



Minutes OV 2

9-12-2014

Present

The faculty board:

Han van Dissel

Jan Dijk

Peter van Baalen

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

9-12-2014

15.00-17.00

E6.32

Technical Chairman: Jordy

Secretary: Renée Bijvoets



1. Opening 15.05

Jordy is opening the meeting.

2. Announcements 15.07

Arkin Zoodsma is not able to attend the meeting.

Minutes are recorded.

3. Determine agenda 15.07

First discuss the budget, then the minutes of the previous meeting and the FSP.

4. Budget 15.08

Artur Rymer and Vlad Marin are leading the discussion. On Monday 8-12-2014 Artur Rymer and Vlad Marin had a meeting with about the budget. The following points are addressed by the FSR:

- About the substantial costs of the budget for research. How will this affect research at the faculty? Jan Dijk explains that this year there is an increase in the budget for teaching and a cut for research. Last year it was 50/50. For the coming years it will be 40/60. This does not mean that the amount of research will be cut by the exact same amount. The balance between research and education is different than it was in the past. The tendency in the coming years is that there will be more money for teaching and less for research. The allocation model needs to be in such a way that this is balanced. What the faculty wants to do is differentiate more on the amount of time given for research per person, some professors will spend more time on teaching and some will spend more on research.
- Another point by the FSR is that due to the REC-moving there will be less square meter, but there will also be zero housing surplus. How big is the difference going to be? Jan Dijk explains that there is a change at the faculty level, right now we are getting 1 million because of the renovation plan and because some rooms cannot be used efficiently. Next year we will be able to use the space again. But there is also a problem at university level where the costs of housing will increase the coming years. The discussion is about whether to increase it regularly or one sharp increase in the short term. A large part of the budget will go to housing. But this discussion is still going on at the central level. The FSR wonders what the impact of the rec-housing will be for the FEB. Yesterday with facility services it was discussed what the right balance is between quantity and quality, Peter van Baalen is also in this discussion.
- There will be a decrease in safety costs, the FSR is wondering why even though there will be more students, why are safety costs decreasing? The costs are the same but the faculty has to pay less for the same services. This is an advantage.
- It was also noticed that additional budgets were received, by for example Tinbergen institute. Can we expect this in the coming years as well? The board hopes so. Contract research is larger than what is budgeted.
- Also, the FSR wants to ask about the 'leenstelsel'. When will it be invested and how will it be reinvested? The board also would like to have more information on that. It is not sure what will be the effect on the number of students, therefore the faculty has a rather conservative budget

for the coming years. Jan Dijk has no signs so far what will be the exact money that comes from the leenstelsel. The Dean also explains that the universities are not aware right now what will happen with the extra money that can be invested by the faculty, this is still only discussed in Den Haag. The FSR understands that there are no first drafts. The Dean also explains that the promise is that it will be from next year till 2025 that the money might be reinvested.

- Last question, the FSR was aware of the hoped increase of 2nd and 3rd revenues. How is the faculty doing this? The Dean explains that this is mostly for research related projects. The faculty wants to be more effective in writing proposals for obtaining better income streams. The faculty has different programmes for this such as training to write those research proposals or better target. This can be either training or collaboration (for example with companies). Jan Dijk also mentions that in the strategic plan contract research hopes to be doubled in six years. It will take a lot of effort to reach this. It needs continuous investments the coming years.

The FSR wants to know if it is possible that the board sends the plans for increasing these 2nd and 3rd revenue streams.

5. Minutes OV 1: 29-10-2014

TO DO lists, see last page. Minutes are agreed upon.

6. FSP advice

15.33

The FSR provided the board with an advice letter and a summary about the FSP. The board has received comments from different groups within the faculty. Some changes in the FSP were small, additional words, shorter sentences, such things. Based on these comments a first “final” version is provided.

About the focus of the FEB, certain sentences were added to make it more clear what the focus is of the FEB, for example the excellence of research. The Dean wants to make clear that the faculty is continuously looking for what fields of research the faculty is excelling in and invest in these areas. Also by attracting professors/researchers that are excellent in that area.

The FSR and the board go over the points made by the FSR in the advice letter:

- The Socratic model, the sentence is already changed. The FSR wonders why it is not possible to teach according to this model. The dean has acknowledged this point and added some parts in the FSP to make it less strict.
- Concrete aims: all programmes in English. The aim is to run most programmes in English, but there are legal limitations. The FEB is the only university to offer “actuarial” science, this has to remain in Dutch. However, the faculty is pushing towards as many programmes in English.
- The point about non-EEA tuition differentiation. The problem is that the UvA is calculating this tuition based on costs-based +. The faculty believes that it is a good idea to have market prices. The Dean wants to receive the difference between the costs and the market price. However, if the faculty is not receiving the surplus it won't make sense to have this differentiation. The FSR does not agree with this point and believes that some students won't be able to afford this higher price and has the idea that the faculty is making profit over students. The dean explains that this money will be invested in education. Generating more income to invest. The FSR wants to know what the subjects are to invest in? Will it not make the FEB less attractive for students outside of the EEA? The faculty wants to aim for the optimal price, according to price-elasticity. The dean also wants to make clear that other universities are already doing this. The non-EEA pricing in Rotterdam is already substantial higher than what the faculty is asking.

- Selection at the gate. The Dean explains that you need selection to arrive at higher quality. The FSR wants more clarification on HOW the faculty wants to be more selective. GRE or GMAT will be the selection criteria for graduate levels. Right now the discussion is only about master level. There is already selection at the undergraduate level for the English group, for the Dutch group there is no selection allowed according to the law. **The FSR wants to see this added in the FSP.** Peter van Baalen would like to know what the opinion of the FSR is on this point. Samantha van der Hoek explains that with selection at the gate there is the possibility that students who are not right according to the requirements but who actually perform really well in their study will be left out of the university. The Dean explains that mechanisms that don't work will not be implemented. Artur Rymer wants to know if there will be a delay in implementing this, since bachelor students now believe they can also do a master here. The Dean explains that the rules will only apply if you enter, therefore the earliest is 2017. Peter van Baalen also adds that the selectivity is a pilot. The Dean also mentions that there is already selectivity in the international bachelor and that results are higher there than in the Dutch bachelor. The problem with the study Economics and Business is that it is a study many students choose if they are not sure. With selection at the gate, the FSR is afraid that students who are not sure when they apply but who change during their study will not be allowed. The council agrees with some part of selectivity, but would like to see more clear points. Also the FSR wants to express their concerns with selectivity at the gate for the bachelor. **The board will keep the FSR updated about this.** Also, the board is not convinced with UvA matching. Peter van Baalen says that students often do not prepare for the exam of UvA matching, they still came and now they perform really well. The board is not sure what the effect of UvA matching is. The dean states that for improving the study success, the English track relative to the Dutch track should grow. Right now in the English track around 25% Dutch students are allowed, we will increase this to 40%. **The FSR suggests that the board rephrases this because it was unclear what the point was here.**
- Split of the bachelor. Peter van Baalen explains that an advice was written to split up the bachelor into economics and business administration. The split will be from the first year onwards. Students choose either economics or business. The FSR states that this is new information, since before the idea was to have a half year as orientation. Peter van Baalen wants students to think better if they want to study economics or business. He wants to enforce students to think better before they apply. If you get students the option to wait, they will wait. Peter van Baalen thinks it is better for the profile of the programme to have clear separate bachelor. He also believes that students will study faster if they chose well thought. Sten Erik Magus explains that the broad first year was the reason to choose the university of Amsterdam for him and many international students. The FSR agrees that students will definitely wait if they have that option, however students will choose differently because they have the first year. It is difficult to choose something after high school, all the different studies are quite vague. Based on the courses you have in the first year you can make a better decision. Peter van Baalen believes that this school is not the place to be wondering around. Therefore, a clear profile of the different studies is what the faculty wants in the future. What year should students then choose between economics and business economics? After the second year or earlier? Also this is a discussion that is still going on. Postponing the moment to choose is something people like, however the decision has to be made at some point. **The FSR wants to have the possibility to make an informed chose, the dean refers to the FSP that it is added that under certain conditions students can change.** Peter van Baalen has his doubts about giving students more options to choose. He believes that in term of profiling it is important to have clear profiles of which students can choose. the FSR mentions again that they believe that this is one of the strengths of the university. The main advantage

from the split is the profiling, the FSR agrees on that. However, the common year provides you with a lot of extra knowledge, and makes it easier to choose your academic career. However, common courses also helps you develop a broader perspective, even though those courses are not from your specialization. **The dean would like to know if the FSR agrees with the way it is formulated in the FSP. The FSR believes it is formulated right now in a way that is still open for discussion, which is good.** The FSR wants to know if there will be basic classes such as macro and micro economics, also for business students. Peter van Baalen states that they want to develop introduction courses, for business and economics. "What is economics". Now you are starting with mathematics and strategy and organization. However, the introduction courses should be the start of the first year. In the discussion of splitting the bachelor, a lot of issues are taking into account, the skill courses, international exchange, internships, right now there is a lot of overlap between courses, therefore there is a lot of redesigning that has to be done. One of the things that was discussed is to have maybe one broad course and after that they have to make the choose. the FSR wants to suggest a plan, in the Model OER it is stated that there has to be 12 contact hours, why not add two more hours a week that helps you to make the decision on your track. The Dean states that there are already a lot of plans to increase the contact hours to 12 hours a week. To create an unique programme, there needs to be a holistic course on what is economics and what is business administration and this needs to be the start of the bachelor

- Cohort related groups, the idea is to have groups that stay "together" that are more or less homogenous. **The FSR approves the idea of social binding.** However, **the fact that groups are based on high school grades is something that the FSR has his doubts about.** The Dean states that homogeneous groups perform better, also the students that obtained a 6 in their high school will get higher results. The idea is to put students together with more or less the same academic background. This comes from the interaction between the students and the teacher. **The FSR has his concerns that homogeneous groups will exactly have lower results.** Also, will there not be a focus only on the groups that perform well. The dean states again that homogeneous groups will lead to higher results for all groups, according to research. **Another concern from the FSR is about the criteria, in each country there are different high school systems and grades.** The Dean states that high school grades will not be the only criteria. Peter van Baalen explains that the cohort approach is also for a big part about the binding between students. It is important to find the proper size of groups to have students feel more at home at the university. Also stated in the FSP, the issue of social bonding, Peter van Baalen really believes in this, also the bonding between professors and students. He wants to create a more academic community between teachers, students. Smaller groups are necessary to stimulate this social binding, which can be obtained by having smaller bachelors. Sten Erik Magus states that implementing the homogeneous groups in the international bachelor, the question is whether international students integrate with Dutch students? The Dean, yes that is one of the problems we want to tackle with this cohort approach, to tackle that international students only bond with other international students.

- Third academic year, extracurricular activities. In the new FSP it is already stated that it will be in the third year, so not only in the first semester? The Dean explains that it is highly likely that it will still be concentrated in the first semester. He acknowledges that it reduces the freedom of students. However this is necessary to increase the level of education. The Dean has no doubts about the fact students will really lose their freedom, there is always a clause. However the faculty wants to push to majority of students to do it in their third year, first semester. The bachelor will be scheduled in a way that the freedom will be in the third year, first semester. The model of the bachelor will be standardized in a way that all bachelors will have the freedom for

extracurricular activities. Peter van Baalen states again that having too much choose, it leads to a system that is too complex. Seen with the study advisors, they are most of the time working on explaining how the different programmes work out. Right now a lot of time is in explaining the model, however there needs to be more clarity on this point and that can be obtained by reducing the amount of choose students have. In principal, all the extracurricular activities are located in the first semester of the third year.

- KPI's. Based on the analysis of UvA data. Already on 74%. This means that the faculty is able to go to 80%. The difference in analysis is related to students who switch from Economics and Business to Fiscal Economics. The dean is willing to go to 80% under the condition that the calculations are based on the UVA wide calculations. **The point that the FSR wants to make here is that study success based on "rendement" might not be the most optimal way to measure something as study success.** The dean explains that this is based on central level. Peter van Baalen explains that right now a lot of students at the faculty are just not motivated, therefore we need to find ways that we can better motivate our students. One way is to make clear profiles of the bachelor (the bachelor split), students therefore need to be better informed about their chose. Also, we want to implement goal setting programmes, students have to set goals they want to achieve in 1-2 years. This was launched in Rotterdam it showed that it really helps students to achieve their goals. In terms of performance, the results of students were much higher. Students work harder, don't get loss in their study, and perform better. According to Peter van Baalen, this has everything to do with study success, he is working on a series of measures to improve study success which is also beneficial for students. The dean explains that the ambition of the faculty is to reach reasonable rendement, however what is more important is that students do more and if they finish on time is less important. **The FSR wants to agree on 75%, however the dean wants to go up to 80% if they use the university calculations.** Jan Dijk adds that the way it is measured is based only on a smaller group of students you already lose a lot of people in the calculation.
- Dropout-rates: curricula reforms in the bachelor will also reduce the dropout rate that is the idea according to the faculty. In this data the students who switch to a different faculty are also included. Less than 25% is fair, however it is difficult to get this goal right.
- 35% students having a study abroad experience. This will be a stretch according to the Dean, this semester around 200 students are on exchange. Roughly that is 20%, they want to increase that to 35%. This relates to the previous point by the FSR that if all the extracurricular activities are located in the first semester of the third year than it might be difficult to obtain this goal (activity of minimum 6 study points, summer school will not be enough).
- Education service centre: it was unclear from the FSP advice of the FSR what the question was. **The FSR want to see the short and long term goals for implementing this stated more clearly in the FSP.** KPI's are now included by the faculty. Peter van Baalen mentions that Artur Rymer and Sophie Mikulski attended a meeting about blended learning. A blended learning professional will be attracted for implementing this. It is also conducted at the UvA level, a university wide policy will be developed. In terms of KPI's, the question is really how much is blended, 10% or 50%, therefore it is not easy to put a number on how many courses a year will be implemented with blended learning. The professional will start working on the policy and that is necessary to make predictions on how many courses will be implemented with blended learning. A more sophisticated number will follow. **The FSR believes the sentence that there will be investments made is too vague.** Peter van Baalen mentions that the priority is to hire someone and then develop a vision, therefore right now it is still vague. The Dean mentions again that this is a directional statement for the upcoming years, therefore it cannot be specified. However the fact that the statement is included, means that there is a commitment by the board.

- Appointment or promotion to a senior academic position: the sentence is changed in the new FSP. it is now excellence in research AND talent for acquiring second and third flow revenues. The FSR does not believe that this should be one of the main criteria for hiring someone. The Dean states that 2nd and 3rd stream funding has to increase, also, top academics are often very talented in acquiring 2nd money streams, therefore it is fair that if we have new external senior position that we can also expect them to be talented in this as well. Jan Dijk mentions that this is related to the budget, it is necessary that we need more 2nd streams, therefore it is included in the FSP because we want to make clear to everyone in the faculty that this is an important part. The FSR still believes that it is a secondary criteria and does not understand why it is put in the FSP as a main criteria. The dean explains that this is also a way to keep professors sharp, that they also have to be focussed on obtaining grants. **The FSR asked the dean to rephrase the sentence. The Dean agrees with this.**
- Marketing, communication and accommodation: a lot has added in this area. The Dean hopes the FSR also realizes that the REC/the building is central, it is not in the hands of the faculty. Jan Dijk explains that the points mentions by the FSR are points the board agrees on however it is too specific to put in the FSP. **The FSR asks for the communication plan.** The communication plan is under development the Dean states, **the moment it is finished it will be shared with the FSR.** This week the app for blackboard is launched by the committee, there is also a mobile site for the UvA website, furthermore they are working on an internal communication passport which will standardize the communication, ready in March/April. The communication of the FEB will fit into university wide plan.

7. AOB

16.51

No other points.

Questions and closure

16.51

Samantha van der Hoek has a question about the model OER. She would like to know what the opinion is of the board on having a central OER. The Dean agrees that the more standardization is always a good idea. It is easier to communicate, more transparent, less errors.

The meeting is closed.

Action list followed from the OV 29-10-2014:

- The FSR sends an email to Peter van Baalen for the specific case of rounding who will have a look at this (action list previous OV 29-10-2014)
- The FSR looked up the document of Plagiarism and Fraud (action point previous OV 29-10-2014), although they were able to find it, the easiest way was to google it. The board will deal with the issue of finding information on the website.
- The FSR will have a clear plan for the lunches with the dean
- The FSR will discuss with the board and communication office for the content of the WC-krant after the frames are installed.

Action list followed from the OV 9-12-2014:

- The FSR would like to receive the plans for 2nd and 3rd stream funds from the board (if possible, page 3)

The main discussion was about the FSP, therefore points for the FSP:

- With regards to “selection at the gate” the FSR would like to see added that selectivity is only for the graduate program as selectivity at the undergraduate level is not allowed by law. And also in which ways the faculty wants to be selective: GRE/GMAT (page 4)
- About increasing the international program versus the Dutch program. It was unclear for the FSR that the board wants to increase the amount of Dutch students in the international program from 25% up to 40% and would like to see this added in the FSP (page 4)
- About the education service centre and blended learning, it was unclear from the advice letter of the FSR what the concern was. The sentence “investments will be made in this area” was too vague according to the FSR. They would like to see more concrete plans (page 6)
- The FSR is concerned about the “appointment based on obtaining grants for research” and would like to see this stated as a secondary criteria in the FSP. The Dean agreed to rephrase this sentence (page 7)
- When finished, the FSR would like to receive the communication plan of the board (page 7)