

MINUTES 148TH FC MEETING – 6 JUNE 2013

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Tim Ficheroux (EM)	Steef van de Velde	Joy Kearney
Sharmayne Schneiderberg	Rik Hendriks (STAR)	Frank van der Kruk	
Lizzy Veldt	Eveline Wijnmaalen		
Naill Deasy	Teun Hardjono		
Jelle de Vries	Carla Dirks		
Gabi Helfert	Peter van Balen		
Thomas Eichentopf	Anne van de Graaf		

1. Opening

Juup opens the 148th at 11:30 am.

2. Agenda

There are no questions or further points to be added to the agenda.

3. Minutes

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

4. Announcements

The FC makes two announcements:

1. The name change of MSc. Gail Whiteman. The FC will approve this later.
2. Lars Norman states that the relevance of the discussion about PCs will appear later. Some delegates are not present at this moment, so there will be no quorum in the short term.

5. Merger departments 1 and 6

The merger is well prepared and everyone has been involved adequately. Peter van Balen states that the merger plan of department 1 and 6 has been an ongoing process for many years and he is confident that it will be a successful exercise.

6. RSM Student Elections for FC and UC

The central committee decided it was not of the nature that the student is expelled from the election process, undue the influence regarding the voting system. The offence was not serious enough for the student to be disqualified. The Central Elections Office should be contact to ask when the new elections will take place.

7. Update Faculty Regulations and PC discussion

Steef hopes that everything will be finalised by this summer. Some programmes need to be repositioned or upgraded from the corporate perspective, otherwise there is a chance programmes to be scrapped. Having a PC for every MSc programmes will cause them to drift apart and processes will become inefficient. Anne states that the PC should be an effective mechanism to ensure platform of common concern is an overarching programme committee – not different PCs for each and every master programme. It is important to keep the group together.

The FC wrote a letter of advice regarding the PC issue to the board, while keeping Rene de Koster (former PC chairman) informed informally. It is regrettable that the FC did not inform the current PC chairman. However, it is

questioned to what extent people should be informed if it is still an ongoing discussion. The task descriptions for PCs and PACs are identical, without the provision for allowing the FC to deal with escalations. The board and the FC do not agree on the outcomes (PCs for every MSc) of the survey the FC conducted, because the board states that the interview was conducted by two biased persons. There are a lot of open questions for which there is not solution available. CEMS and M.Phil are special cases.

Academic directors see specific set up as being up for debate. Steef thinks it is not logical why we want to set it up like this, because monodisciplinary programmes are doing well and interdisciplinary programmes are having problems. Thomas states that it might be better to cluster PCs and have them working side by side. Anne would like to go back to the academic directors and department chairs to see for herself how they feel about clustering. Clustering will require more paperwork. The FC states that the proposal to reduce the number of committees from 14 to 6 reduces the amount of paper, especially because PACs are not needed anymore. If individual committees disagree a summit should be held, because there are too many people involved to have a discussion with and it will take forever to reach a compromise. To improve the communication between the management levels, the traffic between programmes at the level of the academic directors should be institutionalized.

The common TER for all MSc programmes was an important reason for having independent accreditation. The FC states that the representational issue is being bypassed in favour of the managerial processes. However, students must be given a voice. The board agrees on this statement and states that optimization is preferred above abandonment. The FC would like to see a resolution before this summer.

8. Master thesis quality assurance

The FC thinks that fair procedures have never been in place. Anne says that there is a new online system being developed that involves the same forms as are now being used. In this new online system, all traffic between the coach and co-reader can be monitored. Teun Hardjono clarifies that the process is an exam board process and thesis is the most important form of exam. Ruling indicates that undue influence is not permitted and therefore Teun Hardjono wants the freedom to make independent judgements. The FC asks what could go wrong in terms of undue influence resulting in students being unduly failed and losing a whole year. Teun Hardjono says that with an appeal there will always be a delay. Anne states that appeal possibilities are endless. The FC wants this point to be clear. Thomas proposes a tracking system that might improve the efficiency.

9. Teaching and Examination Regulations (TERs)

Not available for discussion yet.

10. Any other business

No further topics for discussion.

11. Closure

The meeting is closed at 2 pm.

Next FC meeting 4 July at 11.30 am in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Task	Person Responsible	Progress
Contact Central Elections Office Resolution for the PC issue	Sharmayne Board	
Clarify appeal possibilities in new online system	Anne/Teun	