Advice
Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes

27 July 2022
Advisory Group Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes

1

Document information

History of changes

Date	Author(s)	Version	Change with respect to previous version
23.06.2022	Esther Poort (Onderzoekerij) & Gerda Korevaar (Education Policy)	1.0	Starting point of 5th meeting of the advisory group (22.06)
27.06.2022	Esther Poort & Gerda Korevaar	1.1	Introduction modified, Management Summary added, Chapter 4 general lines added
28.06.2022	Esther Poort & Gerda Korevaar	2.0	Comments by Bastiaan Rijpkema and Armin Cuyvers integrated + Ch4 general lines + Ch5 incentive.
30.06.2022	Esther Poort & Gerda Korevaar	2.1	Remarks by advisory group, Ton and Jan processed. Went through entire recommendation and set of measures with Bastiaan Rijpkema and made adjustments where needed
02.07.2022	Gerda Korevaar & Esther Poort	3.0	More or less final version, including elaboration of Ch4 – last check by Ton Liefaard and Jan Adriaanse
04/05.07.2022	Gerda Korevaar & Esther Poort	3.1	Final version for FB and advisory group. Final modifications integrated.
27.07.2022	Esther Poort & Gerda Korevaar	Final	

Distribution

Date	Version	Sent to
23.06.2022	1.0	Bastiaan Rijpkema and Armin Cuyvers
27.06.2022	1.1	Advisory group, Ton Liefaard, and Jan Adriaanse
28.06.2022	2.0	Jan Adriaanse and Ton Liefaard
30.06.2022	2.1	Bastiaan Rijpkema
02.07.2022	3.0	Jan Adriaanse and Ton Liefaard
04/05.07.2022	3.1	Faculty Board and advisory group
27.07.2022	Final	
August/September		Faculty units

Proposed routing

Date	Meeting
29.06.2022 + 02.07.2022	Draft version discussed by advisory group chairs
05.07.2022	Discussion of recommendation in FB + supplementary memo
06.07.2022	Discussion of recommendation in Education Board + supplementary memo
26.08.2022	Discussion in FB including response from the Board

| 30.08.2022 | Discussion with Directors of Research, including response from the Board |
| Mid-September | Discussion in Faculty Council, Programme Committee and Education Council (including response from the Board) |

Contents

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In early 2022, the Faculty held a mid-term review of its law degree programmes. Overall, the review committee was positive about the programmes' quality. The committee did however strongly recommend devoting more time and energy to challenges, particularly in the bachelor's programmes. Clear choices are needed to retain our leading position as a Faculty in the coming decades. The Faculty Board concurs with this sense of urgency and intends to follow the review committee's recommendations as part of its mid-term plan of action. As a first step, the Faculty Board has instituted an Advisory Group Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes, asking them to formulate a core vision for the bachelor's degree programmes within a short period of time. The intention is for this advisory group to be followed by an Implementation and Development (I&D) working group and a Long-Term Vision working group.

The advisory group worked tirelessly, and soon produced a core vision: *As a Faculty, we stand for education that stimulates our students to think, and teaches them to reflect, and to critically examine complex societal problems.* We do this by offering challenging and pioneering education. This vision has been elaborated into a coherent set of measures. With these measures, we hope to initiate a cultural shift to combat lack of commitment and promote active study behaviour. The proposed measures should result in a combination of challenging and activating education, and a testing policy that purposefully directs our students' study behaviour. In this context, we work with the principle of 'demanding help'. We set high standards (demanding), but we also support (help) our students to grow into capable adults who know how to take the lead in their personal life, their studies, and their professional behaviour.

One important measure is the introduction of compulsory matching, with the goal of helping students to make a more conscious choice for our degree programmes. In this context, we will use intensive methods such as matching days and online courses to make our enrolment procedure more selective. With this set of measures, we are also strongly investing in the selection function of the first year. We will do so by designing our first-year programme (*propedeuse*) in such a way that only students with the right motivation, attitude, and skills are allowed to proceed to the second year. In this context, we also want to raise the level of our entire bachelor's curriculum, aligning it more closely with the starting level of a master's degree programme. This requires improving the analytical and academic level of courses throughout the curriculum, with more focus on deepening and reflection, in addition to factual knowledge. This will help students to also understand on a more reflective level what is required for a strong and sound legal analysis. In our testing, too, we want to emphasise critical application, analysis, and reflection.

Our aim with these measures is to create a feasible, coherent, and high-quality curriculum. Feasibility will be achieved, among other things, by introducing a fixed structure, making courses with a high failure rate more manageable (ensuring that students are equipped to pass these courses), and strengthening guidance and supervision in the first year of the bachelor's programme, and information and labour market orientation in the following years. The quality aspect will be expressed in a number of measures aimed at raising the level of the curriculum. Our starting point in this context is that graduates should possess the knowledge, skills, and level of academic thinking required for a good start in a master's degree programme.

We fully endorse Leiden University's policy of promoting a diverse and inclusive learning and work environment for all students and staff. In the follow-up phase (see Chapter 4), we want to further integrate this important topic at strategic and tactical level.

By introducing these measures, we also want to bring our educational offerings more closely in line with the interests of students and the breadth of the labour market. We will therefore offer our students more room for electives, and broaden and improve our offerings in this context. This additional elective space will be created among other things by reviewing the current design of Civil Effect.

We plan to introduce minors of 30 EC in the fifth semester. In this context, we are aiming for a wide range of courses, including minors that cover our current specialisations and interdisciplinary minors. Interdisciplinary courses will also play an important role throughout the curriculum. Our starting point here is that we want our students to become passively literate in the theory and research and other methods of other disciplines and skills, thus sharpening and strengthening their understanding of their own discipline. Every course will devote some targeted attention to this passive interdisciplinary literacy.

We choose to offer a rich combination of offline and online education (blended learning). In this context, we will build on positive experiences with blended learning in our bachelor's courses, and will focus specifically on activating teaching forms. We have had some positive experiences at the Faculty with activating students using a participant system. Based on pilots, we will investigate how this system can be implemented more broadly in the bachelor's degree programmes. We will also consider other forms of activating education, such as the flipped classroom.

In line with Leiden University's ambition, we will also devote attention in our bachelor's degree programmes to labour market orientation. We believe it is important to broaden our students' attention beyond the legal professions, to include the broader (legal) professional field in which most of our graduates ultimately find employment. We will therefore offer a combination of curricular activities (which are important for all students) and extra-curricular activities (to give eligible students the opportunity to further develop their skills).

An important guiding principle throughout these measures is that we want to use testing not only to guide our students in acquiring content, but also to strategically guide their study behaviour. This guidance will be demanding and result-oriented. In this context, we will focus on combatting lack of commitment and help students to make purposeful use of resit opportunities.

We will introduce an active monitoring system with the goal of signalling and addressing study delays at an early stage. In the first year, students who fail to make sufficient progress or who display too little motivation will be strongly advised to disenroll before 1 February. In the second and third year, students who incur a study delay will be protected against themselves with a limit on the number of courses they can register for.

We are aware that these measures will demand a lot from us as an organisation. We indicate in the measures that we want to facilitate and support lecturers as much as possible in making the transition within their own discipline. This involves granting and allocating hours (R&D time) and providing individual support via LTC. We will strengthen LTC and position it more clearly. We will create an accessible and recognisable mobile team to actively facilitate lecturers and support them in adjusting their courses. Our starting point is that this mobile team should take over some of the lecturers' work. We are also aware that these measures require a lot of additional effort from our support staff and Board of Examiners. It is therefore essential, before implementing any measures, that we create enough capacity among our support staff and Board of Examiners to enable and guarantee the implementation of this core vision.

The Faculty will reserve financial resources to initiate these changes. Budget will be allocated for such purposes as helping lecturers and staff to proceed with the changes initiated. Our guiding principle in this context is that lecturers and other staff should be given enough hours and, where needed, support in their teaching and other tasks. Budget will also be allocated for implementing measures aimed at reducing the lecturers' workload. In addition, the parameters of the BOOM model will be reviewed to include better recognition of efforts towards education, and rewards for developing and renewing educational offerings.

We expect the implementation of these measures to take two to three years. This process will be monitored and steered by a task force, with an active role, administrative mandate, and legal power for the programme directors of the bachelor's and master's degree programmes. To begin with, four teams will be appointed by the Faculty Board to further elaborate on a number of topics (including final assignments, fifth semester minors, diversity and inclusion, and quality assurance), under the guidance of the task force, to allow us to move forward strongly in implementing this vision.

1.   INTRODUCTION

In early 2022, the Faculty held a mid-term review of the legal degree programmes. This mid-term review focused on development, and took the form of an online symposium on 19 January 2022. Prior to the symposium, the Faculty provided the review committee with information in a state-of-the-art paper.

Participants experienced the symposium as lively and inspiring. The review committee was impressed with the Faculty's open and proactive attitude and focus on improving the degree programmes, and with the important steps that had been taken shortly before that. The review committee was also positive about the quality of the degree programmes. In their report, the review committee primarily focused on potential improvements within the degree programmes, with a particular focus on bachelor's degree programmes. According to the committee, this was the aspect that had received most attention in the state-of-the-art paper; it was also where the greatest challenges were, and where there was still much to gain. In their report, the committee focused on the nine ambitions listed by the Faculty in their state-of-the-art paper. The committee's foremost advice was that the Faculty should make clear, well-supported choices in the relationship between these nine ambitions, and how they wished to prioritise them. The review committee concluded that there was not enough sense of urgency to drive the substantial investment of time and energy required, or enough willingness to make serious efforts to reform education.

The Faculty Board experienced the critical and constructive attitude of the review committee as useful and valuable, and is fully aware of the need to make important choices if we wish to retain our leading position in the coming decades. It feels supported in this awareness by the programme directors, the research directors, and the Executive Board. The Faculty Board aims to follow up on the key recommendations of the review committee with a mid-term plan of action. This plan of action involves developing a Faculty-wide educational vision for all degree programmes (in the short and long term), creating coherence, prioritising, and initiating further developments in the bachelor's degree programmes. Our guiding principle in this context is that the efforts required to realise these changes should be feasible for our staff.

To realise this plan of action, the Faculty Board appointed an Advisory Group Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes, with the intention of following this up with an Implementation and Development (I&D) working group and a Long-Term Vision (LTV) working group. Appendix 1 lists the members of the advisory group. The advisory group was asked to formulate a core vision for the bachelor's degree programmes within a short period of time (maximum 2.5 months). The Faculty Board's starting point in this context is that serious effort is required to improve the selective function of the propedeuse. A second starting point is the need to explore how to optimally use the space available within the current Civil Effect Covenant to provide teaching activities that are in line with the education we wish to offer as a Faculty in coming years.

In concrete terms, the advisory group was asked to:

a) Produce a recommendation articulating the coherence and prioritising of the objectives formulated by the degree programmes themselves, within the set goal of improving the selective function of the entire propedeuse period;
b) Produce a recommendation formulating didactic guiding principles concerning blended and other teaching and digital testing (which the Faculty Board already opted for previously), with the goal of activating students, enticing them back to campus, and stimulating them to perform well;

c) Create a sound cost-benefit analysis of the expected revenues and changes in the bachelor's degree programmes, including a business case;
d) Formulate a working plan for the I&D working group for the next two years, including a number of quick-win proposals that clearly, coherently, and convincingly articulate the cohesion and prioritising mentioned under (a). This plan should include proposals on how to deploy financial resources to reduce the workload.

The advisory group met five times over a period of 2.5 months to jointly formulate this recommendation. The project leaders also spoke to individual members of the advisory group. They conducted interviews with various employees from support units, and organised a joint meeting for all support units. At this meeting, the advisory group presented its plans, which were then tested them for feasibility from the perspective of the support units.

The advisory group has based and supported its recommendation as much as possible using empirical data, such as the re-enrolment revenue study and other studies conducted by the Faculty. In addition, De Onderzoekerij carried out interviews with various sister faculties. The findings from these various sources were integrated into fact sheets that were adjusted before every advisory group meeting and sent out to the group members.

The advisory group has formulated a set of measures, which are listed in Appendix 2. These measures consist of ten core objectives, with underlying measures. For each measure, we have indicated to what extent it contributes to the Faculty's ambitions as listed in the state-of-the-art paper.

In Chapter 2, we discuss the general strategic pillars underlying the measures. In Chapter 3, we focus on the ten core objectives that were formulated as part of the set of measures. We discuss our starting points and underlying assumptions. We also provide explanations concerning a few crucial and/or wide-ranging measures.

In Chapter 4, we discuss what is needed to implement these measures. We also indicate how we believe that we should proceed with some of these aspects, in terms of the process.

2.   STRATEGIC PILLARS

2.1   Introduction

In 2019, there was much commotion and public indignation when it became apparent that the Dutch government had failed in its task, leading to tens of thousands of parents being erroneously thrown into debt. These parents were labelled fraudsters by the authorities without any reasonable grounds. In the aftermath of this event, known as the Child Benefit Scandal, Dutch politicians, government officials, and judges issued a *mea culpa* statement. They admitted to having failed to follow up on critical signals and having insufficiently protected Dutch citizens. The scandal had a profound impact, at the centre of government (the Binnenhof) and beyond.

For a law faculty like ours, such events are a source of ultimate learning: not only as exciting cases for public law lectures, but also as an invitation to reflect on our mission as an educational institution. The people who are expected to act justly and critically in such situations are trained at faculties like ours. The administrators or judges who may prevent the next child benefits scandal are sitting today in our lecture halls. Are we doing enough to stimulate their critical, ethical perspective? Are we making them sufficiently aware of the social context in which the law unfolds?

The same question could be asked about artificial intelligence or fiscal ethics. We live in an environment where changes follow one another at an exponential rate. This asks a lot of us as individuals, and of our education. It means that our degree programmes are balancing on a tightrope: we want to focus on professional legal knowledge and core skills, but also to contribute more broadly to the central challenges of our times. This requires a smart balance between monodisciplinary focus and interdisciplinary agility. Does our education always strike the right note in this respect?

A robust basis for these complex issues is that fact that our degree programmes were assessed as high-quality in the most recent re-accreditation in 2017. The core of our teaching, it seems, is solid as a rock. And yet, as we move through 2022, we feel that greater forces are at work. The legal degree programmes have grown to gigantic proportions, making it increasingly hard to guarantee dedicated attention and interaction between student and lecturer. We have gained some insights into the reasons why bachelor's students from legal degree programmes tend to take too long to complete their programmes, but we have so far been unable to turn this tide. Attendance rate in lectures is seldom high, and we are clearly not always able to effectively appeal to our students' self-reliance.

Due among other things to the financial frameworks, small-scale teaching is an exception, and our workload is at an all-time high, in part due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

And yet, we also perceive brighter prospects. Aside from the well-known difficulties, the pandemic also brought us some interesting innovations in the field of didactics and digitisation. We are becoming more skilful at bringing society into our lecture halls. For our legal bachelor's degree programmes and master's degree programme in Law, the skills line remains an important priority.

We are luckily not alone: we have at our disposal the enormous cognitive and creative powers of hundreds of employees and thousands of students. We are part of a strong university and can learn from our sister faculties. We also seek counsel from our alumni and employers, as well as other critical friends in society. The more diverse the perspectives, the better our work. This was also our motto for the mid-term review of 19 January 2022, as we joined forces for an open and honest look at the future.

As mentioned above, the review committee reported that the quality of the content and organisation of our degree programmes was as solid as a rock. However, the review committee also reported a seeming lack of urgency concerning the need to devote enough time and energy and make serious efforts to reform our education. The review committee advised the Faculty to create a base of support for this sense of urgency, in view of the ambitions we listed in our state-of-the-art paper. The Advisory Group Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes has followed up on this by devoting 2.5 months to the intensive process of developing a coherent set of measures for the bachelor's degree programmes.

In this chapter, we describe the strategic pillars that form the basis of the proposed measures. In doing so, we refer to the core objectives and underlying measures (Chapter 3) that further elaborate on these strategic pillars.

2.2   Challenging and pioneering

As a Faculty, we stand for education that stimulates our students to think, and teaches them to reflect, and to critically examine complex societal issues. Our core values are: interdisciplinary, broad, connecting, active, environmentally aware, coherent, and result-driven.

The urgency of challenging and pioneering education
Our Faculty wishes to build on the solid and positive reputation of our degree programmes and lecturers. This strong basis provides the foundation for further developing our degree programmes so that we can continue to maintain our reputation in the long term. To become future-proof, we need to align with a) changes in society, b) changes on the labour market, and c) educational innovations and changes in the educational landscape.

To align with the changing questions and needs of society, we want to train our students to become versatile, critical, and learning professionals. This requires high-quality education that teaches students to work at an analytical level on legal knowledge and issues. We challenge our students to explore and reflect on the underlying questions in these matters. An important shift that we hope to make with these measures is to place more focus in our teaching on deepening and reflection, in addition to factual knowledge. We also find it important to raise our students' awareness of the social context in which legal practice unfolds. We live in a world where changes follow one another at an exponential rate: think, for instance, of the rapid pace of digitisation, or the emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI). We are also increasingly facing complex societal problems. Aside from the Child Benefit Scandal, one might mention sustainability issues, the nitrogen crisis, or the housing crisis. We want with these measures to prepare our students to contribute to the challenges of this complex society as outspoken and critical professionals. This blends in seamlessly with the core of Leiden University's educational vision: '*Train students to become academic professionals and engaged, responsible citizens, who are able, once they have graduated to make a contribution to resolving the challenges currently facing society – both within and outside academia.*'

Society's increasing complexity also translates to changes on the labour market. To be able to anticipate these changes, we want to adequately prepare our students for a career in which flexibility, resilience, agility, and adaptability are key. Our fast-changing society also makes it hard to predict the content of the work of the future. Today's students may end up working in sectors and professions that do not even exist yet. We want our students to remain employable on the labour market, even when this market changes. This means that we teach our students to be agile, and to work continuously on their personal and professional development. Our aim with these measures is also want to prepare our students for broader legal or other professions, and to be less narrowly focused on the toga professions.

With these measures, we want to integrate educational innovations, such as the use of ICT in education or the principles of the flipped classroom. The COVID-19 pandemic has greatly boosted the deployment of digital tools and online education. This has accelerated the creation of a basis for seizing the opportunities offered by online education. Students also see the advantages of online education. They appreciate how it allows them to process educational content without being bound to time and place. In line with Leiden University's strategy, we will shape our education according to the principles of blended learning. Our guiding principle in this context is to enrich campus teaching with digital teaching methods. We further describe how we plan to do this under the fourth core objective.

An important change in the educational landscape is the growing attention for diversity and inclusion. Our guiding principle in this context is: 'In Leiden you discover the world, and the world is diverse.'

In order to be able to create a diverse learning environment, we wholeheartedly embrace Leiden University's policy on promoting an inclusive and diverse learning and work environment for all students and employees. We see it as our social responsibility to increase the diversity of our student population. Equally in line with University policy, we aim to reflect the diversity of society among other things in terms of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, health, neurodiversity, age, and socio-economic background. To adequately prepare for a more diverse student population, we must take into account the challenges that this entails for education. A more diverse population requires inclusive teaching to allow everyone's talents to flourish.

Interdisciplinary and broad
We invest strongly in interdisciplinary education. Throughout the bachelor's phase, we challenge our students to look beyond the boundaries of their disciplines. This goes further than the boundaries between legal fields; we also teach students to involve perspectives from other disciplines. Our guiding principle in this context is that students should first have a good command of their own legal discipline. Our bachelor's degree programmes will therefore continue to focus on creating a strong core of legal knowledge. In addition, we want to structurally invite our students to become acquainted with theories and research and other methods from other disciplines. Think of economics, political science, sociology, psychology, or the humanities. This will teach our students new perspectives that they can integrate in legal issues. It is also necessary in order to understand what questions can be answered from legal expertise, and what questions require other disciplines. We want our students to become 'passively literate' in other disciplines. By this we mean that students understand the 'language' of neighbouring disciplines and are familiar with their basic concepts. We do not however expect our bachelor's students to have in-depth knowledge of the theories and accompanying methods of other disciplines. Under the third core objective, we discuss how we intend to shape our interdisciplinary teaching.

We often hear from students that they would like a broader career orientation, in which the toga professions are not given so much emphasis. This kind of broader orientation is also better aligned with the professions that our students end up exercising. With these measures, we want to bring our educational offerings closer in line with our students' interests and the breadth of the labour market.

This is why, with these measures, we also focus on broadening, improving, and expanding our current elective courses. Minors will play a crucial role in this context. In line with University-wide plans, we will develop minors of 30 EC that will be offered in the fifth semester

of the bachelor's degree programmes. We discuss in further detail the development of the minors and how we will be deploying them under the third core objective.

Active education based on the principle of 'demanding help'

Students tend to adjust their study behaviour to the requirements imposed by the degree programme. With these measures, we are striving for a culture in which active study behaviour is the norm. To make this possible, we use what we refer to as 'demanding help'. We set high standards (demanding), but we also support (help) students to grow into capable adults who can take the lead in their personal and professional life. We communicate our trust that our students will develop into intrinsically motivated professionals. In this context, we also offer students tools to help them study autonomously.

In our largest degree programmes, it is a real challenge to make the students feel seen and heard. Over the past years, students have repeatedly reported in student evaluations that they felt at times 'invisible' within the mass of the Faculty, with consequences for social bonding and educational performance. In the past few years, this social bonding was also greatly affected by the pandemic. This can partly explain the low attendance rate of educational activities now that teaching is once again being offered in person. It is therefore essential to create clear added value for students in attending a lecture or tutorial on location. In line with Leiden University's ambition, we intend to invest strongly in activating education, i.e. teaching methods that stimulate students to engage actively with the study materials.

We do expect something in return for this investment. One of the guiding principles of these measures is that in practice, it should be clear pretty quickly what the consequences are for students who do not commit to the degree programme. This means that students who do not immediately take active part in education will also suffer the consequences. In this way, we hope to combat lack of commitment with a steering assessment policy that guides students to make use of the first available resit opportunity. Under core objective 6, we explain in more detail how we plan to shape this assessment policy.

We aim with these measures to combine challenging, activating and guiding our students. We want to increase their motivation by offering challenging and inspiring education. An example of activation is that students can gain bonus points for actively taking part in tutorials. This is explained in further detail under core objective 4.

Freedom and responsibility

For our lecturers, we hope to create freedom in connection. We expect lecturers to commit to these measures, such that every course is integrated in the changes. However, it is not our intention that this should impinge on the space we want to give lecturers to express their own creativity and initiatives.

From a sense of connection with our Faculty community, we would like lecturers to feel that there is room for them to develop further, implement educational innovations, and activate and challenge students. Lecturers are, after all, the foundation of educational innovation. We will help our lecturers to further develop their knowledge and skills. We will also support them where needed in translating the measures to their own courses.

We are aware that these measures will require a lot from lecturers. Particularly in the beginning, lecturers will have to devote extra time to implementing the required changes. Here too, we will facilitate lecturers by granting them more hours. However, we are also convinced that these measures will lead to a substantial cultural shift within the student population, which will ultimately have a positive effect both on the lecturers' workload and on their pleasure in their work.

Coherent and environment-aware

We are working together from an environment-aware approach: we consider the perspective of the degree programme, the curriculum, and interdisciplinary aspects. This means among other things that our lecturers should be well aware of their courses' position within the curriculum. They should also be aware of how their courses contribute to the final learning objectives of the bachelor's degree programme as a whole.

Our curriculum has a clear structure with regard to skills. This too requires an environment-aware approach, and the skills theme plays a crucial role in this context. Because of the recent pandemic, skills have not always been given the attention they deserve. To remedy this, in the past year, we started to further develop our legal core skills theme.

We will launch our 'legal core skills new style' in the 2022/2023 academic year. In this context, we critically examined the list of skills and reduced it to six legal core skills that are easy to understand for lecturers and students. We are also developing skills assignments, making sure that courses build on one another in terms of assignments, harmonising assessment forms, and developing new teaching methods (for example quizzes and peer feedback). We are reviewing the 'Leiden Law Skills' website. This intensive process will be extended to include the legal core skills in Bachelor's years 2 and 3.

Result-driven

We aim for good study results, and graduation within a set time period. Quality is not only about achieving a specific level, but also about realising this level within a specific time frame. In this respect, we are demanding, but we also help students when they face obstacles and limitations. With this in mind, we work on creating an inclusive community. As a Faculty, we attach great value to offering the right facilities and support for students who need it, to give all students a fair chance to meet the criteria and requirements, for example of the BSA.

3. CORE OBJECTIVES

We have translated our core values and strategic pillars into ten core objectives. You will find an explanation of these core objectives below. Appendix 2 contains an overview of all concrete measures per core objective. We would like to note at this point that existing regulations and schemes (including assessment regulations) will have to be reviewed, and that they should not form an obstacle for the intended core objectives.

Core objective 1: The degree programmes enter into an implicit 'learning contract' with their students, such that students take responsibility for their personal and academic development.

Every educational system triggers specific study behaviour. A degree programme that demands too little from its students will lead to loss of attention, and students will end up doing too much outside their studies. If the standards are high, most students will also study harder. These measures aim to bring about a cultural shift to combat lack of commitment and stimulate active study behaviour. To make this possible, we apply the principle of 'demanding help'. Demanding help is an exchange: students receive help from the degree programme, especially in the first phase. In exchange, the degree programme expects a certain level of commitment and effort. This exchange is based on trust and collaboration between students and lecturers.

The primary guiding principle of these measures is a focus on the selective function of the propedeuse. In addition, we will also focus on limiting student inflow using matching. Recent research has shown that intensive matching methods are effective and make enrolment more selective.[1] For example, it appears that when degree programmes only use questionnaires, students are less likely to use matching to reflect on their choice of study, and are more likely to ignore a negative advice. With matching days and online courses, students turn out to be better able to assess whether a degree programme suits them. These more intensive methods have as a consequence that fewer students end up enrolling for the degree programme, and those who do make a more conscious choice.

Students should be familiar with the roadmap to success and be aware of what they need to do to successfully complete the degree programme. In this context, it is crucial that all actors within the degree programme convey the same message, based on a clear and uniform vision. This starts with communication aimed at prospective students (in information activities and the compulsory matching we will soon introduce). We will also continue to propagate and communicate the educational culture of the Faculty for the duration of the bachelor's degree programme.

To express the fact that lecturers and students may expect certain things from one another, we use the term 'learning contract'. This implicit 'learning contract' include a number of layers and aspects:

- *Commitment*. Students commit to a full-time degree programme and the desired active study behaviour. In exchange, the degree programme (Faculty Board and lecturers) commits to offering education that is activating and challenging in terms of content.
- *Help*. Students can expect help from the degree programme in finding their way in academic education, and timely help if they get stuck.

---

[1] 'VSNU data have shown that fewer students enrolled at Utrecht University and the University of Amsterdam in the year that these institutions introduced intensive matching. According to Soppe, this indicates that matching is effective; the more intensive methods allow students to better assess whether the degree programme is compatible with their qualities and expectations, such that more students seriously re-considered their choice of programme.' See Janneke Adema, 'Intensieve matching effectief; leidt tot minder inschrijvingen' (Intensive matching is effective; leads to fewer enrolments'), *ScienceGuide,* 24 June 2022, see https://www.scienceguide.nl/2022/06/intensieve-matching-effectief-leidt-tot-minder-inschrijvingen/ (PhD dissertation by Soppe under embargo until 2 July 2022, see https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/421033)

- *Social norms* for students and lecturers. Lecturers and students are respectful towards one another, and mutual acceptance and trust are important values. This also includes knowledge of and respect for academic freedom (see among others the 2021 KNAW report).[2] This includes a respectful attitude on the part of students when evaluating lecturers, and respectful behaviour among students in tutorials.
- Creating a sense of shared responsibility for the quality of the degree programme. Students are invited to actively contribute to the quality and development of the curriculum (co-creation). Tools offered in this context include interim course evaluations.

We want to create an educational culture in which these aspects are self-evident. Clear and unambiguous communication is a key tool in this context, but we will also implement a directive policy to combat lack of commitment (see core objective 6).

An overview of concrete measures associated with this core objective can be found in Appendix 2. The same applies to core objectives 2 through 10.

Core objective 2: *The degree programmes create a feasible, coherent, high-quality curriculum, with the first year acting as a selection phase, with attention to inclusivity. The final learning objectives are clearly expressed in the curriculum.*

This is a wide-ranging core objective that includes multiple principles and measures. Below we first provide an explanation of the various principles: selective, coherent, feasible, high-quality, and inclusive. We then elaborate further on a few specific elements.

Selective. This selection is based on a combination of attitude, motivation, and competencies. Here too, the principle of demanding help applies: students are given targeted support to help them meet the high expectations. It would not be realistic to expect all new students to possess the learning skills required to complete an academic degree programme. We therefore support students in acquiring these skills. To ensure a selective function, it is also important to make assessment challenging right from the start. It should not be possible to pass a course simply by looking through summaries and slides.

Coherent. The quality of the curriculum is largely determined by the way in which the learning objectives are translated to the curriculum (*constructive alignment*). If the learning activities are not in line with the intended learning objectives and planned testing, there is a risk that the learning objectives will not be realised.

Feasible. The curriculum's feasibility is achieved, among other things, by providing a fixed structure, making courses with a high failure rate more manageable (by adequately equipping students to pass them), and providing more intensive study guidance.

High-quality. A general principle in this context is that bachelor's graduates should possess the knowledge, skills, and level of thinking required to start a master's degree programme. Bachelor's degree programmes are currently too focused on knowledge reproduction. To raise the curriculum level, we will need to devote more attention to research skills, critical analysis, deepening, and reflection.

---

[2] 'Academische vrijheid in Nederland: een begripsanalyse en richtsnoer' ('Academic freedom in the Netherlands: a conceptual analysis and guide'), KNAW 2021, see
https://www.knaw.nl/publicaties/academische-vrijheid-nederland.

Inclusive. Diversity and inclusion are core values of Leiden University. In line with University policy, we want our Faculty to reflect societal diversity in such areas as ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, health, neurodiversity, religion, age, and socio-economic background. We also fully endorse the University's policy of promoting an inclusive learning and work environment for all students and employees. In the past year, the Faculty has employed a Diversity & Inclusion (D&I) coordinator who has taken a number steps in this respect. For example, we initiated more targeted recruitment among secondary-school pupils with the aim of increasing diversity among our students. The PoP corner for students and the Faculty's Implicit Bias training for lecturers are two examples of initiatives aimed at making the learning environment more inclusiveWe will further deepen this important theme at strategic and tactical level in the follow-up phase (see Chapter 4).

We discuss below a few specific measures in more detail:

- One important step involves updating the learning objectives to bring them in line with our intention of training future-proof students. In this context, it is important to explicitly articulate the critical, cognitive, interpersonal, and intra-personal and linguistic skills that students should possess after completing the bachelor's degree programme.
- The curriculum's feasibility is expressed among other things in a fixed curriculum structure, with students following three equal-weight courses of 5 EC per block. The experience of some sister faculties shows that a fixed structure helps students to find an optimal study rhythm, which in turn positively affects study performance.
- There should be no courses with a high failure rate after the propedeuse. The assumption in this context is that we aim for a high level from the start. Students who cannot handle this level will not pass the BSA. In other words: those students who are allowed to proceed to the second year will be sufficiently equipped for the high level of the courses that currently have a high failure rate. We will monitor whether this assumption is true in practice, and in particular whether the low success percentage for courses with a high failure rate at the moment may be due to other reasons than their high academic level.
- The programme's rhythm should be clearly apparent. One of the measures involves replacing the bachelor's thesis with a final Moot Court assignment. In this way, the course content and legal core skills theme will build towards a real final assignment. *Then and only then* will students be ready to apply their legal knowledge to a 'real' case 'from beginning to end' (from written plea to defending a case), allowing us to test the content, but also all six skills in the legal core skills theme (not only research design and writing skills, but also for example speaking skills). This will create a better (and clearer) rhythm than a relatively substantial writing assignment for Moot Court in Bachelor year 2 (the written plea), and then another writing assignment in the final bachelor's thesis in Bachelor year 3, but without speaking skills this time. This requires a re-evaluation of the learning objectives of the Moot Court to adequately reflect the final learning objectives of the bachelor's degree programmes. It also requires a broadening and/or reinforcement of the assignments, to raise the analytic level of the cases.
- The curricular strands should be consistent in structure. This should be clearly communicated to the students and all courses that build on one another should have entry requirements that are enforced. Experience shows that students believe they are studying strategically, for example by following courses from different years. They are insufficiently aware of the fact that there is a real difference between courses in terms of level, and that you cannot simply follow a Bachelor 3 course in your first or second year of studies. We will therefore clearly explain to students at the start of the degree programme what the structure of the programme is, and what is meant by level 100, 200, 300, and 400.

Core objective 3: The degree programmes actively contribute to students growing into versatile, learning and critical professionals.

To train our students to become future-proof, we devote a lot of attention to their development into versatile, learning, and critical professionals. In this context, we focus strongly on interdisciplinary education. In the coming academic year, we will launch two new interdisciplinary minors: 'Tax and Society' and 'Artificial Intelligence and Society'.

With this core objective, we invest in broadening, improving, and extending our current elective offerings. We also want to give students more space to follow their own interests. In doing so, we broaden, improve, and expand our current elective offerings. Minors play a crucial role in this context.

In line with Leiden University's plans, we will develop 30 EC minors for the fifth semester of our bachelor's degree programmes. We will look at the space available within our current version of Civil Effect to see whether we can find some room to reduce the number of EC for these courses. A number of other legal faculties are already making use of this space. For example, Utrecht University, the University of Amsterdam, and VU Amsterdam currently offer 30 EC of electives within their Bachelor's degree programme in Law. In addition, the disappearance of the bachelor's thesis makes room to use the newly available EC for minors.

Minors will be deployed for various strategic goals. First of all, we propose that minors include the current specialisations. In addition, some minors will have an interdisciplinary angle. For example, we want to develop a research minor for students who wish to focus on the empirical study of legal questions. This minor will consist of interdisciplinary courses, including courses in empirical research methods. It will offer students a good opportunity to prepare for a research-intensive master's programme, or for the pre-PhD programme of the Faculty of Law. This is in line with our ambition to train our students more broadly than for toga professions alone. We will also develop interdisciplinary minors for a broader orientation. These minors will focus on societal developments that affect the entire legal field (for example our current new minor on sustainability and the law).

Interdisciplinary education will not only be articulated in minors, but it will play an important role throughout the curriculum. To this end, we will invite students throughout the degree programme to work on assignments related to societal issues, and continuously stimulate them to look beyond the boundaries of the legal field. We will also include a few moments in every course to explicitly introduce students to the perspectives of other disciplines. In this context, we will draw inspiration from the courses our faculty is offering in the context of the Leiden University College (LUC).

Within the Legal Methodologies course, we will devote attention to research questions and methods from other disciplines. Here too, we aim to make our students 'passively literate' in empirical research methods. This attention to empirical legal methods is also in line with the faculty's ambition of allowing the Empirical Legal Studies (ELS) Sector Plan to 'land' in education, but also with other valuable initiatives within the faculty, such as the Leiden Law Methods Portal.

We will organise design sessions with bachelor's course lecturers to decide together what is needed in the various courses in terms of interdisciplinary education, and to create a coherent learning pathway.

Core objective 4: The programme structure, assessment, and lecturers' approach stimulate students to actively take part in education.

Ideally, we want students to be intrinsically motivated to actively engage in their studies from the start. However, research has shown that students need external stimuli. Our guiding principle is therefore that the students' motivation in the first two years should be strengthened using activating teaching methods. As the third year progresses, we can increasingly rely on the students' intrinsic motivation.

In accordance with Leiden University's ambition, we will strongly focus on activating teaching methods. To this end, we want to offer a rich combination of offline and online education (blended learning). In this context, we will build on positive experiences with blended teaching methods within our bachelor's courses (Introduction to Administrative Law, Legal Methods). Our starting point is that students should be actively put to work in the tutorials, for example using the principles of the flipped classroom. The flipped classroom model produced excellent results for example in the EU Institutional Law & General Principles of EU Law course (Master's specialisation in European Law). The method is currently being developed further (2022-2024). Within our Faculty, we have also had positive experiences with activating students using a participant system. We are currently running a number of pilots to explore how this system can be deployed more broadly in the bachelor's degree programmes.

We will consider for each course how to optimally deploy the principles of blended learning, the flipped classroom, and the participant system (or other activating teaching methods). We will develop an options menu at Faculty level on how to use activating teaching methods. The course coordinators will decide which option is best suited for each specific course.

Students will be awarded bonus points for taking active part in courses. We will also develop an options menu at faculty level for ways of implementing this bonus system. Course coordinators will be able to select an option from the options menu to apply to their course.

Core objective 5: The degree programmes will facilitate students in exploring the labour market, largely through extra-curricular activities.

In line with Leiden University's ambition, we will devote attention to helping students explore the labour market, as has long been their expressed wish. The review committee also advised us to already devote attention in the bachelor's degree programme to what our students will be doing in their first job. This can help students to make choices that suit them. Students also become more active when they feel that an activity is relevant for their future profession. For example, research has shown that the degree to which students recognise the relevance of a course is positively related to their motivation. It is important to include in this process not only the toga professions, but also the broader legal field in which the majority of our graduates find work.

These measures involve a combination of curricular activities (important for all students) and extracurricular activities (to give eligible students an opportunity to develop further). In this context, we will proceed with and further intensify current initiatives such as Learning my way and Career Services activities.

Core objective 6: The degree programmes apply a uniform assessment policy to stimulate students to engage in active studying behaviour.

Our guiding principle is that we want to use testing both for content and to strategically guide our students' study behaviour.

An important shift that we hope to realise with these measures is to have courses that focus more on deepening and reflection, in addition to factual knowledge. This also has consequences for the way in which we test (content-related steering). One of the measures involves introducing more variation in testing methods, to better align our testing with our learning objectives and teaching methods. We will focus more on testing students' analytical and reflective skills. Where test questions appeal to a higher level, students will have to take this into account when preparing for the tests.

Testing also steers strategic study behaviour: the moment when students start to prepare for a test is determined by the test date and the consequences of passing or failing. We want this strategic steering to be demanding and result-driven. We know that in addition to activating stimuli, we also need steering stimuli to incite students to display active study behaviour. We aim to combat lack of commitment, and we want our students to make targeted use of resit opportunities. We are aware that this approach has the potential disadvantage of making the system more school-like, and that students will (at least initially) feel less engaged in their sense of responsibility.

Core objective 7: The Faculty will create an active monitoring system with the goal of signalling and addressing study delays at an early stage.

A good monitoring and supervision system is important to help students who run into difficulties at an early stage of their studies by offering them additional support (remediation). In addition, many students will already know before 1 February whether they are likely to make it through the BSA and/or whether they are a good match for the degree programme. These students will also be supported in making a choice, for example by helping them explore options beyond their current degree programme.

In the second year, it makes sense to actively monitor study delays. This can particularly help to avoid students having to resit too many courses at once. One of the findings from the re-enrolment study is that the tendency of students to overestimate their abilities can lead them to accumulating courses unnecessarily. These students can be protected from themselves by imposing a maximum number of courses that one can register for (this maximum will only apply to students with a study delay).

Core objective 8: Lecturers and students contribute to the quality of the degree programme on the basis of shared ownership and trust. Teaching activities and courses are further developed using formative evaluation (focus groups and panel discussions).

Our starting point is that students are actively involved in further developing our educational programmes. This also means that we need to redesign our course evaluations. We want to evaluate courses straight after the last class (on paper/QR code) and to evaluate testing separately at specific moments. We plan to invest strongly in interim course evaluations, focus groups, and panel discussions.

Core objective 9: Lecturers adopt an environment-aware approach and endorse our ambitions of offering pioneering and challenging education. They are facilitated and challenged in shaping these ambitions within their own course and degree programme.

We are aware that these measures will require a lot from lecturers. Where possible, we will facilitate and support lecturers in making the transition within their own courses, while leaving enough room for them to make their own choices in how to do so. Lecturers will also be given space to professionalise and develop further in their role as lecturer within the Faculty. We will re-assess teaching hours so that lecturers have more educational innovation hours to renew their teaching. Lecturers can be allocated R&D hours both for personal development and to develop courses. This will be included as an evaluation item in the annual P&D interview.

In addition, lecturers will be supported in various ways. The LTC will play an important role in this context, which is why we plan to strengthen it and position it more clearly. We will establish an accessible and recognisable mobile and multidisciplinary team to actively facilitate and support lecturers in modifying their courses. We will provide concrete in-person support for course design, didactics, testing, and technology (in addition to manuals). Our guiding principle is that the mobile team should lighten the lecturers' workload. The LTC will also actively support lecturers in making their course study materials more inclusive.

Another measure is that course lecturers will receive support in teaching general skills.

We will also explore creative ways of teaching tutorials. This may involve deploying student assistants to teach a number of parallel tutorials, under a lecturer's guidance. This would require more attention for the support and training of student assistants. Another option would be to use peer feedback for the formative assignments that students must complete in preparation for a tutorial.

We are aware that despite these various forms of support, workload remains a serious challenge and that many of our lecturers are already stretched to the limit. In this context, it is crucial to assess how we can optimise collaboration between lecturers and support staff and help them join forces to take a step towards further professionalisation.

Core objective 10: The Faculty will develop a financial policy in which efforts to improve education are recognised and educational innovation is rewarded.

Based on a business case, we have formulated a financial cost-benefit analysis of expected yields and expenses in the bachelor's degree programmes, should these measures be implemented. This business case concerns the development of a financial model that illustrates how a more selective function of the propedeuse phase would affect yields for the Faculty. We have also taken a first step towards calculating the costs of the proposed measures by implementing various BOOM simulations. Our preliminary conclusion is that a strong selection in the first year does not lead to a loss of profit, and that it may even have a positive effect. The selection in the first year also has positive consequences for the funding of our education. See in this context Appendix 4.

The Faculty will reserve financial resources to initiate the required changes. This involves a combination of the following:

- Allocation of budget for lecturers and staff to proceed with the changes initiated. Our guiding principle in this context is that lecturers and staff members should be allocated hours, and where necessary offered support for their other teaching and further tasks. The deployment of all Programme Directors and the Board of Examiners will be financially compensated. Budget will also be allocated for project management.
- Allocation of budget to implement measures focused on decreasing the lecturers' workload. This involves measures such as strengthening LTC, extending and strengthening the group of student assistants, and creating a pool of lecturers responsible for teaching general skills. We will also look more broadly at options for reducing the workload for lecturers, such as creating an examination office responsible for examination logistics.
- Reviewing the parameters of the BOOM model to offer more recognition and rewards for educational efforts and developing and renewing education.

4. ACHIEVING EFFECTIVE CHANGE

With these measures, we hope to achieve effective change in our bachelor's degree programmes. In line with Kotter (2012),[3] we distinguish three phases in this process of change:
1. Create the right environment for change
2. Involve the entire Faculty (lecturers, staff, and students) in the process and equip them for it
3. Implement and consolidate the change

Subject to sufficient administrative support for this set of measures, we will indicate per phase (in bullet form) how the Faculty plans to implement each measure.

Phase 1   Create the right environment for change

- Sense of urgency

Our Faculty wants to build on the solid positive reputation of our degree programmes and lecturers. This strong basis provides an excellent starting point for further developing our degree programmes so that we can continue to maintain our reputation in the long term. To be future-proof, we need to align with a) changes in society, b) changes on the labour market, and c) educational innovations and changes in the educational landscape. In this context, we have developed a set of challenging and pioneering measures for our bachelor's degree programmes. Our core values in this context are interdisciplinary, broad, connecting, active, coherent, environment-aware, and result-driven (see Chapter 2).

- Leading coalition

The Advisory Group Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes has formulated a targeted proposal on how to proceed with our bachelor's degree programmes. We expect the implementation process implicit in this set of measures to take two to three years. We propose to give some members of the advisory group, including the programme directors of the bachelor's and master's degree programmes in law a prominent role in the bachelor's task force. This task force will have an administrative mandate and legal power to implement phases 2 and 3 of this change process.

- A clear and realistic vision

The strategic pillars, ten core objectives, and accompanying measures combine to create a clear and realistic vision.

Phase 2   Linking the change to the Faculty

- Support for the vision

In the coming months (August-September) the Faculty Board will present this core vision and discuss it in the various Faculty bodies. The management of the Cleveringa Institute will do the same for the educational support staff.

---

[3] Kotter, J.P. (2012), Leading Change. Ingram Publisher Services.

The Marketing & Communication department will provide information and visuals to support the core points of this recommendation. To this end, they have already developed a Core Vision Bachelor's Programmes web page.

- Clear obstacles

With the administrative mandate and legal power granted to the task force for bachelor's degree programmes, we expect to be able to adequately and swiftly clear any obstacles arising in the implementation process. To support the task force, at the start of the implementation process, the Faculty Board will institute four teams that will work in the first six months of the implementation process on the basis of a specific assignment and under the task force's responsibility. These four teams will focus on (1) the final Moot Court assignment, (2) a strategy for improving Diversity & Inclusion (D&I), (3) the fifth semester and especially the minors, and (4) the quality assurance system.

The task force will be responsible for implementing all the core objectives and measures. Where necessary, they will form new teams in the interim, if this can help accelerate the change process and/or prevent delays.

For core objectives 9 and 10, measures have been formulated for lightening the workload of lecturers and other staff, to help them experience more pleasure in their work.

- Realise short-term successes for a credible vision

We refer in this context to the measures listed under core objectives 9 and 10, such as strengthening LTC and establishing an examination office.

Phase 3   Implement and consolidate change

- Consolidate improvements

It is essential that we monitor and move forward with the changes. Led by the task force, we will explore what works and what does not. Based on the results of the pilots, we will fine-tune our approach here and there, roll it out further, and evaluate it to see whether we have achieved our intended results.

- Guarantee change

We will monitor the change process on a regular basis with focus groups.

APPENDICES

1. Composition of the Advisory Group
2. Measures
3. Schematic overview of measures
4. Business case

Appendix 1
Composition of the Advisory Group

Chair: Professor Jan Adriaanse (Academic Director of Tax Law and Economics)
Vice-chair: Professor Ton Liefaard (Vice-Dean of Education)

Members of the Advisory Group:
Professor Bastiaan Rijpkema (Programme Director BA Law)
Professor Armin Cuyvers (Programme Director MA Law)
Professor Jan van de Streek (Tax Law)
Dr Sigrid van Wingerden MSc (Programme Director Criminology)
Professor Jean-Pierre van der Rest (Head of Leiden Law Academy)
Dr Danielle Chevalier (Coordinator for Law & Society)
Dr Pauline Memelink (Coordinator for Tutoring, Language Test)
Julie Külsen (Assessor)
Professor Bart Custers (Head of e-Law)
Dr Annemarie Drahmann (Public Law – Constitutional & Administrative Law)
Dr Stijn Voskamp (Private Law – Civil Law, Chair of Programme Committee)

Adviser: Ghislaine Voogd, MSc, educational adviser (ICLON)

Project supervision:
Dr Gerda Korevaar (Senior Adviser Strategy & Education Policy)
Esther Poort, MSc (De Onderzoekerij)
Project support:
Nard Willemse, MA (Policy Officer Strategy & Education Policy)