

NEWSLETTER

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

[All discussed documents can be downloaded here](#)

The main topic of the first discussion meeting of the newly formed University Council and the executive board was the new educational model (TOM). On the one hand the council discussed with the board about the passing/failing regulations and their integration in the education and exam regulations (OER). On the other hand it was discussed which criteria the evaluation of the first year of TOM should meet according to the council. You can find a report of the meeting in this newsletter.

After the meeting there was an informal discussion with the board about the governance agenda for this year with regard to the implementation of Vision 2020. The University Council once again pressed for carrying out an employee-survey soon, in order to gain more insight in the amount in which employees experience an increased work pressure.

[Unsolicited advice about integration of passing/failing regulations in the OER](#)

In the past year the University Council already published a critical advice about the rules in TOM and the way they are used in practical situations. One could think of the 15 EC-all-or-nothing regulation and, as a consequence, the requirement of passing 3 full modules for getting a positive Binding Study Advice (BSA). Another rule that could hinder the students progress is the obligation to re-do the entire module if a student failed one part. Following this discussion the University Council asked for and received an overview of the passing/failing regulations that were applied ("werkende weg") during the past year. As explanatory note the board states that the regulations could be different between programmes, but that these regulations are clearly communicated to the students. Because the TOM-education is still in the start-up-phase, the board does not consider it necessary to integrate the passing/failing regulations in the education and exam regulations (OER).

Conversely the University Council states: if a passing/failing regulation, that a program communicates to students, deviates from the arrangement as stated in the OER, this regulation

should still be included in the program-specific OER.

After all, the OER is the practical and legal framework from which students can derive rights and duties and which the exam committees should use to assess their decisions. In the councils view there is no room for not (yet) including these regulations in the OER. In fact, programs are responsible for doing this. The board should ensure that it happens and has to organize the OER in such a way that the programs can keep up with their responsibilities.

The council has supported its point of view by investigating the current situation. A few programs have a passing/failing regulation, in which for example it is possible to count parts of modules for the BSA, that was communicated to students and included in the OER. A second group of programs communicated a different regulation, but did not include it in the OER. A third group of programs states to keep maintaining the original TOM rules. However, also in that group the view is diverse: sometimes generous compensation regulations are implemented (crossing a 4 against an 8) and sometimes programs make use of the hardship clause (if a student is considered suitable for the program, insufficient progress is disregarded). The board promised to review the council's advice and will come back to this matter later.

Want to respond? Send an e-mail to:
Dick Meijer t.m.j.meijer@utwente.nl



[TOM at the UT](#)

The past year TOM was introduced for all Bachelor programs of the UT. Currently, with a full TOM-year behind us, we can draw up an interim balance. In the

coming cycle we will discuss this with the board in great dept, based on the results achieved by all programs, the evaluation of one year TOM, the findings of the expert committee and the opinion of the Executive Board. As University Council we want to be certain that we will assess the relevant issues. Therefore we sent a [letter](#) to the board indicating which points we are going to focus on and on what topics we expect concrete information. We will regard this information in relation to the objectives the board had formulated at the time TOM was introduced, but also compare with the additional commitments made by the board and the concerns the University Council indicated in the mean time.

A few topics which we will definitely discuss with the board are:

- The contradiction between a mathematics line and a ‘fully integrated module’
- The relation between the objective ‘increased efficiency’, compensation regulations and the achieved level of the program
- The feasibility (in the long term) of a 10% cutoff on education expenses, especially in relation to the work pressure of teachers
- Attractiveness of the UT-programs for potential students.

The Council will critically follow all information in order to determine whether the implementation of TOM is going itself: what is going reasonable or good, and in what cases improvements are definitely needed. As for the points of improvement, we will not hesitate to clearly state how they could be improved according to the University Council and what we expect from the board in this.

In case you have questions regarding (the evaluation of) TOM or additional information about your experiences in TOM, we would like to hear from you. Please contact one of the council members.

Want to respond? Send an e-mail to:

Frank van den Berg f.m.j.w.vandenberg@utwente.nl



[Evening lectures and exams](#)

In July the board announced via UT News they were going to investigate the possibilities for introducing evening lectures and exams. After that the council has contacted the board about the ‘how’ and ‘why’. When the answers on that questions turned out to be

insufficient, a number of written questions were formulated in order to gain clarity about the background of the investigation, the term, and even more important: whether and where the board wants to discuss this topic with student- and employee participation. During the discussion meeting and by means of a written response of the board we can conclude that there is not much clarity yet about the investigation itself. What did appear was that currently there already are some (incidental) evening lectures or exams.

The council considers it important to involve all groups of the UT community in this question, even more when looking at student activism that is highly valued at our university. Also for employees it would be good to remain closely involved with these developments, because this will have consequences for them as well.

Want to respond? Send an e-mail to:

Luuk Geurts l.r.m.@student.utwente.nl



About the University Council

The University Council is the central participation body of the UT and discusses regularly with the Executive Board. The Council contains of 18 members; nine staff members and nine students.

The Council has also a say in the policy of the UT at the central level.

Three parties are currently represented in the UC: Campus Coalitie, UReka and PvdUT.

Currently the council has the following members:

Herbert Wormeester (chair), Frank van den Berg, Jan de Goeijen, Jörgen Svensson, Herman Poorthuis, Anton Stoorvogel, Barend Köbben, Gert Brinkman, Dick Meijer, Luuk Geurts, Tim Schuitema, Derko Budding, Peter Mpuan, Thomas van Tilburg, Nik Huisintveld, Stijn van Winsen, Cathérine de Bruine and Dimah Babugu.

October 2014



Visit our website for more information:

www.utwente.nl/uraad

To receive or cancel this newsletter, send us an e-mail:

: info@uraad.utwente.nl