



Minutes OV 5

19-5-2015

Present

The faculty board:

Han van Dissel

Jan Dijk

Peter van Baalen

FSR:

Artur Rymer – Vice-Chairman

Lisa Leering – Project Officer

Samantha van den Hoek – CSR representative

Sten-Erik Magus – Quality of Education

Vlad Marin – Treasurer

Arkin Zoodsma – Facility officer

Jeroen Hendriks – PR officer

Additional information

19-5-2015

10.00-12.00

E2.52

Technical Chairman: Jordi Beckman

Secretary: Renée Bijvoets



1. Opening 10.02

- Jordi is opening the meeting.

2. Minutes meeting 31-3-2015 10.03

Minutes 31-3-2014 are agreed upon.

Remarks: 2nd page: minutes of the previous meeting. Jan Dijk explains that the problem related to the transfer price is not a “real problem”. The current situation is that the faculty that has done the efforts, will also receive the credits. However, the Dean states that the reality is that the transfer pricing between faculties is not transparent, but this is more a discussion for the board than that students notice this.

Remarks: 3rd page. Peter van Baalen hopes he can start in 2016 with the Bachelor split. But he is afraid that it will become 2017. The Dean’s ambition is to start 2016.

Remarks about the action points:

- About the course registration (Action point 1 minutes OV 31-3-2015), the FSR has looked this up as it came up during the “Lunch with the Dean”. The problem was particularly for Honoursstudents, but also other students mentioned it. There are three issues: 1) it is difficult to sign up for single courses at other faculties, for example students that want to study Spanish before going on their exchange might want to take one or two Spanish introductory courses. In that case they are often forced to enrol for the whole program. 2) There is little freedom in choosing Honours courses and often these are not related to what the student would like to follow. 3) It is difficult to find information about courses the student can follow at other faculties.
- About the one-pager (Action point 2 minutes OV 31-3-2015), the FSR finished the document yesterday and apologizes for the delay. The document will be send after the OV and will further be discussed during the OV (Action point FSR, action point board provide feedback).
- About the Bachelor split (Action point 4 minutes OV 31-3-2015), the FSR has not seen a new draft of the Bachelor split that includes the common half year as proposed by the FSR. The Dean explains that he discussed this with the committee and that they will incorporate it. (Remains an action point for the board)

3. Announcements 10.08

Announcements from the FSR:

- The meeting is recorded for the Secretary
- Sophie Mikulski is absent

Announcements from the Board:

- The Dean has to leave at 10.50
- Peter van Baalen will be here at 11.30
- The board has set a process in motion to increase the number of seats in the FSR at the FEB. The Dean believes the FSR FEB should have 10 students in comparison to the size of the student

councils at other faculties and in comparison with the amount of students at the FEB. The CSB is looking into this. The Dean will update the FSR about this (Action point Board).

- Jeroen Hinlopen, the education director of the graduate school of Economics will leave the faculty by the 1st of September 2015. The board of the FEB is looking for a successor. As the procedures are, the FSR can give advice. In the coming period, the Dean will ask the FSR for advice.

A meeting to discuss the Bachelor split is scheduled on the 23rd of June 23rd 14.00 – 17.00

4. Determine agenda 10.13

Point 5. Socratic model is already in the updates.

5. Updates 10.13

Student panel: Lisa explains that Eva (the student-assistant) send an update. At the moment she evaluates two courses with a budget of 20 euro per evaluation, she asks students to join through blackboard, lecture talks or when they joined a previous evaluation meeting. Both students and lecturers see the benefit of the face-to-face evaluation of the student panel. Next year, the student assistant plans an evaluating the same courses to see whether progress is made in these courses. Further, her suggestion is to have a same panel group throughout the whole year that evaluates courses every period. She noticed that students often have more general comments rather than course specific comments. Also, she would like to evaluate more than two courses in a period within the same amount of hours work. Her comment on the suggestion to do two meetings per course is that she is not sure whether the course will actually change on such a short nice. Also, it is often difficult to find enough students which can be even more difficult if we have two meetings for each course. Laslty, Lisa and Eva will together with the new council look for a new student assistant. Lisa suggests to plan a meeting with Jan Dijk, Jeroen and Eva to discuss this in more detail (Action point FSR).

Although the Dean is happy with the progress, he suggests that the FSR will take another look at having evaluations already during the course. This gives more direct feedback to the lecturers which is much more helpful than only an evaluation at the end.

Jan Dijk also would like to know better what the experience of the lecturers is and whether it is possible for them to change within the period?

Socratic model: Sten explains that the first discussion meeting took place last Monday. It was a two hour discussion meeting guided by Dirk Damsma. He shortly explains what the meeting was about. The feedback from the students was really good. The students find it important to discuss these course related topics, it helps them to be more critical and they believe this is the goal of the university, it helps them understand the topics better, The second discussion meeting will happen in the week of 25th of May. After that the FSR will give an overview with the feedback (Action point FSR). The Dean explains he had a long discussion with a group of students that are working actively on the idea of “Bildung”. The Dean wants that to be taken into account in the discussion on the new bachelor curriculum.

Thinktank: As promised the FSR came up with a one-pager that actually became a four-pager. Vlad goes over a couple of examples. One of them is the 8-8-4 systems which puts a lot of pressure on students. Another common point is the lack of practicality. Students feel that guest lectures, and cases provided by companies or by the lecturer can help. The dean will look into the document and provide feedback. There remains two other important points Vlad would like to emphasize, related to the board of examiners. One thing is that students have only little knowledge about this board and it is really difficult to gain access to them. However, the FSR is already in contact with the board of examiners.

6. 8-8-4 System

10.33

The FSR thought about the 8-8-4 system. The advantages according to the FSR are that the system helps to motivate students and keeps them disciplined. It is good that you can focus on two courses at the same time (and not more). However, the disadvantages include the constant pressure, constantly after three weeks you have another exam. Further, there is too much focus on exams and the FSR would like to see more diversity (For example: projects, papers, or presentations). Also, the FSR believes that not all courses fit in the 8 or 4 week system. The Dean agrees that some courses require more flexibility. The FSR does believe the current system can be improved and would like to discuss this further with the board. The FSR would also like to know the opinion of the board. The Dean explains that the 8-8-4 system has been implemented at a central level. He also explains that not all faculties really use the 8-8-4 system. At the FEB, a lot of education related measurements have been introduced under the label 8-8-4. The whole idea is to get students working from day 1 to increase study success. Study success has increased at the FEB, so this is a benefit of the 8-8-4 system. The principle of challenging students is one that should definitely be kept in place, however the Dean also agrees that the 8-8-4 system can be improved. Regarding the constant pressure, the Dean states that the lack of reflection in the current system is indeed an issue. The Dean also states that the evaluation of the 8-8-4 system relates to the redesign of the bachelor, for example courses at mathematics and statistics. Samantha states that the FSR would like to join this process, and we would like to receive study success data (The board will send the data to FSR, Jan Dijk will bring the FSR in contact with the person who has the information on the data). The FSR also would like to see if there is a difference in study success for courses that have papers and presentations compared to courses that have midterms.

7. Blackboard contract

10.43

The FSR states that they noticed that blackboard is outdated and that central level will decide on whether or not to extend the contract. Artur explains that we have a version 6.1 from the year 2004, but that other universities already have version 9.1. The current blackboard is not convenient to work with and is not an optimal learning environment for students. Additionally, design plays a big role in making the platform more user friendly. Even though this is a central issue, the FSR would like to discuss the topic with the board. The Dean explains that there are three major systems and you should choose one, but the updated one. Samantha explains that there is a working group on central level called Blended

Learning and they are discussing blackboard. Jan Dijk will ask around at our Faculty to see if there is a group working on it (Action point board) and will inform the FSR. The main point of the FSR is that if the university is staying with blackboard it should be updated and if we choose another one than it should be one that benefits the faculty.

8. Catering

10.48

Jan Dijk explains that the contract expires October 2016 and the discussion has just started. He would like to know if the FSR is already involved? The FSR will contact Hinke Nijman (Action point FSR) The Dean states that the contract is typically negotiated UvA wide. A caterer optimizes his logistic process and not necessarily its quality. The Dean suggests that food courts are more optimal because they drive differentiation, and therefore the balance between prices and quality will improve. The only Dutch examples are Eindhoven and Rotterdam. The FSR explains that students provided input on this topic as well, and they are concerned that the current caterer is not offering very healthy food and prices are expensive. Jan Dijk further explains that there is a chance these decisions are going to be made at campus level, rather than central level.

10.50 The dean is leaving. The FSR and Jan Dijk will first discuss any remarks, last point will be the OER when Peter van Baalen arrives.

9. Remarks 10.54

The FSR has some questions from the CSR about the preparatory programs at the FEB.

- Who is determining the organization of these programs? CVB or Faculty? Jan Dijk explains that the faculty is responsible but there are some restrictions. For example the price you can ask. But further Jan Dijk has to asks.
- Do you know if there are any plans to quit one of these problems? Jan Dijk has to check this.
- Who is paying for these programs? Faculty or University? Jan Dijk explains that it is the same as the regular programs, that is the faculty pays the costs. (Action point FSR further discuss this).

The FSR has also a remark about the current status of the elections, as they are postponed there is chance the current FSR has to stay for three more months. Jan Dijk asks if all the parties can participate at the FEB. Partij Mei is allowed to participate at the FEB, same as List Sefa and Uvasociaal.

10. OER

11.30

11.30 Peter van Baalen has arrived.

The FSR prepared remarks regarding the Bachelor OER.

Article 3.2 point 3: The article states that a study unit should be 6EC or a multiple of this. The FSR states that some of the courses in the curriculum of the FEB are offered by other faculties (For example Fiscal Economics can follow Fiscal Law courses at the Law faculty). In this case, it should also be clearly stated in the OER whether these courses have to meet the same requirements. Further, the FSR points out that it should be more clear in the study guide which faculty offers the course. **Peter van Baalen will look into this.**

Article 3.2 point 9: The article states that the requirements for a course have to be met in the third of the fourth week of the current block. The FSR believes this is a vague statement and would like to have some more explanation. Peter van Baalen needs to check this, believes it is an administrative problem. The concern of the FSR in general with article 3.2.9 is that if people follow courses such as intermediate

statistics and econometrics, they cannot follow it at the same time. The article doesn't make it clear whether this is possible or not. **Peter van Baalen will look into this.**

Article 3.2 point 11: The article states that master students cannot follow courses from the bachelor. The Dean and the FSR were both keen on changing this but it hasn't happened.. Peter van Baalen states that they will not change it, he wants to prevent master students of doing bachelor courses. Peter van Baalen explains that if you are enrolled for the master you are expected to fulfil your curriculum with master courses. The FSR explains that then the curriculum for the master should only include master courses, but that the possibility to take bachelor courses should be there. (Benefit for students who want to do a preparatory program or study a language). **Peter will have a look at it.**

Article 4.2 point 4: The article has changed with the old OER. In the old OER this was article 4.2.5. Article 4.2.4 now states that the minimum for an individual exam should be a 5. The FSR already discussed this and kindly requests to leave this out. Peter explains the background of this point, the final grade of the individual exam should be a 5. In most cases you have more grades, so it is a composite grade, and only the individual part should be a 5.. Lisa states that the OC also disagrees with this and Peter van Baalen is aware of that. Further the FSR states that is has changed in two ways, not only did it go up from a 4.5 to a 5.0, last year it was only stated for first year students and now for all students. The FSR discussed this point also in relation to the 8-8-4 system and we believe this add too much pressure on students. **This points needs further discussion between the FSR and Peter van Baalen.**

Article 4.4 point 1: This article states that the examination period for final exams is 15 working days. The FSR agrees with point but wants to make sure this will benefit the way the courses are examined. In the opinion of the FSR the 10 working days was an incentive to have "easier" (for example multiple choice) exams. Therefore, when there is longer time to examine the exams, the FSR believes the quality should be better. Regarding midterms, 10 working days is necessary to have grades ready before the final exam. **Peter van Baalen believes it is a very good point but cannot promise it already for the next year. This point needs further discussion between the FSR and Peter van Baalen.**

Article 4.4 point 6: This point relates to privacy of students. The FSR wants more privacy for students and would like to see the results published through "my grades" in blackboard. The benefit is that you can see the average of the result but not the results of others.

Article 4.5 point 3: This article relates to the discussion whether the highest or the latest grade should count in case of retake. The FSR believes it is better to have the highest grade count rather than the latest grade. The FSR suggest that you can limit the amount of resists a student can have, for example once. Peter van Baalen argues that if you want to take the risk of another exam, you have to take that risk as well. The FSR believes you take the incentive away of students to improve themselves (if they already passed the course). Peter van Baalen argues that students who have the chance to study twice they have to take that risk.

Article 4.6 point 5: This article relates to the NAP that shows in SIS when a student is registered but does not make the exam. This is already discussed before and the outcome is that it is an administrative issue. The FSR believes it is necessary for the faculty to communicate better that students can un-enroll. Peter van Baalen explains that the OR suggested that this can be solved in an administrative way. **Peter van Baalen will check this.**

Article 4.7 point 2: This article is about the possibilities to switch from Econometrics to Economics. In the previous version of the OER there was a 2a and 2b for the possibilities to switch. The fact that it is left out is a good according to the FSR. However, it has to be stated somewhere to make it clear. The FSR would like to know where will this will be stated. **Peter van Baalen will check this.**

Master OER: Peter is not responsible for the Master OER, FSR contact the person who is responsible for the master OER (Action point FSR).

Article 3.2 point 9: See bachelor OER discussion.

Article 4.2 point 4: See bachelor OER discussion. Further, there is a mistake in the numbering of this point.

Article 4.4 point 1: See bachelor OER discussion.

Article 4.4 point 6: See bachelor OER discussion.

Article 4.5 point 3: See bachelor OER discussion.

Article 4.5 point 2: This article states that you cannot have a resit for your internship or thesis if you didn't pass it. The FSR believes you should also have a chance to resit these as well.

Article 4.6 point 5: See bachelor OER discussion.

Article 4.7 point 2 This article states that you cannot ask for exemption for courses you already followed at the FEB and that are in the master's curriculum you are going to follow. The FSR believes it should be possible to get exemption.

Article 4.8 point 3 This point is left out from the old Master OER but the FSR believes it should be kept in.

Questions and closure

11.59

Meeting is closed.

Action list followed from the OV 19-5-2015:

- The FSR will send the one-page advice on the student input to the board (page 2)
- The board will provide feedback on the one-page advice of the FSR (page 2)
- The board will make sure that there will be a new draft on the bachelor split, one that includes the common half year as proposed by the FSR in the OV 13-2-2015 (page 2)
- The board will inform the FSR about the decision of the CSB to increase the size of the FSR at the FEB (page 3)
- The FSR will organize a meeting with Jan Dijk to evaluate the student panel (page 3)
- The FSR will prepare an evaluation on the pilot of the Socratic Model (page 3)
- The board will provide the FSR with the data of study success related to the 8-8-4 system (page 4)
- The board will inform the FSR whether there is a group at the FEB working on the blackboard contract (page 5)
- The FSR will contact Hinke Nijman about the catering contract that will expire in October 2016 (page 5)
- The FSR will further discuss the questions from the CSR related to the preparatory programs of the FEB (page 5)

OER

- The FSR and Peter van Baalen need to discuss the following articles:
 - o **Article 4.2.4**
 - o **Article 4.4.1**