

Attendees: Van der Asdonk, Van den Belt, Horstman (minutes), Römer, Sanchez, Visser
Absent: Baltes, Brouwer, Damgrave, Ten Thij

1. Opening

Römer will be chairman today, due to absence of Damgrave and Brouwer.

2. Adoption of the agenda & minutes secretary

The agenda is unaltered. Horstman will write the minutes secretary this week.

3. Correspondence

None (only the documents from Kamp and Dohmen-Jansen)

4. Announcements

5. Approval minutes internal meeting

Minutes of the last meeting aren't available. The Council decides that minutes should be on the blackboard-site within a week, on penalty of bringing cake.

6. Approval minutes external meeting

Van der Asdonk asks about the progress of the PKM-report. Kamp mailed that it is not available yet.

Römer mentions that the regrouping of the engineering and sciences faculties will take a while. This is because of other priorities at the UT: TOM, budget cuts, etc. The fusion of the faculties MB and GW is more likely to happen in the near future.

The promised strategy-document hasn't been send. We will ask about it in the external meeting.

7. OER

Horstman mentions that the received OER is, in a positive way, quite different compared to the version from early January.

Römer asked his exam committee to give an advice earlier, this did not happen.

Comments on the OER:

- The foreword is curious: it explains TOM. The educational model shouldn't be explained in the OER.
- Art. 1.2
 - What is the role of the BSA-committee?
 - The number of persons in a project-group shouldn't be defined in the OER. It's not necessary.
 - Study speed (studiesnelheid) doesn't have to be defined in the OER.
- Art 3.4
 - Here should be something about the right to receive support in Dutch.
- Art 3.5
 - "en kan bestaan uit deelttoetsen" -> unnecessary
- Art 3.6
 - "bewijzen" misses
 - "onder meer", what are the other possibilities?
- Art 4.1
 - "een modulecoördinator" is the one person? This is desirable.
- Art 4.2
 - Why only enrolled for the first 2 modules? Not only the first?
 - Knowledge requirements shouldn't apply on modules 1 to 4.
- Art 5.2
 - "elektronische leeromgeving" should be defined in art 1.2
- Art 5.3
 - Formulated like this, the interpretation that example questions should only be available with written exams can be made. That is undesirable.
 - Why should also the norm be available?
- Art 5.4
 - Strangely formulated. What is exactly the "inspanningsverplichting"?
 - The sentence "in bijzondere gevallen" is not in the right place here. It should be in the beginning of the article.
- Art 5.6
 - Sentence in art 5.6.2 isn't formulated correctly.
- Art 5.7
 - Weird that a oral exam is public.

-
- Art 5.8
 - 10 days for correction of exams is quite short
 - “werkdag” is a better formulation than “24u”
 - “inleverdatum van opdracht” should be “uiterste inleverdatum van opdracht”
 - The result of tests on the same subject should be available 5 days before the next test (on the same subject). (should be in “toetsschema”)

 - Art 5.9
 - “electronische leeromgeving” should be defined
 - The sentence starting with “De regeling dient...” can be removed

 - Art 7.2
 - Can this only be the ‘studieadviseur’ or also a (student)mentor?
 - In paragraph 4 is something about rights of students, nothing about obligations of students. There should be.

 - Art 7.3
 - “einde van het jaar” is nog clear: it should be a date (August 31 at last)

 - Art 7.4
 - This is weird: one BSA takes away the “inspanningsverplichting” for the other programme.
-

8. Reorganisation**9. ARBO****10. ‘Herinrichting bètafaculteiten’****11. Education****12. Research****13. Any other business (AOB)****14. Question round****15. Closure**

Due to time issues points 8 till 14 were skipped.