

Student Unions comments on propositions

Comments on points of Native Language (chapter 4.1.1)

Good results in said subject and good native language skills have a direct link towards good results in university studies - especially regarding thesis work. Hence the decision to raise its impact is reasonable and efficient.

We do however see a difficult question surrounding the students that have finnish/ swedish as a second language. To make higher education accessible to everyone it is reasonable that the points system of these students align with ones that do finnish/swedish as a native language. We are however giving much more importance to these results based on its link to succession in university studies. The syllabus in finnish/swedish as a second language is much smaller compared to native finnish/swedish so this assumption does not reach out to it. This also creates a temptation to stay in the second language group and get higher results (and points) in there even though the student would be able to jump to the native language group and gain better skills towards university studies there. A direct and justified solution to this matter is hard to find.

Comments on points of Mathematics (chapter 4.1.2)

We see this as a good solution to a long conversation. In fields that emphasize natural sciences and mathematics the impact of the results in mathematics is undeniable and it is reasonable to strengthen the value of it. In other fields the impact of mathematics is not that comparable and so it is reasonable to raise questions on whether or not it should be given the value that it has had before. Based on that we think that a deduction to its value on other fields is a good call.

Comments on points of Academic subjects outside of mathematics and languages (chapter 4.1.3)

Social studies are central to many different fields of study. In the points proposition on academic subjects all other have been given a "field specific knowledge" status and points of at least 24,5 but not social studies. This can have a big impact on the attractiveness of the subject. One solution could be to move social sciences to table F and approach social studies in a similar way as history is.

Comments on the points of foreign languages and the second native language (chapter 4.1.4)

The decision to value languages more is reasonable. English has a growing status as a scientific language and whether or not you think its good, has its skills a growing role in

succession in university studies.

Comments on specific tables(chapter 4.3.)

In table K the change in physics value can be reasoned based on the emphasises in the studies. At this time physics are still given a high value inside the medical entrance exam and this means that there is a clear divide between the points based selection and entrance exams. We also see that the value of long syllabus mathematics should be looked at and moved to the same level with biology and chemistry.

In table F the field specific subject points-system should be changed. Rather than giving the higher value to one of the three subjects that has the best grade the higher value should be locked to the most relevant option. For example you should only get the higher amount of points from history when applying to history.

In table J the higher value on psychology is not reasoned enough. We would move its points back down to other non- natural science or math heavy subjects.

Comments on the approach of the points-system and the basis on the points (chapters 2.1. ja 4.2.)

No comments. We see this proposition as reasonable.

Comments on tresholds (chapter 3.2 and appendix 1)

In table H a treshold to computer science is a Magna from short syllabus math and Cum Laude from long syllabus maths. We see the short syllabus one as an unreasonably high threshold and it should be lowered. This would also probably lead to lowering the threshold on long syllabus math as well so they are not similar.

Comments on even point criterias (chapter 3.3.)

We suggested that the points of long syllabus math should be lowered to a similar level with chemistry on table K. If this goes through it would also be logical to move the impact of long syllabus maths in this criteria to places three of four.

Comments on points of international baccalaureate (chapter 3.5. and appendix 1)

No comments. We see this proposition as reasonable.

Other comments

We praise the goal to make the tables more clear and coherent. We do however see that this approach has been too ambitious in some parts and fields have been combined in a way that might not suit them fully. This can at worst lead to universities and fields becoming too similar with each other. One example of this is table A where logopedics and economics would be better off with the chance to make field-specific prioritizations.