



Minutes OV 4

13-2-2015

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

Sten-Erik Magus – Quality of Education

Vlad Marin – Treasurer

Additional information

31-2-2015

10.00-12.00

E6.32

Technical Chairman: Jordi

Secretary: Renée Bijvoets



1. Opening 10.02

Jordi is opening the meeting.

2. Minutes meeting 13-3-2015 10.04

Minutes 9-12-2014 are agreed upon.

3. Announcements 10.10

- The meeting is recorded for the Secretary.
- Sten-Erik is in Estonia and Lisa is in Venice.
- Peter van Baalen will be here at 11.30

4. Determine agenda 10.11

Suggestion to start with Student Input, after that Bachelor split and OER. If necessary we will take a break.

5. Student input 10.11

Vlad Marin explains that this point is to discuss the student input the FSR gathered. Such as the think tank, the lunch with the dean and the work on the communication model and the Socratic model. The Dean states that he is impressed with the review the FSR has produced. The only thing that in my point of view, is that concrete suggestions for improvement were lacking. Vlad Marin the suggestions will come later, the first point of the document is to gather input and the expressions of the students. Vlad Marin also discussed this with Artur Rymer about Lunch with the Dean, whether this was a successful event and whether it will be frequently. For the next council this should be a regular discussion. The Dean expresses that the moment with the students are always a good thing, he learns a lot from it. Vlad Marin states that the FSR will start working on some suggestions for improvement. He also wants to know what the opinion of the board is and if it is similar to what they expected? The Dean explains that they get a lot of input from different sources and that the FSR helps to provide interesting in depth knowledge about the students. Right now, you have a long list of problems, but what the Dean is looking for is real suggestions for improvement. For example, to have more integration of Dutch and International students you could think of a buddy system. Basically, the Dean is trying to challenge the FSR to take the results one step further, and come up with a one-pager with action points and concrete solutions (ACTION FSR). Some of these points are already part of the discussion of the broader actions as far as the bachelor is concerned. For example, more interaction with teachers. The Dean acknowledges that there is not enough face-time between teacher and student. The big challenge is how to use this face-to-face time more effectively. Vlad Marin states that the FSR is starting with the Socratic Model. Jan Dijk also explains that on one hand we want

more interaction between students and teachers, however, whenever the teacher asks a question in class it often stays quiet. Artur Rymer has a few questions about lunch with the dean. First of all, you mentioned you would like to have it every month. We also envision this, to have a lunch with the dean every month. I just wanted to ask if you agree. The Dean, yes I agree, just schedule it in my agenda, I will be there and pay for the lunch. To keep it effective, the challenge is to organize a topic. So next time with Honours on the agenda, that is great. And if they want to make any remarks in between, that is fine. My second remark is, would you like to have a report after the lunch? The dean states that he likes one pager, (Action FSR, make an action list from the lunch and the think tank, one action list) for events such as the lunch or the think. Last question, do you have any additional suggestions for lunch with the dean? The Dean, another one, make sure that you get a representative sample of people that are invited. I am not so worried about the 10% very active student. I am more worried about the 90% that is less motivated. The FSR will take this into account.

6. Bachelor split

10.22

The FSR prepared questions about the Bachelor split. When the FSR had the discussion, Peter van Baalen send the first draft of the new plan. The FSR would like to hear the opinion of the board. The main comments, as discussed last time, was that the board would like to keep a common first half year. A common block 1 and a common block 2. So around Christmas, students should still be able to switch between business and economics. I personally like the idea of starting with really broad introduction courses, not a collection of separate economic courses, but one big course that explain the basis, the roots of the field etc. And we should do the same for business and business economics, one introductory course that gives the overview there. If you do this, it is completely possible to switch from one program to the other. Also, I think it is clear that if you choose business you should still know something about economics. FSR, and about the rest of the plan? I think the 1,5 year option is a good compromise, I think this is fair. You have the option economics, finance, accounting, and business. Part is minor (accountancy), but roughly the model is that the first 1,5 year is rather fixed, the second 1,5 year you go into various partners. For some streams you have to use your elective space to fill that in. Samantha: the way Peter van Baalen explained it is that after 1,5 year you choose economics or business economics. And within that you don't have different tracks but you can do a different minor. The dean states that this is correct. The less variety the better. Right now, we have too much variance. We cannot control this. This new model will reduce flexibility, you will have less choose, true.

The FSR asks around what time the bachelor split will be implemented? Peter van Baalen is talking about 2017, but the Dean thinks 2016. For people doing the old bachelor they will continue with the old program. But students that have to redo a year or a course, what will happen with them? That is something the board still has to think about. There has to be a transfer schedule.

Samantha explains that the FSR received a different transfer from the previous council. She will explain it by drawing on the white board.

With the proposed plan of Peter van Baalen you don't have any room for electives if you want to do accountancy. With this plan students will not be able to go abroad. They use their minor space to fill up the space with accountancy courses. The dean explains that students who do accounting often want to become a "register accountant" for that you have to do a post-master part. The UVA has chosen to that as short as possible, therefore courses have to be included already in the Bachelor. The Dean expresses that as far as accounting concerned, this is the situation in the Netherlands and not UvA specific. Samantha states that the reality is that a lot of students do the post-master accounting courses already in their bachelor in their minor space. The Dean is not sure about that, but for that we need to talk with Sander. Samantha states that she studied accountancy herself, and that she knows students who do this. The point Samantha is making is that if you want to become an accountant, then you have to use your minor space (and you cannot go abroad) unless you find exactly the same courses to follow abroad, but that is extremely unlikely.

In this system proposed by Peter van Baalen, all the specializations are in the minor space, but the aim of the FEB is also to have more students go abroad. The Dean states that many of the specialization courses can also be followed abroad. Except for accounting probably. The problem is not that the courses are offered abroad.

Samantha: why is the UVA not offering a full accounting program? There is a label for this. The Dean states that the problem is that for economics and business there is only one label. Therefore they want to split it in one or two, maybe even three. Samantha states that last year the discussion was also about having a separate bachelor for accountancy. The dean understands the point of the FSR, but believes that for accountancy you have to use your minor space.

There is also a remark about the fiscal economics students, the track they have to follow will have more economic courses with the new plan, will this increase the number of students? The Dean states that more difficult will also mean more challenging, and therefore will attract more motivated students. Thus the FSR and the Dean agree that the track will be more difficult, but they differ in their expected outcome. Samantha states that students that have followed mostly economic courses, will not get a high level of fiscal economic courses, therefore they might not choose the fiscal economics track.

The Dean states you should ask Peter or the committee. That is something the FSR has a question about that as well, since right now there is no student in the committee. The Dean states there will be a student in that committee (Action board). The Dean understands that for Peter van Baalen it is difficult to have all the parts of the faculty

agree on this plan. Thus the Dean agrees that one or two of the FSR members will join these meetings.

Right now, the FSR is not convinced by the plan yet. Thus the earlier the FSR can be involved the better.

Jan Dijk states that at the end of April there will be a discussion meeting and the plan will also be discussed there.

The Dean believes that it takes too long for the committee to make a new plan. The Dean also doesn't agree that there is not a draft with the half year in it. So everyone agrees that there should be a new draft and that there should be a student in the committee (ACTION).

Artur Rymer had a question about the draft that was made by the committee was it really a draft or already a report? The dean states that it was still a draft and he still wants to have the split at Christmas.

Artur Rymer has another question, will the split be the same for International students? Yes.

The Dean states that if we want to have the split start in 2016, it has to be finished right now and it has to be included in the OER spring 2016.

A final remark, it is more complicated than is sketched here. Right now, there are 19 different combinations and solutions and that is far too much to manage this.

7. OER 10.49

Points:

Article 3.2.3 Onderwijseenheden have to 6. 6 times 1 is also 6. The Dean states that not all cases can be brought under the 6 number. The Dean agrees that this is a problem. FSR discuss this with Peter. The Dean believes Peter will also agree with this.

Article 3.2.7 The problem is that it is stated again in 4.1. The Dean states this is a good point and has to be corrected.

Article 3.2.9 You can only participate in education when you have met all the entry requirements at the third week. This will come with problems because students are following Intermediate Statistics and Econometrics at the same time, so they cannot follow these courses at the same time. The Dean agrees this has to be corrected.

Article 3.2.11 Students who do a master cannot do a bachelor course. If they want to do extra courses than why is that not possible. The dean doesn't understand why this is in the OER and wants to leave it out.

Article 3.3 If you want to have more internationalization and the new bachelor plan, how can you combine this? The dean states that this has to be changed, no empty statements in the OER.

4.1 Same as 3.2.7

4.2.5 Minimum requirement of 5 for exams for the end-term. The Dean doesn't have any problems with this statement. For now, the teacher can decide on this. The FSR just wants to know if this will not be a problem for teachers? The Dean states this is a long result in all sorts of committees, check this one with Peter van Baalen.

4.3.4 When having an oral exam, it would be good if students can see the report afterwards. The Dean agrees that this should be possible. He is also not aware of any oral exams taking place at this moment at the faculty.

Article 4.4.1 Deadline for publishing grades. We understand that the working council would prefer more than 10 working days. Also if there is the pressure for finishing in 10 working days, teachers will more often use multiple choice exams. The FSR wants to know what the opinion is of the board to have this? The dean had this discussion 2 years ago, students want to have good feedback. I don't think that after this decision we have seen more multiple choice exams. Jordi also states that often these deadlines are not met regularly. The Dean knows that professors were angry when they changed it to 10 days. If the FSR doesn't think it is a problem to make it back to 15, the teachers will be happy for all courses. The dean would prefer to do the same for all courses, thus not only change it to econometrics. The FSR thinks it is mostly important that teachers make good tests, and that if it takes more time this is ok. The working council is very much against any rule in principle on this, but rather 15 than 10. **Open for discussion.** The dean also understands that it is a complex rule, for most we allow 10 and for some we allow 15. The more exceptions you make, the more difficult. Thus the dean would prefer one rule for all the courses. The Dean also states that Peter is pro 15. Anne Keegan on the other hand is pro 10 days.

Article 4.4.6 Student privacy on blackboard. The FSR has a concern about this, because often the teacher posts a long list of the grades. But at blackboard there is an option to fill in the grades. And it is easy to use. The Dean wants to know if the FSR believes if this is a really big issue? The Dean thinks this is a more technical issue that should be arranged, he agrees that in principle this is better but it is not a priority.

Article 4.5.3 Latest grade versus highest grade. The FSR wants to know why not the highest grade? Students that want to retake an exam, have to work hard to get a good grade and make sure that you don't fail the second time you take it. The dean explains that we don't want students to gamble with resits. Peter van Baalen explains the thing is when you have two opportunities, you should improve yourself. If you have a second change you are expected to perform better, because you have a second change you should perform better, thus it should be possible to only take into account the latest grade.

There is a discussion about whether or not lectures can be taped. This would make it possible for students to only have one resit. (Resits were reduced but the student council wanted to have the lectures taped). The reason to reduce resits is that the more you offer the later they will study. There is one resit but no taped lectures.

Peter van Baalen states that in general the taping of lectures and resits should not be connected. If it one thing to ask for recorded lectures, that is a different debate than higher versus latest grade. As explained, it is fair that if students have two changes compared to students that only do one exam, the latest grade should count. Samantha: I think the resit is more a second change, especially for students that already passed the course and want to improve their grade. It is always possible that you get a lower grade than you had the first time, we want to cover these situations. The Dean states that we should work more evidence based, and see how often it happens (FSR /Board Check this). How often does it happen that students who have a pass in the first exam, how often does it happen that they don't pass the second time?

Artur Rymer I think there is a link between taped lectures and the resit because resits are often much later than the classes, thus with taped lectures it will be easier to study for the resit. Peter van Baalen then let me give my view on tapping lectures. I have been looking around on this, I think it is a good idea to record lecturers. I know there are some professors who don't agree. And there is the feeling that students will not come if we tape the lectures, and especially in the first year this can be a problem. They might miss the contact with the professors and the university if everything is taped in the first year already. For example, at psychology they tape it but they don't provide it from the start. The discussion should be if it is really a good idea to have the taped lectures, especially for first year students. I am afraid we lose the connection with students if we have taped lectures. Peter van Baalen is working on a faculty strategy on blended learning. They have set up a committee to discuss this (Next OV discuss the video lectures).

Article 4.6.3 Rounding of grades. This was still not completely clear. It was already better than the previous OER. There was nothing states about grades for 5.25 and 5.4. Now 4.75 up till 5.0 is a 5. The FSR suggests to stretch this to 5.49 also has to be rounded to a 5.0 .

Article 4.6.5 No grading if you don't take the exam. No NAP. Peter van Baalen states that this might be an administrative thing. When you enrol you also enrol for an exam. Could it be separated that students don't see it? This is an administrative issue. Jan Dijk states that this is most likely regulated at UVA level. Jordi states that at other faculties you don't get a NAP. If it is not a uva thing, than it can also be changed at the FEB. The less rules in the OER the better. The Dean doesn't understand why it is such a big thing. The problem is mostly if you want to grade cum laude, what are the consequences then? Look this up.

Article 4.7.2B Students from economics and business that switch to econometrics. But it is not stated the other way around. It should be stated both ways. Peter van Baalen this request comes from the program director of econometrics. It means that we would allow students from economics switch to econometrics we should set up rules. I think there might be some problems there if you look at the nature of the courses. Catching up when you come from economics to econometrics then we have to look to what courses you have to take to come up. The question is whether of students from economics can have enough courses in math and statistics if they can switch easy. The point of the FSR is that it is not stated for econometrics to economics. Peter van Baalen states that there are no specific rules for that. Thus there should be a solution for this. The Dean thus than there should be solutions for all possible switches. Samantha explains that in the previous OER there was nothing, now there is something about Economics to econometrics, thus why not for different switches. The Dean is not sure if this should be in the OER and why not leave a document with the study advisors. Peter van Baalen, it comes from the need from the program director of econometrics. He made it explicit, before it wasn't made explicit and now there is an asymmetric situation. Thus the question is indeed if we want it in the OER or at another place? Peter the thing is that it is not settled yet, if it happened in the past we would continue with that. Right now, one

movement is settled, thus the question is do we want to formalize it the other way around, and do we want to do that in the OER? **Thus, one the sheets will be formulated that explain the rules for this and all kinds of switches, and where to put this?** Peter van Baalen will have another look at the OER next week, he has been collecting comments so far, if it is clear what the FSR wants, please send these to Peter.

Article 4.7.5 About exemptions for economics and business and fiscal economics. A lot of people do these studies at the same time, but the exemptions are not valid anymore in the new OER. This advantage of two bachelors is taken away. **Peter van Baalen will have a look at this.**

Article 4.7.6B Same concern as 4.7.5

Article 4.7.7 20 working days for the exam committee, the FSR would like to have this time shorter. Peter van Baalen explains that he is not making the rules for the exam committee. This should be discussed with the exam committee. The Dean wonders if this is not stated in law. For the exam committee it is clear that we have deadlines for the students and the exam committee. The FSR suggests that it should be shorter. Peter van Baalen thinks this is settled at the UVA level. Florian explains it is mainly for the peak times, and they need the 20 days for these times. Artur Rymer asked students what they think about this, a few students often have to send letters to the board of examiners and often it takes them longer than 20 days. Also, there is no way of contacting them even if it is very important. The Dean agrees and also received complains about this. The problem is also that there is no way of contacting them (Artur). Peter van Baalen explains it is also a matter of capacity, one person is dealing with all the request. **Peter van Baalen will discuss this with the exam committee whether it is formulated at the UVA level.** The dean states that the point is that we have to make a system that less of these questions have to go to the board of examiners.

Article 4.8.2 The FSR want to have some explanation about this point. When this OER will be official, from the first of September students that are here for the fourth or fifth year, there first year courses will not be valid anymore. The validity term of three years will be expired. **Peter van Baalen will look into this rule.**

Article 4.9.5 Inspection of the midterm. It would be more convenient if you can inspect the midterm before you have the endterm. The Dean states that the second sentence of this article is not useful. He believes that this should state that the student is entitled to see there exam, for the rest it is up to the teacher. **Peter van Baalen will look into this rule.** Peter van Baalen explains that there is a difference between giving feedback on the midterm, and the possibility of students to look into the midterm during a perusal. Peter will look into this.

Article 4.11.1 Automatic giving of the diploma. The FSR thinks there should be the opportunity to request a delay of giving the diploma. Peter van Baalen wants to have a system that provides it an automatic way, but there should always be an opportunity to ask for delay. For example, an exchange or an internship. This has to be included and it should be clear what kind of situations. Artur Rymer than there will be a long list of exemptions. Peter van Baalen states that 90% of them can be automatic and yes there should be exceptions. If you ask for delay then write the exam commission. If the request is marketed delay of graduation than the graduation will be automatically put on hold (This option should be incorporated in the system). Further discussion with Peter and FSR.

Article 4.13.2 About Fraud and Plagiarism. When you hand in your work it will automatically be put in a database. This is about assignments. As long as the UVA wants to have a check about this, and there is no way that students cannot agree with this. If you do not submit you will not get a grade. The FSR is concerned that a student has no place to agree. Peter van Baalen states that there is no possibility to change it. If we would skip this sentence it will still happen. The FSR suggests that teachers give more information about the database. This is a difficult point to change.

Article 6.3.2 BSA number is not mentioned. In the previous OER it was stated 42 credits, we looked it up and in part B it was 48. Peter van Baalen I want to go to a system of 48 as a BSA norm. But I am aware that we have to do some homework first. The main reason for this high BSA is that we think we should try to prevent that students that still have to do a lot of courses are going to the second year. The less courses from the first year you have to take the more progress you will have in the second and third year. The FSR thinks this standard is too high. Peter van Baalen states that the program should make it possible for students to get the 48 credits. **Peter van Baalen will look into this and will come with a proposal why a BSA of 48 is good and will discuss this with the FSR.** The FSR states that the courses shouldn't become too easy to make the 48 possible. Peter van Baalen states that students will work according to the set norm.

Article 6.3.2 Exemptions are not valid for the BSA, for students that come from different universities. The main idea is that students take the courses at this university. A BSA is also there to show that students can manage the course load. **Peter van Baalen will look into the background of this.**

Article 6.4.3 All the circumstances are already stated in the OER but students first need to go to the study advisor. The FSR doesn't think the study advisor is the best mediator in this sense. Peter van Baalen states that the study advisor is the person that is best up to date and should be able to inform you about the rules. The FSR does not think the study advisor is the person to go to. Florian states it is the only logical place to go to. FSR discuss this further in the PV.

Article 8.1.1 No consent or advice right for the FSR. When there are changes in part A, it is stated that the FSR only has the right for advice. The FSR wants to be included. It is stated in 8.1.2 thus this is not a problem anymore. This point can be skipped.

Remarks 12.03

No remarks from the FSR.

Remark from the Dean that Peter van Baalen will discuss the bachelor split with the FSR. The discussion is about when to get the students involved. Peter van baalen expresses that he has been informing the students. However this plan was made without the students. That is true. The FSR received a complete different story from the previous FSR than was explained now.

Questions and closure

12.04

No further questions.

The meeting is closed 10.55.

Action list followed from the OV 13-2-2015:

- The FSR will look into the idea of “Bildung” when preparing the Socratic Model (page 3)
 - o Sten is working on this.
- ~~The FSR will prepare “dilemmas” for the Lunch with the board (page 3)~~
 - o Second lunch is 23th of April, from 12.00-14.00. Discussion about the honoursprogramme. Dean: One of the take away was that it was difficult to register for courses at other faculties. That was interesting. I would be interested to have a better overview if this is really the case or not. If you can only register for the “left over” courses that is not good off course. When you go abroad and you can only take the courses that are left over. (Action FSR). Ask students about this. In a broader sense there is a problem at the university, how do we transfer price this between faculties. This is a result of an individual negotiation, obviously if you have standardized the transfer price, it will become a lot easier. Jan Dijk what you mean is that now someone from another faculty is doing the work for another faculty. With some faculties this is negotiated but with some this is not negotiated. For example, we give courses to the AUC, but we only receive money for teaching and not for research. Also with PPLE, however we negotiated it better here. Thus, something the Dean is looking to is a common “transfer price”.
- The FSR will look into the possibility to have more regular moments of evaluation with regards to the course evaluation panel (page 3)
 - o Lisa contacted Eva the coordinator of the evaluations. Eva will have a meeting with Jan Dijk about this.
- The Board will inform Peter van Baalen on the suggestions of the FSR to have an orientation semester (page 3)
 - o Samantha: Lisa and Samantha had a meeting about Peter van Baalen and he expressed not to know about the suggestion. The Dean: I did talk with him about this since I have the same vision. We also gave suggestions on how to implement this.
-