Utrecht University Quality Agreements Plan

March 2019
Contents

Preface by the Executive Board
Introduction
Abbreviations used in the text

A

Quality Agreements Plan

Chapter 1
The themes Utrecht University has chosen to prioritise

Chapter 2
Contents
2.1 University framework for student loan system funds
2.2 Examples of how the various faculties have chosen to allocate and spend the student loan system funds

Chapter 3
Utrecht University's procedure with regard to the Quality Agreements Plan
3.1 Procedure at the university and decentralised levels

Chapter 4
The student loan system funds allocated to Utrecht University
Statement by the University Council
University framework for student loan system funds

B

Schematic representation of the various faculties' plans for the student loan system funds (Utrecht University, 2019)

C

The various faculties' plans for the student loan system funds

Science
Veterinary Medicine
Humanities
University College Utrecht
University College Roosevelt
Medicine
Geosciences
Law, Economics and Governance
Social and Behavioural Sciences
Graduate School of Teaching

Appendices (for information purposes)

Self-evaluation performed as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit (ITK)
Advisory report issued by the review panel performing the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit (ITK)
Strategic Plan for 2016-2020
Preface by the Executive Board

You are reading Utrecht University's spending plan for the student loan system funds to be awarded for the 2019-2024 period by the Minister of Education, Culture and Science.

Utrecht University underwent the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit in the spring of 2018. Our plan for how we intend to honour the quality agreements is in line with the self-evaluation we performed as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit and the report issued by the review panel of the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO). Both documents have been appended to this plan.

Utrecht University is very grateful for the funds it will be awarded (hereafter referred to as the ‘student loan system funds’ and feels that all its students should be able to benefit from them. One of the university’s guiding principles in the allocation of the funds was that the plans should reduce rather than increase staff workloads. Partly because of that, the university wishes to prevent dilution of the funds and minimise any transaction costs which may be involved.

This document will touch in some detail on the prioritisation decisions made with regard to the six themes proposed by the Minister of Education, and on the allocation procedure used at the university. The various faculties’ intentions with regard to the funds are appended to this document. In order to make this document easier to read, we have drawn up a schematic representation of the faculties’ plans. This, too, you will find appended to this document.

The present plan outlining how Utrecht University intends to spend the student loan system funds awarded for the 2019-2024 period was drawn up following a university-wide discussion and was approved by the employee and student representative bodies. This consultative process fits in with Utrecht University's ambition and culture of making decisions that are broadly supported by the people making up our academic community.

The discussions we have had with each other in recent months were inspired by this attitude, and this is also the attitude we hope to take with us when we discuss with you the plans that we, the academic community, support.

Utrecht University’s Executive Board
Anton Pijpers, Henk Kummeling and Annetje Ottow
Introduction

We will use this introduction to present the broad outlines of the context in which Utrecht University operates.

UU's vision for teaching and learning

Utrecht University seeks to shape students, challenge them to make the most of their talent and prepare them for whatever career steps they take after graduating. Through the research it conducts, the university seeks to generate new knowledge. This newly gained knowledge is incorporated into our degree programmes, so as to help young people and future employees grow, and also to help them develop their talents during their careers.

Utrecht University has its own teaching model, featuring an Education Guideline that applies to all degree programmes taught at Utrecht University. Chapter 1 of the self-evaluation performed by Utrecht University as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit (ITK) provides an explanation of the Utrecht Teaching Model. The NVAO review panel stated in its report that the development of the degree programmes is informed to a significant degree by the teaching model and calls it ‘an example of a healthy interplay between centralised guidance and decentralised dynamics’.

The Education Guideline not only contains guidelines for how to structure degree programmes, but also regulations on how to establish and implement an internal quality assurance system. Since we believe that quality assurance is more likely to succeed if it is aligned with the nature and culture of the individual department and/or faculty, the guideline does not state how exactly internal quality assurance must be performed – solely the requirements the system must meet.

The university has focused a great deal on the establishment of a culture of quality. A culture that bespeaks collective professionalism and where frank conversations are welcomed. Therefore, the greatest compliment the NVAO review panel could have given Utrecht University after the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit was that it had observed an unmistakeable culture of quality, which, due to its open-minded and frank nature, gave rise to intensive and stimulating dialogues and the sharing of best practices. The NVAO review panel also found that the culture of quality was designed to continually raise the quality of the university's degree programmes, across disciplinary boundaries, and that the combination of the culture of quality and the internal quality assurance system has resulted in predominantly positive reviews by external review panels and students.

However, no matter how good an internal quality assurance system and culture of quality a university has, the quality of its degree programmes depends on the quality and abilities of the lecturers who teach the courses. They must be given enough opportunity not just to teach, but to supervise students and give them feedback, prepare for the seminars they are about to teach, develop new teaching materials and have sufficient time left over to work on their own personal and professional development. Lecturers must be given sufficient opportunity to be open to trends in society, and must also teach students to have an outward focus, to be socially engaged, to join in projects being undertaken in the region, etc. Lecturers are absolutely crucial to successful degree programmes, and will remain so.

The university has observed that the greatest issue currently threatening to undermine the quality of its degree programmes is lecturers’ increasingly heavy workload. This observation is reflected in the themes for the quality agreements that Utrecht University has chosen to prioritise. One of the things the university will prioritise most is allowing academic and support staff enough time to supervise students.

UU’s quality agreements strategy

Utrecht University’s guiding principles in implementing the quality agreements are as follows:

- Alignment with the ambitions and objectives formulated in the current Strategic Plan for 2016-2020
- Making decisions that are widely supported by the UU community
• Minimising the administrative burden associated with the implementation of, and reporting about, the quality agreements to the maximum extent possible.

On that basis, in consultation with the University Council and the deans, the Executive Board has selected a model for allocating earmarked funds to the faculties and for drafting a university framework for student loan system funds to give the faculties guidance on how to spend the student loan system funds. In this procedure, the specific arrangements with regard to the way in which the faculties get to spend the student loan system funds are decided on by the deans and faculty councils – naturally, within the scope of the university-wide framework for the spending of the student loan system funds and the applicable university-wide framework documents, such as the Education Guideline. Reporting on the use of the student loan system funds will be subject to a uniform, university-wide method, as well.

This approach allows us to do justice to the differences between the various faculties, and allows the faculties and departments to focus on the things they wish to prioritise, while at the same time, the university-wide framework document ensures that there is uniformity with regard to the objectives. This approach also fits in with the ‘change in the philosophy on guidance’ mentioned in Section 4.5 of the self-evaluation we performed as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit. This means that the Executive Board will not rigidly implement major reforms top-down, but rather will seek to make sure that major reforms are in line with initiatives undertaken by the academic community. During its visit, the NVAO’s review panel saw our new method in action, and in its report, it stated that it observed many positive examples of the method in the interviews it had with UU representatives.

One consequence of the chosen approach (i.e., faculties deciding for themselves how to spend the funds, within certain boundaries set by the university) was that the decisions on some of the quality agreements were made on the faculty level, meaning that faculty councils had the right of consent with regard to plans concerning their respective faculties. Combined with the aforementioned guiding principle of making choices that are widely supported by the community, the university had its work cut out for it trying to draw up a university-wide plan for the spending of the student loan system funds within the set time frame.
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Quality Agreements Plan
Chapter 1 Selecting the themes to be prioritised by Utrecht University

The university wishes to utilise the student loan system funds to raise the quality of the education it provides. The Minister of Education, Culture and Science proposed six themes to which the funds can be allocated:

1. More intensive small-group teaching (teaching intensity);
2. Curriculum differentiation, including the development of talent as part of degree programmes, but also outside the scope of degree programmes;
3. Continued focus on professional development of lecturers (quality of teaching staff);
4. Appropriate and high-quality teaching facilities;
5. More frequent and better student supervision;
6. Study success including advancement, accessibility and equal opportunities.

Activities and objectives for all six themes were formulated in Utrecht University's Strategic Plan for 2016-2020. The student loan system funds will enable the university to give an additional impetus to several themes.

In order to prevent the funds from being allocated to too many small projects, thus becoming diluted, the university's Executive Board, in association with the University Council and the deans, decided to draw up a top-3 of themes whose quality the university particularly wishes to raise. A brainstorming session with the University Council resulted in the following top-3. In making this decision, the University Council was guided by the input obtained from the various faculty councils. Utrecht University has chosen to focus its additional spending on the following three themes:

- More intensive and small-group teaching (teaching intensity)
- Continued focus on the professional development of lecturers (quality of teaching staff)
- More frequent and better student supervision; including accessibility and equal opportunities.

‘Accessibility and equal opportunities’ (part of the ‘Study success including advancement, accessibility and equal opportunities’ theme) were added to the ‘More frequent and better student supervision’ theme. This means that the university has chosen to deviate from the six themes proposed by the Minister.

This is because the university does not wish to allocate additional funding to improving study success rates, but does wish to allocate additional funding to the accessibility and equal opportunities aspect. The university feels that faculties must be given the opportunity to use some of the student loan system funds to help improve accessibility and create equal opportunities. However, the Executive Board and employee and student representation jointly found that adding a fourth theme, purely dedicated to ‘accessibility and equal opportunities’, was not a desirable option. The employee and student representation indicated that they were fully committed to improving accessibility and creating equal opportunities, but that the university is already doing a great deal to open up access to the university and that creating more equal opportunities could be part of student supervision. The representative bodies also indicated that a fourth theme would result in the available money being unnecessarily diluted. Therefore, in consultation with the University Council, the Executive Board decided to add the aspect of ‘accessibility and equal opportunities’ to the ‘More frequent and better academic student supervision’ theme.

More information on the six themes

We will outline below to what extent Utrecht University is focusing on the six themes listed by the Minister. We will also touch on the subject of the themes in which additional investments will be made, using the student loan system funds.

However, before we will further delve into the individual themes, we should note here that Utrecht University will continue to invest in all six of the themes listed by the Minister of Education in the long term, regardless of the amount of the student loan system funds allocated to the university. After all, all of the aforementioned
themes fit in with the ambitions expressed in the university's Strategic Plan. Furthermore, continued efforts to promote these themes are in line with the findings of the NVAO panel that performed the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit, which told us to continue the clearly defined vision for teaching and learning and to ‘retain’ the highly positive culture of quality that has been created ‘and take it to the next level’.

1. More intensive and small-group teaching (teaching intensity)

As indicated in Chapter 1 of the self-evaluation we were asked to submit as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit, small-scale, activating education is one of the four cornerstones of Utrecht University’s Teaching Model. Experience has taught us that small-scale teaching is one success factor for high-quality teaching and study success rates. The Strategic Plan stipulates that students must be taught in small groups, with intensive teaching, regular feedback and close contact between lecturers and students. This is vital to the development of skills that will enable students to make effective use of their academic background in their later (academic) professional careers. The tutor system plays a key role in this.

In recent years, the university made pre-investments using the student loan system funds to give an additional impetus to small-group intensive teaching. Thanks to this funding, Utrecht University has been able to hire an additional 250 lecturers. These funds for intensive small-group teaching have by now been added to the faculties’ fixed rate in the university’s budget allocation model and will be continued with the student loan system funds. As stated in the Strategic Plan, the university wishes to use the promised additional government funding that will become available due to the abolition of student grants to the appointment of additional lecturers.

When the Executive Board had its aforementioned brainstorming session with the University Council, one of the wishes that was expressed most often was the creation of more contact hours between lecturers and students. When the Board talked to the faculty councils, we found that students also found a reduction of lecturers’ heavy workload to be an important issue.

Therefore, intensive small-group teaching is one of the three prioritised themes to which the university wishes to allocate the student loan system funds it will receive.

2. Curriculum differentiation, including talent development as part of degree programmes, as well as outside the scope of degree programmes

Curriculum differentiation, too, can be seen in the Utrecht Teaching Model, in the cornerstone called ‘Flexibility and the freedom of choice’.

As explained in Chapter 2 of the self-evaluation we were asked to submit as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit, the university grants its students many opportunities to grow, both within the university and elsewhere. In order to do justice to the fact that different students have different ambitions and talents, the Bachelor’s stage of our degree programmes is partially demand-oriented, and students have some freedom in determining their own programme. Utrecht University Bachelor’s students can put 25 per cent of the ECTS credits they need to graduate towards electives of their own choosing. As mentioned in Section 2.2.2 of the self-evaluation, evaluations have shown that students appreciate having so much freedom to pick their own electives in their Bachelor’s degrees, and that some of them actually chose to attend Utrecht University because of this freedom. But once they have embarked on a degree, many students turn out to be quite ‘loyal’ to their own programme. Therefore, one of the ambitions outlined in the Strategic Plan for 2016-2020 is to encourage students to look beyond the confines of their own department and introduce them to interdisciplinary issues that will prepare them for a post-graduate future in which they will have to be able to work in a multidisciplinary environment. The university is currently exploring through the ‘utilisation of the optional courses’ project how to go about this and how to remove any obstacles students may encounter. The objective is to ensure that by 2020 it will be considered normal to take courses outside one’s own department.

In order to encourage students to make the most of themselves, the university has a wide range of honours programmes (on top of the optional courses students can take), both for Bachelor’s students and for Master’s students. An Honours College has been established that will be evaluated in a year. More information on this
can be found in Section 2.2.2 of the self-evaluation we submitted as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit. The university has a long history of honours programmes and will continue to invest in these, as confirmed by the Strategic Plan, as well. Take, for instance, the Center for Entrepreneurship (which was established using policy resources), StudentsInc and UtrechtInc, which helps students realise their entrepreneurial ambitions. Other ambitions laid down in the Strategic Plan include introducing all students to the concept of ‘sustainability’ during the course of their degree programmes and actively encouraging students to be socially engaged and to appreciate activities geared towards that goal. By now we have realised several Community Service Learning Activities, where students can gain experience of volunteering, board membership, being involved in politics, taking part in ‘Educhallenges’, etc.

The university seeks to realise its ambition (outlined in the Strategic Plan) of offering multiple interesting life-long learning courses in 2020, and has allocated policy resources to several pilot studies to this end. The university is providing a modern digital learning environment and is developing several blended-learning programmes, in line with the Strategic Plan.

Having included its ambition to challenge students to look beyond the scope of their own field of study, their own university and their own country in the Strategic Plan for 2016-2020, the university promotes and supports quite a few projects allowing students to grow, both as part of their degree programmes and outside the scope of their degree programmes, partly in relation to the ‘city deals’, the Utrecht region, the National Research Agenda, etc.

Utrecht University will continue to invest in curriculum differentiation in the future, and will add more course/programmes/projects to the existing ones. However, the university will not allocate any student loan system funds to the ‘Curriculum Differentiation’ theme.

3. Continued focus on the professional development of lecturers (quality of teaching staff)

A third and crucial cornerstone of the Utrecht Teaching Model is the professional development of lecturers. After all, the quality of our degree programmes depends on the quality of our lecturers. Chapter 2 of the self-evaluation we submitted as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit presents an overview of the wide range of courses available to lecturers for their continuous growth and professional development. In line with the Strategic Plan, the university has drawn up a policy whereby most new lecturers on a temporary contract are offered a four-year contract of at least 0.7 FTE. Ten per cent of their hours are expected to be used for professional development, and they are given the opportunity to obtain their University Teaching Qualification. This arrangement gives lecturers some security, as well as enough opportunity to grow as lecturers, learn and commit to the university. We believe that if lecturers are offered multi-year contracts, this will raise the quality of the degree programmes they teach. In addition, it will boost lecturers’ chances in the labour market in the event that they end up leaving the university after four years. During the period covered by the Strategic Plan, the Center for Academic Teaching was established. This Center combines a wide range of training programmes, networks and education reform funds. Thanks to a contribution from the university’s Teaching Fund, the university has been able to develop appropriate courses that will teach lecturers how to teach in English and how to deal with intercultural differences, thus allowing students to grow regardless of their background.

In its pre-investment of the student loan system funds, the university already began promoting the professional development of its lecturers through the Educate-It programme. Needless to say, we will continue to invest in this.

The university will use the funding it will receive from the student loan system funds to invest in the further professional development of its lecturers.

4. Appropriate and high-quality teaching facilities

The university has many teaching facilities, which are listed and described in Chapter 2 of the self-evaluation. For instance, there are many well-equipped study spaces, the Skills Lab, the study areas, the Teaching & Learning Lab, etc. These facilities are greatly appreciated by our students. As mentioned in the Strategic Plan for 2016-2020, Utrecht University is increasingly using innovative online options to allow students to gain
international and intercultural skills, but also to allow students to engage in blended learning. For those students who will not spend a year abroad, the university is developing international learning environments in many places, and for international students, the university is offering more opportunities to study remotely.

As part of our advance spending of the student loan system funds, the university has invested €2.4 million in basic equipment for all lecture rooms in recent years. In addition, the university has invested its own Educate-It project resources in an online examination facility. As mentioned in the Strategic Plan, the university will continue to offer its Educate-It programme: by 2020 blended learning will be a fixed part of the curriculum.

In addition, the number of study spaces was increased from 4,500 to 6,000 during the period covered by the plan. In the coming years, too, the university will continue to focus on proper communication with students and prospective students, on showing exactly where study spaces are available through Studyspot, and on the realisation of additional study spaces.

As indicated in the Strategic Plan for 2016-2020, the university will continue to invest in improving and updating its teaching facilities. However, no additional funding from the student loan system funds will be invested in this theme.

5. More frequent and better student supervision

Chapter 2 of the self-evaluation we submitted for the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit provides a list of the various ways in which the university seeks to supervise students. Since Utrecht University Bachelor’s students enjoy a relatively large amount of flexibility and freedom of choice, they require proper supervision. For this reason, all first-year students are assigned a tutor who helps students (both in groups and on an individual basis) understand the choices they need to make during their study careers. During our brainstorming session with the University Council, we found that the faculties would like to invest more in the supervision and consultations provided to students. As a result, Utrecht University has chosen to include this theme in its top-3.

The university, being a public institution, has its responsibilities to society, to future students, to present-day students and to the primary and secondary schools with which it collaborates. Society is changing, which means that the students who enrol in our degree programmes are changing, too. At the same time, some of the pupils and students are having difficulty enrolling in a degree at Utrecht University or successfully completing it. We have established two taskforces tasked with identifying the reasons why these pupils and students are having difficulty, and with finding solutions. One of these taskforces will focus on diversity, while the other will focus on student wellbeing.

Since we have this social responsibility, we came up with the idea of adding ‘accessibility and diversity’ to the ‘student supervision’ theme. The general idea is that the improvements we will be able to make to our degree programmes because of the student loan system funds must benefit all Utrecht University students, regardless of their background and/or type of disability. Adding ‘accessibility and diversity’ to the Student Supervision theme allows faculties to use the student loan system funds to, say, focus more on students who require special attention.

6. Study success including advancement, accessibility and equal opportunities.

In recent years, the university has strongly sought to improve its study success rates – successfully so. Our university has some of the highest study success rates in the country. But there is more to being a successful student than just obtaining a degree. Success also includes the extent to which students are able to make the most of themselves and acquire the skills of an academic. As mentioned in Chapter 1 of the self-evaluation we submitted as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit, the university used to focus too much on obtaining high study success rates and reducing drop-out rates, and did not focus enough on students becoming proper academics. In response to feedback received from our students, we included some objectives in our Strategic Plan for 2016-2020 with respect to broader cultural, intellectual and community education, and to the creation of better opportunities (including the removal of impediments) allowing students to use the full breadth and interdisciplinarity of the degree programmes on offer. For this reason, the Executive Board and the University Council jointly agreed not to allocate additional funds to promoting higher study success rates.
However, accessibility and equal opportunities are aspects that do deserve more attention at Utrecht University, as Utrecht University does not really appear to be on the radar of all students who might be able to complete an academic degree. Once these students have made it to our university, some of them experience difficulties trying to obtain their degrees, partially because of their background (socioeconomic background or possibly disabilities). As mentioned in the section on theme no 5, we have opted to add ‘Accessibility and Equal Opportunities’ to the ‘More Frequent and Better Student Supervision’ theme.
Chapter 2 The decisions

2.1 University-wide framework for the allocation of the funds

As indicated in the Introduction, the Executive Board has drawn up a university-wide framework for the allocation of the student loan system funds. This university-wide framework basically sets the boundaries within which faculties have to act. We are operating from the premise that we will use the full five years (2019-2024) to implement the quality agreements. This means that the faculties' plans have a five-year term (2019-2024).

The university-wide framework contains conditions and instructions on the themes to which the faculties wish to allocate the student loan system funds, the allocation requirements to be taken into account in advance and the requirements afterwards, which stipulate how the faculties are to account for the way in which they have spent and utilised the funds they received. Please find the framework document appended to this document.

The decisions: the reasons why the individual faculties chose to invest in these particular themes

Faculties are required to indicate in their plans which of the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching; professional development of lecturers; and student supervision (including accessibility and equal opportunities)) they have chosen to prioritise and why. If a faculty decides not to allocate additional funds to one particular theme or aspect thereof, it must explain why. In addition, faculties must indicate what kind of results they seek to achieve, when and how they intend to achieve them and what stakeholders (from within the university or possibly from elsewhere) are involved in the realisation of the plans.

Allocation requirements stipulating in advance how the student loan system funds are to be spent

The manner in which the faculties wish to allocate the student loan system funds is subject to certain conditions, to allow for uniform reporting afterwards. In addition, the agreements stipulate that when the student loan system funds are spent and allocated, the administrative costs involved in this will not be deducted from the funds allocated to the faculty.

Reporting afterwards, with regard to the way in which the funds were spent and allocated

The manner in which the faculties allocate the funds they will be awarded is subject to certain conditions, to allow for uniform financial reporting afterwards. Agreements have been drawn up as to the way in which the faculties must indicate the amounts of the investments, the intended outcomes, when the faculty is expected to report to the Executive Board and when the faculty's data must be submitted for inclusion in the university's annual report. Faculties will be allowed to revise their ambitions, e.g. due to internal or external developments that could not be foreseen in advance.

The financial reporting on the funds will be embedded in the university's planning and control cycle and will be included in the bilateral discussions held annually between the Executive Board and the deans. In these bilateral discussions we will touch upon both the measures taken and the resources utilised to implement said measures. In the spring the bilateral discussions will focus on policy and strategy, whereas in the autumn they will focus on the budget. As part of the planning and control cycle, the deans will be asked in the autumn to indicate the following:

- how the process of realising the intended investments using the student loan system funds is coming along,
whether there is a need to revise previously drafted ambitions, and if so, with respect to what, why and how, if the ambitions do not cover the entire 2019-2024 period, the deans will be asked to indicate what their ambitions for the upcoming period are.

In addition, the quality agreements will be put on the agenda of the teaching-related quality assurance meetings conducted between the rector and the dean. These meetings are held annually in the autumn and are part of the internal, university-wide quality assurance system as outlined in the self-evaluation submitted as part of the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit. The meetings will result in agreements that will be laid down in reports. The progress made in relation to these agreements will be a recurring agenda item for the quality assurance meetings.

Involving the employee and student representation bodies in the evaluation of the manner in which the student loan system funds are used

The evaluation of the quality agreements should include both the realisation of the results and the process leading up to it. The process resulting in the Quality Agreements Plan was realised in consultation with, and with the approval of, the employee and student representation, and it goes without saying that the employee and student representation bodies will continue to be involved in the next few years.

When it comes to the budget, the employee and student representation has the right of approval so for that reason alone it will be guaranteed a role in the decisions to be made on the investments made using the student loan system funds. This is true for both the University Council and the faculty councils. In addition, the faculties will be given the opportunity to revise aspects of their plans during the annual evaluation of the quality agreements (see above). The employee and student representation has the right of approval with regard to the drawing-up of those plans.

Moreover, the Executive Board will annually report (in its annual report) on the progress made with regard to the student loan system funds, both with regard to the realisation of the objectives and to the process leading up to it. The above fits into the university’s method of ensuring that there is a broad consensus on the plans being implemented.

It goes without saying that the faculties shared their plans with each other (despite not having much time to do so) and so were able to learn from each other’s examples. This method is right for the university and will be continued for the duration of the term of the student loan system funds.

The progress made on the student loan system funds will be communicated to the academic community on a regular basis. However, we have not yet determined in detail how this will be done. The Executive Board and the University Council have agreed that they will identify the wishes and ideas together, so as to arrive at a follow-up to the plans with respect to the quality agreements that is supported by the entire university.

2.2 Examples of how the faculties went about allocating their funds to the chosen themes

How the faculties and units allocated additional funds to the three chosen themes

The many different ways in which the faculties have given effect to their investments in the three chosen themes reflect the diversity in the various faculties' teaching contexts and histories. See the [BOXED TEXT / NEXT PAGE] for a few examples.

> More intensive small-group teaching (teaching intensity)

All faculties wish to use the student loan system funds to invest in more intensive small-group teaching, generally by appointing additional lecturers, and occasionally combined with the professional development of lecturers.
A few examples: The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences wishes to reduce group size and increase the amount of one-on-one contact between students and lecturers by appointing additional trainee lecturers and additional teaching assistants. The Faculty of Science wishes to use Super Teaching Assistants to allow academic staff more time to design new courses with smaller classes and well-considered teaching methods. University College Roosevelt wishes to create study spaces where students can work on their personal projects and also wishes to spread students’ workload more evenly across the academic year. The Graduate School of Teaching wishes to increase the number of electives students can take by offering popular courses more often on the one hand, and by developing new courses geared towards education and communication on the other.

> Professional development of lecturers (quality of teaching staff)

Here, too, we can present a wide range of examples that reflect the various faculties’ own particular contexts. For instance, the Faculties of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine wish to give lecturers more time to observe each other. The Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance wishes to train lecturers to provide better supervision to students in skill-based learning courses and new types of thesis research. The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences wishes to ensure that lecturers have more time to attend English language, intercultural communication and teaching courses. For its part, the University College actually wants to give lecturers more time to conduct research. This might seem strange for a traditional faculty, but it fits within UCU’s context, where (unlike other parts of our university) lecturers are primarily engaged in teaching activities. UCU hopes that doubling the lecturers’ research hours will result in students being exposed to more trends in science and also in the range of available subjects for dissertations being widened. University College Roosevelt will allocate the funds to increasing lecturers’ ability to work in more than one discipline. More frequent and better student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities.

> Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

Nearly all the faculties and units intend to invest in student supervision. In many cases, the money will be used to increase the number of tutors, which is what the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine is doing, or the number of study advisers, which is what the Faculties of Humanities and Science are doing. The Faculty of Geosciences wishes to ensure that students are better prepared for their later careers in their chosen fields of study. The faculty seeks to do so by ensuring that all its students gain work experience at a company or organisation during their degrees. The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences wants students to be able to schedule individual consultations on their study progress and post-graduation career choices after year 1, too.

Not all faculties decided to use the available student loan system funds to increase accessibility and equal opportunities, their argument being that the investments must benefit all students, regardless of their background. However, there are faculties that do wish to invest in accessibility and equal opportunities. For instance, the Faculty of Medicine will focus on getting students from a more diverse background. Among other things, it will refine its selection procedure and offer a more secure and more inclusive learning environment. Both the University Colleges wish to offer grants to prospective students who are unable to afford the tuition fees, so as to increase the diversity of their student population from a socioeconomic point of view. For its part, the Faculty of Science wants to use its own funds to expand its network of schools with schools with a more diverse and inclusive profile.
Chapter 3 Utrecht University's procedure with regard to the quality agreements

3.1 Procedure at the centralised and decentralised levels

This chapter will outline how Utrecht University arrived at its decisions on how to allocate and spend the student loan system funds. In accordance with the NVAO’s protocol for the assessment of the quality agreements, the plan for the quality agreements was drawn up in consultation with the employee and student representation, the internal supervisors and, where relevant, following a consultation of the external stakeholders.

External stakeholders

The president of the Executive Board discussed the quality agreements with a select group of alumni in January. The discussion with the alumni was one in a series of regularly scheduled meetings. It is vital to the university that it maintains good relationships with its alumni and the professional field in which the graduates will be working. After all, alumni are perfectly placed to tell UU what they gained from the university's degree programmes in terms of careers and growth, and also what their degree programmes were lacking and what they would like to see added to the degree programmes. Since alumni are also part of the professional field in which today's students will be working, they are also well placed to indicate what today's labour market requires from graduates. In the aforementioned meeting, the president of the Executive Board and the alumni discussed the various themes in which the faculties can invest the student loan system funds, as well as the considerations that resulted in three particular themes being prioritised. The alumni supported the university's decision to invest more money into the three chosen themes.

At many faculties, there are close relationships between departments, alumni and the professional field in which the graduates will end up working. For instance, the Faculty of Geosciences has benefited a lot from what it got from its alumni and the professional field, and wishes to use the student loan system funds to organise annual brief excursions and training sessions for all its students, related to the labour market for their particular discipline. For its part, the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences wishes to allocate some of the funds to giving students who are attending teacher training programmes a better understanding of trends within the disciplines for which they are being prepared.

Employee and student representation

The University Council has the right of approval with regard to the plans on how the student loan system funds will be spent. Since the faculties are free to determine how to use the funds at their own faculties (as long as they stay within the boundaries drawn up by the university), the Executive Board and the University Council have agreed that the faculties will also discuss the commitments they have made with their own employee and student representation. Faculty councils have the right of approval with regard to the plans drawn up for their own faculties.

It is probably a good thing to note here that the reason why the university decided to draw up the plan for the quality agreements in consultation with many other parties is not because of the NVAO's protocol regarding the quality agreements. It is mainly because of the university’s ambitions to make decisions that are widely endorsed throughout the institution, as was the case when drawing up the Strategic Plan. It ties in with the tradition that was established in recent decades of creating a culture of quality. A culture that has both formal and informal meeting circuits and in which it is considered completely normal that things are shared. Naturally, students are part of this culture of quality, and they are involved and consulted in the quality assurance cycles in various ways, as the NVAO panel also found in its Institutional Quality Assurance Audit.

However, in reality it is proving nearly impossible to involve all UU students in degree programme quality assurance. The same thing was true for the procedure with respect to the quality agreements. The individual faculties all consulted the people they represented: the faculty councils, the programme committees, lecturers,
students, etc. The student members, in particular, of the various representative bodies (University Council, faculty councils, programme committees) and study societies made their opinions heard and took action. For instance, student members of the faculty councils of the Faculties of Humanities and Social and Behavioural Sciences managed to get the attention of students who are not active in representative bodies, by using social media, visiting study societies and addressing passing students in the university’s buildings. This is quite the achievement, particularly if one takes into account that this happened in two different academic years (2017-2018 and 2018-2019), meaning the representative bodies had different compositions. Not all faculty councils were always very proactive, which sometimes meant that time constraints became even more severe than they already were.

One of the downsides of consulting many parties is that it is relatively time-intensive (more so than time allows), while another one is that the collected input may raise expectations that the councils cannot always live up to. This is not just because of the choices to be made by the various faculties, but also because of the amounts of student loan system funds involved. This means that, no matter how many people are consulted, there will inevitably be some disappointment because certain input was not sufficiently incorporated into the plans.

The way in which the faculties consulted and informed the people they represent differed from faculty to faculty and is explained in each faculty’s plans.

It is stipulated in the university-wide framework document for the student loan system funds that the deans must consult the internal stakeholders and, where relevant, the external stakeholders in drawing up the plans. However, the framework document does not stipulate how this is to be done, thus allowing the dean some freedom in doing this in the way that best suits the faculty’s consultation culture and structure. This freedom to do things their own way is reflected in the way in which the various faculties dealt with the quality agreements. Two examples:

> Example No 1: Humanities

At the Faculty of Humanities, the procedure was highly centralised, with input from members of the faculty. For instance, the student members of the Faculty Council first identified the wishes expressed by students and staff, and then forwarded this input to the University Council, which then used it in a brainstorming session with the Executive Board on the themes to be prioritised.

Furthermore, the student members contacted the student department assessors, who, for their part, are in touch with the programme committees. The feedback thus obtained was compared against the faculty’s Strategic Plan and the priorities agreed between the Executive Board and the University Council. The Faculty Board and Faculty Council then drew up a plan together and submitted it to all of the faculty’s employees, the Faculty Council, the programme committees and the consultation body for study societies. The draft plans were then discussed by the vice-deans and directors of education, and four meetings were organised. These meetings made it clear that the plans were supported by many members of the faculty, and so the Faculty Council approved the plans in late January.

> Example No 2: Law, Economics and Governance

At the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance, the three departments each followed their own path towards drawing up the plan, because the teaching contexts of the three departments are fundamentally different. The departments all obtained feedback from their own organisations, such as programme committees, directors of education, academic staff, study societies, etc. In addition, the Law department included recent recommendations issued by the external review panel in its plans, while the Economics department included the results of the National Student Survey. The Faculty Board then drafted a plan incorporating the feedback provided by the three departments.

Even though many parties were consulted, it was found at the first vote in the Faculty Council that the plan could not be unanimously approved. Members of the Economics department gave their explanation of vote. A follow-up meeting was then held and attended by the vice-dean, the directors of education, the head of the department and those members of the Faculty Council who had voted against the plan. This resulted in several
aspects of the plan being revised, using feedback from the programme committees and study society. In February, the Faculty Council unanimously approved the plans.

**Decision-making timetable**

Generally speaking, the consultation procedure was as follows on the centralised and decentralised levels:

Consultation of the employee and student representation:
- June 2018. Meeting between the University Council and the Executive Board
- June 2018. Establishment of a university-wide group tasked with preparing for the quality agreements, whose members included student members (two persons) and staff members of the UC.
- September 2018. Brainstorming sessions between the UC and the Executive Board
- October 2018. Day of the employee and student representation. Featuring the president of the Executive Board
- November 2018. Collection of feedback from the faculties by the UC
- December 2018: Meetings between the UC and the Executive Board
- December 2018 - January 2019 Collection of feedback obtained from the programme committees and study societies by the various faculty councils
- January 2019. University-wide information meeting, organised by the UC and the Executive Board
- January-February 2019. Discussions of the faculties’ plans by the faculty boards and faculty councils. Faculty councils have the right of approval
- February 2019 Meeting between the UC and the Executive Board
- March 2019. Meeting between the UC and the Executive Board

**Formal:**
- Executive Board plus deans (BO)
- Executive Board plus Supervisory Board (approval)
- Dean plus Faculty Council (right of approval)
- Executive Board plus University Council (right of approval)

**Informal:**
- Discussions between the rector and the network of vice-deans and the network of directors of education
- Discussions between the university's managers and the faculties' heads of teaching policy
- Informal circuits within the faculties, such as the directors of education, lecturers, study societies, etc.
- Meetings between the president of the Executive Board and a few selected alumni.
Chapter 4 The student loan system funds allocated to Utrecht University

Pre-investments of student loan system funds, 2015-2017

The Minister of Education, Culture and Science concluded an agreement with the Dutch higher education institutions stipulating that the institutions must spend a collective advance of €200 million during the 2015-2017 period. In line with Utrecht University's share in the funding allocated by the government to Dutch universities (13%), Utrecht University was required to spend €26 million.

In consultation with the University Council, the Executive Board chose to allocate the money as follows:

a. Intensive small-group teaching.
   The funds allowed UU to appoint 250 additional lecturers.

b. Professional development of lecturers, Educate-it
   These are professional development activities designed to help lecturers work in a digital learning environment.

c. More study spaces
   The funds were used to create 104 additional study spaces.

d. Improved teaching facilities in lecture rooms
   This investment concerned upgraded audiovisual equipment.

e. Pre-investment with regard to teaching-related research in 2017
   These funds were used to allow lecturers to allocate more time to research.

Overview of pre-investments of student loan system funds, 2015-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of investments made using the advance (in millions of euros)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More study spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved teaching facilities lecture rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-investment with regard to teaching-related research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university's total pre-investments amounted to €27.4 million.

The Executive Board chose to spend €1.4 million more than the university's agreed share in the nation-wide pre-investments using the student loan system funds.

Student loan system funds, 2019-2024

The funds to be allocated to Utrecht University by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science during the 2019-2024 period will range from approximately €9 million in 2019 to approximately €27 million in 2024. This will amount to roughly €300 per student in 2019, and €900 per student in 2024.

The Executive Board has decided to continue investing in some of the projects in which it invested as part of the pre-investment of student loan system funds, and to include these expenses in the student loan system funds to be allocated between 2019 and 2024. The projects to be continued concern the professional development of lecturers and intensive small-group teaching, with a total expenditure of €7.9 million.
In addition, the Executive Board has decided to add another €5m in 2019 and 2020 to the €9m allocated by the Ministry of Education from the student loan system funds, thus increasing the total for these years to €14m.

In consultation with the University Council, the Executive Board has decided to distribute the student loan system funds across the faculties in proportion to the number of statutory-tuition-fee-paying students enrolled in the faculties. This allocation method is in line with the university’s intention to ensure that all students benefit from the intended quality improvements in equal measure.

A sum of €0.5m will be temporarily excluded from the pro rata distribution of the aforementioned €14m. This amount will be temporarily – for a two-year period – allocated to the Faculty of Humanities because of the problems encountered by small departments, to help the faculty make the quality agreements. The additional €0.5m will no longer be allocated to the Faculty of Humanities from 2021 onwards.

The additional funds will be added to the fixed rate for funded degree programmes in the University Budget Allocation Model, thus ensuring that these amounts will remain permanently available.

On the basis of the aforementioned inclusion of the student loan pre-investments (€7.9m), an amount of €6.1m was included in the 2019 budget and labelled ‘extra addition to the student loan system funds’. In all, the student loan system funds to be allocated in 2019 and 2020 will amount to €14m (€7.9m and €6.1m).

The €14m distributed across the faculties will be available in 2019 and 2020. Starting from 2021, this amount will be increased in proportion to student enrolment figures by means of the funds to be allocated by the Ministry of Education from the student loan system funds, which far exceed €14m, as explained in the table presented above.

The appendix to this document includes an overview of the funds to be allocated in 2019 and 2020 from the student loan system funds, as well as the pre-investments made using said funds.

### Student loan system funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Intensive small-group teaching and continued professional development of lecturers</th>
<th>Extra addition to the student loan system funds allocated</th>
<th>Total, 2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>€1,525,000</td>
<td>€1,509,864</td>
<td>€3,034,864</td>
<td>€3,034,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Economics and Governance</td>
<td>€1,319,000</td>
<td>€896,405</td>
<td>€2,215,405</td>
<td>€2,215,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioural Sciences</td>
<td>€1,335,000</td>
<td>€979,112</td>
<td>€2,314,112</td>
<td>€2,314,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>€512,000</td>
<td>€629,374</td>
<td>€1,141,374</td>
<td>€1,141,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>€658,000</td>
<td>€1,059,336</td>
<td>€1,717,336</td>
<td>€1,717,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>€126,000</td>
<td>€445,051</td>
<td>€571,051</td>
<td>€571,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>€113,000</td>
<td>€265,311</td>
<td>€378,311</td>
<td>€378,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>€126,000</td>
<td>€196,166</td>
<td>€322,166</td>
<td>€322,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU</td>
<td>€176,000</td>
<td>€119,381</td>
<td>€295,381</td>
<td>€295,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU’s total degree programme funding (Roosevelt not included)</td>
<td>€7,890,000</td>
<td>€6,100,000</td>
<td>€13,990,000</td>
<td>€13,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Roosevelt (equals the Ministry’s contribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€193,276</td>
<td>€229,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appendix provided below presents an overview of the investments to be made in the remaining period (2021-2024).
The amounts allocated to intensive small-group teaching and the professional development of lecturers will remain the same, but the other types of funds will be distributed on the basis of student enrolment numbers T-2, which are not yet known! Please find some indicative figures below, based on the 2017 figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>€3,319,281</td>
<td>€4,117,685</td>
<td>€4,341,987</td>
<td>€4,887,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Economics and Governance</td>
<td>€2,911,691</td>
<td>€3,620,394</td>
<td>€3,819,496</td>
<td>€4,303,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioural Sciences</td>
<td>€3,074,641</td>
<td>€3,848,732</td>
<td>€4,066,204</td>
<td>€4,595,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>€1,630,244</td>
<td>€2,127,830</td>
<td>€2,267,622</td>
<td>€2,607,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>€2,540,179</td>
<td>€3,377,695</td>
<td>€3,612,986</td>
<td>€4,185,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>€916,746</td>
<td>€1,268,605</td>
<td>€1,367,457</td>
<td>€1,607,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>€584,393</td>
<td>€794,150</td>
<td>€853,079</td>
<td>€996,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>€474,539</td>
<td>€629,629</td>
<td>€673,200</td>
<td>€779,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU</td>
<td>€388,110</td>
<td>€482,493</td>
<td>€509,009</td>
<td>€573,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
<td>€2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU’s total expected degree programme funding (Roosevelt not included)</td>
<td>€17,839,825</td>
<td>€22,267,213</td>
<td>€23,511,040</td>
<td>€26,537,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Roosevelt (equals the Ministry’s contribution)</td>
<td>€389,396</td>
<td>€486,034</td>
<td>€513,184</td>
<td>€579,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear members of the Executive Board,

In the autumn of 2018 and in the spring of 2019, the University Council made a very active contribution to the further detailing of Utrecht University's commitments under the Quality Agreements. The University Council's job was, in consultation with the Executive Board, to determine the university-wide framework with regard to the nature of the commitments and the financial aspects and procedures involved.

In order to do so, we regularly contacted the decentralised councils, partly because we felt that, while the framework should be drawn up at the centralised level, the commitments should be further detailed at the faculty level, in closer proximity to the students and lecturers.

On Monday, 11 March, the Quality Agreements memorandum was submitted to us for approval. We were glad to see that the memorandum reflects the involvement of the decentralised units to a high degree. We are also confident that the process of consultation that we have witnessed in recent months will continue now that it is time to actually realise the plans.

Therefore, we have unanimously voted in favour of the Quality Agreements memorandum.

Kind regards,

Fred Toppen, Chairman, University Council
University Framework for the Student Loan System Funds

Introduction

When we switched from a basic student grant system to a student loan system, it was agreed that the funds thus released would be used to raise educational quality.

It was subsequently stipulated in the sector agreement that the allocation of the funds released would be subject to quality agreements (2019-2024) at the institutional level.

The Minister of Education proposed six themes to which the student loan system funds could be allocated:

1. More intensive small-group teaching (teaching intensity)
2. Curriculum differentiation, including the development of talent as part of degree programmes, but also outside the scope of degree programmes
3. Continued focus on the professional development of lecturers (quality of teaching staff)
4. Appropriate and high-quality teaching facilities
5. More frequent and better student supervision
6. Study success including advancement, accessibility and equal opportunities.

Activities and objectives for all six themes were formulated in Utrecht University's Strategic Plan for 2016-2020. Universities were told they were free to invest only in a few themes of their choosing; if they chose to do so, they were expected to indicate why they made those particular choices.

The guiding principles adhered to by UU

The basic principles adhered to by UU in implementing the commitments made in the quality agreements are: alignment with the current strategic plan, making decisions that are widely endorsed throughout the institution, and limiting the administrative burden involved in implementation and reporting to the maximum extent possible. On that basis, in consultation with the University Council and the deans, the Executive Board selected a model for allocating earmarked funds to the faculties and drafted a university-wide framework to give the faculties guidance on how to spend the funds. More detailed agreements about how to spend the funds will be concluded between the deans and Faculty Councils within a university-wide framework; these agreements will take account of the differences between faculties, while at the same time the university-wide framework will ensure uniformity with regard to the objectives to be achieved.

Guiding university-wide framework on how to spend the student loan system funds

The guiding framework sets the boundaries of the projects on which the faculties must spend the student loan system funds, while at the same time giving the faculties the freedom to meet the faculties' or departments' requirements at the decentralised level. The idea is to prevent the funds from being divided over too many projects, which will make it hard to determine whether the funds were actually utilised to raise educational quality.

Following a wide-ranging debate with the UC and the deans, the Executive Board proposed that the funds to be allocated from the student loan system funds be spent on three particular themes, being:

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. The professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

We chose to prioritise these particular themes because the other themes listed by the Minister will receive sufficient funding under the Strategic Plan.
We are operating from the premise that we will use the full five years (2019-2024) to implement the quality agreements. This means that the faculties’ plans will cover this entire period.

Procedure

In accordance with the conditions imposed by the Ministry of Education and the NVAO (the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders), the quality agreements will be decided on in consultation with the employee and student representation, internal supervisors and, where relevant, external stakeholders. The University Council has the right of approval.

The Executive Board and the University Council agreed that the commitments would also be discussed with the faculties’ employee and student representation, i.e., the faculty councils. The faculty councils have the right of approval with regard to decisions that are at the dean’s discretion.

The implementation of the quality agreements by UU will be assessed in May 2019 by the same NVAO panel that also performed the Institutional Quality Assurance Audit. The Executive Board will be required to answer the question as to what kind of decision-making process was used, and particularly, whether the university’s employee and student representation was sufficiently consulted.

The NVAO’s assessment framework consists of three criteria:

1. Criterion no 1: The plan makes a well-argued contribution to raising the quality of the university's degree programmes. The intentions formulated by the university as to how it intends to use the funds and what objectives it seeks to attain in this way with regard to the aforementioned improvement of the university’s degree programmes are clearly defined and fit in with the university’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

2. Criterion no 2: The internal stakeholders were consulted on the plan to be drafted to a sufficient degree, and the plan is supported by internal and (where relevant) external stakeholders to a sufficient degree.

3. Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic with regard to the proposed utilisation of tools and resources, considering the university’s organisation and processes.

Funding

The funds to be allocated to Utrecht University by the Ministry of Education during the 2019-2014 period will range from approximately €9 million in 2019 to approximately €27 million in 2024. This will amount to roughly €300 per student in 2019, and €900 per student in 2024.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount in euros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>9,048,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>10,735,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>18,229,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>22,753,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>24,024,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>27,116,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive Board also wishes to allocate an additional €6.1m to the use of additional funds to be allocated from the student loan system funds, on top of the pre-investments made using these funds already included in the budget to intensive small-group teaching (€5.9m) and the professional development of lecturers (€2.0m). Including these additional funds, on top of the €9m allocated by the Ministry of Education in 2019, UU’s total budget in terms of funds to be allocated from the student loan system funds amounts to €14m. In the 2020 academic year, too, the Executive Board will supplement the funds allocated by the government up to a total of €14m.

The Executive Board has agreed, in consultation with the UC, to ensure that the additional funds allocated from the student loan system funds will not exceed €5.6m, meaning that the total amount of student loan system funds will be €13.5m in 2018 and 2019, rather than €14m. In accordance with the agreement, this additional €5.6m will be divided across the faculties in proportion to the number of statutory-tuition-fee-paying students.
enrolled in the faculties. This allocation method is in line with the university’s intention to ensure that all students benefit from the intended quality improvements in equal measure.

In addition, an additional amount will be temporarily – for a two-year period – allocated to the Faculty of Humanities because of the problems encountered by small departments, to help the faculty make the quality agreements. The sum allocated to the faculty will be €0.5m.

The UU budget includes an entry for a total amount of €6.1m labelled ‘additional funds allocated from the student loan system funds’, which are yet to be distributed.

The result of this is shown in the table below.

Distribution of the student loan system funds (€5.6 million); €500k separately allocated to Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of the student loan system funds (€5.6 million); €500k separately allocated to Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Economics and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive allocation to Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the University Budget Allocation Model, the additional funds are added to the fixed rate for funded degree programmes, thus ensuring that these amounts will remain permanently available. If the results vary from one year to the next, this, too, should result in annual adjustments of the internal projects to which the funds are allocated, which might result in a failure to conclude permanent agreements on their use.
Task for the deans

- Indicate in up to 4 pages how the student loan system funds will be allocated during the entire 2019-2024 period to the three chosen themes:

  1. More intensive small-group teaching
  2. The professional development of lecturers
  3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

Please note:
Your faculty may already have invested a great deal of funds in one of the three themes or an aspect thereof. If this is the case, you have compelling reasons not to make additional investments in that particular theme or aspect. If you choose not to make any additional investments in a particular theme or aspect thereof, please state clearly why and how your faculty is still focusing on that particular theme or aspect, even without any additional investments.

- Consult the Faculty Council (student and staff members alike) on your plans for how your faculty will allocate the student loan system funds you have been allocated.
- Make sure that the employee and student representation is kept updated and facilitated.
- Ensure that the members of the Faculty Council consult the people they represent.
- Also ensure that – where relevant – the external stakeholders are involved in the drafting of the plan.
- Please explain which themes you will prioritise and why.
- Indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.
- For each theme, explain in detail:
  - how you are investing in it (e.g. by appointing additional lecturers or study advisers)
  - the purpose of the investment
  - the intended results and how they will be measured
  - the intended time frame

- Make sure that the results of the faculty’s decision-making process can be submitted to the Executive Board by the second half of January 2019, so that they can be included in the university’s quality agreements report, which will be submitted to the NVAO in March 2019.
- Indicate how the funds allocated to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 from the student loan system funds will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).
- Be sure to include recipients such as lecturers, tutors, study advisers, student counsellors and student psychologists, support and administrative staff, teaching assistants, etc.

Please note:
- Newly hired employees will be granted contracts with a term of at least four years.
- Supporting activities designed to organise investments made as part of the quality agreements must not be included in the student loan system funds.

- In your annual reporting, account for the allocation and results of the funds you used to raise educational quality.
B

*Schematic representation of the faculty's plans for the student loan system funds* (Utrecht University, 2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Type of investment</th>
<th>Intended effect (among others)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching and the professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>- Developing new and innovative courses featuring motivational learning processes</td>
<td>- Allowing academic staff more freedom to teach innovative degree programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Freeing more hours up for lecturers by using Super Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>- Innovating existing courses and designing new courses to be able to offer more intensive teaching (one new course per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision, accessibility and equal opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointing additional study advisers who have received intercultural skills training (from 1 FTE per 1,000 students to 1.5 FTE per 1,000 students)</td>
<td>- Spotting students who are experiencing problems at an earlier stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Expanding the faculty’s U-talent network of schools with schools with a diverse and inclusive profile</td>
<td>- Reducing waiting lists for study advisers, with a focus on particular target groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More intensive supervision of students who are writing theses</td>
<td>- Ensuring that pupils from inclusive schools feel welcome at UU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>- Lecturers to be given more hours to develop online teaching modules</td>
<td>- Further developing online teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthening skills labs by means of 1) new materials, 2) teaching assistants, and 3) appointing a lecturer who will supervise the teaching assistants</td>
<td>- More supervised practice moments for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More intensive supervision of students who are writing theses</td>
<td>- More frequent and more thorough feedback from lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increasing the number of hours students spend with their tutors</td>
<td>- Improving student wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Training tutors</td>
<td>- Improving study success rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioural Sciences</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>- More trainee lecturers</td>
<td>- Ensuring that group size remains small in the various degree programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional teaching assistants</td>
<td>- Lecturers will be given more time for, and support with, the innovation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More trainee lecturers appointed, so that current lecturers have time to attend English language and intercultural skills training courses</td>
<td>- More lecturers are attending the training courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional lecturers appointed so as to create more time and support for online teaching training courses for lecturers and recording lectures/seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Teaching</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>- More trainee lecturers appointed so that the tutors teaching the Year-2 and Year-3 courses in the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees will have more time for one-on-one contact with students</td>
<td>- All Bachelor’s and Master’s students who are interested in this will be able to have individual consultations regarding their progress towards their degree, post-graduation career decisions, etc., even after year 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointment of a teaching assistant to expand the range of services offered by Career Services</td>
<td>- The range of services provided by Career Services has been expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional FTE for the development of a new communications course for the two-year teacher training degree</td>
<td>- Students will have an insight into the relevant trends in the particular disciplines for which the degree programme is preparing them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional FTE so that popular electives will be able to be taught twice per year, rather than just once</td>
<td>- Students will have more opportunity to take the courses they really want to take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>Additional FTE in vocational preparation courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional hours for lecturers: junior lecturers, post-docs and newly hired assistant professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More intensive small-group teaching in ‘bottleneck courses’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecturers will be given more time to work with individual students or small groups of students, and will give more frequent and more intensive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Group size will remain the same or be reduced, and students are sure to receive individual supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointing a professional at the faculty level who will help departments raise educational quality to the maximum extent possible through the newly appointed lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving the quality of the degree programmes by improving the quality of the lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthening the student academic skills learning pathways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthening the tutorial system, raising students’ skill level, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student supervision, easier access and equal opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving the quality of the excursions and training sessions; embedding them in the curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving relations with the professional field, thus allowing students to use the knowledge they have gained in the context of their future jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Annual brief excursions and training sessions for all students, related to labour market orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All students will visit a company or organisation during the course of their degree and will gain relevant experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving lecturers more time to supervise students writing Bachelor’s and Master’s theses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The amount of time lecturers are given to help their students write their theses will be more in line with the amount of time they would ideally spend on this; students will receive higher-quality supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecturers who teach seminars will be given more time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More supervision for students who are writing theses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecturers will be given more time and room for teaching seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student supervision, accessibility and equal opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional study advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More frequent and improved personalised services provided to students, including students with a disability, and faster and better service provided to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More innovative teaching, e.g. due to more motivational teaching methods, the implementation of interprofessional and interdisciplinary project-based learning (e.g. ‘flipping the classroom’, ‘research-based learning’), interprofessional teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More challenging and more in-depth teaching, more interaction between lecturers and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More diverse classes, both in terms of subject matter and in terms of the methods used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increasing students’ and lecturers’ levels of motivation, involvement and competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecturers will have time earmarked for their training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personalised training plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Raising the level of appreciation for teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for careers in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establishing peer assessment for lecturers and exchanging expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creating a culture and structure in which lecturers, students and teaching specialists seek to make the faculty’s degree programmes better and more professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Economics and Governance</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>- Law department. Additional lecturers and a review of 'teaching load models'; a project leader to coordinate more intensive teaching. Establishment of a Legal Skills Academy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- School of Economics. Lecturers will be given more time to help their Master's students write their theses; supervision of Bachelor's students who are writing their theses will be intensified, and Bachelor's students will be given a wider range of subjects to write their theses on.</td>
<td>- Students will receive more opportunities for all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- School of Governance. Tutors will have more responsibilities with regard to the development of their students' skills; an IT tool for feedback will be implemented. More intensive supervision of students who are writing theses.</td>
<td>- Students will be given more one-on-one supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>- Additional FTE to train lecturers in skill-based learning courses and new types of thesis research</td>
<td>- Lecturers will be better equipped to help their students develop their skills and critical thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lecturers will be given the incentive to keep working on their professional development, which will help reduce their workload</td>
<td>- Lecturers will be given the incentive to keep working on their professional development, which will help reduce their workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision, accessibility and equal opportunities</td>
<td>- School of Economics. Focus on the student/mentor system, the development of a 'goal-setting' toolbox and coaching by lecturers</td>
<td>- Students will receive better and more intensive supervision in their development, particularly with regard to the development of their skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- School of Governance. A project designed to increase students' resilience in dealing with pressure and their own position after completing their Master's degrees.</td>
<td>- Students will gain an insight and skills that will allow them to perform properly in a professional environment following their graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Utrecht</td>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>- Curriculum innovation by looking at 1. Requirements for graduation: making the way credits are counted in a particular academic year more flexible 2. The development of course material related to social relevance and diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A more flexible curriculum, allowing students to spread 60 credits over the entire year; a reduced workload for students</td>
<td>- All students will be trained in social relevance and diversity as part of their degree programme, rather than through extracurricular courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>- Doubling the hours lecturers can devote to research, from 10% to 20% eventually</td>
<td>- Creating similar positions for UCU lecturers to the positions their colleagues hold at university colleges elsewhere,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student supervision, accessibility and equal opportunities | - Grants will be offered, covering UCU's tuition fee | - Making it easier for students who may not be able to afford the tuition fee to enrol in UCU, thus increasing student population diversity from a socioeconomic point of view  
- UCU community will get a less one-sided view of reality |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| University College Roosevelt | More intensive small-group teaching | - Realisation of 65 study spaces where students can study on their own or work on group projects  
- Support for blended learning (database featuring knowledge clips, digitised teaching materials)  
- Reviewing the annual timetable and preparing students and lecturers for the new method | - The study spaces on campus are used to better effect  
- Using digitised learning methods, students will be better prepared for their class work  
- A reduction of students’ workload |
| The professional development of lecturers | - Development of training courses for lecturers teaching interdisciplinary core courses dedicated to UCR's six strategic themes | - Students will be better prepared for their interdisciplinary dissertation |
| Student supervision, accessibility and equal opportunities | - Appointment of a UCR-specific student psychologist  
- Offering grants to prospective students who may not be able to pay the tuition fee  
- Elimination of unconscious bias in the recruitment and selection of students | - UCR students will have direct access to a psychologist  
- Increased diversity in the student population, resulting in a more diverse classroom |
C Faculty plans for the student loan system funds
Individual faculties' plans (filled-out templates)

Science
Veterinary Medicine
Humanities (including UCU and UCR)
Medicine
Geosciences
Law, Economics and Governance
Social and Behavioural Sciences (including Graduate School of Teaching)
Faculty of Science

1. Background

The plan outlined in this document concerns the allocation of the funds that became available after the abolition of student grants, and which are being distributed in accordance with the quality agreements concluded between the Ministry of Education and the Dutch universities. In 2019 and 2020, the Faculty of Science will receive additional funding to the amount of approximately €1m annually. Between 2021 and 2024 (inclusive) this annual amount will increase considerably.

2. Themes selected by FS

Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

In accordance with the decision of the Executive Board, the funds can be allocated to three themes: More intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers and Student supervision. The dean of the Faculty of Science decided that €50,000 of the faculty's own budget obtained from a different source will be allocated to the 'Equal Opportunities' theme. This sum will be awarded to the U-talent programme, so as to tie new schools to the current network. However, the newly identified target group of prospective students who will benefit from this investment will have to feel at home at our faculty. We will explain below, in the Student Supervision section, how we intend to ensure that this is the case.

The proposals outlined below involve all three of the aforementioned themes and apply to all departments that come under the schools that make up the faculty, i.e., the School of Pharmacy, the Graduate School of Life Sciences (Biosciences and Science & Business), the Graduate School of Natural Sciences and the Undergraduate School. Furthermore, the Faculty of Science has chosen to provide the departments with a framework for their expenditure lines, without explicitly imposing that framework on the departments. Therefore, details of the plans may vary between departments and degree programmes (within certain set boundaries), depending on the various programmes' needs.

Reporting on the various themes at the Faculty of Science

The funds will be allocated to the following themes:

- **More intensive small-group teaching (KIO)**
  
  The general consensus at the Faculty of Science is that in many cases, intensive teaching and/or small-group teaching are only useful if a well-considered didactic approach and innovative teaching methods are used. In other words, students' learning experiences and learning outcomes are not automatically improved just by their being taught in smaller groups. So a new or updated approach is required here, which automatically results in a need for lecturers who have worked on their professional development. At present, it is hard for lecturers to use innovative teaching methods because they do not have enough time to study and master them. Lecturers must be allotted additional hours to do so if innovative teaching methods are to be used successfully. In many cases, these hours will be assigned to additional lecturers who will be hired for this purpose. This will result in fewer hours for lecturers on permanent contracts, which will have a positive impact on their workload. Therefore, we have decided to include innovative teaching methods, additional lecturers and the professional development of lecturers in one single theme.

  It should be pointed out here that the Faculty of Science is offering its lecturers a wide range of projects designed to help them become more professional teachers, e.g. Science Educate-IT, Teaching & Learning Lab, the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) and the Utrecht Education Incentive Fund (USO). We expect that, once we start giving lecturers more time to invest in innovative teaching methods in an effective manner, they will be more likely to take the courses offered by Utrecht University.
- **Student supervision (including accessibility and equal opportunities for certain types of prospective students)**

Students have expressed a wish to be able to talk to study advisers more often – for instance, to discuss matters that go beyond their degree programmes. The other way around, the study advisers and the head of Education & Student Affairs wish to use the additional funds to implement a more effective and professional method to monitor the progress students are making towards their degrees. This will enable them to identify students who are struggling at an earlier stage and provide them with the right level of support. This, too, will answer a need expressed by students. Inclusiveness and cultural diversity will be explicitly included in this revised integral approach. Study advisers may also be given a role to play in the tutorial system, e.g. a coordinating role, or developing and teaching workshops on particular subjects. This will allow departments that have tutors supervising their students to reduce the amount of work done by tutors.

**Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.**

Criterion no 2: The internal stakeholders were consulted on the plan to be drafted to a sufficient degree, and the plan is supported by internal and (where relevant) external stakeholders to a sufficient degree.

The decision as to how to allocate the student loan system funds to the various departments and how to spend them is subject to a framework to which employee and student representative bodies have contributed to a very significant degree. The present plan for the Faculty of Science was the result of extensive discussions with employee and student representative bodies (the Faculty Council and the programme committees of the School of Pharmacy, the Graduate School of Life Sciences, the Graduate School of Natural Sciences and the Undergraduate School) on 3 December 2018; and the Quality Agreements Working Group (on 17 December 2018 and 7 January 2019), chaired by the vice-dean of teaching, who converted the ideas into clearly defined measurable targets; and the heads of the departments (on 18 December 2018 and 15 January 2019); and the Faculty Council (preliminary consultation on 14 January 2019). The plan you are now reading is a slightly revised version in which additions proposed by the University Council and the Education and Research Department were incorporated, and which was fact-checked by the study advisers. The Faculty Council authorised the plan, subject to the aforementioned revisions, on 4 February 2019. The Faculty Council definitively adopted version 1.4 of the plan on 15 February 2019.

The Quality Agreements Working Group consists of representatives of the four schools of the Faculty of Science (two Board of Studies members, two programme committee chairs) and two student members of the Faculty Council. The reason why the working group features representatives of the schools is because quality assurance is a school responsibility.

The members of the working group were given the explicit instruction to consult the people they represent where possible. They did so several times, both prior to the first meeting of 17 December 2018 and during the entire period leading up to the submission of the plan to the board of the Faculty of Science by the working group (10 January 2019).

The initial conversations the employee and student members of the representative bodies had with the University Council will not be mentioned hereafter with regard to consultation and generating support.
Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2014 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

The following allocation model has been approved:

- All students active in all disciplines – Bachelor’s and Master’s students – will benefit from the funds.
- We will not establish new administrative units tasked with spending the funds. This means that we will spend the funds through existing organisations that are responsible for making financial decisions, i.e., departments and service units. Given the above, the funds will be distributed across the departments in proportion to their student numbers, Bachelor’s and Master’s students combined. The allocation key will be reviewed and adjusted annually, based on the number of students enrolled in the various departments. In order to ensure clear financial reporting on the way in which the quality agreement funds are spent, we will use the same book-keeping approach we use for the sector master plan, i.e., a separate column in the budget. This will allow the Faculty Board and the representative bodies to monitor the annual spending of these funds. The three departments of Biology, Pharmaceutical Sciences and Chemistry will have their funding for the Master’s degree in Biosciences distributed in proportion to the credits obtained by their students.
- Approximately 80 per cent of the funds will go to the departments, whereas 20 per cent will be allocated to the centralised level, i.e., the Education & Student Affairs department of the Faculty of Science. The projects coming under theme no 2 (student supervision, see below) will be paid from the funds allocated to Education & Student Affairs. Equal opportunities projects targeted at certain types of prospective students will be funded from a separate budget.
- Please refer to Appendix 1 to learn more about the way in which these funds were allocated.

3. Explanations for each individual theme

3.1 More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?

In 2019 and 2020, our expenditure will comprise the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Costs for Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>The average mandatory course worth 7.5 credits and taught to 100 students requires approximately 500 lecturer hours. According to a rough estimate of the funding required for a thorough revision and smaller groups, this will require a doubling of the number of hours required, which means 500 additional lecturer hours, at a cost of roughly €40,000.</td>
<td>€240,000 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More support</td>
<td>This may involve Super Teaching Assistants (STAs) and/or young lecturers. An STA costs roughly €50,000 per annum.</td>
<td>€600,000 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€840,000 p.a.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, the funds will be spent on: a) innovative teaching methods and greater support, with a specific focus on didactic skills; b) smaller groups of students, with improved access to their lecturers’ expertise.

In the year 2021, we will receive more funding, but our objectives will remain the same.

What is the purpose of the investment?

Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are aligned with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

1. Innovative teaching methods
We hope to create more intensive teaching by – depending on the department's needs – innovating current teaching methods, designing new courses with innovative teaching concepts and/or updating learning pathways, so as to create smaller groups in which students will learn more and have a better learning experience. Students will engage in learning activities that will help them learn more. We will be able to offer such activities by implementing new methods such as blended learning activities, designing new teaching materials, experimenting with new types of classroom settings and flipping-the-classroom activities, etc. The idea is to make the most of the range of innovative methods in which the university has already invested, and to respond to the recommendations on this subject issued by recent degree review panels. For instance, we may wish to purchase expertise from the Freudenthal Institute, Science Educate-IT, the Teaching & Learning Lab, the Educational Resources Pool and Teaching Consultancy & Training. To this end, the faculty is identifying all the recent education reforms, to get some inspiration for all of its degree programmes. As a result, experiences recently gained will continue to be effective in current courses that have not yet been subjected to any of the university's education reform projects.

Education reform requires a continuous focus on didactic skills. Lecturers or teams of lecturers must try new things that will inevitably result in new didactic expertise. They can then use this expertise when seeking to obtain a teaching qualification (University or Senior University Teaching Qualifications).

The Working Group highly recommends that each department focus on one mandatory course or learning pathway (e.g. a particular skill) per year, so as to ensure that the quality improvement is visible and measurable. Departments that offer more than one degree programme must decide which matters they wish to tackle in each degree programme during the 2019-2021 period. This could mean that some degree programmes will embark on a particular innovation before others, or that a particular innovation may be introduced simultaneously in several degree programmes taught by the same department or group of departments.

2. More support

At present, the quality of our degree programmes suffers a great deal from the fact that our lecturers have a very heavy workload. This heavy workload is already getting in the way of education reform, and the intended further innovation of courses will require an even greater time investment from these lecturers. In order to ensure a successful introduction of innovative methods, we will have to ensure that permanent academic staff have more time that they can devote to innovation, on top of their teaching and research duties. We will explain below how we intend to ensure that academic staff have more time on their hands.

2.1 One way to alleviate permanent academic staff's workloads would be to appoint Super Teaching Assistants (STAs), i.e., selected PhD students and post-docs who have been in the university's employ for five and four years, respectively, and who will be given additional teaching duties if their contracts are extended. To prevent such STAs from doing only those jobs for which no one else could be found and becoming invisible, we will formulate clearly defined assignments for these assistants, for instance by assigning them to the aforementioned education reform projects, thus ensuring that staff on permanent contracts are relieved of certain duties and/or receive direct support. Several departments within the Faculty of Science are already working with STAs. This has proven to be a win-win situation for both the PhD students/post-docs and the faculty.

2.2 When the STAs' contracts expire, they are given a teaching certificate or, if they qualify for it, a University Teaching Qualification, depending on the competences they have acquired.

2.3 The departments will be asked to establish a procedure for: (i) the selection of prospective STAs; (ii) the detailing and recording of STAs' duties; (iii) STAs' supervision; and (iv) a system that will clearly show the didactic skills acquired by STAs (e.g. certificates), thus allowing them to be quoted as evidence of prior learning in, say, a University Teaching Qualification track (if the STA is offered a tenure track position) or teacher training.

2.5 As a general rule, all departments will be asked to appoint two STAs.

2.6 The funds allocated to the departments may be used to create additional positions for lecturers. The committee recommends that departments seeking to appoint additional lecturers focus on young lecturers. These junior lecturers, too, will be able to convert their competencies into a University Teaching Qualification if they are given a permanent contract.
As we have said before, departments are free to go about these staffing decisions differently, provided that they provide good reasons as to why they are deviating from the recommended approach.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

- Several courses or learning pathways will be updated and taught in smaller groups, and will directly benefit students’ learning process. Lecturers will end up with a course design that will result in their students learning more;
- The department will have more lecturers at its disposal;
- The professional development of lecturers will benefit directly from the innovations;
- Lecturers whose wages are paid from the funds will be awarded certificates for competences acquired if they successfully pass courses;
- Departments will have a pool of talented lecturers.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

What changes will the students observe?

- We expect student satisfaction rates to increase significantly;
- Departments and the faculty will gain additional teaching expertise, from which other lecturers will be able to benefit – for instance, through the dissemination of knowledge by means of existing department-wide lecturer meetings and faculty-wide teaching afternoons;
- Naturally, continuous innovation will be an integral part of the Faculty of Science's teaching culture; through employee and student representative bodies, students will have a greater say than ever before in the choices made by their departments with a view to improving their degree programmes. The objective is to make sure that students actually notice where the funds are being utilised. As outlined above, each department will appoint two STAs or junior lecturers. Suppose that each of them is involved in one course. This gives us twelve courses, each taken by 100 students, meaning that 1,200 students (i.e., 20% of the overall number of students) will benefit each year. If the course in question is a mandatory one, the number of students will range from 100 to 300. These are minimum numbers, and estimates, too, and at present we cannot take into account the possibility of a particular innovation being able to be utilised in more than one course. In the next academic year, similar numbers of students will benefit. Over the course of two years, some 2,400 students will notice that their degree programmes have undergone some change;
- Students will be actively approached during the first two years so that we can explain to them what is being done with the funds;
- The Innovative Teaching Methods theme will be evaluated annually, and the evaluation will be discussed by the programme committees and supervisory programme committees.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic in terms of the proposed use of tools and resources and given the nature of the faculty's organisation and processes.

**Governance**

Initially, the departments' programme directors for Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees will be asked to draw up (in consultation with the employee and student representative bodies) an action plan for the next three years, which must state for each year how the funds will be spent, within the boundaries outlined above. All departments and Master’s programmes will be able to use three years’ funding to work on education reform, intensive small-group teaching, innovation and the professional development of lecturers. The results of the recent student satisfaction survey will be incorporated into the plans to be drawn up. As emphasised before, the programme directors will describe in their proposals how the expenditure can be rendered visible and measurable, and how this will result in a considerable improvement of the education provided.
The various schools' boards of studies will be responsible for monitoring the proposals, their feasibility and the measurability of the expected results. They will issue recommendations to the departments and report to the dean. The schools' programme committees will be closely involved in this process.

The implementation will be followed by an evaluation. The programme committees (which will play an important part in the evaluation of courses, learning pathways and curricula) will evaluate the impact of the investment. They will report to the schools' boards of studies, who will decide whether the schools are on the right track. This subject will be an important part of the annual P&C reviews between the schools' boards of studies and the vice-dean.

This method will ensure that the financial resources will primarily be used towards improved education for all students of the Faculty of Science. In addition, it will make work more pleasant for the lecturers and make them more professional.

Time frame

Please find below a rough timeline, divided into the four terms of the academic year, with some explanatory remarks. This timeline focuses on the amount of time needed to establish, implement and evaluate innovative methods, with the initial evaluations to be performed by the programme committees. The managerial decision-making processes (P&C and dean) are not included in the timeline.

Since the funding to be awarded to the Faculty of Science will amount to an annual €1m between 2019 and 2021 (inclusive), €3m will be available during that three-year period.

The first half of the year 2019 will be spent making decisions at the centralised level and preparing for the NVAO's audit (May 2019).

However, during this decision-making period, the programme directors will all have to reflect on the education reforms to be implemented in the next three years. During this period, the departments (in consultation with HR) will prepare the appointment procedure for STAs or lecturers.

It may well take a year for this change to be implemented. Therefore, it seems likely that the effects of the first changes will not be able to be measured until 2020-2021, partially because a great deal will depend on the drafting of class timetables.

In the 2020-2021 academic year, the departments/degree programmes will be able to embark on the second round of changes and the appointment of new STAs or lecturers. This second round of changes will be implemented by Block 4 of the 2020-2021 academic year at the latest. We expect evaluations and measurements of the effects to be performed in 2021-2022. In 2021-2022 we will repeat the 2020-2021 scenario.

At the end of 2021 we will prepare for the next tranches, to be spent in 2022-2024, following an evaluation of the first two years of the changes, once we have a clear view of what our students and degree programmes need. We expect to receive an additional €2m to €3m annually during those years. We believe it is too early as yet to indicate how these funds will be spent. When the time comes, we will establish a similar procedure to the one just completed, in which we will draw up a framework for the spending of the funds, in close consultation with the employee and student representative bodies, taking into account the experience gained in the 2019-2021 period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>Term 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>Preparation of the 2019-2021 plan</td>
<td>Preparation of the 2019-2021 plan</td>
<td>Plans assessed by the schools' boards of studies and approved by the dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>Arrangements for the appointment of STAs/lecturers, round 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off for changes, round 1</td>
<td>Development of changes, round 1</td>
<td>Development of changes, round 1</td>
<td>Round 1 of changes completed, discussed by programme committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020-2021</strong></td>
<td>Arrangements for the appointment of STAs/lecturers, round 2</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 1</td>
<td>Effects of changes round 1 measured by programme committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off for changes, round 2</td>
<td>Development of changes, round 2</td>
<td>Development of changes, round 2</td>
<td>Round 2 of changes completed and discussed by programme committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021-2022</strong></td>
<td>Arrangements for the appointment of STAs/junior lecturers, round 3</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 2</td>
<td>Effects of changes round 2 measured by programme committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off for changes, round 3</td>
<td>Development of changes, round 3</td>
<td>Development of changes, round 3</td>
<td>Round 3 of changes completed and discussed by programme committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2022-2023</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 3</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 3</td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of changes and measuring of effects, round 3</td>
<td>Effects of changes round 3 measured by programme committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off for new tranches 4 and 5</td>
<td>New budget drawn up for tranches 4 and 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2023-2024</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2024-2025</strong></td>
<td>Decision on how to spend the funds, to be made in 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

**What exactly does the investment entail?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional study advisers</td>
<td>3 FTE will be created for additional study advisers</td>
<td>€200,000 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities</td>
<td>Own resources</td>
<td>€50,000 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>€250,000 p.a., including €50,000 from a different budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is the purpose of the investment?**

Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are aligned with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

**The appointment of study advisers**

The Faculty of Science currently aims to have one full-time study adviser (1 FTE) for every 1,000 students. Since study advisers assist both Bachelor’s and Master’s students, this reference amount could be raised to 1.5 FTE for every 1,000 students. This additional 0.5 FTE will help us meet the national reference amount of 0.15 FTE for every 100 students.
For the Faculty of Science, this means that an additional 3 FTE must be created for additional study advisers. We expect this measure to result in the following:

- Students will be able to talk to their study advisers sooner; Study advisers will be able to dedicate more time to their individual students, meaning that they will be able to monitor their students' study progress more proactively and will be able to contact students sooner and give them assistance if they are falling behind;
- All study advisers are expected to keep abreast of the options the university is giving its students in terms of interdisciplinary electives, thus allowing them to give their students personalised academic career counselling that meets their individual needs;
- We would like certain groups of prospective students to be able to do a degree in a science subject. We then want all these people to feel welcome in our organisation. However, we do not want certain groups to feel labelled and treated differently. Since study advisers receive training in intercultural skills and are conscious and aware of the university's views regarding equal opportunities and inclusiveness, they are able to apply their expertise to degree programmes in situations where intercultural skills play a crucial part in teaching activities, e.g. project-based activities;
- Study advisers could also be more actively involved in the degree programmes, e.g. in terms of supervising tutors, assuming duties currently performed by lecturer tutors (e.g. with regard to organising coursework planning and study skills workshops), or organising workshops in which students are taught to reflect on their personal strengths and weaknesses as related to their future careers. This would result in permanent staff and Master’s degree coordinators being relieved of those particular duties.

**Equal opportunities**

Within the Faculty of Science, U-talent is particularly well placed to develop useful activities designed to get the faculty a more diverse student population. U-talent is an organisation allowing approximately forty schools from the Utrecht region to work with Utrecht University and Utrecht University of Applied Sciences towards better teaching at secondary schools (HAVO and VWO levels), particularly with regard to science subjects. It seeks to ensure easier access to, and better alignment with, the degree programmes taught by Utrecht University and Utrecht University of Applied Sciences. The participating schools make a financial contribution to the programme, which is positive because it shows that they are genuinely committed to it, which will help us achieve more. One disadvantage, as far as diversity and easier access to the universities is concerned, is that the participating schools only represent a selection of all schools, and that they tend to be ‘white’ schools. Therefore, the Faculty Board has proposed to invest more in schools with a more diverse and inclusive profile, so as to allow them to join the U-talent network and be active participants in the network. According to a rough estimate, this will require €50,000 per annum. The faculty will bear these costs itself, and will pay them from a different budget. Once students from this network have actually enrolled in Utrecht University, it is vital that they feel comfortable in this environment. This is where the study advisers will come in.

The Department of Education and Student Affairs (OSZ) will be asked to draw up a job profile.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

- Students who are having difficulty will be identified sooner and offered supervision sooner, which will result in fewer students falling behind in their studies and students receiving better referrals to other professionals;
- Greater expertise of intercultural skills;
- More time to study all the possible electives in depth and give more personalised advice regarding the student’s future career;
- More expertise that will allow the study advisers to help Master’s students explore the job market;
- More professional follow-up on measures taken to prevent students from falling behind in their studies.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

What changes will the students observe?
- Study advisers and students will be able to talk to each other sooner;
- Study advisers will be well equipped to properly talk to students from many different backgrounds;
- Study advisers will also be able to use their expertise in teaching activities, e.g. by teaching workshops on particular skills or by coordinating tutor sessions; this will go some way towards reducing lecturers’ workload;
- Students will be less likely to fall behind in their studies, and will receive better supervision that will hopefully prevent them from dropping out;
- In all, all students of the Faculty of Science (some 6,000 students) will experience the benefits of this change.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?

Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic in terms of the proposed use of tools and resources and given the nature of the faculty's organisation and processes.

Between 2019 and 2021 (inclusive):

- 3 study advisers will be hired in 2019.
## Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching and the professional development of lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional hours/changes/hiring of persons with the right level of expertise: course, learning pathway, etc., at the rate of €40,000 for every 500 additional lecturer hours</td>
<td>3,000 hours</td>
<td>3,000 hours</td>
<td>3,000 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual costs for the faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students, cumulative</td>
<td>€240,000</td>
<td>€240,000</td>
<td>€240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional STAs and/or lecturers: €100,000 per department * 6 additional STAs and/or lecturers: €216,000 per department * 6</td>
<td>€600,000</td>
<td>€600,000</td>
<td>€1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>€840,000</td>
<td>€840,000</td>
<td>€1,536,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision and equal opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-time outlay: hiring of 3 study advisers (estimated cost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students who will benefit</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-talent (1)</td>
<td>€50,000</td>
<td>€50,000</td>
<td>€50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Received (2)</td>
<td>€1,040,000</td>
<td>€1,040,000</td>
<td>€1,736,000</td>
<td>€2,525,052</td>
<td>€2,741,118</td>
<td>€3,266,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**

1. Budget for improving equal opportunities, from a separate budget, not included in the ‘total’ or ‘received’ balance sheet items.
2. The budget allocated to the Faculty of Science was determined on the basis of the 2017-2018 student number. For the sake of convenience, we have operated from the premise that the student number ratio between the faculties will not change in the coming years.
Dear Madam Dean / dear Isabel,

I am pleased to report that the Faculty of Science's Faculty Council, having previously approved draft version 1.1 of the faculty's Quality Agreements Plan, has now approved the definitive version (1.4) of this plan, as well. The faculty arrived at this plan in consultation with the employee and student representative bodies. The initial ideas were proposed during a joint session of the board and the programme committees of the various schools (School of Pharmacy, Undergraduate School, Graduate School of Life Sciences, Graduate School of Natural Sciences) and the Faculty Council held on 3 December. The plan was then further detailed by the Quality Agreements Working Group, which included, inter alia, representatives of two of the aforementioned schools and student members of the Faculty Council. The draft plan (version 1.1) was then discussed by the Faculty Council behind closed doors on 14 January, as well as in the publicly accessible faculty council meeting of 4 February. As I mentioned, the document we are approving now is the definitive version (1.4), which was drafted in consultation with the university's Executive Board.

However, I should mention that the plan only provides detailed descriptions of the first two years of the project. The Faculty Council trusts that the other years will be fleshed out in good time, and that the employee and student representative bodies will be involved in this process.

Yours sincerely,

Dr CA van Walree
Chair, Faculty Council of the Faculty of Science

Copies to:
- Chairs of programme committees
- Directors of the schools
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine

Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

We have chosen to focus most of our attention on one theme: ‘more intensive small-group teaching’, in the sense that we will develop or continue to further develop e-learning/blended learning modules and strengthen the skills labs.

We made this decision because:

1. this particular theme is one of the key cornerstones of the faculty's Strategic Plan for 2017-2021;
2. students have indicated that they wish this theme to be prioritised;
3. we wish to allocate the relatively small budget available to the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine to one focus area, without diluting it. In this way we will ensure that students will really see and experience the effects of the spending of these funds.

Within the theme of ‘More intensive small-group teaching’ we will also focus on intensifying the supervision Bachelor's students get when writing their theses, starting from 2020. We do not consider this a priority for 2019, since we have already earmarked funds from our current budget allocation for the further development and strengthening of our students' academic thinking and conduct.

In addition, we will promote better student supervision in 2019 and the following years by ensuring that students have more contact hours with their tutors. Both students and staff have indicated that this is important, which is why we consider it a priority. We have chosen not to allocate funds to the sub-theme of ‘accessibility and equal opportunities’, since this sub-theme will receive sufficient attention even without our allocating any of these funds to it. For instance, we have already recruited someone to develop strategies to increase the diversity of our student population.

As for the professional development of our lecturers, we will start focusing on that in 2020, because right now we do not yet have a coherent system of lecturer feedback and lecturer evaluations in place. This is one of the main priorities listed in our strategy policy agenda for 2019 (drawn up in association with the rest of the university). We propose that we successfully complete this stage before embarking on the next one.

Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.

• November 2018:
The Faculty Council and the programme committee drew up clearly defined ideas, partly inspired by the information and context discussed at the university's ‘Day for Staff and Student Representative Bodies’, and decided together which ideas should be prioritised.

• December 2018:
- Representatives of the Faculty Council further worked out these ideas, in association with the vice-dean for teaching (who is also the director of education of the Master's degree in Veterinary Medicine), taking into account the topics students had indicated should be prioritised and the ambitions outlined in the faculty's Strategic Plan.
- In the meantime, certain members of the Faculty Council spoke to the University Council, and the vice-dean informed the Faculty Board of the progress made in the procedure.
- The plans on how to spend the funds were discussed and further detailed in the programme committee’s meeting of 12 December 2018. The head of Education and Student Affairs (OSZ) and the director of education of the Bachelor’s degree were involved in the procedure from that moment, as well.

**January 2019:**
- On 14 January 2019, members of the Faculty Council, the student assessor, the vice-dean of teaching, the director of education of the Bachelor’s degree, the head of Education and Student Affairs and a policy officer tasked with teaching discussed the projects that should be prioritised in the coming years and the allocation of the budget to the various projects that had been proposed.
- On 16 January, the student delegation discussed these plans with the students they represent at a rally organised by them. This resulted in the students they represent indicating their support for the plans, and actually submitting a few examples of how to implement plans. These were included in the further detailing of the plans.
- On 21 January, the draft plan was discussed by the Board of Studies, which approved it.
- On 21 January, the draft plan was submitted to the Faculty Board and Faculty Council.
- On 22 January, the draft plan was discussed at a meeting of the board, where it was approved.
- On 22 January, the draft plan was discussed with the departments’ portfolio holders for education, who approved it.
- On 24 January, the faculty council approved the draft plan, without requiring any revisions.
- On 1 February, the management team and University Council submitted their feedback. This feedback (what little there was of it) was incorporated into the draft plan and resulted in the present final version of the document.

Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine opted to allocate the funds to a small number of initiatives with a clear profile, and to evaluate each year how to allocate the funds for the following years to these initiatives and any other initiatives that may be established. We chose to do things this way because the annual amount available to the faculty is relatively small and because focused spending of these funds will help increase the profile of the results among the faculty’s community.

In the explanations given for each individual theme, we will outline in broad strokes how we think we will spend our budget from the student loan system funds in 2019, and where possible, in the years after 2019. The amounts listed are estimates, particularly for 2020 and beyond, since it is not yet known exactly how much funds the faculty will receive in these years. See the table below, as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project &amp; subject</th>
<th>2019 (indicative)</th>
<th>2020 (indicative)</th>
<th>2021 (indicative)</th>
<th>2022 (indicative)</th>
<th>2023 (indicative)</th>
<th>2024 (indicative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a E-learning</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Skills labs</td>
<td>€105,000</td>
<td>€105,000</td>
<td>€105,000</td>
<td>€105,000</td>
<td>€105,000</td>
<td>€105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c More intensive supervision of students writing theses</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>€74,000</td>
<td>€74,000</td>
<td>€74,000</td>
<td>€74,000</td>
<td>€74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>€65,000</td>
<td>€65,000</td>
<td>€65,000</td>
<td>€65,000</td>
<td>€65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a More frequent meetings with tutors for Bachelor’s students</td>
<td>€30,000</td>
<td>€47,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b More frequent meetings with tutors for Master’s students</td>
<td>€30,000</td>
<td>€47,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
<td>€64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>€265,000</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 At the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, the students on the programme committee and the students on the faculty council are the same students. There is also some overlap with regard to the lecturer members of the two committees.
Explanations for each individual theme

More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?

a) Additional expenditure on e-learning or blended learning.
   2019: €100,000 p.a. (starting from 2020: €100,000 p.a.)

1,500 lecturer hours will be created for the development or further development of digital teaching modules for both Bachelor’s and Master’s students, so as to create more blended learning modules and motivational teaching. These lecturer hours can be used to relieve current lecturers of some of their duties or to hire temporary staff. The reason why we wish to spend these funds is because lecturers are currently unable to focus sufficiently on the development or further development of digital teaching modules because they do not have enough time to do so.

Project proposals will be evaluated by a committee that will assess applications for project funding twice a year. This committee will consist of both directors of education, a member of the Board of Studies, an Educate-IT staff member (consultant) and at least two students nominated by the faculty council. The costs of the time required by this committee to do so will be paid from the faculty's regular budget.

The application procedure and assessment criteria will be determined by the dean or vice-dean on the proposal of the assessment committee, after the faculty council has issued its recommendation.

b) Strengthening of the departments' skills labs.
   2019: €105,000 (starting from 2020: €105,000 p.a.)

Strengthening of the departments’ skills labs by (1) investing in new practice and instruction materials; (2) training teaching assistants specifically appointed to supervise students; and (3) appointing a lecturer who will be responsible for the above (0.3 FTE), and who will organise and coordinate these facilities (including the training and supervision of the teaching assistants referred to in item (2)). We wish to focus on this because the management of the various skills labs is currently not centrally coordinated, and there are too few supervised practice moments. Strengthening the skills labs will require an annual outlay of €70,000 for materials, €20,000 for the lecturer who will coordinate everything, and €15,000 for the deployment and training of teaching assistants.

c) More intensive supervision of students writing theses
   (Starting from 2020: €74,000 p.a.)

Bachelor's students who are writing their theses will receive 17 hours' worth of supervision each, rather than the current 12. This will result in an annual outlay of €74,000 (225 students x 5 hours x €65). We wish to implement this change because both lecturers and students have indicated that the current arrangements do not allow lecturers to properly supervise their students.

What is the purpose of the investment?

a) Additional expenditure on e-learning or blended learning.
   - Creating a work environment in which lecturers will have more time to develop modules, so that we will eventually be able to use more e-learning in our regular courses.
   - Helping students and lecturers gain more experience of developing and using digital resources in teaching.

b) Strengthening of the departments' skills labs.

By granting students more supervised practice moments, we will do a better job of equipping them with the skills they will need in the further education or professional careers on which they will embark.
Secondly, we seek to implement this change to reduce the number of animals used as part of the curriculum, which is in line with one of the faculty's strategic objectives.

c) More intensive supervision of students writing theses
Raising the quality of the supervision students receive when writing their theses.

What are the intended results of the investment?

a) Additional expenditure on e-learning or blended learning.
- More e-learning-related projects, on top of the regular expenditure on e-learning made by the Faculty Service Organisation (FSO), partly because students, too, indicated that this should be a priority. These projects will help students see not only that they will be in a better position to engage in independent study and proper preparation for contact-based learning (any time, any place, anywhere), but also that this method will allow them to have a say in the projects.
- More intensive and more in-depth contact with lecturers during contact-based learning because the students are better prepared.
- More experienced and happier lecturers, because they will have enough time left over to engage in intensive small-group teaching through e-learning and blended learning.

b) Strengthening of the departments' skills labs.
- Helping students acquire practical skills by:
  - Providing them with new options and better facilities with regard to the skills labs.
  - Ensuring that the skills labs are organised in a clearly defined and well-structured manner.
  - Improving the instructions and supervision given to students.
- Reducing the number of animals used in teaching and making more efficient use of the animals used, partly by replacing animals with other things, and partly by preparing students better for the types of teaching that do require the use of animals.

c) More intensive supervision of students writing theses
More time and one-on-one attention (and uniformity) for students writing theses, which will result in higher-quality theses.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?

a) Additional expenditure on e-learning or blended learning.
1. The creation of additional e-learning projects will help students see not only that they will be in a better position to engage in independent study and proper preparation for contact-based learning (any time, any place, anywhere), but also that this method will allow them to have a say in the projects.
2. In addition, students will see that the time they spend with their lecturers is used more efficiently and effectively, and that they are more likely to have in-depth contact with their lecturers during contact hours.

b) Strengthening of the departments' skills labs.
Students will notice the changes in the scheduling of the practice moments and the actual practice moments themselves.

c) More intensive supervision of students writing theses
Students will notice that lecturers now have plenty of time to provide proper feedback.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?

a) Additional expenditure on e-learning or blended learning.
The impact the expenditure of €100,000 per annum in 2019 and 2020 will have on educational quality and the number of students who obtain degrees will be evaluated annually. If necessary, the criteria and the amount of the allowances and allocations will be adjusted. Evaluations will be used to determine whether this project will
be continued in the next few years (from 2021 onwards). We expect that it will be, and have allocated funds to the project accordingly.

b) **Strengthening of the departments' skills labs.**
This expenditure will definitely be included in the budgets for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Evaluations will be used to determine whether these annual expenditures will be continued in the coming years, and if so, to what extent.

c) **More intensive supervision of students writing theses**
This will require an annual expenditure of €74,000, starting from 2020. In 2019, funds from the regular budget were allocated to the further development and strengthening of academic thinking and conduct throughout our students’ Bachelor’s degrees.

2. **Professional development of lecturers**

**What exactly does the investment entail?**

**Peer coaching for lecturers**
(Starting from 2020: €65,000 p.a.)

Making sure that lecturers have more time for peer observation and providing feedback to their colleagues. We wish to do so because feedback and advice given by colleagues are regarded a valuable tool in lecturers’ professional development, but lecturers rarely have the time to give such feedback. The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine wishes to encourage peer feedback and make it a standard component of the improved professional development of lecturers. This being the case, an annual 1,000 hours will be created starting from 2020 for lecturers to engage in peer review, which will result in an expenditure of €65,000 to €70,000 p.a. This amount will be placed at the departments’ management teams’ disposal, in proportion to the departments’ student numbers. The management teams of the three new departments will explain to the vice-dean of teaching and the directors of education each year roughly how this amount was spent.

**What is the purpose of the investment?**

The further development of a policy for a professional teaching climate, and thus for better degree programmes for students, in line with the objectives outlined in the faculty’s Strategic Plan for 2017-2021.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

Since lecturers will be granted more opportunities to observe each other and obtain feedback from their experienced peers, they will be given an incentive to keep working on their development as professional lecturers:

1. Lecturers who are assessed can use the feedback they receive towards their own professional development and growth.
2. Lecturers who observe their colleagues can incorporate the best practices into their own teaching. As a result, lecturers will be more satisfied, and the quality of our degree programmes will be raised.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

Students will notice that the quality of the teaching they receive has improved, because lecturers have been enabled to grow and develop in their capacity as lecturers.

Moreover, students will notice the presence of a lecturer who is observing classroom behaviour; the observations can be used as an example to their own education.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**
At present we do not have a well-structured system in place for lecturers providing each other with feedback and assessing each other. We must establish such a system in order to embark on the next step (peer coaching). This is one of the main priorities listed in our strategic policy agenda for 2019 (drawn up in association with the rest of the university). We propose that we successfully complete this stage before embarking on this project.

3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

What exactly does the investment consist of?

*More frequent meetings with tutors for Bachelor’s and Master’s students.*

2019: €30,000 for each degree programme  
(2020: €47,000 for each degree programme; starting from 2021: €64,000 p.a. for each degree programme)

- The number of hours newly incoming students will spend with their supervising tutors will be raised from 3 to 4 per year, because students and lecturers have indicated that two conversations per year is too little, and that students should speak to their tutors at least four times per year. This is in line with the performance agreements regarding this subject concluded with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.  
- Starting from 2019, we will invest in the training of all tutors, including tutors who are already supervising tutores. We will be doing this because the tutors play an increasingly important coaching role in students’ studying process, which role is changing due to the introduction of matching activities for Bachelor’s students. The student counselling provided by tutors to Master’s students must focus more on the student’s transition to a career.

What is the purpose of the investment?

- Higher-quality tutoring sessions.  
- Giving students improved support in their professional development and personal growth.  
- Helping students make decisions on their further education.

What are the intended results of the investment?

- Better classes in professional development and personal growth for both Bachelor’s and Master’s students.  
- Improved student wellbeing.  
- Higher study success rates.  
- Students who are highly motivated to embark on their next degree.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?

More one-on-one counselling by truly well-trained tutors, which will improve the students' professional development and personal growth: students will be better able to reflect on their own knowledge and competences, and will do so more often.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?

A gradually increasing annual expenditure on increasing the number of counselling hours: €15,000 in 2019 (1 hour x 225 newly incoming students x €65),

---

2 The performance agreements concluded with the Ministry include the following stipulation: ‘*In addition, students indicated during the HE tour that they need more student counselling, in the form of tutoring and mentoring. A publication by the Higher Education and Research Review Committee 62 shows that personalised student counselling results in closer ties and thus in improved study success rates.*’
€30,000 (1 hour x 450 students x €65) in 2020 and €45,000 (1 hour x 675 students x €65) in the following years per degree programme. In addition, we will earmark an annual €15,000 per degree programme for training purposes.
Dear members of the Executive Board,

I am writing to you to inform you that the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine has approved the plans drawn up by the faculty with regard to UU's quality agreements, 2019-2015.

I trust this information is sufficient for your purposes.

Yours faithfully,
on behalf of the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine

Dr J.M. van Parlevliet
Chair, staff delegation of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine’s Faculty Council

Ms A.J. Boon
Chair, student delegation of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine’s Faculty Council
Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

The proposals made below are in line with the course of action outlined in the strategic plan of the Faculty of Humanities: a comprehensive faculty with intensive small-group teaching. In drafting these proposals, we have worked within the framework drawn up by the Executive Board, taken account of the wishes expressed by staff and students, and been financially conscious. We have also considered the high workloads of lecturers. The proposed measures focus on the key aims of ‘professional development of lecturers’ and ‘student supervision’ as outlined in the framework drawn up by the Executive Board. We will build on the intensive small-group teaching that is already being financed from the existing intensive small-group teaching funds. The effects of the measures we will implement will be felt by all of our Bachelor’s and Master’s students.

Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.

The three measures the Faculty of Humanities wishes to implement partially arose from a letter written by the student members of the Faculty Council to the University Council, in which they described their wishes with regard to the quality agreements very extensively and in great detail. The plans outlined in this letter resulted from the students having asked their fellow students for their opinions on the student representatives’ Facebook page. The student members also contacted the Faculty’s four department assessors, who in turn are in frequent touch with the various departments’ programme committees. This served as input for the letter to the University Council, which set out the widely-supported opinions held by Humanities students. We examined these wishes with reference to our own strategic plan and the priorities outlined by the Board. Following a discussion by the Faculty Board on the question of what measures would contribute to improvements from which all of the Faculty’s students would profit, we drafted the broad outlines of a plan and discussed it with several representatives of the Faculty Council. It became clear from those discussions that students agree that lecturer workloads are an important issue, because reducing those workloads would contribute to higher-quality teaching. After further detailing of the plan, and more discussions with the Faculty Council, it became clear that the selected measures were supported by the Faculty Council. We explained the plans in a memorandum that was sent out before Christmas to all faculty employees (a separate letter was sent to the programme committees) and to the Consultation Body for Study Societies.

At the end of December the vice-deans discussed the plans with the directors of education. In January, the faculty held four separate meetings for staff and students (including a meeting for all 34 programme committees). A total of 118 persons attended these meetings. We also explained the plans during a meeting of the Consultation Body for Study Societies. At these meetings, we informed staff and students of our plans and answered their questions. Representatives of both the Faculty Council and the Faculty Board were present at all meetings:

- 8 January, 10-11am: meeting for staff
- 10 January, 3-4pm: meeting for staff
- 14 January, 1-2pm: meeting for staff
- 15 January, 3.30-5pm: meeting for chairs and student members of programme committees
- 15 January: Meeting of the Consultation Body for Study Societies
- Still to come: 31 January: Meeting with heads of departments

During the meetings it became clear that the proposed measures are widely endorsed. On 23 January, the plans were submitted to the Faculty Council for approval at an extraordinary meeting. The Faculty Council approved the plans. On 24 January we will submit the plans to the Executive Board. Please note: In the Faculty Council meeting held on 19 December 2018, the Faculty Council formally approved the expedited
implementation of one component of the plans, namely the appointment of 2 FTE's worth of study advisers, so that the recruitment process could begin in January.

Once the agreements have been adopted, consultation within the faculty on the precise nature of the agreements will continue. With regard to the second measure (more time for lecturers running seminars), we want to give departments the freedom to allocate the additional hours in a manner of their own choosing. For one degree programme, this may mean a greater focus on, say, feedback; for another, the emphasis may be on more time for innovation, or improved teaching simply because lecturers are given more time to focus on their teaching. We suggest that each programme committee identify what the needs are within their own programme and how they can raise the profile of the improvements to be made, and use this information to advise the programme coordinator and director of education on how to use the additional funds, with the director of education making the final decisions, in consultation with the vice-deans where necessary. The directors of education will report to the Faculty Board. Students’ interests will be protected by keeping the student members of the departments' employee and student representative bodies involved in the decision-making process. We expect to complete this procedure by mid-May 2019.

Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

- Student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities:
  - 2 FTE's worth of study advisers (€150,000)
  - creating more opportunity for feedback by allowing more hours for the thesis supervision of Master's students and students taking Research Master's (€411,000)

- Professional development of lecturers:
  - allowing more hours for the thesis supervision of Master's students and students taking Research Master's (€411,000)
  - More time for lecturers running tutorials (€1,519m)

In terms of FTE, the picture is as follows:
- 16 FTE's worth of lecturers teaching Bachelor's degrees
- 4.3 FTE's worth of lecturers teaching Master's degrees
- 2 FTE's worth of study advisers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income from the student loan system funds</td>
<td>€1,500</td>
<td>€1,500</td>
<td>€1,857</td>
<td>€2,673</td>
<td>€2,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA LCH increase WG 5 LCU</td>
<td>£544</td>
<td>£1,304</td>
<td>£1,304</td>
<td>£1,304</td>
<td>£1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA LCU increase int disc min</td>
<td>£89</td>
<td>£214</td>
<td>£214</td>
<td>£214</td>
<td>£214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's theses</td>
<td>€171</td>
<td>€411</td>
<td>€411</td>
<td>€411</td>
<td>€411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study advisers (2 FTE)</td>
<td>€150</td>
<td>€150</td>
<td>€150</td>
<td>€150</td>
<td>€150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of quality agreements</td>
<td>€954</td>
<td>€2,080</td>
<td>€2,080</td>
<td>€2,080</td>
<td>€2,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2019 and 2020, the Faculty of Humanities will be allocated €1.5m. This amount consists of €1m from the student loan system funds and a €500k supplement awarded to the faculty by the Executive Board. In 2021, the allocation of these structural funds will be reviewed, and the amount of funding will be increased (meaning that the faculty will no longer receive its supplement).

The total cost of the proposed changes will be approximately €2m per annum. This means the total cost will exceed the €1.5m available. In 2020 and 2021, the deficit will be partially financed by surplus 2019 funds carried forward (because the bulk of the measures will not take effect until September 2019). Over the next
few years, we plan to use approximately €250k\(^3\) from our own budget to finance the remainder of the measures to be implemented. We will do so in consultation with the Executive Board (which has already approved this proposal) and the Faculty Council (which has a right of consent with regard to the budget and with regard to the use of significant funds from the reserve). Because the amount of funding we will receive from the student loan system funds will increase over time (we expect to receive £1.8m in 2021 and £2.6m in 2022), we expect that it will no longer be necessary to draw on our reserves after 2021.

Explanations for each individual theme: Professional development of lecturers

Measure no 1 – more time for thesis supervision of Master’s students and students taking Research Master’s degrees

What exactly does the investment entail?
In the current teaching load model, 17.4 hours are allocated for the supervision of students who are writing Bachelor’s theses (7.5 ECTS).\(^4\) This was made possible with the introduction of intensive small-group teaching funds in 2015. The allowance for Bachelor’s students is thus exactly the same as the allowance for students writing Master’s theses (17.4 hours for 60 and 90 ECTS programmes) and slightly less than for students writing theses for Research Master’s (21.7 hours for 120 ECTS programmes). This means that students writing theses for their Master’s and Research Master’s degrees are not granted as much time as Bachelor’s students. Lecturers who teach Master’s degree programmes are all too well aware of this fact, as they often have too little time to give the kind of feedback they would like to give. By implementing the new measure, we will increase the amount of time allotted to lecturers for thesis supervision for Master’s and Research Master’s students to 26 hours.

Cost (including scope and time for miscellaneous tasks) = €411,000

What is the purpose of the investment?
This expenditure will bring the number of hours allotted to lecturers for supervision purposes more in line with the time actually required to provide students with proper supervision. In this regard, the measure fits in with the ‘more intensive student supervision’ theme, as well.

What are the intended results of the investment?
For each Master’s and Research Master’s thesis, lecturers will receive ~9 hours (+50%) and ~4.5 hours (+20%) more time respectively for supervision.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
We believe that students will find that their supervisors are able to provide the desired level of supervision while they are writing their theses, and that staff will find that they have sufficient time to provide such supervision, without their other duties being negatively affected.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
We will start implementing this measure in September 2019.

Measure no 2 – More time for lecturers running seminars

What exactly does the investment entail?
The measure allows lecturers to be allotted more time to prepare for and teach seminars for their Bachelor’s students. The time allocation for each tutorial will be increased from 87 to 109 hours (+25%). Lecturers who teach a 7.5-credit Bachelor’s course with one seminar group will be allocated 152 rather than 130 hours. If lectures and seminars are not taught by the same lecturer, the additional hours will be assigned to the lecturer teaching the seminars. The teaching load for seminars taught as part of interdisciplinary minors and individual courses will also be increased (from 54 to 65 hours for each seminar, i.e., a 20% increase).

\(^3\) Because the majority of the funds will not be used until September 2019, €1m from our 2019 budget allocation will be carried forward to 2020 and 2021.

\(^4\) At the Faculty of Humanities, teaching loads are calculated using lecturer contact hours (LCH). One LCH equals 21.7 hours. For the sake of readability, in this text all LCUs have been converted to hours.
Cost €1,377m + €142k scope and time for miscellaneous tasks = €1,519m

**What is the purpose of the investment?**
By means of this investment, we hope to resolve several issues experienced by our teaching staff:

The current teaching load model is based on the amount of time an experienced lecturer needs to teach a course that is not new to him/her. In a number of respects, this does not reflect reality: (1) Beginner lecturers need more time to prepare for their lectures/seminars than experienced lecturers. Seminars are often taught by beginner lecturers. (2) Lecturers who teach courses that are new to them are not given any additional time for preparation in the current system. (3) No additional time is earmarked for the development of new courses or thorough revisions to current courses in the current system. (4) Too little time for lecturer professionalisation: lecturers under time pressure have little enthusiasm for upskilling themselves, or experimenting with teaching innovations or new IT products (such as Educate-IT).

The allocation of additional hours for each seminar group will put lecturers in a better position to prepare for new courses, revamp courses they have taught previously, and work on their professional development in general. The priorities in the area of improving teaching will be identified for each programme.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**
Depending on what shape this measure takes in each programme, students should notice that their lecturers have more time for their work. This may result in the structure of a seminar being improved, in the implementation of blended learning, or in new, more in-depth ways of giving feedback. This will allow students to develop their academic skills more thoroughly, and will allow lecturers more time (within the allotted time) to prepare for the teaching duties they are expected to perform. If it turns out that more departments opt for the same improvement measure, it could become faculty policy. For instance, within the faculty we are working hard to develop policy around giving feedback. This policy will be discussed with the Faculty Council during the 2018-2019 academic year.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**
Lecturers will notice that they can devote more time to their teaching, because they will be teaching fewer courses. In this regard, it is important to ensure that those lecturers whose teaching load is the heaviest (e.g. lecturers with little or no allotted research time, beginner assistant professors) benefit the most from the measure. For example:

1. A lecturer or assistant professor who exclusively teaches seminars in Bachelor’s programmes will see a 20% reduction in his/her workload.
2. A lecturer or assistant professor who teaches exclusively in Bachelor’s programmes, and who teaches both lectures and seminars for courses featuring only one group, will see his/her workload reduced by 16%.
3. A lecturer or assistant professor with a 0.7 teaching load, whose time is split evenly between Bachelor’s and Master’s programmes and who teaches both lectures and seminars to one single group, will see his/her workload reduced by 8%.
4. An associate or full professor who only teaches lectures in Bachelor’s programmes and spends most of his/her time working in Master’s programmes will see no reduction in his/her teaching duties.

Between February and June 2019, priorities will be identified for each degree programme with regard to which changes should be implemented to ensure higher-quality teaching. The measures in question will be embedded in teaching activities during the 2019-2020 academic year.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**
This measure will be implemented starting from September 2019.

**Explanations for each individual theme: Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities**

Measure no 3 – study advisers
**What exactly does the investment entail?**
We will invest in the appointment of 2.0 FTE study advisors on top of current staffing numbers. We are doing so because more and more students have contacted the study advisers in recent years. Among other things, this is because of the nature of the degree programmes taught at the Faculty of Humanities (many degree programmes with many possible electives), the changing role played by tutors, the attention paid by the media to stress and pressure to perform, the growing number of international students (who come with their own/different types of problems) and the waiting lists for psychologists and regular doctors.

We are currently following the national standard of 0.15 FTE for every 100 students (LAS/TCS: +50%; Master’s students = half of this). We will raise this standard to 0.2 FTE for every 100 students (LAS/TCS 0.3). If we operate from the premise that we will have 4,000 Bachelor’s students, this will mean an additional 2.0 FTE. Study advisors can also be used in Master’s programmes.

This will cost 2 x €75,000 = €150,000

**What is the purpose of the investment?**
The expenditure will allow the quality of the services provided to students, including students with functional impairment, to be improved, and students will receive better supervision. Counselling will be more proactive and personalised. Students will be served sooner and more efficiently. This measure will reduce wait times for appointments with the study advisers.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**
There will be more study advisors for Humanities students and the standard we use to calculate the number of advisors per student will increase. We will focus on group-based counselling and a proactive approach.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**
We believe that this will result in new types of counselling and faster and better service being provided to our students, which in turn will result in shorter wait times.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**
We will implement this measure as soon as possible. The Faculty Council approved this measure on 19 December 2018, in anticipation of approval of the full package of measures, so that job advertisements can be published in early 2019 and the vacancies will be able to be filled as soon as possible.
To the members of the Faculty Council

Decision

The Faculty Council, which met for a meeting on 23 January 2019,

having familiarised itself with the Proposed Quality Agreements memorandum for the Faculty of Humanities (GW/BES/CH/2019/02a), and having heard it discussed by the Council,

HAS DECIDED

to approve the measures proposed by the Faculty of Humanities

with regard to the quality agreements (governing the use of the student loan system funds).

Utrecht, 23 January 2019
Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

Given the nature of UCU’s degree programmes, which have always followed the intensive small-group teaching format, we have chosen not to allocate our share of the funds to theme no 1 for now. We spend a great deal of funds from our teaching budget on this as a matter of course. However, we are currently reconsidering our curriculum, and will probably end up with a few ideas that come under this theme. We have included those changes in this plan from 2021 onwards.

With regard to theme no 2, the professional development of lecturers, we propose that the funds be used mostly in those first few years to increase the amount of time lecturers are allotted to conduct research, which will benefit the academic level and background of the classes they teach, and which will thus benefit the students.

With regard to theme no 3, we will invest in scholarships for Dutch students so as to improve access to our degree programmes, as well as to promote diversity in our student population. UCU is already working actively towards improved student supervision through its tutor system, but will conduct a study in the coming period on the use and quality of non-academic student counselling, such as the appointment of a second (female) Student Life Officer. Whatever we end up doing, we will take into account the proven counselling needs of a diverse student population. This may result in certain expenditures, which have been included in the plan from 2021 onwards.

Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.

In the autumn of 2018, the UCU Council (comprised of the Faculty Council and the representative advisory council) alerted the UC Management Team to these funds and the need for a plan. Once the themes and the amounts to be allocated had been announced, they were asked to draw up a plan for the spending of these funds. This plan was discussed with them by representatives of the UCU Board, which resulted in a proposal that was approved by the UCU Board. On 24 January, this proposal was discussed with the UCU Council, which resulted in several small revisions being added. After this input, the plan was considered adopted, and we are hereby submitting it, with the UCU Council’s permission.

Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Allotted research hours for UCU academic staff</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Grants</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 More intensive student supervision</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Making the curriculum more flexible</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Diversity &amp; social engagement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts expressed in thousands of euros

Explanation for each individual theme – More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?

In 2019, UCU allocated a sum to curriculum innovation. This resulted in two plans that are relevant here:

1. We are looking at our graduation requirements in relation to our current academic timetable. In the current system, students are required to obtain 60 credits per year in two 15-week semesters. In addition, we teach courses between the semesters, but the credits obtained for those courses cannot be used towards the 60 credits students are required to obtain annually. We wish to use the funds we
will be awarded to make the requirements more flexible. However, this will require an overhaul of the courses taught, particularly during the summer and winter periods.

2. Social relevance (social engagement) and diversity are important values that are reflected in our learning outcomes. However, the number of courses reflecting these themes in the UCU curriculum does not suffice to allow all our students to work on these themes during the course of their degrees. We wish to invest in the development and teaching of courses related to these themes that will be incorporated into the standard curriculum taken by all UCU students. This also includes investing in establishing and maintaining good relations with non-governmental organisations and other stakeholders.

What is the purpose of the investment?
The objective is to offer students a wide range of courses throughout the academic year, which will allow students to pick courses of their own choosing, including courses designed to increase social engagement and diversity. In addition, a more flexible curriculum will perhaps relieve students' workload at peak times. Before implementing a more flexible curriculum, we must conduct a thorough study on how the implementation will affect lecturers' workloads. This is what the curriculum innovation budget for 2019 will be allocated to.

What are the intended results of the investment?
- A wider range of courses will be taught, both in terms of time and of subject matter
- More courses focusing on social engagement and diversity will be added

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
- A flexible curriculum allowing students to obtain the 60 credits they require throughout the year would reduce the pressure experienced by students who would rather spread their workloads. If students only take three courses per semester, rather than four, this means that they will typically spend 42 hours per week studying, rather than 56 hours.
- As outlined in our learning outcomes, social engagement and diversity are considered very important at UCU. Students are already made aware of this through the UCU community, and particularly through extracurricular activities. However, we feel that these themes have not been sufficiently included in our curriculum. This investment will allow all of our students to work with these themes as part of their degree programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Making the curriculum more flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Diversity &amp; social engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts expressed in thousands of euros

Initially, the expenditures made with regard to this will be financed from the curriculum innovation budget. After 2020, clearly defined and permanent social engagement- and diversity-related additions to courses will be able to be financed from this same budget.

Explanations for each individual theme – Raising the quality of our degree programmes by promoting the professional development of our lecturers

What exactly does the investment entail?
At UCU, 10 per cent of academic staff's time is allotted to research, on top of their teaching duties. As of September 2019, this will be increased to 15 per cent. Our proposal is that the time allotted to research be doubled, i.e., increased to 20 per cent. This additional 5% will cost €36,000 in 2019, and starting from 2020, it will annually cost €110,000, which amount will increase gradually, commensurate with inflation indexation and the professional development of UCU's academic staff.

What is the purpose of the investment?
90% of UCU students go on to do a Master's degree, and 25% go on to do a PhD. It is absolutely vital that they be frequently exposed to research and researchers, so as to be able to learn from them. We can only provide high-quality education if lecturers are granted the opportunity to remain active in their fields of research, and if they share the knowledge they gain from their research with their students and show them what conducting
research entails. It does not make sense that the highly talented students of University College Utrecht only get to meet researchers who spend a significant percentage of their time conducting research when they take courses taught by lecturers on secondment from UU faculties. A survey of UCU alumni showed that the students would have liked to learn more research skills.

Moreover, ‘scholarship time’ (as it is called at UCU) is good for students’ professional development. By increasing the amount of time allotted to research to 20 per cent, we will give UCU’s academic staff similar research opportunities to those enjoyed by their colleagues at sister university colleges such as UCR and LUC and at the Faculty of Humanities. As a result, they will be better able to join in research programmes conducted at several faculties. On average, lecturers will have fewer teaching duties, and they will have more opportunity to engage in ‘scholarship time’ of their own (possibly mainly outside the compact semesters). Furthermore, this will make UCU a more attractive employer to talented lecturers from elsewhere. All these things taken together will make us more competitive. Lecturers will have to account for the way in which they use these hours. They may focus on research on their own discipline, teaching-related research or SOTL.

However, the main thing is that this focus on the development of our lecturers will directly benefit our degree programmes, and our students. UCU’s view of ‘teacher-scholars’ is based on the idea that research (i.e., scholarship) must raise the quality of the classes taught by the lecturers. The time lecturers spend on their research will be reflected in their teaching, which means our degree programmes will feature more state-of-the-art research, e.g. through research-based work placements and ‘scholarly stories’ seminars taught to students. Students will improve their research skills or obtain a more comprehensive view of what research entails. Furthermore, this measure will improve the quality of the supervision, as well as increase students’ opportunities to write research-based theses and participate in academic networks. If the budget allows it, UCU will organise lecturer retreats focusing on incorporating research into teaching (in 2019, 2020 and 2021) so as to establish best practices, thus ensuring that all students will benefit properly from this measure.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

An increase in the amount of time allotted to research will result in the following:

- UCU will be a more attractive employer to academic staff representing various disciplines
- UCU’s academic staff will have their workloads reduced because their teaching duties will be reduced in favour of more research time.
- UCU’s academic staff will be more likely to be offered jobs outside university colleges, even if they have been employed by UCU for a longer period of time.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

The measures will have the following effect on students:

- Students will be exposed to the latest scientific developments in their degree programmes.
- The quality of our degree programmes will improve due to teaching-related research, and because students will be exposed to research more often.
- The range of subjects on which students can write theses will be broadened, and students who are writing their theses will receive better supervision

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Allotted research hours for UCU academic staff</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts expressed in thousands of euros

The percentage of time allotted to research will increase as of 1 September 2010, and will remain at 20% afterwards. Because our academic staff will become more professional, and due to inflation indexation, we expect the costs associated with this measure to increase slightly over the years.

**Explanations for each individual theme – Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities**

**What exactly does the investment entail?**
UCU offers its students an intensive small-group teaching programme in selected fields, meaning its tuition fee is higher than the tuition fees charged for regular Bachelor’s degrees. By offering students grants, we will be able to improve access to our degree programmes, as well as promote equal opportunities.

For budget-related reasons, UCU had to reduce the budget available for grants by €50,000 last year. We propose increasing the grant budget to a level exceeding the original amount. In addition, if necessary, we will invest in more intensive student supervision.

**What is the purpose of the investment?**

It is vital to UCU’s degree programmes that the student population be diverse. UCU’s teaching philosophy operates from the premise that students bring their own sociocultural and education backgrounds to their seminars, where they constitute a part of our intensive and interactive teaching method. We have noticed at UCU that socioeconomic diversity leaves a little to be desired, particularly among our Dutch students. We wish to improve our socioeconomic diversity by offering grants, primarily to Dutch students who would not otherwise be able to afford to study at UCU. If there are not enough grant applications from Dutch students, we may offer grants to prospective students from the EEA.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

By implementing this measure, we wish to open up UCU’s degree programmes to a more socioeconomically diverse student population.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

A more socioeconomically diverse student population will result in different types of input being provided by students during classroom discussions, which will result in matters being analysed from even more points of view.

This will also have an impact on the community. By putting together students with different levels of disposable income, we will give our students a more varied view of reality, which will give UCU students living in UCU’s social hub a broader perspective on society.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More intensive student supervision</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amounts expressed in thousands of euros*

We intend to increase the budget available for grants by €50,000, and to have €65,000 available eventually. Given the expenditures on theme no 2, this amount will be lower in 2020 (€30,000).
Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

a. More intensive small-group teaching
b. Professional development of lecturers
c. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

With regard to theme no 1: More intensive small-group teaching.

a. In December 2018, UCR’s executive board and the UCR Council agreed that the funds awarded to us from the student loan system funds will be allocated to projects designed to facilitate more intensive small-group teaching. This allowed us to realise a wish long held by UCR’s students: the creation of study spaces for both individual students and students working in teams in the Elliot Common House. These study spaces were completed in January 2019, and we have recently formally opened the study spaces we were able to create due to the student loan system funds. All our students will benefit from this useful improvement.

b. In the next few years, we will further invest in computer-aided learning for our students as part of our plans for theme no 1. A database of videos presenting knowledge, to be used in blended learning modules, will strongly support our small and intensive working groups and project groups.

c. UCR students have a heavy workload (see theme no 3, too). To some extent, this is inevitable at an honours college. However, we will check whether the current system, in which academic years are divided into two semesters lasting a mere fifteen weeks each, and in which students take four courses at the same time, will need to be revised. We are discussing several options, but more research will have to be carried out before we will be able to (a) spread our students’ heavy workload more evenly over the year, and (b) prevent our students from having to do too much multi-tasking by the 2021-2022 academic year. Such a change will require thorough preparation and proper training of lecturers and current students in a new method.

With regard to theme no 2: professional development of lecturers.

a. As part of UCR’s Strategic Plan for 2017-2018, the college is currently focusing on several strategic themes that exceed the boundaries of our curriculum. Themes such as global health, sustainable deltas, institutions of freedom, arts and heritage, youth and education, and data in science and society require a stronger focus on interdisciplinary research on the part of lecturers, who are currently working in tracks organised along single-discipline lines. The professional development of lecturers in teaching-related matters and in research that will benefit their teaching will take our degree programmes to a higher level in the coming years.

With regard to theme no 3: supervision.

a. It is necessary that we allocate additional funds to more intensive student supervision. Students are suffering heavy workloads, and students and current tutors are justified in wishing a new student supervision system in which student psychologists will be used more often. Because UCR is a small college, we have so far always had to turn to external partners for psychologists for our students, which does not always result in the highest-quality service, partly due to the highly diverse and international nature of our student population.

b. Lastly, as part of theme no 3, we will invest in diversity grants in the coming years, so as to promote accessibility to our degree programmes and increase the level of diversity in our student population. Furthermore, we will invest in the elimination of possibly unconscious biases in our student selection and recruitment systems, so as to ensure that our student community will remain as diverse as possible in the long term.

We have made a conscious decision not to be too specific about our commitments for the next five years. After all, our student community changes every year, as do our students’ wishes with regard to the manner in which our share of the student loan system funds is spent. We have made some commitments for 2019, and in April 2019 we will have a more in-depth discussion on three themes in which more expenditure is desirable. We will be guided in these discussions by the agenda outlined above. We continue to attach great importance to flexibility and support by the employee and student representative bodies. Our commitments are evaluated and revised where necessary at the annual budget discussions with the UCR Council.
Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.
In late 2018, the UCR Council (comprised of the Faculty Council and the advisory board) discussed the spending of the funds in 2019 with UCR’s executive board. The Council unanimously decided to allocate the funds awarded from the student loan system funds to the realisation of study spaces in the Elliot Common House. This expenditure was included in the 2019 budget. The Council conducted a survey regarding the years 2020-2024, which will be discussed in the next meeting of the UCR Council. The themes referred to above were drawn up in anticipation of these discussions. Once the themes and the amounts to be allocated have been announced, they will be asked to draw up a plan for the spending of these funds. The definitive plan for the 2024-2024 period will be discussed in the Council's April meeting.

Indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Student facilities benefiting intensive small-group teaching</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Diversity grants</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 More intensive student supervision</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Making the curriculum more flexible</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts expressed in thousands of euros

Explanations for decisions regarding each theme – More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?

a. In 2019 UCR invested in the improvement of facilities benefiting intensive small-group teaching. Specifically, 65 additional study spaces were created in the Elliot Common House. The next few years will see improved ICT facilities that will benefit intensive small-group teaching.

b. We will develop a database of videos presenting knowledge clips and online teaching materials that will allow us to include blended learning in our intensive small-group teaching methods. The project will be designed in association with Elevate-IT, UU.

c. UCR students have very heavy workloads. To some extent, this is inevitable at an honours college. However, we will check whether the current system, in which academic years are divided into two semesters lasting a mere fifteen weeks each, and in which students take four courses at the same time, will need to be revised. We are discussing several options, but more research will have to be carried out before we will be able to (a) spread our students' heavy workload more evenly over the year, and (b) prevent our students from having to do too much multi-tasking by the 2021-2022 academic year. Such a change will require thorough preparation and proper training of lecturers and current students in a new method.

What is the purpose of the investment?
The objective is to improve the conditions for intensive small-group teaching along the lines of physical, digital and planning methods.

What are the intended results of the investment?
- Improving students’ UCR experience and student and lecturer satisfaction rates with regard to the prerequisites for intensive small-scale teaching.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
- Now that the study spaces for individual students and students engaging in team work have been upgraded, they are visibly being used more often. We only completed the upgraded spots a few weeks ago, and the results have not yet been measured.
- We expect this measure to result in higher scores on the study facilities and programme feasibility indicators in the NSE and other evaluations.
- Preventing multi-tasking and a more even spread of teaching over the academic year will result in a measurably and clearly discernibly alleviated workload.
- We hope that the digitisation of certain teaching components will result in students being better prepared for their classwork. The effect of this will be measured in a pilot study phase during which some courses will work with the new tools, while others will not.
- Changing the way in which the academic year is structured will result in a reduction of the number of hours students are expected to spend on their coursework, from 56 hours per week to, say, 42 or 48 hours per week. Other university colleges work with workloads like that, and they generally perform better in the workload and perceived programme feasibility questions in surveys.

Explanations for each theme - Professional development of lecturers

What exactly does the investment entail?
Developing more interdisciplinary-style core courses revolving around the strategic themes of global health, sustainable deltas, institutions of freedom, arts and heritage, youth and education, and data in science and society, and providing lecturers with training in teaching these courses.

What is the purpose of the investment?
The objective is to develop UCR, which is currently mostly a multidisciplinary education institution, into an education institution that also focuses on interdisciplinary courses.

What are the intended results of the investment?
Stronger theme-based collaboration between lecturers representing differing academic disciplines in teaching and supervising interdisciplinary projects. A revision of components of the curriculum so as to prepare students throughout the curriculum for an interdisciplinary ‘senior project’ (Bachelor’s thesis).

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
Students will be better prepared for the challenges presented by the interdisciplinary final thesis, the so-called ‘senior project’.

Lecturers will be better trained in supervising students who are writing their theses and in conducting interdisciplinary research that will help them teach their classes.

In this way, UCR will help steer the concept of undergraduate research (which was partially developed by UCR in the Netherlands) towards more interdisciplinary research.

Explanations for each theme – Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

What exactly does the investment entail?
- Due to our college's strong stand-alone nature, UCR cannot call on UU's student psychologists to provide assistance to its students. We want to use these funds to hire a UCR student psychologist who can assist students where necessary. Clearly, there is a demand for this among our students. However, it should be noted that we are also seeking to alleviate students' workloads in different ways, as explained in section 1c (more intensive small-group teaching).

UCR wishes to make changes in two fields. We want to make our student population more diverse by awarding grants, and we want to give students more intensive supervision.

- As far as diversity is concerned, we also wish to invest in grants in the next few years, and in eliminating possibly unconscious biases in our student selection and recruitment systems, so as to ensure that our student community remains as diverse as possible in the long term.

What is the purpose of the investment?
a. The wellbeing of UCR students is partly ensured through a tutor system featuring a social counsellor; if students need a psychologist, UCR refers them to external facilities. By investing in a student psychologist, we will be able to offer this important service in house.

b. By investing in greater diversity by offering grants (among other measures), we wish to ensure that we make the right decisions in our recruitment and selection procedures and that we are not unconsciously guided by mechanisms that do not favour students from various underrepresented groups (men, people from a poor socioeconomic background, students from a migrant background within the Netherlands and Europe).

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

I. Our organisation will get a better grip on student wellbeing, will provide better services, and students will have a more positive experience of UCR being a supportive organisation.

II. Our organisation will get a better grip on diversity policy, which will result in UCR's student community becoming more diverse.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

a. Students having more direct access to a student psychologist when they need one will be considered a result, and UCR will be perceived to be a more supportive organisation because of it.

b. The level of diversity will increase, because our student population will be more representative of society in terms of gender, socioeconomic background and migration background. A diverse classroom is a crucial educational tool in our teaching concept. Diversity in the classroom positively affects the epistemological perspectives incorporated into the learning process, the development of intersubjective and intercultural skills, and the personal growth and civic responsibility components of UCR's core mission (academic excellence, personal growth and civic responsibility).
From the Secretary's Office at University College Roosevelt

To the members of Utrecht University's University Council

DEcision

The UCR Council, which met on Friday, 15 February 2019,
having read the Proposal for the Quality Agreements memorandum and having heard the discussion held by the council,

HAS DECIDED

to approve the measures proposed by UCR's Executive Board

with regard to the quality agreements (governing the use of the student loan system funds).

Chair, UCR Council

Middelburg, 15 February 2019
Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

The Faculty of Medicine has had a widely supported Teaching Strategy in place since 2016. Its key aims are as follows: More innovative teaching effectively combining online and classroom teaching; appreciation for and professional development of lecturers; and increasing staff and students' resilience.

For this reason, the faculty believes all three themes chosen by UU are equally important and form a coherent whole and regards them as inextricable. The faculty already engages in a great deal of small-group teaching. Where necessary, this will be made more effective, and more small-group teaching will be introduced. Making our current small-group teaching more effective will require a critical look at the current learning and assessment activities (and the question as to whether the type of assessment promotes the right learning activities), and revisions of these activities where necessary (theme no 1). In order to provide our students with well-developed and effective teaching, we will need highly trained and highly qualified lecturers who feel that their teaching is being appreciated and who believe they are being supported (theme no 2). In addition, success also depends on proactive, more personalised student supervision (theme no 3).

The recurring theme in the Faculty of Medicine’s plan is increasing the effectiveness of both lecturers and students in matters of teaching. We will do so by increasing their autonomy and their level of engagement in their degree programmes, and by improving their teaching and studying competences.

Indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.
The entire process, from consulting lecturers and students to the actual adoption of the plan, was overseen by the student assessor and the management team of the Education Centre, in close consultation with the Education and Research council.

On 10 January, students were consulted. On that occasion, a total of twenty students (Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Biomedical Sciences, SUMMA and Medicine) provided ideas for improvement for both groups. On 11 January, Clinical Health Sciences students were consulted during a seminar where they were invited to give some input through an online app.

These ideas were then worked out and included in a survey that lecturers and students were invited to take. By 22 January, 138 people had responded, some eighty of whom were lecturers. Unfortunately, only very few Medicine and Clinical Health Sciences students responded.

The members of the programme committees were allowed to provide input on an individual basis through the student consultation and the survey. They were also asked on 23 January, in their capacity as a programme committee, to share their feedback regarding the draft plans with the Education and Research Council, since the Education and Research Council has the right of consent.

The consultation resulted in the following key themes, many of which are relevant to all of the faculty’s degree programmes: more personalised feedback for students regarding subject matter and their progress towards their degrees, more challenging lessons, more highly personalised student supervision, training sessions for students to prevent burnout, improving lecturers’ didactic skills and greater appreciation and more time for dedicated lecturers.

Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

As indicated above, all three themes are equally important to us, but we will need to allocate different amounts to the various themes to be able to bring about substantial improvement. Therefore, we have chosen
for now to allocate the larger share of the budget to more intensive small-group teaching, followed by the professional development of lecturers and student supervision, in a ratio of 3:2:1.

We chose to do so because the expenditure must most of all be beneficial to the degree programmes themselves; the professional development of lecturers and student supervision support this process.

With respect to the theme of more intensive small-group teaching, we are operating from the premise that the basic facilities must be in good order. The current curricula already include a great deal of small-group teaching, financed from the right budget. The quality agreement funds will be used for the further improvement of our current range of small-group teaching and, where necessary, for an expansion of our range of small-group teaching. In other words, we are not allocating any funds to the appointment of additional lecturers to teach the current courses. Please find more information on the allocation of the funds to each theme in the appendix.

The spending of the quality agreement funds will be a recurring item on the agenda of the Education and Research Council, allowing it to monitor the expenditures made, the objectives achieved and the plans for the next year, and adjust things if necessary, in close consultation with the relevant parties. This will involve an analysis of the ratio between the three themes and of the distribution of the funds across the various degree programmes.

Theme no 1 – More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?
With respect to this theme, the faculty has chosen to allocate the quality agreement funds to making the current small-group teaching more effective (i.e., innovating it) and to expanding it where necessary (also see p. 1). This may include improvements to existing small-group methods and the further development of new motivational small-group teaching methods in the curricula (e.g. ‘flipping the classroom’ (which is defined as actively using / building on / applying basic subject matter that the students studied at home during seminars), team-based learning, interprofessional and interdisciplinary project-based seminars, interprofessional Communications & Attitude seminars, discovery-based practicals, course-based research, research-based learning). Different degree programmes may make different choices in this regard, depending on their respective situations. These innovative methods may be able to be supported by junior lecturers, teaching assistants and teaching experts.

What is the purpose of the investment?
Depending on the choices made and focus areas decided on by the various departments, the purpose may be:
- Encouraging students to challenge themselves and do some in-depth thinking by presenting them with varied, motivational and interactive methods, which feature interprofessional learning and collaboration, among other things.
- Strengthening students’ academic and scientific skills and ability to apply research results to real-life situations
- Greater focus on ethical aspects in biomedical sciences
- Greater focus on trends in society

What are the intended results of the investment?
The steps we will take will result in more challenging and more in-depth degree programmes, featuring more interaction between students and lecturers. The students will be exposed to the subject matter in several ways, since it will be presented in different ways, and they play quite a significant part in this process themselves and are responsible for it themselves (autonomy, proper preparation). They will receive more intensive supervision in this from trained lecturers (see theme no 2).

In 2019, at least two courses per degree programme will be analysed, and an innovation plan will be drawn up where necessary. The various departments have expressed the following preferences:
- Medicine and SUMMA: reforming interprofessional communication seminars and blocks using the ‘flipping-the-classroom’ method
- Bachelor’s degree in biomedical sciences: challenging methods, such as ‘research-based learning’ in methods such as ‘discovery-based practicals’ and ‘course-based research’
In order to be able to respond to the changing circumstances (society, clients) and the changing needs of lecturers and students, and in order to be able to learn from experiences gained previously, we have drawn up a rough outline of our plans for after 2020 (see paragraph 5: intended time frame). We will perform an evaluation in late 2019, after which we will work out our plans for the next two years. The departments all aspire to establish an interdisciplinary teaching programme focusing on ‘the health care of the future’ together. In addition, the departments will share experiences and best practices with each other, and where possible they will collaborate so as to make the best possible use of available expertise.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
The range of courses taught will be more diverse, both in terms of subject matter and in terms of teaching methods, and the focus will be on interaction. This may motivate students and lecturers and increase their competence and autonomy.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
2019: see paragraph 3 (intended results)
2020-2024: Further development of motivational teaching methods such as ‘flipping the classroom’ and of interprofessional (project-based) seminars; development of teaching blocks dedicated to themes such as ‘Open Science’, ‘Bioinformatics and Data Sciences’, ‘Biomedical Research Lab’ and ‘Diversity and Biomedical Sciences’.

The appendix includes a table outlining how the budget for small-group teaching will be divided among the departments. We have decided to distribute the funds across the departments in proportion to the number of students enrolled in their programmes. On top of this, the Clinical Health Sciences department has been awarded a fixed sum of €40,000 at the expense of the other departments. We decided to award the department this sum to enable Clinical Health Sciences, too, to substantially improve its programme.

The funds will be used to appoint additional lecturers who will support the current lecturers in implementing the changes (please note: these new lecturers will not teach the current curriculum).

Theme no 2 – Professional development of lecturers
What exactly does the investment entail?
The annual expenditure will comprise the following:
- Earmarked hours during which lecturers can work on their professional development. Beginner lecturers will be allotted hours to get their University Teaching Qualifications and/or Senior University Teaching Qualifications and so to become assistant professors, while experienced lecturers will be allotted hours to work on their permanent professional development as lecturers (continuing education).
- Further development and implementation of continuous didactic courses (instead of existing stand-alone courses) and custom-designed activities for lecturers with different types of teaching duties and different levels of experience. This also includes programmes for PhD students and specialty registrars who wish to master teaching as part of their degree programmes, and sub-qualifications for lecturers with one specific teaching duty, such as supervising seminars or medical interns. What we need is additional teaching experts for the development of these courses, and additional trainers and mentors to implement them.
- Establishing and implementing the exchange of expertise between colleagues and representatives of different fields, with a view to helping lecturers grow and raise the quality of the degree programmes. Possible activities: (peer) observation and feedback, mentoring, peer review, linking the professional development of lecturers to the results of their evaluations, coaching, training on the job, didactic recommendations issued to individual lecturers or teams of lecturers.

What is the purpose of the investment?
- Raising the appreciation for teaching as an academic duty that requires particular expertise, training and time to engage in said training.
- Supporting teaching careers by offering talented young academics the opportunity to opt for a teaching career at an early stage and to acquire didactic skills (among other things).
- Motivating all lecturers and giving them the personalised didactic support they need (i.e., focused on their own particular teaching duties), regardless of the nature of their teaching duties, the number of hours allotted to said teaching duties and their level of experience; not just until they obtain the requisite qualifications, but permanently.
- Allowing lecturers easy and optimised access to expertise and feedback provided by teaching experts, their own colleagues, students (course evaluations), so as to ensure that lecturers keep working on their professional development and raise the level of the degree programmes.
- Raising lecturers' involvement in their students' learning and helping students enjoy a safe and effective learning environment and a sense of wellbeing.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

Highly motivated lecturers with good teaching skills at several levels, ranging from lecturers with one specific teaching duty to all-around lecturers who can be used in many courses and to full professors dedicated to teaching. How will be achieve this?

- Personalised ongoing courses to allow lecturers to obtain University and Senior University Teaching Qualifications, a system allowing lecturers to obtain sub-qualifications for specific types of teaching duties, to which the lecturers may keep adding until they are eligible for University Teaching Qualifications.
- A culture and structure in which lecturers, students and teaching experts work together towards continuous professional development and higher-quality degree programmes.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

Students will find that they are receiving better training from lecturers who are more highly engaged and motivated and more competent, are better able to structure their teaching and challenge their students, provide more thorough feedback more often, act like role models and feel responsible for teaching high-quality courses. Lecturers will feel more appreciated and better equipped for their particular teaching duties.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

In 2019, ongoing University and Senior University Teaching Qualification courses will be developed, and we will discuss with the divisions how exactly the budget earmarked for giving lecturers more time to work on their professional development will be allocated. The first courses will be taught in late 2019.

The development of specific teaching duties as EPAs (Entrustable Professional Activities) will be completed in 2019, and declarations of aptitude for these EPAs will be drawn up in 2019, as well. During the course of 2020, training modules and assessment methods will be developed that will result in sub-qualifications.

In 2020 we will establish an infrastructure designed to encourage lecturers, students and teaching experts to share useful information with each other. Activities as outlined above in bullet point no 3 of the first paragraph will be organised starting from late 2020.

Starting from 2021, courses, sub-qualification modules and exchange activities will be continued and expanded where possible.

**Theme no 3 – Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities**

**What exactly does the investment entail?**

All departments of the Faculty of Medicine are expected to share in the expenditure, with the various departments being allowed to focus on different aspects, depending on their wishes and options.

**Equal opportunities and accessibility**

- Developing an inclusive introduction at the start of the first year of each degree programme so as to ensure that all students, regardless of their background, gender, religious affiliation or disability (where relevant), feel welcome and can get off to a good start in their degrees.
- Development an extracurricular ‘personal leadership’ track that will give students the tools they need to be in charge of their own growth and career.
More intensive and personalised supervision and teaching methods
- More frequent and more personal student supervision by tutors and lecturers. Frequent and integral feedback on students' progress towards their degree in the broad sense of the word (cognitive, study behaviour, student experience, choice of Master's degrees and preparation for the job market, guidance and supervision after graduation)
- Developing optional or mandatory workshops that will teach students how to study properly, be more resilient and prevent burnout: dealing with perfectionism, dealing with stress, mindfulness, dealing with the ‘fear of missing out’ and self-care
- Dedicated coaches/psychologists with whom students can discuss matters in a proactive or preventive way, both in individual meetings and in peer review groups (and to notify the departments of problems)

What is the purpose of the investment?
The creation of a safe, inclusive and personalised learning environment in which students receive proactive feedback from their tutors, lecturers and fellow students on their progress towards their degrees and study behaviour. This will allow them to successfully complete their degree programmes and make the most of their potential while remaining highly motivated, and will properly equip them for performing their professional duties in a pluriform society.

What are the intended results of the investment?
Easy access to supervision and workshops related to learning how to study properly, become more resilient and increase one’s sense of wellbeing.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
We seek to ensure that students and lecturers will notice that the learning environment is becoming safer and more inclusive, thus genuinely allowing all students to successfully complete their degree programmes while remaining highly motivated. We seek to ensure that students will notice that they can more easily and more quickly access supervision by tutors and coaches or therapists.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
Inclusive introduction
- 2019-2020 Further development of Introducing Life Sciences for BMS/GSLS. Where appropriate, a similar introduction may be developed for other programmes taught at the Faculty of Medicine

Personal leadership track
- 2019: Collecting ideas and designing the track
- 2020-2021: First pilot studies, to be evaluated and refined
- 2022-2024: Track offered to the student population at large as a matter of course

More frequent and more personalised student supervision
- 2019-2021: More hours spent with tutors/mentors; pilot studies involving tools used in USO/EU projects (THERMOS/OFLA) for personalised feedback based on data on the student's progress towards his/her degree, study habits and study experience.
- 2022-2024: Large-scale implementation of feedback tools that allow students to steer their own study habits in the right direction and set goals, in association with their tutors or mentors.

Resilience-promoting workshops
- 2019-2021: Development and pilot studies
- 2022-2024: General roll-out and evaluations
- Dedicated coaches/psychologists
- 2019-2024: 0.5 FTE for all degree programmes taught at the Faculty of Medicine
## Appendix: Budgets

### Integral Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-group teaching</td>
<td>€446,609</td>
<td>€446,609</td>
<td>€455,606</td>
<td>€568,523</td>
<td>€600,442</td>
<td>€677,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>€297,739</td>
<td>€297,739</td>
<td>€303,738</td>
<td>€379,015</td>
<td>€400,295</td>
<td>€451,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision</td>
<td>€148,870</td>
<td>€148,870</td>
<td>€151,869</td>
<td>€189,508</td>
<td>€200,147</td>
<td>€225,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>€893,217</strong></td>
<td><strong>€893,217</strong></td>
<td><strong>€911,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>€1,137,046</strong></td>
<td><strong>€1,200,884</strong></td>
<td><strong>€1,355,443</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-group teaching</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>8.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development of lecturers</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.08</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget for Theme no 1 (Small-group teaching) expressed in FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Med/SUMMA</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS (B)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS (M)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE (1 FTE = €84k)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget for Theme no 2 (Professional development of lecturers) expressed in euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time allotted to lecturers for professional development activities</td>
<td>€148,400</td>
<td>€159,000</td>
<td>€180,000</td>
<td>€238,500</td>
<td>€265,000</td>
<td>€318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing didactic skills training courses</td>
<td>€109,953</td>
<td>€93,024</td>
<td>€78,252</td>
<td>€78,695</td>
<td>€68,580</td>
<td>€63,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of expertise between colleagues</td>
<td>€39,386</td>
<td>€45,715</td>
<td>€45,286</td>
<td>€62,468</td>
<td>€66,714</td>
<td>€70,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in EUR</strong></td>
<td><strong>€297,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>€297,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>€303,738</strong></td>
<td><strong>€379,015</strong></td>
<td><strong>€400,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>€452,096</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget for Theme no 3 (Student supervision) expressed in FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive introduction</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal leadership track</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent and more personalised student supervision</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience-promoting workshops</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated coaches/psychologists</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in FTE (1 FTE = €84k)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr Miedema,

The Education and Research Council discussed the faculty’s plan for the quality agreements to be made using the student loan system funds with you during its meeting of Thursday, 7 February. In response to this discussion, the Council requested in its letter of 11 February that you revise a few aspects of the plan. On Wednesday, 13 February, the Education and Research Council received the revised version of the faculty’s plan (version 0.4, dated 13 February 2019).

The Council submitted this version to its members for a vote. The Council approved the plan with 16 votes in its favour. One member of the Council refrained from voting.

The Council would like to take this opportunity to express its appreciation for the manner in which it was involved in the process that resulted in the present plan as submitted by the faculty. In addition, the Council will put the quality agreements to be made using the student loan system funds on the agenda of its meetings as a recurring item, thus allowing the Council to keep abreast of the results obtained and progress made with regard to the quality agreements every once in a while.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Stijn Wenmaekers, Chair
Utrecht UMC Education and Research Council
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Geosciences

Indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

We obtained an initial set of clearly defined wishes from our students. We then formulated the guiding principles for the Faculty of Geosciences. After that, we converted these wishes and guiding principles into clearly specified objectives for the spending plan, which were then discussed with various parties involved. During this process the guiding principles and objectives were revised.

Clearly defined wishes as expressed by students
- Students called more small-group teaching a good theme to invest in. However, they did say it was important that the faculty *clearly demonstrate* what exactly this small-group teaching entails and how it is effective;
- Many students expressed a strong desire for more extensive and properly scheduled feedback – feedback both on the contents of assignments and on skills (e.g. writing, presentations, debating, etc.);
- Many students also brought up a wider and more structured array of career orientation activities as an example of something that would raise educational quality. Although it is true that students are already being offered quite a few activities, much can still be gained from proper embedment of such activities in the curricula:
  * Regularly scheduled excursions (‘field trips’) to companies, organisations, etc., linked to courses;
  * Training of skills relevant to the students’ next career moves, both highly practical skills (how to use certain IT tools) and more general skills.
- Professional development of lecturers was also mentioned by students. Students mainly indicated that they wanted lecturers to become more proficient at practical skills such as the use of IT tools, presentation (better Powerpoint presentations, better English), etc.
- Furthermore, the students highly recommended that we communicate properly on the chosen expenditure lines and how students will notice in practical terms what has been done with the funds.

Guiding principles for the Faculty of Geosciences
- All expenditures must demonstrably contribute to improved educational quality;
- We are choosing to spend the money on a mix of the three themes listed in the university’s framework document, distributed across the following projects: designated hours for lecturers, support, and excursions and training courses;
- The chosen expenditure lines are well aligned with the ideas proposed by the students as expressed in the student representative body (Faculty Council);
- We are operating on the premise that there will be three stages: one initial two-year phase (2019-2020) featuring quick wins, as well as a second and third phase, each lasting two years (2021-2022 and 2023-2024) featuring more long-term expenditures as our income grows;
- At the end of the first and second phases, we will review the effects of the expenditures. Based on the outcomes of those reviews, we will revise the plans for the next phase if necessary, in close consultation with the employee and student representation;
- As far as staffing is concerned, some of the newly appointed lecturers will be offered temporary contracts (junior lecturers, i.e., Lecturer-4s), while others will be offered permanent contracts (assistant professors, support and administrative staff);
- Newly appointed assistant professors will be expected both to teach and to conduct research, because the faculty feels that students will benefit most from lecturers who can provide high-quality teaching informed by their knowledge and experience of geoscientific research;
- We will also continue to hire Lecturer-4s, but not too many, due to the temporary, non-sustainable nature of their appointments;
- The budget for degree-specific activities will be distributed in proportion to the number of students enrolled in each department. We do not use different weighting methods for science degrees versus social and behavioural science degrees;
The Faculty of Geosciences has decided not explicitly to allocate any funds to the sub-theme of accessibility and equal opportunities. A major guiding principle for the faculty, supported by the Faculty Council, is that the expenditures must benefit all students. Accessibility and equal opportunities are causes benefiting a sub-group. While we think it is an important theme, it does not fit in with the aforementioned guiding principle. However, the faculty does wish to contribute to this sub-theme by contributing to U-talent. As part of the regional ambitions plan, there will be a greater focus on advancement and a more diverse student population in the U-talent collaborative partnership between regional schools (both primary and secondary) and UU. The Faculty of Geosciences will share that focus.

Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.

- First we had a general discussion with the Undergraduate Board (UGB: with the faculty's directors of education, student assessor and the head of the Department of Education and Student Affairs) on 19 November 2018
- Faculty Council's discussion paper, 5 December 2018
- Brainstorming session between the vice-dean of teaching and the policy officers of the Department of Education and Student Affairs, 6 December 2018
- Intrafaculty meeting organised by and for the students on the student representative body, also attended by several lecturers, 7 December 2018
- Brainstorming sessions between the vice-dean of teaching with some of the students on the Faculty Council, 7 December 2018
- Faculty Council and Faculty Board, 11 December 2018
- Draft plan v.1 discussed by UGB, 20 December 2018; v.2 submitted to UGB and Faculty Board before Christmas
- Draft plan v.2 discussed by Faculty Board, 8 January 2019, written feedback by UGB
- Student responses to survey held in Koningsberger Building and online, 9 January 2019
- Draft plan v.3 discussed by Faculty Board, 15 January 2019
- Draft plan v.3 discussed by Faculty Council and Faculty Board, 15 January 2019

The present plan (16 January 2019) was revised slightly in response to the Faculty Council's meeting of 15 January. The Council approved the plan on the condition that these revisions be made.

Indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

The Faculty of Geosciences formulated three expenditure lines, based on the clearly defined wishes expressed by the students (see above) and the faculty's own guiding principles. The three expenditure lines are related to the themes listed in the university's framework document in the following manner:

1. Designated hours for lecturers: More intensive small-group teaching.
2. Support: Professional development of lecturers and student supervision.
3. Excursions and training courses: Student supervision.

1. We will allocate the majority of the funds to designated hours for lecturers,
   - by which we mean hours that are meant to be spent on a particular type of task;
   - Lecturers will be allocated hours for clearly designated activities related to more intensive supervision;
   - This supervision concerns both subject-matter-related (i.e., discipline-related) aspects and skills-related aspects;
   - In order to prevent dilution of the funds and in order to make the improvements easy for all to see, we will focus on a small number of ‘bottleneck courses’, i.e., courses that are mandatory or essential to Geosciences degree programmes – in other words, courses that a lot of students will or must take, and where it is clear that more intensive small-group teaching will directly benefit all students;
   - The newly designated hours can be allocated to a mix of junior lecturers (relatively inexperienced but flexible), post-docs who only do a little teaching (reasonably experienced, but cannot be used for many courses) and newly appointed assistant professors (who have a great deal of knowledge and will be experienced and permanently embedded in the long term);
- The nature of the mix will be determined by the characteristics of the selected bottleneck course and the designated activities;
- Some of the newly created hours will be used to reduce the number of hours for current permanent (senior) staff; the hours that have been cleared for them will now be allocated to designated activities to be carried out by these experienced (senior) lecturers, whose total number of hours meant to be spent on particular types of tasks will not increase.

2. We will allocate a relatively small percentage of the funds to support provided by support and administrative staff with regard to (a) the professional development of lecturers, and (b) the embedment of skills training in teaching at all teaching institutes.

3. Another relatively small percentage of the funds will be allocated to cover the actual costs of excursions and training sessions for students, related to skills and career orientation sessions embedded in the degree programmes. Judging from our formal, and more particularly, our informal contacts with people working in the Geosciences industry, the industry values these sorts of things, and is very willing to facilitate them where practical.

The present plan presents a broad outline of the projects to which the Faculty of Geosciences wishes to allocate the student loan system funds. With each expenditure line, different departments will place an emphasis on different aspects. Once the plan has been approved, we will enter a phase during which we will work out the listed activities, bottleneck courses, excursions and training sessions in greater detail.

Why the various expenditure lines and themes were chosen

1. Designated hours for lecturers: More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment consist of?
Additional designated hours for lecturers: Junior lecturers (Lecturer-4s), post-docs, newly appointed assistant professors.

What is the purpose of the investment?
To ensure that we offer more intensive small-group teaching in selected 'bottleneck courses', and to allocate hours to certain specially designated activities.

Explanation: For every degree programme and year of the programme, we will identify one to three courses that are mandatory or essential to the programme, and identify activities that clearly have a direct impact on the students.

For instance, these may be the following activities:
- More extensive feedback on current assignments/papers
- Feedback on general skills such as presentations, writing, collaboration, communication, debating, reflection, etc.
- Additional training with regard to certain selected skills, including skill-based learning
- Motivational teaching in association with companies and organisations (excursions, guest lectures featuring assignments, challenges - see also expenditure line no 3)
- Teaching subject matter in small tutor groups,
- etc.

Newly appointed assistant professors who seem likely to be offered a permanent contract will be offered a fixed teaching/research hours ratio: 60% versus 40%.

What are the intended results of the investment?
To improve the quality of our degree programmes by allowing students to have more intensive contact with lecturers, designed to help them attain clearly defined and visible goals.

How will students notice the investment?
In what way will the intended results have an effect?
**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

Lecturers will share more opportunities for direct contact with individual students or small groups of students (e.g. five or fewer participants); more frequent and more thorough feedback.

All students will feel the effects due to the fact that changes are implemented in strategically selected bottleneck courses. We will create designated hours for lecturers during the entire period. Exact number of hours/FTE in proportion to the increasingly generous budget available during the 2019-2024 period. For a scenario, refer to the end of the document.

2. **Support: Professional development of lecturers and student supervision**

**What exactly does the investment consist of?**

A professional will be appointed at the faculty level who will help the departments raise educational quality through the newly designated lecturers to the maximum extent possible.

**What is the purpose of the investment?**
- To further expand the faculty's policy regarding the professional development of lecturers;
- To help lecturers grow (in terms of teaching) and reform their teaching methods;
- To serve as an intermediary between the Centre for Academic Teaching and lecturers working at the faculty;
- To advise departments and actively support them in strengthening and embedding skills in their curricula (particularly in the bottleneck courses);
- To ensure that students reflect more on their knowledge and skills by giving them a great deal of support, thus ensuring that tutor groups and counselling will be permanently embedded in the faculty.

Explanation: This professional will not be a skills teacher, but rather someone with a background in teacher training and expertise of student and lecturer supervision and curriculum design – someone who is very familiar with the various training courses on offer.

**What are the intended results of the investment?**

Quality will be improved due to:

a. stronger professional development of lecturers, which will result in even better lecturers;

b. stronger learning pathways in terms of students' general skills, which will result in students becoming more academically proficient.

**How will students notice the investment?**

*Tutor groups will be embedded in the programmes, students will receive better skills training, they will become aware of their own strengths and weaknesses, more professional lecturers. All students will benefit through the improved learning pathways.*

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

We will allocate 1 FTE to Support during the 2019-2021 period, which will increase to approximately 2 FTE by 2024, provided that the interim evaluations are positive. This is because the available budget will grow over the course of the 2019-2024 period. For a scenario, refer to the end of the document.

3. **Excursions and training courses: Student supervision**

**What exactly does the investment consist of?**

Better excursions and training sessions, embedded in the curricula.

**What is the purpose of the investment?**

To organise a small number of brief excursions and training sessions each year for all students, embedded in the degree programmes, but related to labour market orientation for the students' particular disciplines. Every year we will earmark funds for:
- covering the costs of excursions/field trips to companies, by organisations, regions or cities – costs that cannot be covered by other means (e.g. when a student’s public transport chip card does not cover all the travel expenses incurred).

Explanation: Students want to be exposed to the industry outside academia more often. More particularly, they wish to get a much better understanding of the nature of the work being done in the professional field. In other words, they wish to visit companies, organisations, regions or cities and experience (through ‘real-life assignments’) what life is like in the field for which their degree is preparing them.

- covering the costs of training courses designed to improve certain particular skills related to the students' next career move (Master’s degree, labour market).

Explanation: linked to certain designated activities in bottleneck courses.

General information: these excursions and training courses will be organised/taught in conjunction with the activities organised by UU, the faculty's Career Services Unit and the study societies. The difference is that the excursions and training sessions referred to here will be permanently embedded in the degree programmes. To this end, they will have to be incorporated into clearly defined courses in which an introduction to the industry is an obvious choice.

What are the intended results of the investment?

There will be more contact with the professional field, thus allowing students to regard their knowledge and skills in the context of their future profession outside academia. They can then use this experience to decide on the remainder of their degree.

How will students notice the investment?

In what way will the intended results have an effect?

All students will visit companies, organisations, regions or cities related to their future profession a few times during the course of their degrees, and so will gain additional experience that will be important to their future.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?

We will invest in short excursions from the start of the period covered by the plan; we will begin to offer training courses starting from 2021; and we will then expand the range of activities offered, provided that the interim evaluations are positive. This is because the available budget will grow over the course of the 2019-2024 period. For a scenario, see below.

SCENARIOS

Funds

The funds allocated to UU by the Ministry of Education will increase from approximately €9m in 2019 to approximately €27m in 2024. For the first two years of the period covered by the plan, the Executive Board will supplement these amounts up to an annual amount of €14m.

Unless the current policy is revised, the Faculty of Geosciences will be awarded some €0.6m in 2019 and 2020, which will increase to €2m by 2024. See Appendix 1 for more details.

Indicative model

We have created an indicative Excel model that allows us to test scenarios in terms of the financial consequences of decisions made with regard to the three aforementioned expenditure lines. The model seeks to demonstrate the extent to which students will actually notice the effects of the investments.

- With regard to the designated-hours-for-lecturers expenditure line: The number of additional hours a lecturer will devote to individual contact moments with students each year, and the number of Bachelor’s and Master’s students who will benefit each year;

- With regard to the excursions-and-training-courses expenditure line: The number of excursions (visits) and training sessions per year, per Bachelor’s student and per Master’s student, and the number of Bachelor’s and Master’s students who will benefit each year;
With regard to the support expenditure line, this model does not allow us to demonstrate the results in quantitative terms.

For an example of the type of output this model produces, see Appendix 2 (which relates to 2019).

Please note: several scenarios will have to be tested before a definitive decision can be made.

**Multi-annual planning**

The Excel model presented in Appendix 2 will also allow us to draw up a multi-annual planning. This will come with fixed expenditure lines (the three chosen expenditure lines), but the desired demonstrable outcome for students will have to be the subject of more discussion. We are providing an indicative sample plan to illustrate the trend below. In this sample model, during the 2019-2024 period,

- the number of additional contact hours for each Bachelor’s and Master’s student will gradually increase;
- the number of newly appointed assistant professors will gradually increase;
- the FTE of support staff will increase;
- the number of short excursions/visits for both Bachelor’s and Master’s students will increase;
- The number of training sessions for both Bachelor’s and Master’s students will increase starting from 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure line no 1: Designated hours for lecturers</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional hours per Bachelor’s student per year:</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional hours per Master’s student per year:</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE for junior lecturers (Lecturer-4s):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE for post-docs:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE for assistant professors:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual costs:</td>
<td>€506,800</td>
<td>€581,440</td>
<td>€701,440</td>
<td>€981,440</td>
<td>€1,176,950</td>
<td>€1,287,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure line no 2: Support</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE for support staff (skills and professional):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual costs:</td>
<td>€80,000</td>
<td>€80,000</td>
<td>€80,000</td>
<td>€112,000</td>
<td>€128,000</td>
<td>€144,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure line no 3: Excursions and training courses</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of excursions per year for Bachelor’s students:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of Bachelor’s students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of excursions per year for Master’s students:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual costs:</td>
<td>€50,000</td>
<td>€50,000</td>
<td>€87,500</td>
<td>€125,000</td>
<td>€168,750</td>
<td>€212,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of training sessions per year for Bachelor’s students:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of Bachelor’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of training sessions per year for Master’s students:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of Master’s students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual costs:</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€190,000</td>
<td>€190,000</td>
<td>€260,000</td>
<td>€310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>€636,000</td>
<td>€711,440</td>
<td>€1,058,940</td>
<td>€1,408,440</td>
<td>€1,733,700</td>
<td>€1,953,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available in the year concerned:</strong></td>
<td>€629,374</td>
<td>€629,374</td>
<td>€1,065,728</td>
<td>€1,532,500</td>
<td>€1,663,634</td>
<td>€1,982,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deficit/surplus:</td>
<td>-€7,426</td>
<td>-€82,066</td>
<td>€6,788</td>
<td>€124,060</td>
<td>-€70,066</td>
<td>€29,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note:
- How the budget will be allocated after 2020 depends on the results of the interim evaluation performed after two years;
- During Phase 1 (2019-2020), the entire budget will be allocated to the selected expenditure lines, and the funds will be transferred at once. During Phase 2 (2021-2024), some of the budget will have to go towards covering the general expenses, as is commonly done in the faculty’s budget allocation model. If necessary, some of the student loan system funds can be held separately as a teaching fixed rate, as was done previously with the funds awarded for more intensive small-group teaching.
## Appendix 1 – Available Budget Forecast, 2019-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allocated by the Ministry of Education</th>
<th>Advance expenditure</th>
<th>Supplement allocated by UU</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Now available for all of UU</th>
<th>Allocated to Geosciences</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>€9,048,053</td>
<td>€7,900,000</td>
<td>€4,951,947</td>
<td>€14,000,000</td>
<td>€6,100,000</td>
<td>€629,374</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>€10,735,207</td>
<td>€7,900,000</td>
<td>€3,264,793</td>
<td>€14,000,000</td>
<td>€6,100,000</td>
<td>€629,374</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>€18,229,221</td>
<td>€7,900,000</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€18,229,221</td>
<td>€10,329,221</td>
<td>€1,065,728</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>€22,753,247</td>
<td>€7,900,000</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€22,753,247</td>
<td>€14,853,247</td>
<td>€1,532,500</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>€24,024,223</td>
<td>€7,900,000</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€24,024,223</td>
<td>€16,124,223</td>
<td>€1,663,634</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>€27,116,234</td>
<td>€7,900,000</td>
<td>€0</td>
<td>€27,116,234</td>
<td>€19,216,234</td>
<td>€1,982,655</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To remain in the budget allocation model; concerns the 'previously spent' part of the budget (more intensive small-group teaching, professional development of lecturers)

UU will not allocate supplements after 2020

On top of the advance expenditure assuming that Geosciences' share will remain 10.3%, and will not be revised annually based on the latest student enrolment figures

**Average**
### Appendix 2 – Potential Scenario for 2019

#### Start data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support and administrative staff:</th>
<th>€80,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer-4:</td>
<td>€60,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-doc:</td>
<td>€62,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor:</td>
<td>€80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contact hours, 1 FTE teaching, not including preparation:</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of students taking Geosciences Bachelor’s degrees</th>
<th>2,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students per Bachelor’s degree per year</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students taking Geosciences Master’s degrees</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students per Master’s degree per year</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure line no 1: Designated hours for lecturers

**BACHELOR’S DEGREE**

- number of students taking the course: 85
- additional hours per student, per course: 1.25
- total additional hours per course: 106.25
- bottleneck courses per Bachelor’s degree: 6
- bottleneck courses per year: 2
- additional hours per student, per year: 2.5
- number of Geosciences Bachelor’s degrees: 4
- number of Bachelor’s students benefiting this year: 2,040 (102%)

**MASTER’S DEGREE**

- number of students taking the course: 50
- additional hours per student, per course: 1.5
- total additional hours per course: 75
| course: | bottleneck courses per Master's degree: | 1 |
| additional hours per student, per year: | 1.5 |
| number of Geosciences Master’s degrees: | 14 |
| number of Master’s students benefiting this year: | 700 | 47% |
| total number of hours for Geosciences: | 6,150 |
| FTE for Lecturer-4s: | 5 |
| FTE per Lecturer-4: | 0.8 |
| Number of Lecturer-4s: | 6.25 |
| Hours for Lecturer-4s: | 4,000 |
| annual costs: | €301,500 |
| FTE for post-docs: | 2 |
| FTE per post-doc: | 0.2 |
| Number of post-docs: | 10 |
| Post-doc hours | 1,600 |
| annual costs: | €125,300 |
| FTE for newly appointed assistant professors: | 1 |
| annual costs: | €80,000 |
| Teaching duties for newly appointed assistant professors: | 0.6 |
| Hours for assistant professors: | 480 |
| Total number of hours: | 6,080 | -70 |
| TOTAL annual costs: | €506,800 | 80% |

**Expenditure line no 2: Support**

| FTE required: | 1.0 |
| annual costs: | €80,000 | 6% | 6% |

**Expenditure line no 3: Excursions and training courses**

<p>| costs per visit: | €25 |
| number of visits per Bachelor's degree, per year: | 1 |
| number of Bachelor's students benefiting this year: | 2,000 |
| number of visits per Master's degree, per year: | 0 |
| number of Master's students benefiting this year: | 1,500 |
| annual costs: | €50,000 | 8% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs per training course:</td>
<td>€5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants per course</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training sessions per year of Bachelor's degree:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training sessions per Bachelor's student:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bachelor's students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training sessions per Master's student:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Master's students benefiting this year:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual costs:</td>
<td>€0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intensive small-group teaching</th>
<th>Student supervision</th>
<th>Professional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available in this year</td>
<td>€629,374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-€7,426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear members of the Executive Board,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Faculty of Geosciences' Faculty Council to express our approval of the plan drawn up by the Faculty of Geosciences' Faculty Board regarding the student loan system funds.

In recent months the faculty's Faculty Council has made an active contribution to drawing up this plan by means of hearings of staff and students, council meetings, additional meetings with the Faculty Board, and a memorandum of its own. The Geosciences Faculty Council acknowledges that many of the ideas and wishes proposed by the parties consulted have been included in the plan that was drafted and submitted by the Faculty Board.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Bas van de Schootbrugge
Chair, Geosciences Faculty Council
Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

The Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance (LEG) will use the funds to give its students an even better opportunity to grow into professionals who will be able to play a meaningful role in the debate on, and tackling of, societal issues. Because of this overarching purpose, we will somewhat emphasise theme no 1 over the other themes. At the same time, the sub-projects were typically designed in such a way that they will touch on several themes (for instance, by making the professional development of lecturers and student supervision components of other plans). To us, the creation of equal opportunities is not a priority in its own right; we will partly seek to create equal opportunities through more intensive student supervision (in which personal growth will be promoted, too), and partly by means of other ongoing projects organised through the faculty's 'Diversity' programme, which is targeted at students switching to university from universities of applied sciences (among other students). When the faculty's plans were worked out, we took into account the Faculty Council's views on teaching.

Since our departments' teaching contexts are significantly different in terms of size, Dutch versus international, with the special characteristic of intensive small-group teaching, the overarching objective was embedded in the various degree programmes in different ways.

Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.

The input provided by the departments was used by the faculty board to discuss an initial proposal with the Faculty Council on 7 December. This initial proposal was also discussed by the Board of Studies tasked with teaching affairs, and served as input for meetings with the departments' boards, which drew up their plans on the basis of this proposal.

The departments consulted several parties before drawing up their proposals. The Department of Law consulted the heads of the departments, the programme committees, associate professors tasked with teaching, education coordinators and study societies. The recent recommendations made by the review panel were included, as well. Utrecht School of Economics (U.S.E.) consulted students through student societies, and also consulted Master's students' communities and study advisers so as to be able to draft its plans. Furthermore, U.S.E. performed an analysis of its position through benchmark studies such as the National Student Survey and its own evaluations. Recommendations made in recent reports issued by external review panels were included in the considerations, as well. The School of Governance's plans partially resulted from a previous strategy-building meeting attended by lecturers, the programme committee and students. The boards of the various departments used this input to draft their proposals.

These proposals served as input for the faculty's plan, which was then discussed with the full professor tasked with teaching affairs. The first draft was discussed with the Faculty Council's Education and Research Committee on 15 January. The plan was approved by the Faculty Council on 22 January. In response to an explanation of vote and position submitted by members of U.S.E.'s Faculty Council, the vice-dean of teaching had an additional meeting with the councillors in question, the directors of education and the head of the U.S.E. department, in which procedures and content were discussed. This meeting resulted in slight revisions being made to the plans, based on suggestions by the members of the Faculty Council (with some input from the programme committees and student societies) and agreements on the procedure concluded between the U.S.E. board and the employee and student representative bodies with regard to the implementation of the plans at the department. In response to these discussions, U.S.E.'s Faculty Council indicated that it approved the faculty's plans after all in a letter to the vice-dean of teaching dated 12 February and received on 13 February.

Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).
By and large, the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance will distribute the funds across the departments in the same way the university distributed the funds across the faculties, i.e., in proportion to the number of students enrolled in the various degree programmes.

In line with the Faculty Council’s request, the faculty intends to establish an innovation fund, for 2019 and possibly for the subsequent years, on top of the budget the faculty received from the Utrecht Education Incentive Fund (USO). Individual lecturers and/or teams of lecturers will be able to apply for a grant for an innovation project related to the three themes. Ten per cent of the funds awarded to the faculty (approximately €90,000) will be earmarked for the establishment of this fund.

In the longer term, many of the changes will be realised following a review and readjustment of the teaching load models, based on the faculty’s guiding principles.

Explanations for each individual theme

A. More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?
The faculty will spend the money on additional lecturers and a review/readjustment of the teaching load models. A total of 5.2 FTE’s worth of new lecturers will be hired in 2019, and 9.6 FTE’s worth of new lecturers will be hired in 2020.

The department of Law will focus on intensifying small-group teaching so as to improve students’ writing skills by giving them more one-on-one supervision. This will require additional lecturers to teach Year 1 and to some extent Year 2 of the Bachelor’s degree. A project leader (assistant or associate professor) will be assigned to the content-focused coordination of more intensive classes and the professional training of lecturers. The department’s proposal also provides for the establishment of a Legal Skills Academy (LSA). This will require that a project leader (assistant or associate professor) be tasked with the establishment of the Academy, and will also require the hiring of an external expert who will develop the methods to be used to train certain skills (e.g. negotiation techniques) that can be integrated in existing courses, as well as the corresponding training courses for lecturers. After 2019 we will also start focusing more on writing skills in Years 2 and 3 of the Bachelor’s degree. The LSA will be the first step towards a Skills Academy to be run by the faculty, which will present students with a range of integrated skill-based learning courses.

Expenditure in FTE:
- In 2019, the department will require approximately 0.6 FTE’s worth of coordination/project leadership, an additional 3 FTE’s worth of lecturers who will teach, and 0.25 FTE for the establishment of a knowledge database.
- In 2020, more FTE will be required: approximately 0.9 FTE’s worth of coordination/project leadership, an additional 6 FTE’s worth of lecturers who will teach, and another 0.25 FTE for the establishment of the knowledge database.

U.S.E. will focus on providing Master’s students who are writing their theses with more intensive supervision, consisting of more supervision time (more assessment moments, more one-on-one feedback sessions, a clearer role for the second reader) and a wider range of possible subjects for theses. Furthermore, U.S.E. will focus on more intensive supervision of Bachelor’s students who are working on their graduation projects, featuring more supervision time for students, smaller groups and a wider range of possible subjects for theses. This is in line with previously implemented changes with regard to skill-based learning courses, such as a tool that shows all the competences required for all the subjects taught in Bachelor’s degree programmes and the training of presentation skills.

Expenditure in FTE:
- In 2019, U.S.E. will need approximately 0.3 FTE to allow lecturers to spend more time supervising their Master’s students, as well as 0.2 FTE to allow lecturers to spend more time supervising their Bachelor’s students, and also because students will work in smaller groups.
- In 2020, U.S.E. will need approximately 0.8 FTE to allow lecturers to spend more time supervising their Master’s students, as well as 0.6 FTE to allow lecturers to spend more time supervising their Bachelor’s students, and also because students will work in smaller groups.

The School of Governance will focus on further strengthening the development of skills by expanding the role played by tutors, meaning that tutors will be involved in coaching students with regard to the development of their skills. In 2019 more skill training courses will be offered, and an IT tool will be established to ensure better use of feedback in several places. In subsequent years coaches will be used in more and more situations. In addition, the department will focus on situation simulation exercises for teaching purposes, most of which will be developed elsewhere. In the long term there will also be more room for more intensive supervision for Bachelor’s and Master’s students who are writing their theses, and new types of graduation research will be explored.

Expenditure in FTE:
- In 2019, the department will need approximately 0.6 FTE for the development of skills by giving tutors more duties (including project coordination). In addition, the department will need approximately 0.2 FTE to incorporate situation simulation exercises into classes.
- In 2020, the department will need approximately 0.85 FTE for the development of skills by giving tutors more duties (including project coordination). In addition, the department will need approximately 0.15 FTE for incorporating situation simulation exercises into classes.

What is the purpose of the investment?
More intensive small-group teaching is designed to bring about the following:
- A broadening and deepening of students' skill set so as to give them the very best preparation for their professional careers, in which young professionals are expected to have an extensive skill set.
- A strengthening of students' critical thinking skills (including the development of 'their own voice'), thus allowing students to learn to express themselves within an academic, professional (legal, financial and managerial) and social context even more clearly and effectively.
- Raised awareness on students' part of the societal context in which they will be developing their skills in their capacity as young professionals.

What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?
After completing their degree programmes, students will be better able to use their academic knowledge and skills in a way that will allow them to make a meaningful contribution to the debate on, and approach to, various types of societal issues. Since they have received more in-depth training, have received more thorough feedback more often and have been asked to reflect on their own performance more often with regard to writing skills, they will be able to further develop those skills. Since real-life situations will be incorporated into their classes, knowledge and skills will be more actively connected, which means that students will find it easier to apply them in real-life situations. In addition, students will feel better equipped for professional practice.

What changes will the students observe?
In practical terms, students will find that they are receiving more intensive supervision in the development of skills (wide range; focused on writing skills or academic research skills): they will be given more one-on-one supervision time, and at U.S.E. they will be offered a wider range of subjects. They will notice the effect in the way classes are taught (e.g. because of the use of situation simulation exercises), in the courses and in one-on-one supervision. Intensive supervision and small-group teaching have been proven to have a positive impact on students' study habits and the processing of knowledge. Furthermore, the changes will help students develop a more professional attitude. It is also important that students feel more responsible for what they learn in their degree programmes. A proper focus on both academic and professional skills, on top of knowledge and understanding, will considerably help them do so. The LSA will ensure that students have a more extensive skill set by the time they enter the job market.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
The departments will start detailing the measures to be taken at once, and will gradually implement them in their degree programmes starting from the 2019-2020 academic year. In the long term there will be other options allowing them to invest in intensive small-group teaching (see above). See the appended document for more details on the measures, both in terms of funds and in terms of hours.
B. Professional development of lecturers

**What exactly does the investment entail?**
The measures designed to bring about more intensive small-group teaching and more intensive student supervision will also require a focus on the professional development of lecturers. Therefore, one of the plans is to train lecturers in teaching skill-based learning courses and new types of research for students' theses. Lecturers will be allotted hours and facilities that will allow them to keep developing their knowledge and skills. These facilities may include professional development in the field of multidisciplinary education, the development of a toolkit that may help students who are writing theses, data science training sessions and the provision of feedback and feedforward.

**Expenditure in FTE:**
- In 2019 0.45 FTE will be invested in professional development and curriculum development, and 0.15 FTE will be invested in the development of a toolkit for students.
- In addition, 10% of the budget (the faculty's 'innovation fund') will be invested in education reform projects undertaken by lecturers. The main expenditure here will be additional hours worked (approx. 1.0 FTE).

**What is the purpose of the investment?**
The objective of the measure is to ensure that lecturers are better equipped to supervise students in the development of their academic and critical thinking skills. This will also improve the student satisfaction rate and minimise the number of drop-outs. In addition, this preparation will go some way towards giving lecturers the confidence to effectively help shape these developments. This means that this measure will also help alleviate lecturers' workload, which is perceived to be very heavy. The innovation budget is an active incentive for lecturers to further grow as lecturers because it gives them the opportunity to work on innovative teaching methods.

**What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?**
Students will be taught by lecturers who are better equipped to do so, which is expected to result in higher student satisfaction rates and fewer students dropping out of their degrees. Additionally, we hope the measure will result in more coherent and up-to-date degree programmes. Lecturers will find energy while designing more innovative classes and will feel properly equipped to give meaning to their classes, which will benefit the quality of said classes.

**What changes will the students observe?**
Students will do degrees that are better aligned and higher quality because their lecturers have become more professional. The use of a toolkit by students who are writing theses (at U.S.E.) will result in more supervision hours for students. Since economics lecturers are receiving training in data science, this subject will eventually be included in the curriculum.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**
An increasingly large group of lecturers will play a role in these projects, and must be equipped to do so. Supervision will continue to be available. In 2019, the 'innovation budget' will be part of the call for innovation projects that are eligible for USO funding.

C. Student supervision

**What exactly does the investment entail?**
Thanks to the expenditure on, particularly, more intensive small-group teaching, including U.S.E.'s student mentor system (in addition to the tutor system), the development of a goal-setting toolkit (in which students will learn to formulate professional objectives and seek to realise these) and coaching by lecturers as part of the tutor system, students' growth will be more properly supervised (one on one). For more details, see the ‘More intensive small-group teaching’ section. In addition, the faculty will invest in a project to be undertaken at the School of Governance to help students get more resilient after completing their Master's degrees, i.e., in terms of their understanding and skills with regard to dealing with pressure and determining their own position in a professional environment.
Expenditure in FTE:
- In 2019: approximately 0.45 FTE's worth of student mentors, including mentor supervision by a lecturer.
- In 2020, this will increase to 1.1 FTE's worth of student mentors, including mentor supervision by a lecturer.

What is the purpose of the investment?
Through intensive small-group teaching (also see section A), students will be guided in the development of their skills, thus allowing them to play a meaningful role in professional practice, through a more active linking of knowledge and practical experience (among other things). This will also involve a focus on individual learning developments and the associated programmes.

What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?
Students will be able to map out the course of their own degree programmes, will receive more support from trained student mentors and will make more effective use of one-on-one feedback by reflecting on it in association with a lecturer. This means they will master more advanced skills. Furthermore, students will be better prepared for the duties they will be asked to perform in real-life work settings.

What changes will the students observe?
Students will notice that they will receive more intensive one-on-one supervision, particularly with regard to the development of their skills. Students will be more resilient, and they will have developed the understanding and skills that will allow them to perform well in a professional environment following graduation.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
The departments will start spending their budgets at once, and will gradually start implementing measures in the 2019-2020 academic year. In the long term there will be room for new expenditure lines, linked to the plans for more intensive small-group teaching (see appended document). In addition, Master's students at the School of Governance will be able to take resilience training, designed to help them develop professional resilience, starting from 2019.

Total intended expenditure in 2019 and 2020 (including FTE if the measures involve the appointment of additional lecturers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of the student loan system funds</th>
<th>FTE*</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2011 and beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of skills, e.g. by connecting and strengthening the tutor system</td>
<td>0.6 FTE</td>
<td>€61,700</td>
<td>0.85 FTE</td>
<td>€67,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation exercises for Bachelor's and Master's students</td>
<td>0.2 FTE</td>
<td>€42,300</td>
<td>0.15 FTE</td>
<td>€19,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching workshops to increase the resilience of Master's students studying governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>€7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>€7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG revision of the teaching load model, after Sept 2019</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>€111,000</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>€94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor system and mentor supervision in Year 1 of the Bachelor's degree programme**</td>
<td>0.45 FTE</td>
<td>€15,000</td>
<td>1.1 FTE</td>
<td>€45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more intensive supervision of Master's students who are writing their theses</td>
<td>0.3 FTE</td>
<td>€23,000</td>
<td>0.8 FTE</td>
<td>€69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smaller-scale graduation project for Bachelor's students</td>
<td>0.2 FTE</td>
<td>€17,000</td>
<td>0.6 FTE</td>
<td>€51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovative teaching methods for</td>
<td>0.6 FTE</td>
<td>€51,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's and Master's programmes</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal-setting toolkit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data science training for lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.E.</td>
<td>1.6 FTE</td>
<td>€165,000</td>
<td>2.5 FTE</td>
<td>€165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more intensive small-group teaching &amp; development of Legal Skills Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>€100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>€40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination/project leadership</td>
<td>0.6 FTE</td>
<td>€48,000</td>
<td>0.9 FTE</td>
<td>€68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecturer training</td>
<td></td>
<td>€60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>€80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointment of additional lecturers for teaching purposes</td>
<td>3.0 FTE</td>
<td>€240,000</td>
<td>6.0 FTE</td>
<td>€504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge database</td>
<td>0.25 FTE</td>
<td>€25,000</td>
<td>0.25 FTE</td>
<td>€26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>€36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>€48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3.9 FTE</td>
<td>€509,000</td>
<td>7.2 FTE</td>
<td>€766,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty’s innovation fund</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>€90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Law, Economics and Governance</strong></td>
<td>7.3 FTE</td>
<td>€875,000</td>
<td>10.7 FTE</td>
<td>€1,025,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* actual expenditure in FTE in 2019 (i.e., appointment for a part of the year) – FTE includes project coordination
** including paid student mentors

In the calculations, FTE is rounded to one decimal place. In addition to expenditure on newly hired lecturers (expressed in FTE), we will also hire external experts for certain aspects, e.g. trainers and IT developers.
Dear members of the Executive Board,

I am writing this letter to inform you that the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance approves the faculty's spending plans for its share of the student loan system funds for the 2019-2024 period.

Between December 2018 and February 2019, the faculty board actively involved the Faculty Council in the drawing-up of the plans in several ways. The Faculty Council has found that the ideas and wishes it expressed have been incorporated into the definitive plans. To give you an example, the faculty board has incorporated aspects of the council's vision (dated 4 December 2018) and the education reform memo drawn up by the council (dated 6 December 2018) into the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance's plans.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Jasmijn van Harten
Chair, Faculty Council, Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance
Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences

Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

The Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences seeks to make targeted investments in particular objectives that touch on all three themes (intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, and student supervision, including accessibility and diversity).

We consider the following objectives priorities:
- ensuring the availability of high-quality, more intensive small-group teaching involving innovative teaching methods;
- facilitating and promoting the further professional development of lecturers, particularly with regard to their ability to teach in English, intercultural skills and digital didactics;
- more one-on-one student supervision in the tutor system and the Career Services.

We will invest in each theme in two ways, which has resulted in a plan featuring six lines of action (among other reasons, to prevent a dilution of the available funds). The expenditures required to realise the agreed objectives vary from theme to theme. Some objectives will be able to be realised with relatively small expenditures; others will require a more significant outlay.

* The Executive Board asked the deans to draw up a plan for the allocation of additional funds from the student loan system funds for the 2019-2024 period. In 2019 and 2020, the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences will receive an annual share of €0.9m from these funds. In 2021, the key for the allocation of the available funds across the faculties and schools will be reviewed and revised. The guiding principle here is that the faculty will receive at least the same amount starting from 2021 that is receiving in 2019 and 2020, because the total amount available in 2021 will be higher.

Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.

Criterion no 2: The internal stakeholders were consulted on the plan to be drafted to a sufficient degree, and the plan is supported by internal and (where relevant) external stakeholders to a sufficient degree.

Although the dean is responsible for the present plan and the faculty council approved it, we feel that it is important to point out that the plan for the spending of the student loan system funds was drawn up jointly by the faculty board and the faculty council, and is a genuine co-production. The faculty council began discussing potential ways to spend the money in its meetings from October 2018 onwards. During this process, the faculty board formulated its preferences, while the students on the faculty council drew up a thorough Advisory Report on the Quality Agreements, partly for the benefit of the University Council. In December the board and council agreed to establish a small working group that would draft a proposal based on the previous input, and adhering to the scope determined by the Executive Board, following a discussion with the University Council. The working group comprised two students members and two staff members of the faculty council, as well as the vice-dean of Undergraduate Studies and the faculty director, on behalf of the faculty board. The proposal was then discussed at an extraordinary meeting of the faculty council, and approved by the faculty council.

Between October and January, the staff members and particularly the student members of the council consulted many of the people they represent (see Appendices I and II). Both the staff members and the student members of the council have extensive and effective networks, and organised different meetings and occasions to consult the people they represent. In all, they spoke to some 300 students, several directors of education, lecturer members of the programme committees and groups of lecturers. The Boards of Studies were notified of the intentions (there was not enough time to properly consult them). The consultation of the stakeholders and the discussions between the faculty board and the faculty council resulted in a valuable discussion on further improvement of the quality of our degree programmes, and in the end, we jointly arrived at a decision on three priorities.

Detailing and evaluation

Certain measures (e.g. nos 2, 5 and 6) will require further detailing (i.e., an action plan) this spring and summer to determine the exact plans and details. The faculty board and faculty council have agreed that the more detailed draft plan will be discussed by the faculty council, to check whether the plan is in line with the measures explained here.

In addition, the board and the council have agreed that the impact of the measures will be evaluated by the faculty board and faculty council to determine whether the intended outcomes were actually achieved.
Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

**Please note:**
Newly hired lecturers will be given a contract with at least a four-year term.

Organisational activities undertaken to support the measures taken under the quality agreements will not be funded from the student loan system funds budget.

In order to realise the selected objectives (e.g. facilitating and promoting the further professional development of lecturers, or ensuring that students receive more one-on-one supervision from their tutors), we will also have to increase the number of lecturers working at the faculty. After all, if our current lecturers are to spend more time on their training or tutoring duties, some of their other teaching duties will have to be performed by others.

Since 2014 the faculty has spent a considerable amount of money on increasing its number of assistant professors (total ± 35 FTE, i.e., 15% of our core workforce). At this stage, in order to make sure our workforce is well balanced, the faculty mainly wishes to focus on adding trainee lecturers to its academic staff. These are lecturers who, like PhD students, are given a four-year contract (preferably worth at least 0.7 FTE) and 10 per cent of whose hours is allotted to a supervised training programme that will result in their obtaining a University Teaching Qualification. This is very much in line with the recommendations issued a while ago by the Woertman Committee, which, at the behest of the dean, sought to determine how better to deal with the appointment of temporary lecturers.

In other cases, the faculty may opt for more frequent and more targeted use of student assistants, who may serve as teaching assistants, but can also be hired to support ICTO and Career Services. One major fact that should be considered here is the fact that student/teaching assistants, being students themselves, are probably very well placed to express students’ wishes and needs – for instance, with regard to applying innovative digital didactic methods or the need for training of particular skills. In this respect, student/teaching assistants might be able to bridge the gap between lecturers and students in our rapidly changing world. Altogether, the agreed measures will require the addition of 18 FTE (30,000 hours) to our teaching workforce.

Lecturers who work at faculties with many students tend to have a heavy workload. This is definitely true for the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, whose lecturers have a heavier workload than the average UU lecturer. In the 2013 Employee Survey, 54% of the faculty’s employees indicated that their workload was either too heavy or far too heavy; in 2017, despite a wide range of measures implemented and a great deal of money spent to address this issue, that figure was still 49%. While the measures proposed here that come under the headings of more intensive small-group teaching and professional development of lecturers are mostly designed to improve the quality of our degree programmes, they are also designed to alleviate the heavy workloads suffered by our lecturers. Students in general, and the student members of the faculty council in particular, are (and have been for the last few years) very much aware of, and quite worried about, lecturers’ heavy workloads and are also very much aware that the quality of the degree programmes has been compromised, partly because of the ongoing underfunding of higher and tertiary education and because this is resulting in lecturers suffering increasingly heavy workloads. Although alleviating lecturers’ heavy workloads is not the primary objective of the Dutch Student Loans (Higher Education) Act, it was a crucial consideration for the students, staff and board of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, since lecturers’ workloads and the quality of the classes they teach are closely interrelated.

**Explanations for each individual theme**

1. **More intensive small-group teaching**

**What exactly does the investment entail?**

Thanks to additional funding from the Executive Board and several outlays from its own reserves, the faculty has been able to expand its number of lecturers on permanent contracts a great deal in recent years (± 35 FTE, i.e., 15% of the workforce). This has resulted in smaller groups (in seminars), raised the supervision percentage and allowed for more one-on-one contact between lecturers and students. In addition, it has given staff more time to work on education reform and innovative teaching methods. The faculty would like to use its share of the student loan system funds to provide the departments with even more incentives to keep doing so by appointing additional trainee lecturers and teaching assistants (15,000 hours in total)

1. Additional trainee lecturers

   *Measure to be implemented:* 4.2 FTE’s worth of additional trainee lecturers, each of whom will be given a four-year contract worth 0.7 FTE, as well as time to work towards a University Teaching Qualification (10% of their hours).

2. Additional teaching assistants
Measure to be implemented: 5.2 FTE’s worth of teaching assistants, each of whom will be granted a 0.2-0.3 FTE appointment, a contract (preferably with a term of two years) and a training course when they are first appointed. 5.2 FTE means they will be able to dedicate 8,700 hours to this.

What is the purpose of the investment?
Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are in line with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

Although the dean is responsible for the present plan and the faculty council approved it, we feel that it is important to point out that the plan for the spending of the student loan system funds was drawn up jointly by the faculty board and the faculty council, and is a genuine co-production. The faculty council began discussing potential expenditure lines in its meetings from October 2018 onwards. During this process, the faculty board formulated its preferences, while the students on the faculty council drew up a thorough *Advisory Report on the Quality Agreements*, partly for the benefit of the University Council. In December the board and council agreed to establish a small working group that would draft a proposal based on the previous input, within the scope determined by the Executive Board, following a discussion with the University Council. The working group comprised two students members and two staff members of the Faculty Council, as well as the vice-dean of Undergraduate Studies and the faculty director, on behalf of the faculty board. The proposal was then discussed at an extraordinary meeting of the Faculty Council, and approved by the Faculty Council.

Between October and January, the staff members and particularly the student members of the Council consulted many of the people they represent (see Appendices I and II). Both the staff members and the student members have extensive and effective networks, and organised different meetings and occasions to consult the people they represent. In all, they spoke to some 300 students, several directors of education, lecturer members of the programme committees and groups of lecturers. The Boards of Studies were notified of the intentions (there was not enough time to properly consult them). The consultation of the stakeholders and the discussions between the faculty board and the faculty council resulted in a valuable discussion on further improvement of the quality of our degree programmes, and in the end, we jointly arrived at a decision on three priorities.

**Detailing and evaluation**

Certain measures (e.g. nos 2, 5 and 6) will require further detailing (i.e., an action plan) this spring and summer, with regard to exact plans and details. The faculty board and faculty council have agreed that the more detailed draft plan will be discussed by the faculty council, to check whether the plan is in line with the measures explained here.

In addition, the board and the council have agreed that the impact of the measures will be evaluated by the faculty board and faculty council to determine whether the intended outcomes were actually achieved.

Please indicate how the student loan system funds awarded to your faculty for the years 2019-2024 will be allocated to the three themes (more intensive small-group teaching, the professional development of lecturers, student supervision and accessibility and equal opportunities).

**Please note:**
Newly hired lecturers will be given a contract with at least a four-year term.
Organisational activities designed to support the measures taken under the quality agreements will not be funded from the student loan system funds budget.

In order to realise the selected objectives (e.g. facilitating and promoting the further professional development of lecturers, or ensuring that students receive more one-on-one supervision from their tutors), we will also have to increase the number of lecturers working at the faculty. After all, if our current lecturers are to spend more time on their training or tutoring duties, some of their other teaching duties will have to be performed by others.

Since 2014 the faculty has spent a considerable amount of funds on increasing its number of assistant professors (total ± 35 FTE, i.e., 15% of the core workforce). At this stage, in order to make sure our workforce is well balanced, the faculty mainly wishes to focus on adding trainee lecturers to its academic staff. These are lecturers who, like PhD students, are given a four-year contract (preferably worth at least 0.7 FTE) as well as a supervised training programme that will result in their obtaining a University Teaching Qualification (10% of their hours). This is very much in line with the recommendations issued a while ago by the Woertman Committee, which, at the behest of the dean, sought to determine how better to deal with the appointment of temporary lecturers.

In other cases, the faculty may opt for more frequent and more targeted use of student assistants, who may serve as teaching assistants, but can also be hired to support ICTO and Career Services. In this respect, one major consideration is
the fact that student/teaching assistants, being students themselves, are probably very well placed to express students' wishes and needs — for instance, with regard to applying innovative digital didactic methods or the need for training of particular skills. In this respect, student/teaching assistants might be able to bridge the gap between lecturers and students in our rapidly changing world. The agreed measures will require the addition of 18 FTE (30,000 hours) to our teaching workforce.

Lecturers who work at faculties with many students tend to have a heavy workload. This is definitely true for the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, whose lecturers have a heavier workload than the average UU lecturer. In the 2013 Employee Survey, 54% of the faculty's employees indicated that their workload was either too heavy or far too heavy; in 2017, despite a wide range of measures implemented and a great deal of funds spent to address this issue, that figure was still 49%. While the measures proposed here that come under the headings of more intensive small-group teaching and professional development of lecturers are mostly designed to improve the quality of our degree programmes, they are also designed to alleviate the heavy workloads suffered by our lecturers. Students in general, and the student members of the faculty council in particular, are (and have been for the last few years) very much aware of lecturers’ heavy workloads and are also very much aware that the quality of the degree programmes has been compromised, partly because of the ongoing underfunding of higher and academic education and the resulting increasingly heavy workloads for lecturers. Although alleviating lecturers’ heavy workloads is not the primary objective of the Dutch Student Loans (Higher Education) Act, it was a crucial consideration for the students, staff and board of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, since lecturers’ workloads and educational quality are inextricably bound up.

Explanations for each individual theme

I. More intensive small-group teaching

What exactly does the investment entail?

Thanks to additional funding from the Executive Board and expenditures of funds from its own reserves, the faculty has been able to expand its number of lecturers on permanent contracts a great deal in recent years (± 35 FTE, i.e., 15% of the workforce). This has resulted in smaller groups (in seminars), raised the supervision percentage and allowed for more one-on-one contact between lecturers and students. In addition, it has given staff more time to work on education reform and innovative teaching methods. The faculty would like to use its share of the student loan system funds to provide the departments with even more incentives to do so by appointing additional trainee lecturers and teaching assistants (15,000 hours in total)

1. Additional trainee lecturers

   Measure to be implemented: 4.2 FTE’s worth of additional trainee lecturers, each of whom will be given a four-year contract worth 0.7 FTE, as well as a training programme that will result in their obtaining a University Teaching Qualification (10% of their hours).

2. Additional teaching assistants

   Measure to be implemented: 5.2 FTE’s worth of teaching assistants, each of whom will be granted a 0.2-0.3 FTE appointment, a contract (preferably with a term of two years) and a training course when they are first appointed. 5.2 FTE means they will be able to dedicate 8,700 hours to this.

What is the purpose of the investment?

Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are in line with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

Re 1:

Objective: ensuring the availability of, and further strengthening, more intensive small-group teaching (if we have more lecturers, students will be able to receive more supervision), and also ensuring that current lecturers have sufficient time and scope (now and in the future) to engage in education reform. Once we have subtracted the hours trainee lecturers will spend receiving training, the appointment of trainee lecturers will result in 6,350 additional lecturer hours, which will be able to be allotted to more intensive small-group teaching and education reform. This will help the faculty improve the quality of its degree programmes and introduce new teaching methods. Appointing trainee lecturers will have a side-effect, too (also see 3, 4 and 5): it will help alleviate lecturers’ heavy workloads. If we have properly trained and experienced lecturers on temporary full-time or close-to-full-time contracts with a fairly long term, our current lecturers will not need quite so much time to prepare for their courses, and there will be greater continuity in our degree programmes.

Re 2:
Objective: This measure will help ensure the availability and strengthening of more intensive small-group teaching (more time for supervision) and more innovative classes, which will mainly be realised in this form (teaching assistants) by having a range of different types of methods.

What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?
Re 1:
Results and measurement: the availability of high-quality, more intensive small-group teaching, particularly for Bachelor’s students; an improved staff: student ratio; ensuring the continued existence of small-group seminars and high supervision percentages; more time for one-on-one contact between lecturers and students, and more time to introduce innovative teaching methods.

Re 2:
Results and measurement: the availability of high-quality, more intensive small-group teaching, particularly for Bachelor’s students; ensuring the continued existence of small-group seminars and high supervision percentages; more time for one-on-one contact between lecturers and students because some of the lecturers’ teaching and preparation duties will be able to be performed by teaching assistants.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
What changes will the students observe?

Re 1 and 2:
Group size within degree programmes will remain small, and lecturers will feel more supported and will have more time to incorporate innovative methods into their classes. For instance, more courses will involve informative videos (which students tend to like) and other innovative teaching methods, and we will also introduce methods designed to get students to collaborate (teaching assistants may be involved in this). In three years’ time, students taking student satisfaction surveys will give a much higher score for one-on-one contact with, and feedback from, lecturers.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic in terms of the proposed use of tools and resources and given the nature of the faculty’s organisation and processes.

Re 1 and 2:
Time line: recruitment in early spring; new employees to start in their new jobs on 1 July 2019; training, supervision and preparation for courses to be taught over the course of the summer of 2019; new employees will be able to be assigned teaching duties starting from the 2019-2020 academic year.

II. Professional development of lecturers

What exactly does the investment entail?
Increasingly high demands are placed on lecturers, e.g. with regard to digital didactics and their command of the English language. The UU and the faculty offer quite a few training courses and professional development courses for lecturers, and in principle, the budget allows lecturers to take those courses. However, a lack of time (and a lack of peace of mind) often prevents lecturers from actually attending these courses. The best way to realise our ambition of having all our current lecturers spend more time on their own professional development is to allot them more hours (a realistic number) to do so, as part of their teaching duties. In order to do so, we will have to assign some of their duties to others, and the number of lecturers will have to be increased. The measures we wish to implement will result in 6,600 hours becoming available for this purpose.

3. More English language and intercultural skills training courses for lecturers, and more time to take those courses
Measure to be implemented: 2.2 FTE’s worth of trainee lecturers who will assume so many teaching duties that all of our current lecturers will have enough (or at least more) time to attend training courses. A 2.2 FTE addition to the workforce will result in 3,300 hours becoming available for this purpose.

4. More online teaching training courses for lecturers and the recording of all lectures, as well as more time and support for these courses.
Expenditure a: 2.2 FTE’s worth of trainee lecturers who will assume so many teaching duties that all of our current lecturers will have enough (or at least more) time to attend digital educational skills training. A 2.2 FTE addition to the workforce will result in 3,300 hours becoming available for this purpose.

Expenditure b: 0.8 FTE’s worth of teaching assistants to join the faculty’s Teaching IT (ICTO) team to help lecturers use new and innovative IT applications in their classes, including the recording of all lectures (provided that the lecturers
allow themselves to be recorded), until such time as an Enterprise Video Platform for large-scale automated recordings has been realised.

What is the purpose of the investment?
Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are in line with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

Re 3: 
Objective: further strengthening the intercultural and English language skills of all our current lecturers, primarily but not exclusively for lecturers who teach classes in English-language Bachelor’s and Master’s degree programmes.

Re 4: 
Objective: further strengthening the digital didactics and presentation skills of lecturers who teach Bachelor’s and Master’s courses, and in the short term, ensuring that all lectures are recorded, provided that the lecturers have agreed to their being recorded.

What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?
Re 3: 
Outcome: more lecturers will attend training courses focusing on intercultural skills (Teaching in the International Classroom), English language skills and presentation skills.

Re 4: 
Outcome: more lecturers will attend teacher and digital didactics training courses; knowledge and use of new and innovative IT applications will increase, and all lectures will be recorded, provided that the lecturers giving the lectures have consented to their being recorded.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
What changes will the students observe?
Re 3:
Students have indicated that, if the faculty wishes to provide high-quality degree programmes, it is vital that lecturers have a good command of the English language so that they can convey the course material to students in a clear and persuasive manner. Giving lecturers enough time to actually attend training courses will result in significantly higher scores for the lecturers’ intercultural skills and command of the English language in student satisfaction surveys held three years from now.

Re 4: 
Given the current developments and trends in teaching, it is crucial that lecturers master digital didactics, as well as have a good knowledge of their subject. However, many lecturers have not sufficiently mastered these skills. Giving lecturers enough time to actually attend training courses to work on these skills will result in significantly higher scores for the lecturers’ ability to use innovative IT applications in student satisfaction surveys held three years from now. Furthermore, all lectures will be recorded.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic in terms of the proposed use of tools and resources and given the nature of the faculty’s organisation and processes.

Re 3 and 4:
Preparation for the implementation of the measures in the spring of 2019; implementation starting in the 2019-2020 academic year.

III. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

What exactly does the investment entail?
Students (particularly in faculties with a large number of students) need more personalised advice and supervision of their growth path. They need both more one-on-one contact with their tutors and a wider range of training courses, e.g. the skills training courses taught by Career Services. For this reason, the expenditures outlined below must be understood to be interrelated. The first objective can be achieved by increasing the faculty’s lecturer workforce; the second can be attained by appointing student assistants to the faculty’s Career Services unit.
5. More one-on-one contact with tutors in Years 2 and 3 of Bachelor’s degree programmes
   Measure to be implemented: 2.5 FTE’s worth of trainee lecturers appointed to ensure that tutors have more time (3,800 hours) for one-on-one contact with their students in Years 2 and 3 of the Bachelor’s programme, and also in the Master’s programme.

6. Wider range of training courses offered by Career Services
   Measure to be implemented: 0.8 FTE’s worth of student assistants appointed to the faculty’s Career Services unit so as to further expand the unit’s range of future-proof skills training courses (including, possibly, online training courses focusing on things such as how to apply for jobs, how to give presentations, how to build a network, how to become an entrepreneur, etc.), depending on students’ needs.

What is the purpose of the investment?
Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The education institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are in line with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

Re 5:
Objective: further strengthening the tutor system and the one-on-one supervision and counselling of students who need to make programme-related decisions.

Re 6:
Objective: further strengthening one-on-one supervision and counselling of students, and expanding the range of skill training courses available to students.

What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?
Re 5:
All Bachelor’s and Master’s students who express a need for one-on-one consultation of their tutors, e.g. with regard to study progress, which electives to choose, what kind of decisions to make for their future, etc., will be able to continue consulting their tutors in Years 2 and 3 of their Bachelor’s programmes, and while doing a Master’s degree.

Re 6:
The Career Services unit will expand its range of available courses, more students will use the services provided by the unit, and the new components will be rated highly by students.

In what way will the intended results have an impact?
What changes will the students observe?
Re 5:
Allowing students to have one-on-one meetings with their tutors in Years 2 and 3 of their Bachelor’s degree programmes and while taking their Master’s degrees will give students the idea that they are being taken seriously. Furthermore, the scores awarded to tutor services in student satisfaction surveys will rise considerably in three years, both for Bachelor’s students and for Master’s students.

Re 6:
Widening the range of services available and offering more online content will allow more students to use the services provided by the Career Services unit. It will allow for more effective collaboration with important parties. The new services will be rated highly.

What is the intended time frame for the investment?
Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic in terms of the proposed use of tools and resources and given the nature of the faculty’s organisation and processes.
Re 5 and 6:
Preparation for the implementation of the measures in the spring of 2019; implementation starting in the 2019-2020 academic year.

Budget
The aforementioned measures will result in the appointment of 11.1 FTE’s worth of trainee lecturers (on four-year contracts) and in the appointment of 6.8 FTE’s worth of teaching assistants (ideally on two-year contracts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More intensive small-group teaching / introduction of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Additional trainee lecturers</td>
<td>Additional teaching assistants</td>
<td>Total I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Additional trainee lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td>€234,287</td>
<td>€236,630</td>
<td>€238,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Additional teaching assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td>€218,249</td>
<td>€220,431</td>
<td>€222,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total I</td>
<td></td>
<td>€452,536</td>
<td>€457,061</td>
<td>€461,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time for English language and intercultural skills training</td>
<td></td>
<td>€122,722</td>
<td>€123,949</td>
<td>€125,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Time allotted for digital didactics training</td>
<td></td>
<td>€122,722</td>
<td>€123,949</td>
<td>€125,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Time allotted to digital didactics skills (recording of all lectures)</td>
<td></td>
<td>€33,577</td>
<td>€33,913</td>
<td>€34,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total II</td>
<td></td>
<td>€279,020</td>
<td>€281,810</td>
<td>€284,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time for more one-on-one contact with tutors</td>
<td></td>
<td>€139,456</td>
<td>€140,851</td>
<td>€142,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Widening the range of services provided by Career Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>€33,577</td>
<td>€33,913</td>
<td>€34,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total III</td>
<td></td>
<td>€173,033</td>
<td>€174,763</td>
<td>€176,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>€904,589</td>
<td>€913,635</td>
<td>€922,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
<td>€902,708</td>
<td>€902,708</td>
<td>€902,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>($1,881)</td>
<td>($10,927)</td>
<td>($20,063)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate School of Teaching

In this memorandum, the GST will set out the choices it has made with regard to how to use the €76,342 the school was awarded from the student loan system funds for the years 2019 and 2020. We will explain in broad outlines how the funds will be allocated during the 2021-2024 period. In 2021, the allocation key that will determine how much of the funds will be allocated to each faculty and school will be reviewed and revised. The guiding principle here is that the GST will receive at least the same amount starting from 2021 that it is receiving in 2019 and 2020, because the total amount available in 2021 will be higher.

**Please indicate which themes you have chosen to prioritise, and why.**

1. More intensive small-group teaching
2. Professional development of lecturers
3. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

In order to prevent an undesirable ‘dilution’ of the awarded funds, the Board of Studies has chosen to prioritise activities undertaken to promote themes 1 and 2.

Most of the courses taught at the GST already feature intensive small-group teaching. In the teacher training department, students from varying academic disciplines are prepared for teaching professions. Students receive intensive supervision. Classes designed to prepare them for their profession are taught in seminars for up to 25 students, supervised by two lecturers. During the course of their degree programmes, students are visited twice at the place where they are doing their work placement. Due to the small-scale nature of teacher training and the lecturers’ high level of engagement with their students, the GST has created an environment in which all students feel like they are receiving the right level of attention, and in which students are offered personalised assistance where possible.

The additional funding will be used to further boost this type of teaching and will ensure that students will continue to have their options wide open in their degree programmes. Students will be able to select more courses that are in line with their own personal interests and areas in which they need to improve. The appointment of additional lecturers will go some way towards ensuring that students will continue to enjoy small-group teaching and thus personalised student supervision.

**Please indicate when and with whom your plan was developed.**

Criterion no 2: The internal stakeholders were consulted on the plan to be drafted to a sufficient degree, and the plan is supported by internal and (where relevant) external stakeholders to a sufficient degree.

Clearly defined agreements on the spending of the funds will be concluded between the deans and the employee and student representative bodies (generally, the faculty councils). The GST chose to involve the programme committee (PC) in the decision-making process, the programme committee being an employee and student representative body of sorts. At the GST, the programme committee plays the same role faculty councils play at regular faculties (e.g. discussing the provisions included in the teaching and examination regulations), and has ways to consult the people it represents regarding the submitted proposals.

In late November 2018, the Board of Studies (BoS) and the PC were notified of the intended allocation of student loan system funds to the GST. The PC was the first to submit (on 17 December 2018) suggestions on how to use the funds, within the scope of the aforementioned themes. The BoS then discussed various options on 8 January and submitted a first draft document outlining its chosen priorities to the PC. The PC discussed this proposal on 14 January. The BoS then discussed the proposal presented below on 5 February. The document was then submitted by e-mail to the PC, who approved it.

**Explanations for each individual theme**

I. More intensive small-group teaching

II. Student supervision, including accessibility and equal opportunities

**What exactly does the investment entail?**

€76,342* will be spent in the 2019-2020 academic year:

1. 0.3 FTE for the development and teaching of two new ‘Teaching and Communication’ courses (for humanities and social sciences) to prepare students for professional practice in the fields of information, teaching and communication on their chosen fields, and on scientific subjects and the societal context of these subjects. A course like that has already been developed for students specialising in science subjects; it will be further developed.
2. 0.15 FTE to allow us to teach two popular electives that are currently only taught once per year twice per year. Students like having more of a choice in each semester. The PC will be involved in the decision-making process regarding the question as to which courses will be taught twice per year from now on. 3. 0.12 FTE to use additional lecturers in vocational schools (e.g. to teach courses in educational sciences, teaching skills or work placement supervision courses). If we use more lecturers, we will be able to make all groups smaller, and where possible, we will be able to put students with a similar profile (e.g. wider-access entrants, people who already have a Dutch Grade-2 teaching qualification) in the same group, so that we can give them even more targeted supervision.

In 2020-2021 we may choose to offer the two communication courses twice, and three electives, as well. However, if we do that, we will not be able to appoint additional lecturers. We will have to review and readjust our budget allocations for the period after 2021, based on the funds we will be awarded in those years.

* Labour cost was calculated in accordance with GST agreements, on the basis of pay scale 13, rung 8, based on the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences’ wage table dated 1 May 2018, including 25%).

**What is the purpose of the investment?**

Criterion no 1: There are good reasons why this plan will help raise the quality of our degree programmes. The institution’s intentions for the student loan system funds and the objectives it seeks to realise with regard to improving the aforementioned aspects of its degree programmes have been clearly formulated and are in line with the institution’s context, history and general vision for teaching and learning.

The objective of the measure is to give students a wider range of possible choices during the course of their degree programme, ensure that they will continue to receive intensive supervision from their lecturers and provide them with more career counselling activities in the two-year degree programmes.

The ‘Education and Communication’ courses will give students an insight into the main trends in the lines of work for which the programme prepares them, such as teaching jobs at schools and related places, educational publishers, TV or school TV broadcasting corporations, organisations working in the field of development/heritage/sustainability education, museums and visitor centres. We will focus on types of communication involving the use of multimedia and social media. We will hire experts for lectures and guest lectures. These courses will be incorporated into the two-year teacher training courses. Other students attending the GST will be able to attend components of the courses, e.g. guest lectures by experts working in the field.

By spending the available budget from the student loan system funds, we will also promote the intensive supervision provided by lecturers. Students have indicated that they greatly appreciate this type of personal supervision by both general trainers and teaching specialists.

**What is the intended outcome of the expenditure?**

The results we hope to achieve are ensuring the continued availability of high-quality, intensive small-group teaching, giving students a wider range of choice with regard to the courses they can take, and strengthening our courses designed to prepare our students for the broader field of education and communication.

**In what way will the intended results have an impact?**

What changes will the students observe?

Students will be given a wider range of choice within their degree programmes. Group sizes will remain small, and students will continue to receive one-on-one supervision from their lecturers.

The department will determine whether the measures have had the desired impact by examining the outcomes of student panel reviews, conversations with the student members of the PC and the results of the NSE.

**What is the intended time frame for the investment?**

Criterion no 3: The intentions laid down in the plan are realistic in terms of the proposed use of tools and resources and given the nature of the faculty's organisation and processes.

Spring/summer 2019: the development of new Education & Communication courses; deciding which additional electives will be offered in 2019-2020; arranging for and preparing the additional lecturer(s) (recruitment of new lecturer or giving current lecturers more hours).

Starting from autumn 2019: teaching, evaluating and modifying new courses; offering additional electives; offering small seminar and supervision groups.
III. Professional development of lecturers

The GST has chosen not to allocate any of its budget from the student loan system funds to this theme.

At the GST, many people are involved in the training and supervision of the students. The following types of lecturers contribute to our teacher training programmes:

- General trainers (teaching specialists) affiliated with the university's faculties;
- General trainers affiliated with the secondary schools with which we work (on secondment to UU);
- Teaching specialists affiliated with UU’s faculties;
- Lecturers specialising in certain subjects, affiliated with the faculties;
- Educational sciences lecturers affiliated with the faculties;
- Work placement supervisors affiliated with the secondary schools where our students do their work placements.

Furthermore, study advisers and tutors (lecturers specialising in certain subjects, affiliated with the faculties) play an important role in the student supervision provided in the two-year degree programmes.

When it comes to training students and beginner and experienced teachers and aiding them in their professional development, and when it comes to innovation and research, teacher training colleges and secondary schools are increasingly actively engaged in intensive partnerships. These collaborative partnerships are called 'Teaching Together', and involve clusters of training schools. Teacher training is no longer provided exclusively at universities, but also increasingly at universities' partner schools within a particular cluster of training schools.

All lecturers involved in teacher training, particularly general trainers, teaching specialists and work placement supervisors affiliated with the schools, are involved in these trends. We must make lecturers more professional so as to be able to properly train students and beginner teachers within the scope of the agreed quality agreements. In the coming years, the GST will draw on other budgets to invest in the professional development of lecturers as part of the Teaching Together initiative.

**BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Education and Communication course</th>
<th>Development hours</th>
<th>Total lecturer hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 - humanities</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 - social sciences</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 - science</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>495</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total cost of new course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offering an elective twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>255</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total cost of existing course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total cost of additional trainer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total expenditure 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€75,744.21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Available</strong></td>
<td><strong>€76,342</strong></td>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Education and Communication course</th>
<th>Development hours</th>
<th>Total lecturer hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1 - humanities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1 - social sciences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 - humanities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 - social sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>581</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total cost of new course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offering electives twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Cost of Existing Course</td>
<td>Total Expenditure 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>€30,516.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>€30,516.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>€30,516.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total FTE</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost of existing course:

€30,516.93

Total expenditure 2020:

€76,783.11

Available:

€76,342

Balance:

€-441.11
FACULTY COUNCIL’S DECISION

The Faculty Council of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, which convened for a meeting on 24 January 2019, hereby declares that it has read the quality agreements for 2019 (18/038-18/042) AND HAS DECIDED to approve these.

The Chair of the Faculty Council

Dr S. Doosje