



Centrale
Studentenraad

College van Bestuur
Postbus 19268
1000 GG Amsterdam

Nieuwe Achtergracht 170
1018 WV Amsterdam
(020) 525 3726
csr@studentenraad.nl
studentenraad.nl/csr

Datum	28 maart 2019	Ons kenmerk	CSR-1819-09
Contactpersoon	Sofie ten Brink	E-mail	csr@uva.nl
Bijlage(n)	-		
Betreft	Profiling Fund Regulations		

Dit betreft een Engelstalig advies

Dear Executive Board,

With this letter, we provide advice on the Profiling Fund, which can be discussed during the OV on 02-04-2019. The CSR is content with the intention of JZ to update the Profiling Fund Regulations. This letter is intended to initiate discussion on points we expect may be contentious. The CSR advises you to update the Profiling Fund and bring it in line with art. 7.51h, sub 1 WHW and the CBHO ruling regarding this article dated the 1st of November 2018 (CBHO 2018/080). Considering the necessary revision, the CSR will also outline advice on other parts of the Profiling Fund in this letter.

The current Profiling Fund regulation outlines the requirements and procedures for students to apply for the Profiling Fund. While the WHW requires the institutional board to implement regulations of a procedural nature regarding the Profiling Fund, the CBHO ruled that these should be limited to rules of a strictly procedural nature. Considering these constraints, the CSR believes a revision of the regulations to be necessary, leading us to propose to also alleviate other shortcomings experienced with the current regulations.

1st-years students

First, we believe preventing 1st-years students from receiving restitution from the Profiling Fund constitutes a non-procedural regulations and is therefore in violation of the WHW. Sections 3 and 4 of the Profiling Fund regulations currently prevent 1st-years students from receiving funding for their *medezeggenschap* work or compensation for being board members of a student association. There are two different rules to this effect: the rule that the student should meet the BSA at the beginning of the year (if applicable), as well as the rule the student should have been enrolled at a university/UvA in the preceding year. Instead of regulating the procedures, these regulations categorically exclude a group of students.

It is quite unfortunate this group is excluded. Especially for OCs, who are required to evaluate an entire curriculum, including first years' courses. Many OCs feel they require the participation of first years' students to

ensure proper quality assurance of the first year of the curriculum. The CSR would prefer the quality of education not to suffer from this regulation and therefore feels this should be a strong motivation to remove this rule.

Since for certain programmes (i.e. bèta-gamma), a large difference in the situation between 1st years students and other students is in place, their study associations require 1st years students in their board to function.

Further objections arise from the historical motivation of this exclusion. These regulations have historically been primarily motivated by the need for first years' students to make their BSA. However, not all programmes use the BSA: it is limited to bachelors' programmes, and even some bachelors' programmes have not implemented BSA. Further, this argument does not seem applicable to medezeggenschap at all, since art. 2.1, sub 1, under e *uitvoeringsbesluit WHW* explicitly mentions that membership of a *medezeggenschap* body serves as a ground for dispensation of the BSA. The same applies to any student association primarily aimed at furthering the public interest (under g of the same article).

The risk of confusing the *medezeggenschap* with a membership of a student association board seems unlikely since the distinction is clearly made in the regulations by addressing them in separate chapters. Moreover, the nature of these bodies also differs to such an extent that they seem unlikely to be confused.

60 EC cap on study delay

The CSR also believes that the calculation of study delay for students with a history of extracurricular courses should be revised. The current regulations cap study delay at 60 EC – achieved credits this year. Moreover, Folia suggests not just the current year, but also preceding years are taken into account.¹ This creates a situation where students with a history of extracurricular courses before personal circumstances arise, would not qualify for the Profiling Fund, even if they could no longer attain the required credits for their main programme due to these personal circumstances. For example, a student attaining 60 EC in their first semester, who then has to be hospitalised during the second semester, would have a real study delay of one semester. Moreover, in most situations only 30 EC would have been acquired in their main programme, causing a real delay in the date of achieving their degree. This student would then be punished for previous excellence by not being compensated for the semester of extra study they require. While the CSR does not yet have a clear position on excellence programmes as such, the CSR believes that excellence should not be punished.

Part-time students

Currently the regulation also categorically excludes part-time students. While it seems reasonable to estimate the expected study progression of these students to be slower than for full-time students, this does not mean they cannot get study delay due to personal circumstances or unstudyable programmes. We feel they should receive compensation for this study delay.

The evaluation itself

Considering the regulations need to be revised and that there seems to be demand for more elaborate changes from the further organisation, we propose doing a full evaluation of the regulation. For the evaluation itself, we propose setting up a full working group including all stakeholders, for example, these could include: the CSR, Legal Affairs, Student Deans, Academic Affairs, ASVA, AKvV and Disability Platform. AZ has already contacted us; we will discuss with them about the process next week.

1 <https://www.folia.nl/opinie/126227/de-uva-doet-vertraagde-studenten-tekort>

Other points for evaluation

Apart from these two main concerns we have other points from the regulation we would like to have evaluated in any upcoming full evaluation:

- Is the amount of compensation still sufficient, in light of increasing costs associated with study delay due to inflation and costs of living?
- Is the expected study delay for board years and medezeggenschap still reasonable based on time spent on these activities.
- Is the time of deposit acceptable?
 - Amount of time spent waiting before first deposit?
 - Depositing the money in June when six or less months
- What is the policy around the tuition free board year, and should this be changed?
- Is increased waiting time covered (i.e. from 6 months waiting required to 12 months of waiting to be FSR chair)?
- Is waiting time, that could have been spent on an internship within the curriculum or on extracurricular courses, covered?
- Is combined delay due to a medezeggenschap/board year and an unstudyable programme covered?
- Is the situation regarding the international students covered sufficiently in light of their higher costs of living as well as tuition fee.
- Is the policy sufficiently covering the part-time students?
- Scope of functional limitations
- Remove references to the “*prestatiebeurs*” (textual)
- Check for gender neutral language (textual)
- Are OC parties covered in case they are ever founded?
- Are the current categories of student associations sufficient? Especially in light of strengthening student engagement.
- Is waiting time for internships a grounds for classifying an unstudyable programme?
- Can students paying institutional tuition fees be added?

Apart from these points regarding the regulations themselves, we also have some concerns to evaluate regarding the execution of the regulation:

- Is the communication good enough?
 - Communication about the Profiling Fund procedures.
 - Communication about the existence of the Profiling Fund.
 - Are students informed timely?
 - About the Profiling Fund?
 - When and how to apply?
 - Is there enough information available (online)?
 - Are the regulations and procedures updated and available (online)?
 - Are the people responsible responsive enough?
- Are there any inconsistencies with different forms?
- Are the forms clear enough?
- Do the student-deans, and StS (Beurzen), have enough time to do their job?
- Is the application procedure generally still working?
- Is there a reliable English translation available?

In summary, we believe a revision of the Profiling Fund is required and advice to:

- Remove obstacles for restitution to first years' students.
- Remove the current limitations for restitution of study delay of excellent students.
- Include part-time students in the Profiling Fund.
- Further evaluate the regulations as well as the execution using the points mentioned in this letter.

With kind regards,



Roeland Voorbergen
Voorzitter CSR 18|19

~