

With interest, I have seen the filing of the motion on the Internet. Thank you very much for your contribution.

I would like to share a single point of attention with you. It is true that the Minister has promised legislation (and similar regulations) and an Internet consultation in advance, but I fear there are two things in it.

It is true that I don't know exactly what to expect from an internet consultation, but I suspect that the individual teacher at the Gwendoline van Puttenschool - after all, the one most involved in this process - plays no role in this, or that the concept of legislation or regulations only comes to light when an advice or finding on his or her part is actually no longer relevant (because a time period will have passed).

The second point that I fear is that from a proverbial ivory tower (after all, who in The Hague has knowledge of CXC education...?) legislation is being conceived that on the one hand does not fit in well with current practice and on the other hand will hit students unnecessarily hard.

Admittedly it sounds good to be "busy with legislation or regulations", but that is of course very late: five years after the decision to introduce the CXC on St. Eustatius.

I would like to express the wish to monitor these aspects well in the months ahead. Many thanks in advance for that.

Kind regards,

J.H.T. (Jan) Meijer MSc MBA.

Note 1: May I ask you to bring this e-mail to the attention of those who are "guarding" the follow-up process?

Note 2: The Minister is of course right when Saba must also be understood under these laws and regulations. At the same time I note that Saba has been working with the CXC for many years, their school guide contains "own" rules about equating a CXC-result with a NL-havo diploma, while all this time - apparently - the legal framework for this is lacking. Seen through those glasses, the legislative process by the responsible ministry has in fact been even more lax than seems to be the case now.