



## FSR-meeting

Date 28-01-2016

Location E0.05

16:00-17:00

### Minutes

Presents: Samantha van den Hoek, Mourad Farahat, Tijmen de Vos, Nickardo Postma and Mick Fruytier.

Absents: Swiss Jurriens, Ioana Nicolau, Mink Perrée, Victor Oprea, and Rinus van Grunsven.

Guests: Jan Dijk, André Oosten, José Terra.

Secretary: Yirong Lo

#### 1. Determine agenda 16.00

1. Opening and determine agenda	
2. Minutes of previous meeting	
3. Announcements	
4. Update committees and CSR-representative	
5. Allocation model	Remarks

#### 2. Minutes previous meeting 16.05

Minutes of 21-01-2016 are approved.

#### 3. Announcements 16.06

- Absent councilmembers due to exams.
- The council has invited UvA staff members, mr. Dijk, mr. Oosten, and mrs. Terra, to join this meeting to provide information and advice on UvA's allocation model.
- Mr. Oosten needs to leave at 16:30.
- This meeting will end at 17:00.

#### 4. Update committees & CSR-representative 16.07

Rinus (chair O&M):

- We came up with some questions about the budget which Tijmen will ask during the OV of Thursday
- I walked by at the library learning center and they said that students aren't allowed to randomly remove other people's stuff. The problem however is that in case of exam weeks it's extremely busy and students are very eager for study spots. So there's a possibility that students are rude and just remove other people's stuff. It's very annoying but there's not that much that they can do to provide that from happening.
- Nickardo is planning a meeting with Annemarie from Blended Learning.
- Mick and I only have to print the WC-krant and then we'll have our first edition!
- Mink is in contact with the Communication department about the PR-event. They really like our idea but want an exact date which we'll discuss during the cv
- Tijmen did the last things for our Think Tank event. Please invite as many friends as you can, since it can help us a lot.

#### 5. Allocation model 16.08

Jan Dijk prepared a presentation about the UvA allocation model and explains this.

The present allocation model was introduced in 2006. This system deviates from the national system and has strong historical elements. The funds that go to the UvA can be divided into the first flow of funds (1<sup>st</sup> stream: government funding and tuition fees), second flow of funds (2<sup>nd</sup> stream: NWO and KNAW grants) and third flow of funds (3<sup>rd</sup> stream: remaining income from the EU and third parties). The first stream provides about €400m, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streams together are about €80m. The major part of the 1<sup>st</sup> stream is passed on to the faculties, and a small part (10%) is for central costs. To determine the faculties' budgets, the UvA divides the allocation model into 'education' (about €200m) and 'research' (about €200m). First stream for 'education':

- Funding per student per year for the nominal period (€3454)
- Funding per degree (€3454)





- 3 cost levels (low 1.0; high: beta 1.5; top: medical 3.0)
- Only 1 Ba and 1 Ma per student
- Additional budgets (E.g. for small languages)
- **UvA-share 12,58% in lump sum budget** (funded by the government without any related criteria, = €62m!)

First stream for 'research':

- Funding per degree (€2016, Ba x 1, Ma x 2)
- 3 cost levels (low, high, top)
- Additional budgets
- **UvA-share 10,62% in lump sum budget** (= €102m!)

UvA has its own internal system of cost levels:

FdR	1.00
<b>FEB</b>	<b>1.06</b>
FMG	1.22
FGW	1.15
FNWI	1.55

The FdR (1.00) and FEB (1.06) are basically subsidizing the other faculties, so they can improve their programmes more since the FEB already has a lot of students, this is a matter of choice. We are the only university in NL using this system. It is not clear why there is such a large difference with FEB and FMG or FGW. UvA is free to divide the allocation for education and research separately but the UvA does not do this.

Funding for 'education' per faculty 2016 depends on:

- Number of 1<sup>st</sup> year Ba students on 1 October 2015
- Number of degrees in 2014/2015
- Number of EC's in 2014/2015
- Cost level factor

Funding for 'research' per faculty 2016 depends on:

- Number of degrees in 2013/2014
- Number of theses in 2014/2015
- Cost level factor
- Size of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> stream funding
- **'historical policy budget'**
- Budget for priority areas

Note that the number of EC's is 80% of our budget for education. Most faculties use the same principle: the faculty gives the department money based on the number of students. For research: a lot of money goes to social and beta sciences, and the FEB gets around €5m as historical budget per year. The difference in this historical policy budget with other faculties is quite large. Each year 1% of the historical budget is set aside for priority areas. The board is satisfied with this amount and does not think it is necessary to discuss every single year.

The board wants a new allocation model for 2017 named "inside is outside".

Important issues for the FEB:

- Allocation of the 'historical budgets': with a growing number of students, the ratio between 1<sup>st</sup> stream education budget and 1<sup>st</sup> stream research budget becomes lopsided.
- Cost level system should be more in line with the national system
- Smaller point: system of matching 2<sup>nd</sup> stream funding
- General: besides 'inside=outside' as leading principle, it is also important that (research) budgets become more linked to the number of students/degrees

In 2010 the education/research ratio was 57/43, now it has become 67/32. This is an important matter because we want to have research-based teaching. We want to be able to pay teachers so they can do half teaching and half research, which is becoming harder. It is difficult to find good people to work for UvA because of this. This is something to be discussed with all the faculties. The inside=outside principle would be a solution, but the historical budget is still a very large part and needs to be taken into account.

#### Questions:

Tijmen: Our faculty has a lot of international students who are not funded by the state, is this directly going to UvA?

- It is going directly to UvA. The dean has been having ongoing discussions to get this flow directly to the faculty. Even though this may lead to higher costs for the faculty, but he still thinks it should be done in this way.





Tijmen: Why are ACTA and AMC not in the model?

- They get financed directly by the government, therefore do not have effect on the allocation model.

Samantha: About the cost levels (FEB 1.06). This number was determined in 2006, maybe time for an update? How is the faculty involved in this process?

- Right now, the faculty is not involved in this process. There will be a discussion about this.

Samantha: Should it be based on simplicity?

- The cost levels system seems simple but is very complex, e.g. housing prices must be taken into account etc.

Tijmen: Funding on the number of EC's, instead of on the amount of students in the course would enhance "rendementsdenken".

- Our dean is keen on keeping the idea of 'rendementsdenken' because he thinks it gives the right incentives and does not want to focus on the wrong incentives. Indeed, for some courses it is easier to earn on EC, however for other courses it is not. This way it can be balanced out, since students who don't pass their courses will cost the faculty money. Also, courses with a lot of student-contact get 30% more. There is a yearly discussion needed on the allocation of money to the Business school and the Economics school.

Tijmen: Back in 2006 the idea was to promote beta sciences. Currently this discipline is growing steadily. Do you think this model was built on stimulating this, and now it has worked we don't need it anymore?

- Hard to give an argument on this. The social sciences get more money (1.22) because they have strong research groups, maybe something to think about. In 2012 the board made a decision resulting in a disappearance of €2.5m. The FEB suffered the largest loss whereas the law faculty gained about €2-3m more. This is something that should not happen in the future.

**Remarks:**

-



#### **ACTIONPOINTS**

151106-05 Swiss state your ultimate goals for your files on the “dream on” document that Samantha made.

151120-04 Discuss the schedule for promotion and also make sure to evaluate it after one week and think of the next steps to take.

151218-02 Swiss fill in the datum prikker for the teambuilding weekend. Nickardo added new dates, please check these.

160107-01 Rinus (or Tijmen) discuss the idea that the B/C building also needs to be opened during the weekends before the exams (at the REC campus overleg). (*Old Action point of Rinus but he cannot be available at the pre-campus overleg*).

160107-02 Mink find out how much “flex studying” would cost for international students who pay the full tuition fee.

160107-03 Mink inform the council when the course evaluations will be for this period.

160114-01 Mink inform the CSR that the FEB is fine with the current compensation (Profile fund).

160114-03 Mourad find out what the time plan is for the BSc split and inform the council.

160121-02 Tijmen contact the Finance coordinator.

160121-03 Rinus make more elaborate updates.

160121-04 Everyone give your availability to Nickardo for the Evaluation weekend (11-13 March).

#### **Pro-memory**

151009-02 Respond to questions on Whatsapp.

151113-01 Actively invite students for the course evaluations (& Mink inform the council on time when the evaluations are).

151120-01 The council works according to the working agreements.

151204-01 In January: PV from 16.00- 18.00 on Thursdays.

151211-01 During events you are representing the FSR, so no looking on your phones and act excited!!

160121-01 Every other week on Tuesdays the council is having Coffee Time from 12:00-14:00.