



## **Minutes OV 1**

**29-10-2014**

### **Present**

The faculty board:

Han van Dissel

Jan Dijk

FSR:

Sophie Mikulski - Chairman

Artur Rymer – Vice-Chairman

Lisa Leering – Project Officer

Samantha van der Hoek – CSR representative

Jeroen Hendriks – PR-officer

Arkin Zoodsma – Facilities officer

Sten-Erik Magus – Quality of Education

Vlad Marin – Treasurer

### **Additional information**

29-10-2014

10.00 – 12.00

E6.32

Technical Chairman: Vlad Marin

Secretary: Renée Bijvoets



- 1. Opening 10.00**  
Vlad Marin is doing the opening of the first OV, by introducing the new council members. Peter van Baalen is not here, but during the next OV meeting he will be there.
- 2. Announcements 10.04**  
Jan Dijk has a meeting until 10.00, therefore he will join the meeting a bit later.
- 3. Determine agenda 10.04**  
FSR is going over the agenda to see if there are any remarks. There are no remarks.
- 4. Determine minutes 10.05**  
The previous minutes are accepted.
- 5. To Do's OV 26-06-2014 10.06**
  - 1) Sander van Triest will provide the FSR the adjusted OER.**
  - 2) Sander van Triest will inform teachers that the personal grading on blackboard is an option.**
  - 3) The rounding of grades will come into a guideline, which is made by the board of examiners, Jessica will ask them to get it. *FSR has to check if this is done.*
  - 4) Sander van Triest states that he will make sure that the information about fraud and plagiarism will be on the website. *The Dean explains that formally the exam committee who looks into this, they are enforcing more and more strict rules about this. The Dean states that he doesn't want the lecturers to use old exams. With media the exams can be all over the world and the faculty wants that teachers only use exams once. The FSR has to check if this document is on the website.*
  - 5) The FSR will be informed on the new selection criteria of the Honoursprogramme. *The Dean explains that there is a university wide criteria, 7.5 after the first semester, these students are entitled to enter the Honoursprogramme. FSR wonders if there are changes on the requirements of the resists. The Dean mentions that there is a clear document about the Honoursprogramme but this is university wide so that is a CSR task. FSR should get the document about the Honoursprogramme which is a university wide policy.*
  - 6) English version of the OER**
  - 7) Status of late registration (Sander) Han: *this is about UVA matching I believe. O no, this about whether students registered in late June/July in the fall semester while this was normally in August and therefore they were late. I haven't seen the data but I have to check. Peter will have to provide the data for this. Samantha:*

*there used to be a fee about late registration but that is not valid anymore. Han: that fee was a formal flexibility from our side, now the risk is that we simply have to say you cannot register anymore, which is a higher penalty than the fee. The consequence will be that you can't register late anymore.*

*a. 10.12 Jan Dijk is here.*

### **8) Casper send invitation**

9) Peter on teaching junior staff and HRM plan *FSR is not aware of this. FSR will look into this. TO DO.*

10) **E-learning in September FSR Attended** Han: we have established a university wide project group on e-learning/blended learning and Peter is chairing that also.

11) **FSR informs about the splitting of the bachelor** *FSR had an informal meeting with Peter to discuss this as well.*

12) **FSR and Jan Dijk informed on renovation**

13) About the additional case on page 6/7, organisational skills of teachers: Han: is this an additional course on case-based teaching? FSR not clear what this point is about. Han: Peter is organizing seminar series on teaching, for the staff and everybody is invited. TO DO FSR look into this.

14) About the study advisers: Sophie is taking over that file and made an appointment about this.

15) **FSR on evaluation project with Jan Dijk**

FSR we agreed on the agenda, and on the last OV meeting, TO DO point 2,3,7,9,13 and 14 will have to be looked into by the FSR.

## **6. Update file-holders and CSR-representative 10.17**

(This was done during the introduction of the new FSR members). A short introduction is given again by the FSR since Jan Dijk was later in the meeting.

## **7. Course Evaluations**

**10.18**

FSR is represented by Jeroen Hendriks and Lisa Leering and will discuss this using the MEMO.. Han the general position of the FEB is that this is an excellent idea so get it going. One remark, the set-up and a very essential element is a continuous improvement and I wonder if evaluation is the right word for this. FSR in the CSR they call it the student panel. The board and FSR agree that this is a better word. Jan, we run already a first pilot and now it is developing. The board is very supportive and the challenge is to make this standing practice. FSR set up a vacancy and will do the

interviews and start in November. At the end of the year we can do an evaluation and see where to improve.

Conclusion by the technical chairman: this has been discussed for a long time, to get students and teachers together, the name is changing to student panel and the board is supportive of this idea and the FSR will make it a reality this year. And is now analysing the applicants for this position.

## **8. Faculty Strategic Plan 2015-2020**

## **10.21**

FSR is represented by Sophie and Samantha. The FSR made remarks on the Faculty Strategic Plan and will discuss this point by point.

*Page 4, "Quality rather than quantity"*

The FSR wants to know what exactly is meant with positioning of the FEB. What is the position they aim for? And how would they like to do this? The FSR also would like to have more information about selection, what type of selection criteria the FEB will use etc. The Dean explains that the faculty has three main pillars in the strategic faculty plan, of which quality rather than quantity is one. The ambition of the FEB for the next 5 years is not to grow but to become better. To improve the quality the focus is on two points, namely education, thus improving the programmes and by being more selective. And second, by the research conducted at the FEB, where they also want to be more selective in hiring and which types of incentives they use.

The FSR would still like to know what the position of the FEB would be, what makes the FEB (and its programmes) and the UvA unique and how will you communicate this to future students? The Dean argues that the FEB should focus on four topics in which they are better than other universities. For example, Erasmus is better in Logistics so the FEB should not focus on this. The FEB will focus on 1) Governance, 2) Behavioural Economics, 3) Micro-finance and 4) Big-data/Business analytics. The Dean explains that this will also be implemented more in the marketing campaign and that the fit between the overall campaign of the UvA ("Independent Minds") is important. However, the board was also aware that this needs improvement and that clarity on this topic is important.

*Page 6, topic: Education.*

*"Education following the Socratic model is not feasible for many of the FEB's degree programmes".*

The FSR understands that small lecture groups and small working groups is not always possible. The FSR came up with an idea for implementing the Socratic model. This could help to make it more personal and improve the readiness of students for discussion. The

proposal is that a weekly gathering additional to tutorials could be provided by the University. Students that are more interested in the topic (which will be provided by the professor, PhD or master student) can come to this extra meeting to discuss this topic. For a master student it can be a good practice to lead this discussion and answer the questions, and for students it can be a great opportunity to have more extensive discussions which are more difficult during lecturers or tutorials. The FSR believes that students will only join these meetings when it is organized by the University.

The Dean explains that in general there can still be a lot improved in the curriculum of the faculty. Although this is a big challenge, Peter van Baalen already created a working-group to discuss and improve this. There are some points that need to be improved:

- 1) Number of contact hours needs to increase. Right now students have on average 12 contact hours in a week. The board wants to increase this to on average 20 hours a week. This is a 40% increase in class hours which also means that the staff can do less research. It is difficult to find the right balance for this. A solution would be a mass lecture (500-800 students) given by one of the top professors, combined with a small tutorial (20-30 students), and in addition all sorts of e-learning/blended-learning. What is important is that students are forced to work from the start of the period, so continuously learning and time on task.
- 2) Homogeneous groups. If you want to improve how students perform, it helps to make more homogeneous groups. Right now students are in mixed groups, whereas in the future the board would like to have groups where all students for example have a VWO average of a 6.

The Dean explains that there is still a whole set of measures that can be implemented to improve the curricula without having to force the faculty staff to teach more. Jan Dijk also explains that the budget per student has decreased and also that there are international norms for the balance between teaching and research. Therefore of the faculty will ask staff to teach more this could be a problem at the international level. The FSR points out that with the proposal of discussion groups you can really trigger students to learn more, which doesn't necessarily have to be done by a professor. Right now, students often come to class and afterwards go home right away, without really thinking about the content. A discussion group can really facilitate that students think about what they have learned. The Dean explains that the faculty also wants students to be more active and present at the university, however given the reality of the budget this is difficult to obtain. Also, the number of dropouts in general in our society is unacceptable. Especially 'business and economics' is one of those large studies that students choose if they don't know what they want to study. That is not the motivation we want. Therefore, the more selective we can be, the less dropouts we will have. Also,

if the UvA improves its curricula, the results will be better which leads to a better appreciation in the labour market.

*Page 6, Education, concrete aims, point 3: to offer all degree programmes in English to the extent permitted by law.*

The FSR would like to know which courses exactly will be in English? The Dean states that right now almost all courses are already in English. Except for the courses that can only be in Dutch such as Fiscal Economics. Also, there has to be at least one degree offered in Dutch, therefore the Dutch Economics and Business programme will remain. However, even here a lot of the courses are in English. However, the law courses will not be given in English since they are very context dependent. The Dean also explains that this is a directional statement, towards the future the faculty wants to move more and more to English, however, some courses are only possible in Dutch and will therefore be an exception.

*Page 6, Education, concrete aims, point 4: To differentiate tuition fees for non-EEA students in line with the market so as to acquire funds to support continued internationalisation.*

The Dean explains that legally the university is forced to charge the “Dutch fee” to students from within the EEA. However, for non-EEA students the university is allowed to decide on the fee themselves. Right now the UvA has chosen for the “cost-plus strategy”, they calculate the costs and that is the tuition fee. The Dean states that he would like to have market prices for non-EEA students. This means, setting the price at a point where the students are still willing to come and pay that price, but likely for a higher tuition fee than we have right now.

The FSR would like to know how this will support internationalization? The Dean explains that as a faculty we will make more money with a market price fees on the one hand, internationalization will also require more funds on the other hand. Right now, we leave money in the market and the faculty has the ambition to become more international, therefore we should acquire this money and invest in internationalization. The FSR asks if there will be a different fee for each country or region? And will higher fees won't work the other way around, scare international students away? The Dean replies to first question that this could be done in theory, but that it is difficult and they are more likely to have a fee for EEA students and non-EEA students, like it is right now, only the fee for non-EEA students will change. With regard to the second question, right now, non-EEA students already pay a substantial higher fee than EEA students, but the board acknowledges that it is an important question.

---

*Page 6, Education, concrete aims, point 5: "To gradually improve its position in the national and international rankings by ensuring that students are offered a high-quality, innovative and unique degree programme".*

The FSR points out that there is already more clarity on this point from the previous discussions. The Dean makes a regard about the rankings. At the university wide level the UvA is actually doing a good job on international rankings. However, the faculty never invested in faculty rankings, but rankings are important for you international reputation. That is also a reason to invest in the accreditations, those are necessary to be in the faculty rankings. Rankings are relative but important for your reputation, a better reputation will lead to more applications and that can help you to be more selective. Jan Dijk also explains that this relates to the previous point, namely that if you want to ask a higher fee it is also important to provide the quality for that. The faculty believes that they can ask around 15.000 or higher, given the quality of the FEB. The FSR suggests to have a gathering of international students to discuss that. The Dean answers that this is already happening.

*Page 6, Education, concrete aims, point 6: "To introduce, to the extent permitted by law, selection at the gate for all degree programmes both at undergraduate and graduate level".*

The FSR would like to know which selection criteria the FEB will use, average high-school grades or motivation letters for example? The Dean answers that at the master level they will use the GMAT or GRE, which are worldwide used selection tests. They go from 0-800 and the FEB wants students with a score of 620 or higher. However, the predictive power of the GMAT is quite low, only 18%, but the benefit is that it is organised worldwide and most universities also use this. With regard to the Bachelor, The Dean explains that they will look at high-school average and in the future maybe a stronger weighting for exact subjects such as maths and physics. The FSR would like to know if there will be decentralized selection? The Dean explains that right now there is already UvA matching, but it is not allowed by law to implement full selection at the bachelor level. So this is again a directional statement, that selection criteria will only be used to the extent permitted by law. The FSR also asks if bachelor students of the FEB will always be allowed to do a master at the FEB as well? The Dean answers that the bachelor of the FEB should be selective for the masters at the FEB as well (meaning that the bachelor of the FEB should be good enough to make sure students are always allowed at the master level as well). But in the future there might be a change that FEB students will also have to do the GMAT, however that should not be a problem because the level of our students is high enough. Also, letting your own students also do the GMAT can be a good way of branding your faculty in the labour market, because it is a signal of quality. The FSR would like to have some extra explanation about the selection

criteria for high school students. It was mentioned that for example maths will have a higher weighting compared to other subjects. The Dean explains that there are strong relationships between certain courses at the high-school level and success at for the bachelor programmes. A motivation letter is not a strong predictor for success but certain courses (the more beta-courses) are a strong predictor. However, all our selection criteria are bases on research and if it is not proven to be a good predictor of success we will not use it.

*Page 6, Education, concrete aims, point 7: "To increase the number of international students pursuing Bachelor's and Master's programmes relative to the number of Dutch students".* The Dean argues that if you compare the English bachelor and the Dutch bachelor (Economics and Business) that the English track performs significantly better than the Dutch track. Therefore, we want to grow our English bachelor and reduce the Dutch bachelor, which will lead to higher performance on average. The FSR asks why they are not stimulating the Dutch students to perform better but only aiming at the reducing the amount. Jan Dijk explains that also the Dutch students perform better in the English track compared to Dutch students in the Dutch track. So the idea is that students who are in a group that is more motivated they will also become more motivated and work harder.

*Page 6, Education, about the split of the bachelor:*

The FSR will also discuss this later with Peter van Baalen. However, the Dean already explains that although we have chosen to offer one bachelor, in fact we offer four very distinct directions. If we want to have accreditations, we have to ask them for these four different studies and not for one. However, the board wants to keep as much of the broad first year since this is a big advantage. It is better to have distinct programmes that also fit this faculty better, however there should be the option to switch. For now, we wait on the results of Peter van Baalen. The FSR is mainly concerned about the first year, since this broad basis is really important and it makes the UvA unique. The Dean explains that the faculty is aware of that and also finds it highly important.

*Page 7, point 1, subdot 3: "By simplifying the structure of the Bachelor's curricula and by concentrating all the electives, internships and international exchange programmes in the third academic year".*

The FSR is concerned that the electives, internships and exchanges are all going to be concentrated in the third year. Is the faculty not afraid that less students will actually go abroad then? Does the faculty think it is a good idea to reduce the freedom of students? The Dean argues that although we will reduce the freedom of students, this will mainly improve the quality of our programmes. Right now we don't clearly signal to students

what we want from them and there is not one clear point when we want our students to do that. The FSR shows concerns about this point and wonders why the faculty does not focus on improving the communication instead of only providing this in the first semester of the third year. Also, will there be enough places for all the students if they all go abroad in the same period? The Dean agrees that right now this is not done well enough and that students don't know what will be expected from them. With regard to the places, this will be the responsibility of the faculty to provide enough places for all the students. The main reason for this concentration is that students should have a certain basis before they go abroad, therefore the second year is too early, however the fourth year would also be possible, but the first semester of the third year is the best option. The Dean understands that students want to have as much freedom as possible but for the faculty board it is important to offer a quality program and those two things don't work together. The FSR remains concerned about this point. However, any data on when students are going abroad in which period of their study could help to inform the FSR on this point.

*Page 7, about Fiscal Economics:*

The Dean explains that his is a programme with a high labour market demand, therefore it is good to increase the amount of students in this programme. The FSR wonders why the faculty wants to attract international students for this programme since it is about the Dutch law. The Dean can only explain that this is more an open point, a broader statement. However in the future it could definitely be that there will be one master in Dutch and one in English for this track.

*Page 8, Education KPI's:*

The Dean explains that the dropout rates lower than 25% is not really realistic. However, there is a tension between Maagdenhuis and the faculty on this point, and the faculty already reduced this number compared to what Maagdenhuis provided. The CSR wanted 70% success, Maagdenhuis wanted 80% success and the FEB goes for 75%. Although it is always good to set high ambitious and have some stretch in your goals.

With regards to the international experience, the Dean states that right now it is less than 10% of the students who go abroad. However, we have 6 years to improve this and increase it till 35%.

*Page 10, EP KPI's, about the Education Service Centre, point 3: Investments in ICT support for the teaching processes.*

The FSR finds this point a bit vague. The Dean argues that there are good reasons to invest in blended learning/e-learning solutions. The problem right now is that your

professors have been teaching in a certain way and that is not always easy to change. Therefore we need a step-wise approach for implementing these blended-learning solutions, if our professors are going to use this in their classes it needs to be in a clear and well-thought way. The FSR suggests to rephrase the point a bit, to make it clear that all professors and lecturers will be incorporated in the implementation of this.

*Page 11, point 5: About the hiring and promoting of academic positions.*

The FSR wonders if being able to obtain grants a good reason is to hire and/or promote academic? And what is someone is not good in acquiring these grants/funds, will that person be less likely to be hired although it is a good researcher or teacher?

The Dean explains that that is not the point of this statement. In the future they want to build in a promotion system that strongly incentives people to acquire these funds. The Dean also explains that there are 3-4 criteria for hiring and promoting, which are teaching, research and ability to require funds. And also whether they can contribute to administrative services, such as coordination tracks or courses. So, acquiring grants is only one part of the selection.

*Page 16, Marketing and communication:*

The FSR would like to see more specificity on this point. Especially how the faculty wants to make communication more clear.

The Dean acknowledges that this is an area where a lot of improvement can be made. However, the board also believes that the unclear communication is related to the structure and flexibility of the programme we have right now. The splitting of the bachelor can help to make the communication about different study tracks more clear.

The FSR asks if there are any clear plans about this and suggests that the FSR can also help in reaching the students.

The Dean answers that these plans are on the way and also explains that an app for blackboard is on the way, since this is one of the main communication tools students use.

*Page 16, Accommodation:*

The FSR prepared three points with regards to accommodation, that might be added to the Faculty Strategic Plan:

- 1) The REC reconstruction should have positive outcomes for the FEB. Right now we as students from the FEB are sharing for example the learning centre with

students from other faculties, however if you come a bit later in the day you cannot find a spot to study anymore. The Dean agrees with this statement. The Dean also acknowledges that students should feel like students of the FEB, although REC is now used by many other faculties, there should be some point of identification.

- 2) Cooperation with the B/C building on opening hours and study spaces. Also related to the previous remark, it is difficult to find a place to study if you are not here early in the morning. In the weekends and before the exam the B/C building was closed, however these buildings could also be used to study. The Dean suggest that there are many other places to study. Also, the H-building is not under the control of the FEB. Jan Dijk suggests that if the FSR has any other remarks related to this it could be send to him.
- 3) Opening classrooms during the exams to study. The FSR explains that this is already done at the VU. The Dean is aware of this, however the FEB is in the centre of the city whereas the VU is not. Therefore, we need a higher control/security at the UvA than at the VU. However, the board is aware of these options and looking into them. Jan Dijk also explains that they had no idea what to expect beforehand from the library learning centre and that they are happy to see it is such a success.

Conclusion by the Technical chairman: the FSP is a directional statement, the university wants to become better and not bigger, the faculty wants to internationalize and have as many English programs as possible, to the extent legally possible. About tuition fees, the idea is to have market prices and use the extra funds for internationalization. About education, the faculty is a supporter of blended learning and wants to improve the curriculum in many different ways. About selectivity, for the masters we have GMAT and GRE, for bachelor will the high-school average be taken into account.. About the splitting of the Bachelor, a common first year/semester/orientation should remain, and the discussion is still going on about this. Exchanges will be third year and first semester. But better informing is also an important part. Mobile app in November (Communication will be improved). There is an advice following from the FSR based on the points discussed of today.

## **9. Lunch with the Dean**

**11.37**

Samantha van der Hoek will represent the FSR in this discussion. The Dean excellent idea, it is not a new idea and we have tried it before but for whatever reason it seems difficult to maintain. The Dean is very in favour of these ideas. One advice for the FSR, be very strict about the organization. The FSR would like to invite other members of the board as well. The board agrees with this. The FSR and the board agree on

organizing 'lunch with the dean' events. The FSR will be responsible for inviting and selecting students and will choose topics to discuss. The board will be responsible for providing a lunch for the students.

Conclusion by the technical chairman: fast point, strict organization is important, enthusiasm on both sides. **Action point: Further discuss the Lunch with the Dean within the FSR and Samantha van der Hoek set up an action plan for this.**

### **10. WC-krant**

**11.40**

Samantha van der Hoek will represent the FSR in this discussion. The FSR explains that at central level there is already a "WC-krant". The idea is that you are on the toilet and you have to read it. As the example shows, there is a part of the CSR and of the communication office of the UVA. And maybe we can do a part of the faculty board. The Dean mentions that we already have the FEB newsletter so we can use content from there. The FSR explains that a big advantage of this paper instead of the newsletter is that students have to read it. The Dean agrees that this is a good idea and that the FSR should be allowed to do it. The board and the FSR will both need to negotiate to get the frames installed. Jan Dijk suggests to also discuss this with the communication department of the FEB.

**TO DO: The FSR should make a plan for the content of the newsletter. TO DO: The board should negotiate on having the frames installed.**

Conclusion by the technical chairman: the WC-krant is already in CREA by the CSR. It is a good idea and will be conducted. Frames are the solution and we have to work that out with a budget and get them in place. For content, we will use the newsletter of the FEB, work together with the communication office and the board, and the FSR will provide content. Samantha van der Hoek and Arkin Zoodsma will take care of this as they are the file-holders.

### **11. Remarks**

**11.45**

No other remarks.

### **12. Questions and closure**

**11.46**

The CSR-representative of the FSR FEB had a meeting with the rector with regards to the 'kaderbrief'. From that two questions for Jan Dijk followed. One of the discussions was about the budget cuts and whether or not faculties were supposed to have been prepared for this. Especially since there are two faculties that have problems with their budget now because of the cuts. Jan Dijk explained that before the summer it already

---

showed that there will be less money per student, but why this was happening was unclear from the budget. However, the extra cuts that happened came as a surprise and the faculties could not have been prepared for this.

The FSR would like to know how the FEB dealt with the budget problems in 2010. Jan Dijk explains that transparency and simplicity are two most important things. Also, make it clear from the beginning of the year what are the budgets for each group and have responsibility lower in the organization. The Dean also explains that the administration of the UvA is input driven but the governance model is output driven. The FEB has implemented a fully output driven model for its faculty since the restructuring. However, this is a difficult discussion since the FEB here has a different idea than central level.

The meeting is closed.

Action list:

- FSR has to check for the document on rounding of grades (page 2)
- FSR should ask for the university-wide criteria of the Honoursprogramme (page 2)
- FSR should check if the document about fraud and plagiarism is on the website (page 2)
- FSR should set up an plan for the lunches with the dean (page 12)
- FSR should work out the content of the "WC-krant" (page 12)
- **The board should negotiate for the installation of the frames for the WC-krant (page 12)**