

Annual Report

Programme Committee Econometrics and Operational
Research
Academic year 2024-2025

Dear reader,

This is the annual report of the Programme Committee Econometrics and Operational Research. This annual report describes, and provides details, of the membership, working methods and activities of the Programme Committee in the 2024-2025 academic year.

The Programme Committee advises the Erasmus School of Economics' Programme Management on issues concerning the education in the following programmes:

- Bachelor Econometrics and Operations Research, variants:
 - Econometrie en Operationele Research (b-ectrie)
 - Econometrics and Operations Research (b-ibeor)
 - Bachelor Squared Econometrics/Economics (b-ibsc2)
- Master Econometrics and Management Science (m-ectrie)

In 2024-2025, approval from the Programme Committee was requested on the:

- Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026
- Service Level Agreement 2025-2026
- Proposal for Savings on tutorial education

The Programme Committee was asked for feedback on the:

- Quality and Innovation Education Agenda ESE 2025-2028
- Project Proposal strengthening participatory bodies
- Rules of Procedure Programme Committees
- Thesis Management System
- Changes in the Master track

The minutes of all meetings that were held in 2024-2025, as well as all advice letters are attached as appendices to this report.

October 2025

Prof. dr. Richard Paap, chair
Suzanne Leentvaar MA, secretary participatory bodies ESE

Table of contents

Foreword	i
1. Structure of the Programme Committee.....	3
1.1 Teacher echelon and student echelon	3
1.2 Recruitment of commissioners	3
1.3 Way of working	3
2. Tasks, communication and reporting.....	4
2.1 Tasks and activities.....	4
2.2 Communication and reporting.....	4
3. Overview of activities	4
3.1 Activities within the legal framework (WHW)	4
3.1.1 Teaching and Exam Regulations (TER).....	4
3.2 Activities on new (parts of) educational programmes	5
3.2.1 Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028.....	5
3.2.2 Service Level Agreement	5
3.2.3 Thesis Management System	5
3.2.4 Master track changes	6
3.2.5 Proposal Savings on tutorial education	6
3.3 Other activities	6
3.3.1 Rules of Procedure Programme Committees.....	6
3.3.2 Project Strengthening the participatory bodies	6
4. Points of interest for the next academic year	7
4.1 Professional development of the programme committees.....	7

Appendices

- Minutes Meetings Programme Committee Econometrics and Operational Research
- Feedback on Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2024-2028
- Approval/advice on Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026
- Advice on Service Level Agreement 2025-2026
- Advice on Master track changes
- Advice on Proposal Savings tutorial education
- Approval on Proposal Savings tutorial education

1. Structure of the Programme Committee

1.1 Teacher echelon and student echelon

The Programme Committee Econometrics and Operational Research consists of eight members: four staff members and four student members. In 2024-2025, the members are:

Staff:

Prof.dr. Richard Paap
Dr. Emö Oldenkamp-Bazsa
Dr. Rutger-Jan Lange
Dr. Remy Spliet

Students:

Romy Koelewijn
Anissa El Mazouzi
Bram Mesland
Wessel van de Weg

The Programme Committee is supported by Suzanne Leentvaar, secretary for the ESE participatory bodies.

1.2 Recruitment of commissioners

New student members are recruited and selected by the current student members. They inform the chair and secretary, so the members can be officially presented and approved of by the dean and the student members of the School Council. When the appointment needs to be renewed, the current members are asked if they would like to remain for another term. Additionally, a vacancy is placed for new staff members to apply. If there are more applicants than seats, the dean is asked to choose, based on a motivated advice from the chair of the Programme Committee. Staff members also receive renewed appointment letters for every academic year.

An important task for the student members of the Programme Committee is to organize the process of the Student Representatives. Student Representatives gather feedback from students during the course and discuss this half-way with the coordinator of the course, suggestions for improvement can be implemented during the course.

1.3 Way of working

The members of the Programme Committee meet up at least five times per academic year, preferably in the fourth or fifth week of each educational block, to be able to discuss the courses of the previous block. If needed, additional meetings can be organized to discuss documents that need reviewing, such as the TER. Tentative dates are set for the whole academic year, members will be asked for their availability. Documents for the members are distributed via MS Teams.

During the academic year 2024-2025 the Programme Committee convened five times:

- Meeting 159 – 17 October 2024
- Meeting 160 – 28 November 2024
- Meeting 161 – 13 February 2025
- Meeting 162 – 10 April 2025
- Meeting 163 – 22 May 2025

Most meetings were attended by the programme director as well as the bachelor programme manager. According to the School Regulations, the Programme Committee can request the dean to join one of their meetings. In 2024-2025, the dean Patrick Groenen was invited to join the meeting of the Programme Committee on 28 November. The dean was asked for assistance with tackling the problems that started one-and-a-half years ago after the implementation of new support systems, including grade registration and academy attendance, which causes a lot of stress for both students as well as lecturers.

Furthermore, members of the Programme Committee were invited to the joint meetings that are organized five times a year, at the start of each educational block. These meetings are organized for both members of the School Council as well as the Programme Committee participate, to discuss questions and remarks on the education that concern the whole school. Ideally, one staff member and one student member are present at these meetings. The ESE representative for the University Council is also invited to join these meetings.

2. Tasks, communication and reporting

2.1 Tasks and activities

The main task of the Programme Committee is to advise the board on all matters regarding (quality of) education. A key task undertaken by the Committee is the evaluation of courses. Furthermore, the Programme Committee is requested to review and approve of the bachelor and master TER annually.

Other topics that were discussed this year were:

- Problems with registration of attendance tutorials
- Pilot OR track master
- Recruitment process student representatives
- Changes in Econometrics track master programme curriculum
- Grade registration and registration of partial grades

Last year, a focal point for the Programme Committees was the Bachelor curriculum redesign. In December 2024 it was decided by Programme Management to put his project on hold until further notice.

2.2. Communication and reporting

In line with School Regulations, the Programme Committee submits their advice and proposals to the School Council for information. For every meeting minutes are made, which are distributed among members. The minutes are included in this Annual report.

3. Overview of activities

3.1 Activities within the legal framework (WHW)

3.1.1. Teaching and Examination Regulations

No major changes were made to the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) for the academic year 2025-2026. Comments of the Programme Committee were regarding:

- the availability of the compensation rules for lecturers;
- maximum weight of partial test from 40% to 30%;
- the new ILO's for the bachelor;
- article 4, referring to Education on campus;
- phrasing of the language requirements.

The Programme Committee approved of the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026 for the articles for which they have right of consent and advised positively on the articles on which the Programme Committee has right of advice.

3.2 Activities on new (parts of) educational programmes

3.2.1 Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028

The Programme Committee was informed that HOKA funding is going to be structural as of 2025 and will be renamed to BAO (Bestuursakkoord Onderwijskwaliteit); funds remain available and a planning for the budget was proposed in the Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028. Comments of the members were regarding:

- the teacher professionalization and support and what it entails;
- if student success, including personal professional development and career skills, is going to be evaluated; it was debated whether learning career skills is useful for Econometric students.

3.2.2 Service Level Agreement

The Programme Committee wondered why the ruling regarding the use of 30% for interim tests and assignments is in the Service Level Agreement, as it is not so much a service that is offered, but rather an exam rule. The Programme Committee had no further comments and advised positively on the Service Level agreement 2025-2026.

3.2.3 Thesis Management System

As of this academic year, TMS was introduced as the system for handling theses, to replace the thesis workflow in SIN-Online. Programme Management is planning to further develop TMS, as improvements are possible. The students of the Programme Committee provided Programme management with the following feedback:

- overall, the system works well and is liked;
- a mobile-friendly version would be appreciated, as there are problems when using it on mobile devices;
- the "deadline expiring in ..." notification appears too soon for bachelor thesis projects and feels daunting for some;
- is it suggested to add a final-version upload button, as it feels somewhat odd that the final version of a thesis is handed in by sending a message;

- the system does not meet expected accessibility standards for an international educational institution;
- the interface is not intuitive for people with visual impairments, icons lack contrast and are not easily understood;
- button names or icons are often poorly labeled, making navigation unclear.

3.2.4 Master track changes

The master Business Analytics & Quantitative Marketing (BAQM) will be relabeled, emphasizing less on the marketing part. Underlying the changes are the following considerations:

- students indicate that they prefer to take more econometrics subjects than economics subjects;
- the intake shows a decline, while data science within university courses shows an increase; the focus will be shifted to data science and the courses will be adjusted accordingly;
- there will be a transitional arrangement for courses that disappear;
- the major BAQM will also be included in the rebranding.

The members of the Programme Committee agreed with the changes. Content wise, the programme looks better and the changes will make the programme become more efficient.

3.2.5 Proposal on savings on tutorial education

Because of governmental decisions, universities are facing budget cuts. ESE raised a taskforce to investigate where funds can be raised, but also to see where money could be saved. A proposal for savings on tutorial education was presented to the Programme Committee for approval. In the proposal, five options were presented. The Programme Committee commented that:

- the tutorials for Econometrics are perceived very useful by the students; especially in bachelor year 1, students feel seen and can bond with the TA, which is very valuable;
- asking PhD's to do the tutorials would most probably give problems with capacity, as there will be less PhD's and the workload for lecturers will increase;
- it is unclear what the benefits are related to the costs and how substantial the savings are;

Initially, the members advised negatively on the proposal, as small-scale education is highly valued by the members; the measures are quite strong for a relatively small saving, and it will have a big impact on the quality of the education and the workload of staff. Programme Management revised the plans based on the input of the Programme Committee. The members finally approved of four of the options that were presented in the final draft; the Programme Committee withheld their approval to having PhD's teaching tutorials.

3.3 Other activities

3.3.1 Rules of Procedure Programme Committees

According to Dutch Educational law, Programme Committees need to have their own Rules of Procedure. In this document, the way of working of the committees is explained. The Programme Committees were presented a draft of the Rules of Procedure for feedback. The remarks and comments of the Programme Committee will be taken up in the final draft.

3.3.2 Project Strengthening the participatory bodies

In March 2025, the EUR participatory bodies were informed that EUR budget will be made available for the strengthening of the participatory bodies. A proposal was drafted up by programme management consisting of the input from the Programme Committees as well as the School Council. From the Programme Committee, a request was made to provide for a substantial database and archive.

4. Points of interest for the next academic year

Looking forward to the academic year 2025-2026, the Programme Committee will continue its recurring annual tasks, but will also look at:

- The futureproof bachelor curricula,
- Quality of education in the light of budget cuts,
- The use of AI in education for both students and lecturers becoming more important in the future.

4.1 Professional development of the Programme Committees

This year, the members of the Programme Committee were offered a basic training on the tasks of participation in general and more specifically the activities of the Programme Committee. None of the members followed the training.

Next year, a similar training will be organized via EUR Central as part of a project in which the EUR aims to strengthen the participation and encourage collaboration between participatory bodies EUR wide. As well as last year, an introduction day will be organized for the (new) members, where they will be able to meet the other members of the Programme Committees as well as the members of the School Council. New members will be provided with some general and background information on the activities and tasks of the Programme Committees.

Other steps that will be taken towards the professionalization of the Programme Committees for academic year 2025-2026 are:

- Finalize and approve of the Rules of Procedure of the Programme Committees;
- Enhance collaboration between participatory bodies across ESE and EUR wide; improve joint meetings;
- Keep monitoring the educational service systems: systems often fail because the users are not always included in the process. Programme Management is requested to make sure to ask users and stakeholders for feedback before implementing a new system.

Appendices

- Minutes Meetings Programme Committee Econometrics and Operational Research
- Feedback on Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2054-2028
- Approval/advice on Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026
- Advice on Service Level Agreement 2025-2026
- Advice on Master track changes
- Advice on Proposal Savings tutorial education
- Approval on Proposal Savings tutorial education

Draft Minutes PC Econometrics 159

17 October 2024, 13.00-15.00 hrs (EB-01)

Programme Management (PM) present 13.30 hrs – 15.00 hrs.

Present: Staff members: Richard Paap (RP), Remy Spliet (RS), Rutger-Jan Lange (RL), Emö Oldenkamp-Bazsa

Student members: Anissa el Mazouzi (AM, online), Romy Koelewijn (RK), Bram Mesland (BM)

Other participants: Brigitte Hoogendoorn (BM, programme director), Erik Kole (EK, programme manager), Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, secretary, minutes)

Not present: Wessel van de Weg

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

- a. The chair opened the meeting, the agenda was approved.
- b. All members were asked to be present during the meetings, preferably on campus. Being on exchange is not the most convenient for the meetings, it is suggested not to appoint students that are on exchange next year.
- c. There were some problems this year with selecting the Student Representatives (SRs). Student members of the PC are responsible for recruiting the SRs. A process outline will be drafted up as guideline for next year, so the SRs can get a head start as of block 1.
- d. Ideally the PC meets every block on a Thursday afternoon in the 4th or 5th week. The current planning does not fully meet this requirement. SL will send the schedule and will send the outlook invites for the meeting.

2. Minutes meeting 157 – 14 May 2024

- Point 8: add that the AI guidelines is a work in progress.
- Last bullet under point 8: RS was not the one mentioning this.
- Point 3: replace 'regular courses' with 'tutorials'.

With these changes, the minutes were approved.

3. Action point list

- Registration Osiris is on the agenda
- Update on study choice activity. BH: from next year on, the obligatory math course will no longer be offered, students will only need to fill in a form. The timing of the course was off, as it was offered in August, just after the exams. Furthermore, study choice activity implies that this part was to help make a choice, but in August, a choice had already been made. Research also shows that students do not improve their performance after the course. EO: the level of the course was also too low; this has been adapted.
- Elective with Erasmus MC. EK: the electives have been announced and 20 students applied for the Health Care Elective, 70 students applied for Machine Learning. It is not visible which students enrolled in what elective.

4. Announcements

- EK: the expert group of the curriculum redesign had their last meeting and is now preparing a report. EK found that the stakeholder groups gave often very brief feedback on the reports that were shared with them. RS: this had to do with the fact that the reports lacked the argumentation behind the conclusions, therefore it was difficult to give good feedback. BH: the idea behind the stakeholder groups was to involve participation from the beginning. It reflects the conceptual phase the project is in, where the stakeholder group merely receives conclusions, and some flexibility is requested. EK: details will follow; a list with new ILOS

will be provided, with a block scheme, how education will be implemented. RP would rather not see that a choice needs to be made in the first year, as varieties can be unfair when it comes to the BSA. It would be better to be able to follow the complete track. EK: the programme would like to offer more choice, but it is not decided yet how this will be done.

- BH: the taskforce for a smarter academic year sent their advice to the Executive Board, consisting of two parts: 1. How can the academic calendars be harmonized and to look for windows of opportunities, such as following courses at other faculties. 2. The faculties were asked to share a blueprint of the desired academic year. The blueprints were shared in the University Council (UC), after which the option was raised to have faculties choose from the blueprints. This did not go down well with the taskforce, as the blueprints were not worked out for this purpose and were not yet discussed with the vice-deans. The taskforce spoke to the rector about it, the status is now unclear. RS did not recognize the block structure in the report. BH: the structure is not enrolled only based on the smarter academic year, but also on other input.

5. Draft Annual rapport 2023-2024

It is suggested to add 'Internationalization' to article 4. Points of interest upcoming year. The Annual report is approved.

6. Pilot OR track master

RS: students keep doing the same thing, only the report changes; presentations should give more substance. RS: lecturers have considered practical terms and how to monitor it, as the quality of the research may not suffer from it; there is a tentative list of evaluation criteria. RP thinks students should be informed upfront about the criteria. The PC agrees with the pilot. RS hopes to receive funds from HOKA to develop the track, like preparing a thesis manual and the development of AI related surveys. It is suggested to evaluate the pilot halfway. RP: it needs to be determined beforehand on what criteria the pilot is deemed successful.

7. N=N/BSa

BH: as the topic was on the agenda of the previous government, it has been thoroughly discussed. Although it is not on the agenda of the (new) government anymore, ESE wishes to anticipate on political trends. The document is intended as discussion piece for the discussion on EUR level: N=N works well on several parts but can be enhanced when it comes to student wellbeing. Three scenarios have been investigated: 1. Keep it as it is, 2. Abolish it and look for an alternative and 3. Keep N-N, with more intensive guidance to meet the standard in the first year, to eliminate some of the stress. The third scenario was chosen, other faculties were also convinced this might work. EO feels bad for students that are very motivated but, in the end, fail to reach it by a thread. Unfortunately, the law does not allow students to repeat the year, unless there are personal circumstances.

RL: it was discussed during the working group curriculum redesign that if people drop out in the first year, there is more quality in the 2nd and 3rd year. RL wondered that, if more people are helped to make the first year, if the quality and success rate be the same.

RP wondered why there are still compensation rules in year two. The reason was to relieve the exam pressure. BH: in the new academic year, the resits are different. RP wondered whether there is a check on the resits, as students are only allowed three resits.

8. HOKA progress report

BH was asked to provide access for the PC members to the dashboard.

9. Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028

The HOKA plans have been shared for feedback. Comments:

- The text on page 4, under ‘teacher professionalisation and support’ is not very clear. BH explained that this is a multi-year plan to expand teacher support. The idea is to develop a professional group who know the systems and who will take on the support for lecturers, so that they no longer have to do this themselves. This will still be worked out in detail. Costs can remain low because the idea is to deploy individuals centrally per programme.
- Student success, including personal professional development and career skills: RS asks if this has been evaluated. BH: individual modules are evaluated every year, but the inclusion of career skills in the programme has not been evaluated. BM wondered if the course is achieving the right goal for econometrics students, as they generally have no problem finding a job. It is suggested to offer the course in a different way, as it is not only about finding a job, but also about preparing and presenting yourself. Faector also provides information, but study associations do not reach all students; the course is placed in the curriculum for students who do not get the information elsewhere, for example students with a migration background, as research shows that they are harder to reach. BM: the course takes quite a bit of work, next to the thesis in the same period. RK: students only take the course because it is compulsory. BH: whether it is the right way it is implemented can be debated, but BH hopes the PC agrees with the intention to reserve money for this. The budget is for the period of 3 years. BM: if the course is evaluated, a suggestion would be to evaluate it separately for econometric students, as they might perceive the course differently than other students.

10. Problems with registration of attendance tutorials

Prior to the meeting, EK shared an email from the head of BIAM about the problems. The system is still not working, but nothing is done about it. If it does not work, an alternative needs to be provided. EO: the lecturers receive the mails when students encounter problems. EO asked the head of BIAM to provide a general email address on canvas that students can use if having difficulties with the system. BM knows it can lead to a lot of stress with first-year students if the grades are not there. As the option to provide two simultaneous systems seems to be difficult and the problems are still not solved, the PC decided to escalate the situation to the dean, who will be invited to join the next meeting.

11. Attachments for information

No comments.

12. Any other business

BH: as of next year, lecturers will be able to decide for themselves whether they want to prepare a 2- or a 3-hour exam. A concern is that it is not known what lecturers consider when choosing for either a 2- or 3-hour exam. It might be possible to check it during the peer reviews, as the exam needs to reflect the educational goals.

The chair closed the meeting at 15.00 hrs.

Draft Minutes PC Econometrics 160

28 November 2024, 12.30-15.00 (E2-20)

Dean present from 12.30-13.00; Programme Management (PM) present 13.30– 15.00

Present: Richard Paap (RP), Remy Spliet (RS), Rutger-Jan Lange (RL), Emö Oldenkamp-Bazsa

Romy Koelewijn (RK), Bram Mesland (BM)

Other participants: Patrick Groenen (PG, dean ESE), Iris Versluis (IV, policy officer Education), Erik Kole (EK, programme manager)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Not present: Wessel van de Weg, Anissa el Mazouzi (with notice)

SC=School Council

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

Extra agenda point: evaluation course Markov processes.

2. Meeting with Dean ESE, Patrick Groenen

The PC invited Patrick Groenen, as the PC wishes to address and ask for assistance with tackling the problems that started one-and-a-half years ago after the implementation of new support systems, including grade registration and academy attendance, which causes a lot of stress for both students as well as lecturers. The PC members gave various examples of malfunctioning of the processes. There is a lot of frustration: students experience a lot of stress when their grading is not correct and lecturers do not feel supported by the systems at this moment; communication with BIAM has not led to any improvement of the systems. Suggestions are:

- That, prior to implementation of a system, BIAM should ask the users what they need and test the new system before implementing and keep a back-up of the old system in case problems occur with the new system.
- To enhance collaboration between BIAM and lecturers.
- Instructing the information desk to only send the students to lecturers if the lecturer can solve the problem.

PG agrees that new systems should be tested prior to implementation and that the systems should be based on what the users need and should work properly for those who use them, staff and students alike. If there are problems, they need to be fixed. Collaboration seems key and processes involving students have the highest priority. PG will address the issues through the proper channels.

3. Minutes meeting 159

- Point 4: ELO should be ILO.
- Re the process of recruiting student representatives: the names of the current SRs were shared; some masters still need a SR. BM worked on a proposal for the process. EK: make sure that the SRs are recruited as soon as possible in block 1; the secretariats and coordinators can be asked for help making the announcements in time. For the first year, first year lecturers can be asked for help. BM will share the proposal to discuss the next meeting.

4. Action point list

- Register and form groups in Osiris: the PC spoke to the dean about the problems
- Study choice activity: remove from list.

- Dashboard: the PC members were granted access; remove from list.
- Resits (action point from minutes): IV: the examination board checks on the resits. If a student has more than three resits, only the first three are valid.

5. Announcements Programme Management

- Staff were informed that as of 1 January 2025 the current position of Director of Education, Brigitte Hoogendoorn, will not be prolonged. Until a successor is found, vice-dean Michel van der Wel will take over the educational subjects – such as the curriculum redesign – whereas Director of Operations Mario van Boven will take over the organizational subjects. When asked, EK does not think the curriculum redesign will suffer a lot from the budget costs; although only the English programmes need to be reviewed in the light of the governmental decisions, the Dutch programmes can benefit from the revisions as well.
- Curriculum redesign: the orientation phase has ended; the reports have been discussed with the stakeholders. PM is asked to share the reports with the PC members. The next phase is the design phase, in which the 'leerlijnen' will be developed further, and to look at where the courses fit. This depends on the outcome of the smarter academic year, which is still in process. For the design phase possibly more people will be involved than the ones from the current expert groups. EK will take the suggestion of RS, to possibly form dedicated roles as 'leerlijncoordinator' and already bring up names of designated people, into account. Further actions:
 - development of design teams per 'leerlijn';
 - development of teams that will look at adjacent topics, such as didactics, the tutor academy, student wellbeing
 - Investigating the feasibility of educational support
 - set-up skills group
 - cross-involvement in the development of the 'leerlijnen', to involve people from Economics, for example.

EK will discuss this with Dennis Fok. In this phase, stakeholdergroups will be formed as well, with participants coming from the participation bodies. The PC has a right of advice when it comes to the quality of the education.

- EK: the registration of grades for standard courses should be working properly now. RP wondered whether the PC could expect feedback on the implementation, but EK does not expect a reaction if all goes well. The secretariat now knows how to retrieve the grades from Osiris. The final grades can only be seen after publication. The TER states that the lecturer is responsible for the final grades, the lecturer therefore should be able to check the grades and approve them before they get final grades, which is not possible now. IV is investigating this with BIAM.
- Policy officer Annette Toet will be leaving ESE in February and is substituted by a new colleague as of March.

6. Course evaluations Block 1

- The PC had no remarks on the evaluations of block 5 (2023-2024) and of block 1 (2024-2025). EK remarked that the scores for the course Machine learning are low, and steps are taken by the coordinator to look at the didactics.
- BM addressed a problem re the course Markov Processes (in block 2). In the feedback received from the SRs, it was mentioned that although the lecturer was very enthusiastic, he

seems to be struggling with didactics and content, is often reading from the slides and not giving explanations. The feedback was shared with the lecturer, but the students feel that this needs more attention, as they are not sure that the lectures will improve, which will disadvantage students in this difficult course. It was suggested to have another lecturer attend the class and give a peer review. EK will take it up further.

Grade registration

RS wondered why it is needed to register partial grades. By implementing this, a lot of problems occurred, and it led to a higher workload. IV explained that it was triggered by the exam organization: it would not be possible to plan midterms without this implementation. Next to that, it is more transparent for the students. EK: it also prevents shadow administrations and the lecturer being asked questions regarding the BSA, when the system provides the final grades. The possibility for lecturers to manage the grades somewhat is not possible anymore. The information in the course guide is leading. The way the grades are calculated should comply with Canvas. RS: it is not possible to describe in the course guide how the preferred calculations would be, or to look at the grades and adjust them. RS prefers that the list with final grades is provided, instead of asking the secretariat for a correction of a grade. Another problem is that there are a lot of different lists that are not compatible, and the chance of making mistakes when merging data is big. EK will contact BIAM to look at a solution.

7. Attachments for information

8. Any other business

RP requested to take up in the course guide that pre pre-master students do not have an attendance requirement. It frequently happens that the education desk refers the students to the lecturer. EK will take this up, to either make it clearer that courses for those students are not mandatory or take up this information in Osiris. IV: it can be added to the other exceptions in the course guide and also inform the desk about it.

The chair closed the meeting at 14.45 hrs.

Draft Minutes PC Econometrics 161

13 February 2025, 13.00-15.00 (EB-01)

Programme Management (PM) present 13.30– 15.00

Present: Richard Paap (RP), Remy Spliet (RS), Rutger-Jan Lange (RL), Emő Oldenkamp-Bazsa (EO)

Romy Koelewijn (RK), Anissa el Mazouzi (AM), Wessel van de Weg (WW)

Other participants: Erik Kole (EK, programme manager)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Not present: Bram Mesland (with notice)

SC=School Council

PM=Programme Management

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Minutes meeting 160

On p.3, change 'change' into 'chance'. With this change, the minutes were approved as presented. The final minutes will be shared with the dean, as he was a guest during that meeting.

3. Action point list

- Educational support systems: during the last meeting of the SC, it was discussed that the MT will set up an informal sounding group in which members of the participation, BIAM and the Examination Board can discuss solutions for the existing problems. The MT will send out an invitation and the members that will join the sounding group are requested to make sure that all sorts of questions are addressed, as all departments work differently.
- Student representatives: on the agenda.
- Final reports Curriculum redesign: the MT reviewed the change projects and decided to put the Curriculum redesign on hold. The development of the smarter academic year however continues; the MT hopes they get the possibility to postpone. It is useful to know what the criteria of the smarter academic year will be, but sufficient time is also needed for implementation of necessary developments.
- Course Markov processes: the evaluations are now available. The lecturer should take more ownership of the course, the supervisor is asked to discuss this with the lecturer.
- Compatibility different systems: the educational systems need to be better connected. This is a challenge for all software-developers university wide. The focus should be less on management processes and more on educational processes. EK thinks it would be good to have a dedicated business consultant for education processes at BIAM.
- Attendance requirements pre pre-master students: the course guide is not finished yet. Due to several changes in personnel, the processes were unclear. It should be clear now, that the tutor or student assistant can repair something in the attendance, only for a specific course. In other situations, for example a double registration or relocation – it needs to be handled by the front desk, who can check if it happened more often and can take proper action.

4. Announcements Programme Management

- The search for a new programme director of education is in an advanced stage and an announcement from MT is expected shortly.
- A sounding group is looking at the education column and the functioning of educational institutions, for example on the role of the bachelor and master coordination, or the separation of the rostering and Osiris, to see how processes can be made more efficient and logical.

- Today, policy officer Annette Toet-Teijl retires, her successor starts in March.
- Riley Badenbroek will give a presentation this afternoon; the idea behind these presentations is to narrow the distance between students and lecturers. As it is scheduled in week 6, not a lot of students are expected to join.

5. Other announcements

The problem with access for staff members of the PC to the results of course evaluations in the new system is solved.

6. Course evaluations Block 2

The evaluations are sufficient, there is no cause for worries.

7. Recruitment process Student Representatives

BM prepared a manual for the recruitment process of the student representatives. Comments were:

- Middle of August is already too late, change this to 'Block 5'.
- AM prepared a survey with several standard questions that can be added to the manual.
- The manual could be interesting for other PCs as well.
- Student members of the PC can contact EK to reach out to all students via mailing lists at the start of block 1. Simultaneously, lectures can be asked to raise the subject in their courses during the first week.

8. Registration tutorials (premaster students end up in regular tutorials)

RP: there is a disbalance in tutorial groups as some are very big, and others too small. The number of students that were able to register to one group was raised to fifty students. AM: for Marketing for Econometrics, one of the two groups was full, and the other was only for premaster students; in general, AM thinks two groups is too little. EO: it was decided to have less groups because after the first week, there are a lot less students and it would cost too much to keep all the tutorial groups. At this moment, premaster students can still register for the regular groups. Upon request of RP this was altered for the Dutch groups, but they did not think to change it for the English groups as well. It is not optimal to make the groups available for both regular as well as premaster students; although the content is similar, premaster students tend to slow down the courses, as they ask more questions because of their different background. Another problem is that a lot of premaster students enroll, but only few show up. EK will check the current processes to see what changes could be made.

9. Rules of Procedure Programme Committee (Draft)

The members were asked to comment on the draft document:

- Date on page 1
- Change committee to committees as there is more than one committee
- Art 1.5.2 The chair sends an e-mail through the internal channels with a request to staff to submit their candidacy
- Art 1.5.5: check if it is correct that the dean appoints the members
- Art 1.8.1 Make the possibility of appointing a vice-chair optional. If the chair is absent, another member will be appointed to take the role as interim-chair
- Art 1.8.3 Terms? Members that can stay longer have experience and secure continuity, but a fresh look is also needed. It would be good to renew a part of the committee on a regular basis.
- 2.2.1 Change sentence
- Art 3.1 Change two months for advice to six weeks
- Art 3.6: article numbers refer to WHW
- Art 2.2.4: Training for student representatives?
- Art 4.1.6 is redundant
- Art 4.5.8 is redundant

- Art 5.1.2: questions regarding the programme through programme management, or address the Examination Board directly? Check with Victor Beerkens.
- Throughout document: replace 'raad' with 'programma commissie'
- Final provision: consent majority needed, but this is not the same as in regular vote: in this case, the majority of members decide

10. Attachments for information

EK requested the members to ask the department director how the compensation turns out in practice, if the department is expanded structurally. Will it reduce the workload or will the work be divided over the same number of people.

11. Any other business

The chair closed the meeting at 14.45.

Draft Minutes PC Econometrics 162

10 April 2025, 13.00-15.00 (EB-01)

Programme Management: present 13.30– 15.00

Present:

Staff: Richard Paap (RP), Remy Spliet (RS), Rutger-Jan Lange (RL), Emö Oldenkamp-Bazsa (EO)

Students: Romy Koelewijn (RK), Wessel van de Weg (WW), Bram Mesland (BM)

Programme Management: Erik Kole (EK, programme manager), Josse Delfgaauw (JD, programme director, until 14.00)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Not present: Anissa El Mazouzi (with notice)

SC=School Council

PM=Programme Management

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

The chair welcomed Josse Delfgaauw (JD) as new programme director to the meeting. It used to be custom for the programme director to attend all the meetings of the PC. The last meeting of this academic year is already scheduled in JD's agenda. JD, however, has not as much time allocated for this role as the former programme director had, therefore it is not sure if he can be present at all the meetings of the PC.

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Minutes meeting 162

The minutes were approved as presented.

3. Action point list

- Educational support systems: a start has been made to improve the systems, in collaboration with the lecturers.
- Compatibility different systems: no update.
- Attendance requirements pre pre-master students: it will be taken up in the TER and the study guide. Special groups will keep needing attention. Action point can be removed from list.
- Curriculum redesign as part of smarter academic year: the curriculum redesign has been put on hold. EUR wide, the smarter academic year is going to be implemented, the vice-dean requested postponement, and the curriculum redesign needs to be taken up again.
- Registration tutorials (premaster students end up in regular tutorials): as of next year, it should no longer be possible for premaster students to register for regular tutorials. EK: a lot of people seem to be working on different parts, nobody has an overview. Also, there are no longer study assistants at the information desk, but only dedicated staff members, who complained that they were treated improperly by lecturers at various occasions. Lecturers are encouraged to pass by the desk if they have questions.
- Rules of procedure PCs: to be continued.

4. Announcements Programme Management

- EK: regarding the Wet internationalisering in balans (WIB), a file needs to be submitted in October for the Toets anderstalig onderwijs (TAO) regarding the international track. There are not many possibilities content wise, therefore arguments are sought in 'working together'. One of the ideas is to no longer have students form their own groups, but to have them formed randomly, adding at least one Dutch speaking and one non-Dutch speaking student for international courses to the groups. Lecturers will be asked for their opinion and if it would suit their course. BM and RK know that students prefer forming their own groups to be able to choose people that have the same objectives. EK: random groups will prepare students better

for the future, as it will seldomly occur that you will work with like-minded people. in Ectri 1 the groups are already formed randomly and this works well; additionally, it is beneficial to meet other people. BM requested considering the possibility for forming own groups for courses that are less strict and for which the grades are more substantial. JD: the school aims to teach their students to work together inter-professionally and this is a first step in this direction, to offer training to enhance those skills.

- EK: the master Business Analytics & Quantitative Marketing will be relabeled; the marketing part will be less emphasized. Andreas Alfons is working on a proposal which will be shared in the upcoming meeting of the PC. The use of different titles can make a difference for prospective students. EO suggested making the compensation rules clearer by using videos for example, as 'nominal is normal' could scare away new students, when it is not clear how the compensation rules work.

5. Other announcements

There were no other announcements.

6. Course evaluations Block 3

- Academic skills: the academic skills for the BSc2 programme do not really fit. PM is asked to consider making the academic skills fitter for this programme, and/or if a special track can be considered when the curriculum is redesigned. JD: the academic skills are under constant development and JD would like to see all the skills education incorporated in other courses.

7. TER 2025-2026

Education offer 2025-2026

There is little change for Econometrics. To be able to fit Machine learning, it will be taught in two blocks.

TER 2025-2026

- The rules for compensation are available for students, but nowhere to be found for lecturers. It is requested to be made available, for example as an appendix to the TER or by linking to the rules.
- Numerus-fixus for IBEB will be integrated when the MT decides to use it. The proposal is submitted to the Executive Board for IBEB. If needed, the numerus-fixus card can be played as part of self- management, then it will be added to the TER. If it is not beneficial, then it will not be implemented; the influx will always be lower than the number of students allowed; students need to apply sooner and can also retract their application.
- Maximum weight of partial test from 40% to 30%. EK: the Examination Board favors this, partly because of the risk when generative AI is used, but it is also a measure for students that have not been able to do their midterm; it would then be easier to drop the midterm. It is a rule for specific courses.
- There are new ILO's for the bachelor, but the adjustments are unclear and are not the same in the English and Dutch TER. The international new ILO's are not in the English TER yet.
- Article 4 refers to Education on campus, but it is unclear if it means it cannot be online, or on another location all together, as sometimes, education can be organized on a different location.
- What is the reason that the language requirements are phrased like they are? Would it be sufficient to phrase them as minimum B2?

8. SLA 2025-2026

The PC wondered why the ruling regarding the use of 30% for interim tests and assignments is in the SLA, as it is not much a service that is offered, but rather an exam rule.

9. Attachments for information

10. Any other business

- RS and WW attended the joint meeting of the participation bodies. Not all topics that are discussed are relevant for the programme committees. It is suggested to address topics during these meetings on which the PCs also have a say.
- The next meeting is scheduled for 22 May.
- It is suggested to start with the recruitment of new members for the PC 2025-2026.

The chair closed the meeting at 14.20.

Minutes PC Econometrics 163

22 May 2025, 13.00-15.00 (EB-01)

Programme Management: present 13.30– 15.00

Present:

Staff: Richard Paap (RP), Rutger-Jan Lange (RL), Emö Oldenkamp-Bazsa (EO)

Students: Wessel van de Weg (WW), Bram Mesland (BM), Anissa el Mazouzi (AM)

Programme Management: Erik Kole (EK, programme manager), Josse Delfgaauw (JD, programme director)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Not present:

Remy Spliet (with notice), Romy Koelewijn (with notice)

SC=School Council

PM=Programme Management

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Minutes meeting 162

Change ELO to ILO. EO will share her remarks via email with SL. With these changes, the minutes were approved as presented.

3. Action point list

160.4 Compatibility different systems: no update. RP: it would be better to use study numbers instead of names. JD knows BIAM is looking into this.

161.1 Curriculum redesign as part of smarter academic year: the project is being restarted; a first meeting is scheduled with ODMT upcoming Monday.

153.3 Educational support systems: no update.

4. Announcements Programme Management

- WIB: the self-management proposal was received by the minister; a reaction is expected before summer.
- PM started a project to enhance the influx/transit of students for both the bachelor as well as the master, alongside the curriculum redesign. Current procedures and criteria are being looked at. As the recruitment of international students is currently more difficult, focus is on influx of Dutch students. The content and the tone of the communication after enrollment is something that needs to improve.

5. Other announcements

There were no other announcements.

6. Course evaluations Block 4

- Machine learning scored low. The score was based on four evaluations only, WW acknowledges however there is room for improvement, as it was chaotic, and the information came in very late. PM will inform EK about this.
- AM remarked that Marketing was not added to the evaluation, possibly because this course is offered by Economics instead of Econometrics. The average was 2 points lower compared to the year before.

7. Master TER 2025-2026 (changed)

The change has limited effect: only once in two years an HBO student from a premaster starts the master programme.

In the TER it is stated that a grade of 5.49 will be rounded down, which is currently implemented in the systems as well. RP: before, a lecturer could choose to round down the final grade, but now all mid-term grades will be rounded down as well which can have a big effect. It should be clear to the students how the system works, but even lecturers do not know how the grade comes about, as they cannot see the grading in Osiris. JD: the rights of lecturers in Osiris will be discussed, because it is not desirable that lecturers cannot see the final grades in Osiris. In June, a meeting with SC members, BIAM and the examination board on partial grading is scheduled.

8. Proposal savings on tutorial education

- BM: from the student's point of view, the tutorials for Econometrics are very useful and it would be a waste to cut the number of tutorials. During tutorials, students feel seen and can bond with the other students, which is very valuable, especially in bachelor 1. Possibly cuts can be considered in other programmes where tutorials are less attended or useful.
- Asking PhD's to do the tutorials would most probably give problems with capacity, as there will be less PhD's and the workload for lecturers will increase.
- The members would like to know what the benefits are related to the costs and how substantial the savings are, as it concerns cheap labor and primary processes. JD: The highest costs are for fixed personnel. The savings amount to 3-4% of the total.

JD: changes on tutorial education are inevitable in the light of the budget cuts as well as the curriculum redesign. Savings on tutorial education are relatively easy as there are no fixed contracts. Undoubtedly this will mean it will affect the quality of education. JD elaborated some more on the four proposed ways to save money:

1. Less tutorial hours: in 2025-2026, lecturers will be invited to discuss if all tutorials are necessary. The decisions will not be made top-down, but are not completely without obligations, as savings are necessary. Implementation is scheduled for 2026-2027, as part of the new curriculum. It is preferred not to wait for the cuts until the new curriculum is ready.
2. The Tutor Academy has already started on a different way of working on contracts for the TA's and is looking into the benefit of having a TA for at least two groups instead of one.
3. To ask PhD's to give the tutorials.
4. Use a part of the reserves from HOKA for tutorial education. RP wondered whether HOKA money could be used to keep the tutorial education until the curriculum is renewed, as all the changes will be stressful for lecturers.

The members advice negatively on the proposal, as small-scale education is highly valued by the PC members; the measures are quite strong for a relatively small saving, and it will have a big impact on the quality of the education and the workload of staff.

9. Changes in Econometrics track Master programme curriculum

Proposed changes (taken from the email of EK):

1. ECT: although the choice for electives is not completely clear, students do indicate that they prefer to take more econometrics subjects than economics subjects.
2. BAQM: intake shows a decline, while data science within university courses shows an increase. From discussions it appears that the Marketing part in particular puts students off. The focus will be therefore shifted to data science and the courses will be adjusted accordingly.
3. There will be a transitional arrangement for courses that disappear.
4. The major BAQM will also be included in the rebranding, but this is a smaller operation.

Comments on the changes:

- The idea is good, rebranding and content wise the programmes look better.
- With the changes the programme will become more efficient.
- AM regrets that Marketing will disappear.

The PC members advice positively on the changes. A formal advice on the plans will be shared with PM.

10. Attachments for information

An evaluation on HOKA 2019-2024 was shared. HOKA changed to BAO (Bestuursakkoord onderwijsmiddelen), but the earmarked money can still be spent. 2025-2026 will be a transition year. The HOKA reserves will be added to the planning of the BAO means and will be used for the curriculum redesign. ESE asked for and received postponement of the smarter academic year until 27-28, and ideally the new curriculum will start at the same time. EUR central has set up a framework for the smarter academic year and faculties are allowed to make choices within this framework.

11. Any other business

- BM will end his term as a member of the PC. RK, WW and AM will continue and will start the recruitment process for a new member.
- RL: systems often fail because the users are not always included in the process. JD is asked to make sure that stakeholders are asked for feedback before implementing a new system.

The chair closed the meeting at 14.20.

To Brigitte Hoogendoorn
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
23 October 2024

Subject
Feedback on Quality and Innovation Agenda
Education ESE 2054-2028

Our reference

ese/pc-econometrics

Page

1/1

Appendix

none

Department

Econometrics

Visiting address

Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address

PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E paap@ese.eur.nl

W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Hoogendoorn, dear Brigitte:

Upon your request, the Programme Committee Econometrics reviewed the Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2054-2028, that was send to us for feedback.

The PC would like to share the following feedback with you:

- The PC requests clarification on page 4, under 'teacher professionalisation and support', as the content is not very clear. During the meeting of the PC on 17 October, it was explained that this is a multi-year plan to expand teacher support. The PC would like to be updated on the follow-up of this plan.
- Student success, including personal professional development and career skills: the PC would like to see that the course and the place in the curriculum are evaluated. It is suggested to offer the course in a different way, as it is not only about finding a job, but also about preparing and presenting yourself. If the course is evaluated, we suggest to have a separate evaluation for econometric students.

The Programme Committee kindly requests to take the above-mentioned feedback into consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Richard Paap
Chair PC Econometrics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
27 May 2025

Subject
Advice on Master track changes

Our reference
ESE/PC-econometrics

Page
1/1

Appendix
none

Department
Econometrics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E paap@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse

The Programme Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the Econometrics track of the Master programme and provides the following feedback:

- The Committee supports the proposed changes. Both the rebranding and content updates are viewed as improvements that will enhance the overall structure and appeal of the programme.
- The proposed adjustments are expected to improve programme efficiency and better align with student interests and market trends.

The Programme Committee advises positively on the proposed changes to the Econometrics track

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Richard Paap
Chair PC Econometrics

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
2 June 2025

Subject
Advice on Proposal Savings on tutorial
education

Our reference

ESE/PC-econometrics

Page
1/2

Appendix
none

Department
Econometrics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E paap@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse

The Programme Committee has reviewed the proposal outlining cost-saving measures for tutorial education. Below is the formal feedback:

1. The tutorials in the Econometrics program are highly valuable and play a crucial role, particularly in Bachelor 1. Reducing their number would be a significant loss. These sessions not only enhance understanding but also foster a sense of belonging, as students feel seen and supported by their TAs. This personal connection is especially important in the early stages of study.
2. If cuts are necessary, it may be worth evaluating other programmes where tutorials are less attended or less impactful, rather than targeting a core component of a programme where they are clearly effective.
3. Relying on PhD candidates to take over tutorials in the econometrics programme is likely not feasible due to capacity issues. In the econometrics programme PhD candidates are already involved in the bachelor skills course, bachelor seminars and thesis supervision. With fewer PhD students available and increasing pressure on staff, this could shift the burden to lecturers and impact overall teaching quality.
4. Members would also like to understand the trade-offs: what are the actual benefits of these proposed cuts compared to the costs? Given that tutorials involve relatively inexpensive labor and relate to primary educational processes, the rationale behind cutting them should be clear.
5. Having a closer look at the amount and content of tutorials could be part of the coming curriculum redesign. To reduce the burden for lecturers of changing the setup of their course, HOKA funds can be used to cut back costs until the new curriculum starts.

The PC advises negatively on the current proposal. Small-scale education is a cornerstone of the faculty's educational philosophy and is highly valued by both students and staff.

The proposed measures would lead to a notable decline in educational quality and significantly increase the workload for lecturers, without yielding sufficient financial benefit to justify such consequences.

Page
2/2

Our reference

Error! No text of specified style in document.

Your reference

Error! No text of specified style in document.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Paap', is centered within a light gray rectangular box.

Prof Dr Richard Paap
Chair PC Econometrics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information

Dr. Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director ESE

Date
16 June 2025

Subject
Approval on Teaching and Examination
Regulations 2025-2026

Our reference
ese/pc-econometrics

Page
1/1

Appendix
none

Department
ESE, PC Econometrics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

T +31 10 408 1377
E paap@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

Upon your request, the Programme Committee Econometrics discussed the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026.

The Programme Committee Econometrics approves of the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026 for the articles for which the Programme Committee has right of consent and advises positively on the articles on which the Programme Committee has right of advice.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Richard Paap
Chair Programme Committee Econometrics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
23 June 2025

Subject
Advice on Service Level Agreement 2025-2026

Our reference
ese/pc-econometrics

Page
1/1

Appendix
none

Department
Econometrics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E paap@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

Upon your request, the Programme Committee Econometrics reviewed the Service Level Agreement 2025-2026. The Programme Committee would like to thank you for your reaction to the feedback that the committee provided previously. The Programme Committee however would like to share some further feedback and suggestions with you:

1. The Programme Committee does not share the view that the Service Level Agreement could be used as abstract for the TER. The general opinion is that lecturers as well as students should read the TER to inform themselves. Any overlap would lead to more confusion. It is therefore advised to treat the TER and SLA as separate documents, serving their own goal.
2. The Programme Committee would still like to know why the rule regarding the 30% for interim assignments in the SLA, since it is not so much a service being offered as an examination rule.

The Programme Committee kindly requests to take the above-mentioned feedback into consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Richard Paap
Chair Programme Committee Econometrics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
1 July 2025

Subject
Approval on Proposal Savings on tutorial
education

Our reference
ESE/PC-econometrics

Page
1/1

Appendix
none

Department
Econometrics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E paap@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

In its letter dated 2 June, the Programme Committee provided feedback on the proposal outlining various cost-saving measures related to tutorial education. The Programme Committee appreciates that the feedback was taken into account and that a revised proposal has been submitted for consideration.

After reviewing the revised proposal, the Programme Committee gives their approval on initiating discussions and further exploring the measures 1 – 4 as presented in the proposal.

The Programme Committee, however, do not support the idea to make it compulsory for all PhD students to teach in BA1 and BA2 courses. We understand that teaching is perhaps not equally distributed among PhD students. However, at the moment all PhD students in econometrics have already reached the maximum number of teaching hours per year. Letting econometric PhD students teach tutorials of first and 2nd year courses means that we have to reduce their hours for seminar and theses supervision. If we combine this with the intention of the faculty to reduce staff, this means that we have less and probably not enough capacity to supervise theses and seminars. Spending less time on supervision, leads to a severe drop in quality of the econometrics programmes.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Richard Paap
Chair PC Econometrics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information