), Eline Keemink (Secretary), Deval Raj (CSR representative E&R),

Absent FSR-FEB 17/18 Members:

Atma Jyoti Mahapatra (E&R), Momo Komatsu (Treasurer, O&M)

Present board members and faculty employees:

Han van Dissel (Faculty dean)

Absent board members and faculty employees:

Wilma de Munck (Director of operations), Peter van Baalen (College director of Economics & Business), Koen van Leeuwen (Student assessor)

Other members: Pim van Helvoirt (Chair CSR)

Minutes

1. Opening and determination of agenda

Chair opens the meeting and welcomes all participants.

2. Determine minutes previous meeting (*att: 180117 FSR FEB OV Minutes draft*)

Wilma de Munck sent some adjustments, which have been agreed to by the council. There are no other changes to the minutes of the previous meeting.

3. Announcements

• From the FEB Board

- The board invites council members to the NY event of the faculty.
- Issue of extra study places and the letter the CSR and FSR sent to the CvB: Facility Services has to arrange these things and make sure that classrooms are open for studyplaces if there are no lectures or tutorials scheduled. Studyplaces are formally organized by the library. Extra spots are made available in the weekend before the exams, but not throughout the week. The dean says that there if no class scheduled he sees no problem in opening these for extra study places, and Facility Services is informed about this. The dean lives under the impression that these rooms are made available before the examination and under the condition that there are no classes scheduled.

ACTION POINT 180117 01: The FSR will contact facility services about the extra study places and opening up the classrooms and will keep the dean updated.

• From the FSR FEB

- The FSR agrees with the name change of the bachelor Econometrics & Operations Research to Econometrics.
- Marcin will join us later as he is having a meeting about housing.





4. Review action points

171009 04 *The FSR will be included in the discussion sessions on the management of discussions about the influx of first year students with regards to the Numerus fixus and/or UVA matching. These discussions will start in January according to the board.*

In the previous meeting it was determined that these discussions will be pushed to May or June, when it has become clear what the implications of UvA matching for the selection are and if they have been successful.

The dean gives an update: In terms of applicants, it looks like we are up 10 to 15% at this point in time. At the same time, it seems that conversion rate is going down (applicants and the number of people actually show up at the study). Same as last year there will be looked at numerus fixus, depending on the number of applicants, in case the matching does not work. This decision should be made somewhere in September, the FSR is closely involved in this procedure.

171009 05 *Wilma de Munck will make sure that the information sharing directory that was promised to the FSR of 16/17 will be developed as soon as possible.*

Is completed.

171128 01 *The FSR will meet with Pepijn van Neerijnen to get involved with the Future First project.*

The FSR will contact Pepijn: this happened and an appointment has been made. The 1.0 plan was discussed and there will be a brainstorm about the 2.0 plan, the FSR is involved in this.

171128 03 *The council will visit R. van Hemert and from there the discussion on exam quality will be continued. A point will be added to the agenda of the next OV.*

FSR is closely involved in the new protocols regarding exam quality, but certain issues will be brought up in the next agenda point.

5. Tutorial Sizes

The council has some unclarity about whether 46 is about the number of people or the number of chairs in the classroom, in the letter which was sent from the board. In the letter it says that in the first block 50 students will be scheduled, from the 3rd block there would be 40 students scheduled instead of 50. The only difference the dean knows of is that instead of having scheduled 50 students in one tutorial in the first block, this is lowered to 46. For next academic year, given the uncertainty of student numbers, there will be 46 students scheduled in one class in the first year. From the 2nd block onwards there will be 40 students scheduled in tutorial sizes. Christoff points out that the problem, which came up in the Bachelor Split meeting, is that more tutorial/seminar teachers need to be hired and that this hiring should have happened in December. The hiring now has not been sufficient to decrease tutorial sizes to 40 students. The dean tells that there has been nothing than job interview going on in Philadelphia. It is confusing because the recruitment process happens in such a way that new staff can start at the beginning of August. As far as the dean knows, a lot of effort on this faculty is made to hire more people.

Teachers' contracts

Another thing that came up during the Bachelor Split meeting is the fact that contracts of tutorial teachers are sometimes not flexible enough in terms of their research and teaching time. An idea of the Worker's Council was to make the contract more flexible. The dean says that the





faculty does not want to hire full-teaching staff, to prevent becoming a university of applied sciences. The board thinks that every person that teachers here, should have at least a minimum time to conduct research. The question is, can it be made more flexible to choose the percentage of the time teachers spend on their research and the percentage of time teachers spend on teaching? People with a ten-year contract get a guaranteed research time of 50%. Depending on past performance, people get more or less research time allocated up to a certain maximum (50%). It is now between 10 and 50%, which used to be between 0 and 50%. It is also possible to buy off part of their teaching, when they extract a lot of external money for research projects. The dean is not supportive of making it more important for ten-year trackers.

Lecturers

What currently happens in a few courses is that lecturers are being live-streamed to another room, it is for example happening in the whole block of first year statistics. The dean cannot guarantee that this will not happen next year. The problem according to the Dean is the lack of big enough lecture rooms. He thinks that it is far better to have larger rooms available than to have more lectures gives. As far as the dean knows, Peter has made some sort of compromise with Hessel Oosterbeek (Section Microeconomics) to give his lectures twice. The FSR says that it is a problem that one lecture is given in one class, which is being live-streamed to two other classrooms. The dean asks how many students are actually sitting in those classrooms. According to him, it is not a real problem. Everybody has the right to go to the lecture, but the faculty also has the right to check whether the rooms are full or not and whether there is a real need for larger classrooms.

The dean supports that the lecture room should be of sufficient size. If there are indeed students The dean concludes that students are not forced to go so that not everyone will show up. Some students might not show up because they cannot go to the actual lecture.

The dean supports that the lecture room should be of sufficient size. Video-beaming lectures to other rooms in principle is not a good idea. He hopes and trusts that the university is capable to deliver what they promised him, larger rooms.

The dean is not aware of this particular case in statistics, and he supports that the lecture will be taught to everyone without a livestream in the beginning of the year.

6. BSc. Split (*att: 180117 1st year students' remarks*)

Meeting/tutorial sizes (meeting yesterday)

One of the biggest problems: not classroom, not class size, but pin-pointing absent students that are enrolled here but do not study here. The question is how to create a system or mechanism that finds these students and clean lists of students and if the dean has any ideas.

What the dean observes is that there are always students drop out, but he is unsure when this is formalized. The FSR thinks it is an idea to look at the mandatory classes and highlight the students who do not show up, and to ask them after the first block for confirmation if they are actually studying here or not. Then, for those students who actually study here, tutorials can be scheduled for 40 students as there are more rooms available for this number of people.

The dean agrees that more information is better, but that due to legal constraints it is often only possible to guess this. Another issue according to him is making tutorials mandatory. According to the FSR it would also be possible to check attendance without mandatory tutorials, as you can still check the students and ask them whether they are enrolled or not. According to the Dean, it is a lot of work and an administrative load to do this. The dean will ask Peter to look into this but is not convinced whether this would work and whether the faculty has the legal conditions to allow this. The dean is trying to offer the student better schedules, from a students' perspective as well as a teachers' perspective – but the main constrain is the availability of classrooms at REC. The FSR asks for any innovative ideas.





Examination Structures

The FSR asks for a general guideline for official structure examination structure of the courses. Also, course coordinators in the 2nd and 3rd year are asked to adapt this structure. The dean thinks that, especially for the later years, a protocol for this makes sense.

Curriculum committee

There was the idea to create a curriculum committee over the next 2 years that will take a look at the outline of the curriculum and the learning outcomes students are supposed to obtain at the end of their bachelor's degree. The FSR sees some groups of subjects which have a lot of overlap, for example finance and microeconomics and hopes to overcome the overlap in the curriculum and hopes that this project will be launched. The FSR asks the faculty board for any other ideas about things that could be implemented in the curriculum.

The dean has a lot of ideas, but first of all wants a very clear structure. If you have the structure in place, it becomes a lot easier to improve curricula. He wants the curricula to be more unique. Business Administration, in his opinion, is fairly standard in a global perspective.

It is the role of quality cycles and OC's to make sure the curricula are right, and the dean thinks that the curriculum should be reformed every year. Quality is part of a continuous process, on an annual basis there is a quality cycle and there is the midterm review every few years. For the dean it is quite normal to improve curricula continuously.

Attendance + tutorial teachers.

There are big differences between the presence of students in tutorials. According to the students this is because of the quality of seminar teachers, as according to them they do not give any additional information. According to the dean the only way to make sure everybody shows up is to make tutorials mandatory. The dean says that he closely monitors what students think of their seminar teachers. PhD students are typically giving the seminars. The dean wants examples of badly performing tutors and he will act. The FSR says that the evaluation of teachers is relative, as students cannot really compare their teachers to other universities. For PhD students the faculty has a wider responsibility, first of all they have to do their research. But they are also obligated to do teaching, so also have to be developed as teachers. Many of them do not have teaching experience yet.

The FSR thinks that it might be an idea that in future PhD supervisors carry more responsibility for the quality of the teaching of PhD students. The dean says that this should already be happening and that they should mentor them. Course coordinators are also responsible for these people. The mentors are accountable and responsible for talking to them and helping them. The question is, according to the dean, if we can come up with a system that is more effective.

There is a concrete plan in terms of careers, in terms of training them, BKO light, etc. The FSR offers the idea to start a workgroup with PhD coordinators, 10-year trackers, the FSR and to really look at what the student numbers are, how many tutorial teachers are needed, how the quality of the tutorials is improved etc. The dean says there is a program for PhD students to become more sufficient in teaching. They are looking right now to the components of this program and whether this is very effective or not. According to the dean this is a problem that will keep on reoccurring because it has to with the faculty's responsibility towards PhD students. In general, the dean says the level of tutorials and seminars is quite high. He talks to many students that go on exchange, each of them comes back with the remark that the course quality content is higher here. The dean is always in favour of revolutionising seminars/tutorials. The dean cannot send the plan that is being made about the seminars and teachers, as Henk (Henk van den Bergh) is now in the process of the evaluation of BKO light. The council can set up a taskforce to improve the effectiveness of tutorials.



The dean thinks that our problem is in two things: the didactic ways of tutorials and the way it is being executed here, and secondly the preparation and training of the PhD students who teach these tutorials. This is all the responsibility of the program director.

The Research directors, van Kleinbergen for Economics and Deanne den Hartog for BA are responsible for the PhD program but probably not much involved in the teaching. The FSR can contact Henk van den Bergh (BKO-light) and the program directors.

The dean: the FSR should use program directors to make tutorials more challenging, develop the didactic construction further, talk to Henk as far as the content of training program BKO/BKO light is concerned. To pinpoint: names and numbers, because then the dean can take action.

7. **OER** (att: 180117 FSR proposal to the OERs 18-19)
Asks the board their stands on certain articles.

Bachelors OER

Article 3.2: Programme structure and participation in courses

6. Electives within the elective part of the curriculum for a Bachelor's programme are subject to the following criteria:

- the student must request permission in advance from the Examinations Board in relation to courses taken outside the Faculty of Economics and Business. Some degree programmes and majors have restrictions on elective subjects. These restrictions are explicitly stated in the course catalogue.

The FSR thinks that students should be able to fill in the free-elective space with the courses they like, without asking the permission from the Examinations Board. The restrictions on elective subjects should be responsible for guiding students to the appropriate electives.

3.2: The dean agrees, he thinks this article only creates administrative burden. Examinations Board could make a list of courses that could not be taken. The general rule according to the dean should like: any 2nd or 3rd year course can be taken as an elective. Some thought should be given about the overlap between courses.

Article 3.3 Internationalisation

Attention will be paid to internationalisation during the Bachelor's programme.

Internationalization is an important feature of our faculty, hence, the FSR calls for specification of this article. Is it referring to examples of different countries in courses? Having all documents in English? Hence, in what ways and regarding which aspects of internationalization attention will be paid to?

3.3: The Dean agrees. NSE indicated that internationalisation is an issue at our faculty. The article as it stands here is quite ridiculous.

Article 4.2 Type of examination

5. A bonus may not exceed 0.5 points and will only be awarded if the final mark without bonus is at least 5.50 or higher.

Obtaining a bonus sometimes require a lot of effort or time, that could be spent on the usual course material instead. Therefore, we believe that students can be entitled to a bonus of maximum 1 point. In addition, in practice this article of quite often violated as there are courses with bonuses of 0.65 or 1.





Article 4.2: the dean agrees. Personally, the dean thinks it is a ridiculous rule and wants to get rid of it. Bonus is the responsibility of the course coordinator and he/she can decide about the bonus.

Article 4.4 Determining and announcing results

1. The examiner determines the result (=mark) of a written examination or thesis as soon as possible, but at the latest within fifteen working days. Central organised interim examinations are subject to a marking period of ten working days. The examiner submits the final marks to the relevant Programme Administration and the Programme Administration will then immediately ensure that the results are registered within three working days following the submission of the marks by the examiner. The Programme Administration also ensures that the student is immediately notified of the mark, taking due account of the applicable confidentiality standards.

The FSR FEB agrees with these limits if they are applied to exams, consisting of open questions only. If the exam is made from multiple choice questions, we urge for shortening the correction period from 5 to 7 working days. This would be valid for both types of examinations, namely, midterms and finals.

Article 4.4: dean cannot oversee all the consequences. If a distinction can be made and it is a sole MC exam, it seems reasonable that the results can be published in 5 days, taking into account some processing time.

Article 4.5 Opportunities to sit examinations

5. If a student takes the same course twice within a year, all interim results from the first participation are declared void.

The FSR FEB believes that interim grades obtained in the first participation, should be optional for students (take or leave to the next participation). This, only if assignment is same; or else must be disregarded if assignments are different. This is due to the fact that students are very likely to remember the material that they have learnt in the same academic year, and, hence, their interim grade can still be valid. If the grade of interim grade does not satisfy the student, then he should have an option to retake the assignment.

Article 4.5: the dean says it is very difficult in an administrative sense to carry this over to other years. The system is changing anyway which gets rid of this problem in a sense. If you do not pass the course, you have to redo it completely. There are very few courses you can do twice a year. The dean does not agree.

Article 4.8 Validity period for results

1. Passed Bachelor's courses have a guaranteed validity period of 6 years. The Examinations Board will extend the validity period of passed courses so long as the courses are still part of the curriculum and their substance has not changed.

The FSR would like to ask for clarification of this article. Does it mean that courses passed 6 years ago are not valid anymore, so that students, who are still trying to complete their bachelor, have to retake such courses? If we understand correctly, the period of 6 years is not related to the validity of bachelor's degree itself, is that correct?



Article 4.8: bachelor diploma is a terminal degree. In the article they are referring to the courses. Dean supports the principle that there should be a certain period that exams remain valid. The reason why master courses are valid for a shorter period of time is because the master takes less years than the bachelor.

Article 5.1 – Honours programme

7. To continue participating in the Honours programme, a student must fulfil the nominal study obligation as stated in Section B every semester, with an average mark of at least 7.5 at the end of the second academic year.

This article does not specify if the 2nd year grade average only has to be at least 7.5, or a cumulative average of year 1&2 has to be at least 7.5. We believe that the cumulative grade should be the case, since a student is supposed to have an overall (cumulative) average of 7.5 in the end of his Bachelor to obtain Honours degree (as stated in Article 5.1.6).

Article 5.1: Dean thinks the FSR makes a good point. The more can be clarified, the better. He understands the article as follows: He interprets the "average mark at the end of year two" as a cumulative average of 7.5 of both year one and year two".

Extra note: Appendixes of the OER are only in Dutch, the council would like them in English as well and the dean agrees.

Masters & executive programmes.

The council gathered exams, and at least 5 or 6 of them had the same questions in them for different years, or similar questions in which only numbers were changed. The quality checking of the exams therefore is not good enough as there are too many cases in which it does happen. This has been discussed with Rob, and he told the council that he has one expert on exam checking. Above this, there will be a new mechanism in place, but the council has understood that there are concerns about this mechanism. The dean says that the way the council describes it, this should not happen. However, for multiple-choice questions the dean can understand similarity in tests as there is a limit to the different number of questions there exist. The dean will discuss this with Rob. He would also like to receive the exams with the same questions in it.

Articles that should be included

First point: the review period of the first draft of the thesis should be determined and included in the OER. The dean thinks this is a good point, it seems to him like a sensible suggestion to formalize reviews etc also for a thesis. He is not sure if this is a big problem though.

Second point: the OER is not well-known among students and the FSR wants the faculty to encourage this. Workshops or brochures could be organized. The dean says: the more the better. There is an agreement about brochures.

Third point: guess correction for MPC questions. The council wants a standardized formula for all the courses, of course it is different when there are 10 MPC questions or 100. The dean cannot say if this is possible or not. It was also discussed about the Bachelor Split meeting, but there was a consensus that there should be a more standardized way, and there should be a difference depending on the number of MPC questions.

Fourth point: fixed lecture sizes in the OER. The dean does not think the OER is the place to organize these things. There is no document in which this can be placed, as there are too many constraints on which this depends.



Fifth point: optional midterms. A student who passes the final but fails because of the result of the midterm. The dean agrees with the council in principle. He says however that this problem will disappear because midterms will disappear. For him it makes a lot of sense that if a student passes a final and the final covers the content of the whole course, the student passes the course.

Kader toetsbeleid 2012 (not included in the OER)

Right to an answer key of tests. It is stated in the jurisdiction of kader toetsbeleid. The dean agrees that this is clear. If students have the right but do not receive it, the council should let the dean or Peter know.

Assessment rate of the course (censure): the dean tells that most of the grading here is done in absolute grading. The council says student want to know beforehand how they're being graded. The dean would assume that in the course syllabi is explained how there is arrived at a certain grade for a course. There are examples of previous years in which the grades were increased because of too low passing grade. This is however after evaluating the course, and someone responsible for the course finds the passing rate not acceptable. But this should not be put in the syllabi. The dean is against publicizing passing rates.

Exams should be peer reviewed, and the examination committee is responsible for this as an independent body to access exams. The dean thinks that it is clear there is an issue. However, hard peer reviewing leads to a lot of bureaucracy according to the dean and he is not convinced that this leads to better outcomes. He is for a softer review.

The points from the NVAO are not currently included in the OER, the council asks if they should not be included herein. The dean says that the NVAO are more about quality assurance and that they should be anchored in the quality control cycles, but not in the OER. There is the kader toetsbeleid on the central level, but there is no such thing on faculty level. Rob told the council that he needs to work on it. From the side of the dean, he just appointed an additional person to work in the examination committee.

Articles often violated

There are many cases in which teachers violate the OER, for example about the grading term, inspections, not allowing students to take their exam papers etc. The dean wants the name and the case, so he can act upon these cases of violations, he does not want to send a letter to staff regarding sections of the OER which are often violated. The council points out that they do not observe all the courses in the faculty so are not aware of all violations there are.

Bring up a point on what sections of the OER are often violated.

Dean wants to take action if there is a problem (*ex post* not *ex ante*). He does not want to bother a lot of people just to tackle a few rotten apples.

8. Remarks

There are no remarks or questions.



Faculty Student Council

ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

ACTION POINTS

Roetersstraat 11
1018 WB Amsterdam
(020) 525 4384
fsr.feb@studentenraad.nl
studentenraad.nl/feb

- 171009 04 The FSR will be included in the discussion sessions on the management of discussions about the influx of first year students with regards to the Numerus fixus and/or UVA matching. These discussions will start in January according to the board.
The board announces that their preference for now is to use UVA matching as the means of selection at the gate. The board does not want to submit a NF application anymore at this point. The dean proposes to push this discussion point to May/June when it has become clear whether the implementation of UvA matching as means of selection has been successful. The council agrees with this.
- 171009 05 ~~Wilma de Munck will make sure that the information sharing directory that was promised to the FSR of 16/17 will be developed as soon as possible.~~
- 171128 01 ~~The FSR will meet with Pepijn van Neerijnen to get involved with the Future First project.~~
- 171128 03 ~~The council will visit R. van Hemert and from there the discussion on exam quality will be continued. A point will be added to the agenda of the next OV.~~
- 180117 01 The FSR will contact facility services about the extra study places and opening up the classrooms and will keep the dean updated.

PRO MEMORIA

- 171009 01 Management planning will be shared with the FSR by the board on an annual basis.

