1. Opening
The Chair opens the meeting at 10.05 and congratulates Huib Tabbers with his birthday. As Trude Michels is unfortunately ill, Manou Windhausen makes the minutes of the meeting.

2. Approval agenda
Approved without changes and thanks to Trude Michels.

3. Approval minutes 112th meeting dated March 7th, 2016
The minutes are approved with thanks to Trude Michels.

Referring to page 1, under section 3, JvA informs about two letters to be expected. HvdM answers that no formal letter is needed in the ‘summa cum laude’ case, as communication with the examination board has taken place and the new rules are already added to the Rules and Regulations of the examination board. Regarding the Study Loan System, the Executive Board approved that this funding will come to the faculty, but has not sent a formal letter yet. Tomorrow in the BiLO meeting, the point will be put forward.

Referring to page 2, third point under section 4, HvdM informs about the representation of the new students in the Faculty Council over the different studies. The Students reply that most studies and all departments are represented. Except for one. No students from EUC are represented. As Suzanne Overbeeke left the Council, new elections are needed to replace her.
Actionpoints:

- 111.3 (Election Regulations): the letter MA received from the Faculty Council has been sent to the legal department. They sent it through to the Executive Board with a positive advice. The faculty regulations will be updated shortly.
- 112 (New Intraweb): MdJ informs the Council that the implementation is delayed to later this summer. Implementation is to be expected sometime in july-august-september.

Other actionpoints will be addressed later this meeting.

4. Announcements

ML announces this is the last Faculty Council she will attend before her maternity leave starts. She will return in February and would like to stay part of the Council. There are no replacement regulations for the meantime, therefore she will continue to receive documents and can discuss with her colleagues by e-mail.

5. Decisions in meeting of Management Faculty Board (FMO)

The Council has no comments on the decisions and thanks the Faculty Board for sending them.

6. Education- and Examination Regulations Bachelor and Master

Dr. Guus Smeets, Education Director DPECS and Dr. Katinka Dijkstra, Director Examination Board are invited to discuss this point. KD points out that the EER is the responsibility of the educational directors and dean, the examination board has an advisory role.

JvA asks why the document is not also provided in English. GS replies that it is better to first finish the Dutch version and then translate everything at once. MA adds that there is a translation of a preliminary version that was sent to the programme committee of Psychology. Since then the advices of the four programme committees, meetings with educational directors and the meeting with the Faculty Council have resulted in changes. To keep the English draft version up to date would require sending it to the translation office several times. This is a costly affair, both in time and money. JvA stresses that discussion on the matter is hard to follow for the non-Dutch speaking members of the board without an English version.

Three action points relate to this agenda point:

- 112.7a (Changing article 3.3.): MA indicates that the proposed changes to allow Dutch speaking students to answer English exam questions in Dutch, have been adapted in the regulations. Except when improving English proficiency is a learning objective of the course. KD adds that this is important for certain master courses in which writing research proposals in English is a goal of the course. It is important for course coordinators to know about this. She will later explain how changes in the regulations will be communicated to staff under point 8b.

ES clarifies that the students have not requested Dutch exam questions. She notes that it should not be too easy for teachers to just add English proficiency to the learning objectives in order to require answers in English on the exams. HvdM explains that learning objectives have to be in line with the whole programme. Knowledge parts will always be answerable in English and Dutch.

- 112.7b (Compensation Rule): MA informs the Council that the letters from the program committees have been discussed. After hearing the program committees, the suggestion is to completely drop transition requirements between bachelor-2 and bachelor-3 in the EER. We
strive for one regulation for the whole faculty, and strict transition requirements between bachelor-2 and bachelor-3 faced strong opposition of two of the four programme committees. For some courses, like the bachelor thesis, special entry requirements will be set. More discussion is needed and will take place next week. Also the consequences of this change for the compensation regulations will be discussed.

GS comments that abandoning transition criteria is a big step for PSY. However, he supports to strive for one system for the whole faculty and understands that the rules need to be changed at some point. He finds it important to discuss entrance criteria for specific courses and advises not to change the compensation system in the second year as it proves to be effective and students are used to it.

GN asks whether it is possible to set entry criteria for each block. HT and KD react that this is undesirable as blocks follow one another. If a student fails one, problems arise for the rest of the year.

KD states that only setting entry requirements for theses is not strict enough. When to put in which requirements is an issue that needs further thinking.

MA states that at this moment there are no entry level requirements for Ba3. The bottom line of the current state of affairs is that no strict rules will be set at this point and the new system will be more liberal than the previous one.

HT notes that students should be motivated to speed up their study progress and informs about the implications of this more liberal policy. GS reacts that in a too strict system, students will have to wait a whole year to retake a course they didn’t pass. In this time we run the risk that students lose their rhythm of study and they might change to another university. HvdM adds to this that there will be one system for FSW in which N=N applies to all first year students, and the compensation and limited resit regulations are extended to the second year. The risk of strict rules is a loss of flexibility and own responsibility of students, and maybe even losing students to other universities.

ES indicates that the students agree with the proposed changes, if these are in line with the wishes of the program committees. MA explains that the program committees advised on previous versions of the EER. BSK and SOC suggested alternatives to the strict rules in Ba2, which do not seem favorable. PSY and PED already have the stricter system.

HT would like to know the opinion of the program committees on not setting any transition requirements.

MA asks for a preliminary advise, so the Board can look into the program committee’s opinions. The council agrees in principal with the suggestion to let loose of the strict transition requirements between bachelor-2 and bachelor-3, but stresses that the advice of the program committees is important and would like to be informed on the matter.

- 112.7c (Article 5.6): MA states there is no new information. The option to extend the validity of grades is still in place if the exam board chooses to. KD adds that partial tests have been skipped from the article as these might include attendance, which is hard to undo. Thoughts
are devoted to a correct formulation of this point. Changes need to be implemented in Osiris too.

JvA states that the Council received the document quite late and not in English. MA followed up on all suggestions except for the possibility to do resits for practicals of skills classes. This summer it will become clear how many extra exams or resits are needed. Practicals take more time to prepare for teachers. ES stresses that next year an evaluation will take place, if redoing exams does not take too much time, the students would like to change the regulations. For students redoing a practical exam takes a lot of time too and when improving an assignment, only a 6 is possible at the highest.

MA explains that receiving a 6 at maximum when improving an assignment is a phased out regulation. JvA finds it unfair when students can still achieve a 9 or higher after receiving more feedback than their peers. KD says that the discussion should be whether students should completely redo the assignment and then receive a high grade.

HT concludes that the regulations are fine and that the N=N is a good system for study progress. The Faculty Council noticed a drop in the BSA and asks whether and how this will improve next year. According to GS it is hard to predict how students will do in the last exam round. Figures seem comparable to last year. There is a higher number of student that are not passing their attendance grades. KD adds that a leniency procedure is in place, and 200 requests have been received. These will be processed in time so students know about their attendance and substitutive assignments before the resists.

To conclude the point of the EER MA will send a revised version included transition requirements for specific courses a.s.a.p., also in English (action). The Council is requested for their approval in writing (action). MA will ask the program committees for their opinion on the changes (action).

HvdM has a final question about the master EER. A second influx moment in November is included, is that correct? MA will look into it (action). HvdM adds that one of the entry requirements for Ma PED should be knowledge about the Friedman test (instead of Frintman).

7. Framework budget and financial planning

BL shortly explains that this document contains the budget the faculty will receive from the central level. The budget is based on numbers delivered from the central level. No changes in the structure of the model have taken place as of last year. The figures are more positive than last year, because of a small raise in tariffs. In Part 2 the model is explained. The predictions from now until 2020 and the Dean’s Office are included separately. The budget will be completely in English, but unfortunately this has not been possible for the internal framework (Interne Kaderstelling).

JvA explains that the Council has a right of consent concerning changes in the model and major policy changes. As no major changes have taken place this year, the question is what to agree upon. HvdM explains that all changes are within the reorganisation plan and indeed, the model has not been changed. MdJ clarifies the changes that follow from the reorganisation plan: separate budgets for PSY and PED and a single one for DPAS and a lower percentage for the dean (from 5.5% to 4%).

MA explains that changes in policy will become visible in the budget plan.

HT clarifies the topics on which the Council has a right of consent: changes in the distribution model as well as major policy changes for the upcoming year, the University Council agreed on this with the Executive Board. MA reacts that for now only the distribution system is discussed, which included the
incomes of the Faculty. Legal affairs will be asked on which topics the right of consent applies (action). ES informs about why a 1000 extra students are to be expected. BL explains these numbers are based on estimates of the education directors.

HT checks whether the amount per student achievement is a bit higher, which is the case (appendix 1a). HT notes that influx numbers are rising, however diplomas are going down (appendix 3a). Is this a need for concern? BL explains that numbers are based on real diplomas obtained last year. As the system has changed, it is hard to get an impression of the number of diplomas for this year. Because of the numerus fixus, the past years have been fairly stable, numbers are rising now. MA adds that these numbers are not unexpected. The favourable prognosis for 2017 is based on new programmes that are starting, in which there is interest. HvDM adds that the best number to look into is the bachelor influx, which is predicted on 746. In the reorganisation plan striving is to get to 900, but this does not have to be achieved in 2017 alone.

HT replies that last year’s prognosis from the central level of 700 students was too optimistic (639). When do we get a more definite number? MA explains the 1 October count and 1 February count will give definite answers. Although bachelor students have been overestimated, the amount of master students has been underestimated, which compensates.

HT is surprised about the large reduction for housing of the Dean’s Office. MdJ explains this is due to the reorganisation plan in which fewer square meters for both departments are in use after relocation. She further explains the rise in the budget for the Marketing department: these are material costs for activities, ambassadors, making films and externally hired services (facebook, allocation programs). Personnel costs will be booked on the Dean’s Office.

BL explains that the Study Loan Resources are not in the Framework, but will be visible in the budget.

MdJ explains that the Faculty does not have a separate budget for the reorganisation projects like Lean, but that these costs are reimbursed by the Executive Board. It is therefore not visible in the budget.

HvDM understands the importance of having the document in English, but requests the Council for a consent on the internal framework within one week to continue with the process.

After a suspension of 10 minutes JvA announces that an English version is a requirement for consent (action) because the use of the principal English Language point. After receiving the English version the Council can react within 3 days. The Council requests clarity on its rights in the budgeting process. The dean will make a note (in English) that all changes are in line with the reorganisation plan (action).

8. Projects Implementation Reorganisation Plan
   b. Education and Examination Regulations Bachelor and Master

KD explains that from last September the examinations board was operational as one board. A senior secretary, Barbara van Zeijl, has been added to the team since then, but two ambtelijk secretaries have been lost. Barbara helps coordination and preparation of implementations. From last year all examinators have been nominated with letters including requirements. Standard procedures for fraude and plagiarism have been set up. The devision of tasks for members and
responsibilities of the board has been set: the examination protocol, advice on EER, establishing the Rules and Regulations. A vision for the future has been set up (document will be send round). For next year a number of improvements are planned: rules for setting up and interpreting test results, a testing committee (5 members) will implement the new examination protocol, courses will be evaluated with random samples. The main objective of the board is to make sure that the quality of exams is warranted and that criteria for examinations are transparent. To achieve this, communication is important. For DPECS ‘examinators days’ with trainings will be organised. The implementations have already been communicated in DPAS.

Considering the time left for this meeting and the responsibility of the FC, JvA would like to know what parts of the transition are going less well. KD replies there is a lot of time pressure in implementing the test protocol, which is why a testing committee is needed. This is funded with the Study Loan resources.

HT informs about the division of difference studies in the examinations board. KD replies that all studies are represented, also in the testing committee.

ML asks about whether guidelines will be set about a certain percentage of student that needs to pass/fail an exam (threshold). KD replies that there will be no preset norms for this. Examinations Board will look at exams beforehand and give advice on the topic.

ES has some questions about the ARR:
- Article 9.7.: It is unacceptable that students can only go to the toilet more than once when they have a doctor’s letter. Certain physical conditions can come up overnight and then there is no time to see a doctor. After some discussion KD will bring the matter up this afternoon when discussing the EUR general rules.
- She would like to read the appendix on mandatory attendance for practicals. KD will send them round and stresses that for some practicals absence is problematic for achieving learning objectives.

All other topics under this point on the agenda will be postponed to next meeting.

JvA: Next meeting will be on July 7th.

JvA: Translating policy documents into English remains an important topic.

9. Other Business

HT: Colleagues have heard about a new digital learning environment being built and informs about the current status. MdJ explains this is an EUR project ‘DLWO’. A lot of changes are to be expected. This summer a migration of the program environment to the MyEUR environment will take place, which is based on Liferay software, same as the Intraweb. In 2017 a totally new learning environment like Canvas or Moodle will be installed. A EU tender started for this. The new system should be more user friendly and stable. HT advises to announce something about this to prevent rumours.

10. Closure
The chair closes the meeting at 11:59 hour.