

PC MA PSTS: Master EER BMS 2018-19

The PC MA PSTS discussed the current draft of the “Education and Examination Regulations for the Master’s Programmes (2018-2019)” in the PC meeting on May 28, 2018. This document also reflects the discussion at the additional PC meeting on June 22, 2018.

Since September 2017, programme committees have the right to consent for specific aspects of the EER.

In accordance with Art. 7.13 of the Higher Education and Research Act these aspects include:

- “a1 the method by which the teaching in the relevant programme will be evaluated”

This aspect is addressed in section 4.11 (Evaluation of education) of the Master EER BMS 2018-19.

We do not consent to the section in its current form, because of the following reasons:

1. The first paragraph states: “The programme board applies annual Plan Do Check Act cycles for the programme and for units of study.” – However, the “Plan Do Check Act cycle” remains undefined. For example, if this is a reference to the “Plan Do Check Act cycle” as described in “Opportunities for strengthening the quality culture of degree programmes” (JOIN: QA 1413-1), the consequences would be significant. Therefore, the first paragraph needs to be revised.
2. Section 4.11 doesn’t mention the Programme Committees. By ignoring the PCs, the current draft of the EER does not reflect the new legal and formal status of the PCs as participatory bodies.

The PC MA PSTS may consent to the section, if the following revisions were made:

1. Remove or clarify the reference to the “Plan Do Check Act cycles.” A link to an online document may be sufficient.
2. Include the PCs in section 4.11. This may not be necessary if the “Plan Do Check Act cycle” includes the PC (e.g., JOIN: QA 1413-1 is quite clear about the tasks of the PCs). – See, also, our comment on the neglect of the PCs in the EER.

Art. 7.13 of the Higher Education and Research Act also entitles the Programme Committee to advice on various aspects of the EER.

We strongly advise the Dean to clarify section 4.1, where it states:

“4) The ownership/copyright of (the content of) exams/tests belongs to the examiner/department/University of Twente”

The current formulation doesn’t make clear, who owns the “copyright of ... exams/tests”: Is it the “examiner” or “the department” or UT? – This question should be addressed in view of

temporary staff members. For example, is a former employee of UT allowed to use old exams in a different university? And is the department entitled to use old exams, if a staff member leaves UT? The latter question is also relevant in view of paragraph 10 of section 4.1 (“The student has the right to either view ... representative past exams including the corresponding model answers and assessment standard.”). Finally, the copyright notice raises questions about the use of exams by students (e.g., archiving exams by student associations).

In addition, Footnote 3 makes paragraph 4 even more confusing, because it is not clear how data protection regulations relate to copyright law in this context. We recommend to either remove footnote 3 or to provide more information.

Finally, we noted that

1. The EER does not do justice to the new legal and formal status of the Programme Committees since September 2017. At least, the PCs should be included in section 4.1. It would be more appropriate to dedicate a specific section to the PCs (as it is the case with the examination board).
2. The current EER does not define and clarify the role of the “penholder education / vice chair education.”

Especially if the EER is meant to provide guidance for both, students and teaching staff, it should always be clear, who needs to be contacted and involved. The “penholder education” and his supporting staff obviously play a major role here. However, the generic use of “the Dean” doesn’t make clear, who needs to be contacted in which regards.

Summary of our findings:

- (1) The PC MA PSTS does not consent to the current draft of the “Education and Examination Regulations for the Master’s Programmes (2018-2019).” In particular, we section 4.11 needs to be revised in view of the unclear reference to the “Plan Do Check Act cycles.”
- (2) The current draft doesn’t do justice to the new legal and formal role of the Programme Committee due to the legal reform in September 2017. As a minimum, we advise the Dean to include the PCs in the revised version of section 4.11.
- (3) Section 4.1 requires attention due to the unclear statement about the ownership of exams and the puzzling reference to Data Protection Regulations in footnote 3.
- (4) We advise to define and make visible the role of the “penholder education / vice-dean education.”

Twente, June 25, 2018

Dr. Michael Nagenborg
PC MA PSTS / Chair