



Minutes of the Overleg Vergadering (5) of the FSR FMG

Faculty Student Council of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural sciences

Date: 15th of May 2020

Location: Online via Zoom

Present executive board FMG: Agneta Fischer, Sterre Minkes

Present OWI's & policy advisor Richard van der Wurff, Annette Freyberg-Inan and Jurian Glas

Present FSR FMG '19-'20: Alexandra Rosca, Siddharth Jethwani, Ana Mar Kreutzenbeck Pérez, Artem Gryshchenko, Birgit Peters, Minou De Rosa Silvera, Teun Prins, Marc Olsen, Viktoriia Akhankova, Nadya Manuputty, Tom Flipse

Absent FSR FMG '19-'20:

Technical chair: Arend Habbema

Minutes: Lieve Bastiaan

1. Opening and setting the agenda

Arend opens the meeting at 14:03. The agenda is set without changes. Later in the meeting, HST is added as the second topic.

2. Setting the draft minutes of the OV (4) on April 9th

The FSR FMG has accepted all of the dean's changes to the minutes of the fourth OV of '19 - '20. The minutes of the OV of the 9th of April 2020 have been set.

3. Announcements

Dean

The FSR gave conditional consent to the new bachelor HST. The dean would like to talk about the conditional consent, some of the issues brought up by the FSR cannot be solved before the programme starts. The conditions were related to the way the programme is going to be organized, not the content and nature of the programme. The dean wonders whether the council can give a non-conditional consent. The four issues that were raised can, of course, be discussed again. The dean will email the FSR with updates about new developments.

FSR

The FSR will discuss this during their meeting on Friday so they can provide a proper response.

4. Subject 1: Teaching and Examination Regulations

MSc. International Development Studies article B3.3:

FSR

In the FSR's initial advice they asked to completely remove the selection procedure based on Global South background. The FSR believes that using the cultural background as a selection criterion can be seen as rather patronizing. Students should not be used to improve diversity.

The FSR is concerned with the content, not with how often it is implied. The FSR wonders if there is a network in place to help these students thrive in the programme, in terms of cultural and emotional support.

The FSR accepts the proposal of involving the programme committee (PC) in the decision. The FSR will send a document with their reasoning to the PC and ask them to put it on the agenda for the next meeting. The FSR will accept the decision made by the PC on the article.

OWI

Annette states that originally the reason for this factor as a possible criterion of selection is that they wanted to be transparent about how the admission committee chooses students when more students apply and qualify than there are places for. It almost never happens. It only comes into play if students are otherwise similarly qualified. It is important to note that it is not about race but about the experience of living in the global south. They want to avoid having a programme where only people from the global north talk about the global south.

The programme feels that it should keep that wording in place. What can be done is to task the programme committee to discuss this again. If they would also think that this should be taken out the programme will do so.

Annette does not see any reason why the students in the programme would have a hard time integrating and would not be comfortable. Richard adds that a lot has been done in the master programme to ensure that there is a good community of students.

Dean

The dean emphasizes the urgency behind this decision; it cannot take weeks before this is resolved.

BSc. Political Science article B5.6 / BSc. Psychology article B9.3 (among other OERs):

FSR

This article concerns the determining and announcement of results at the social sciences. What remains unclear is what the follow-up action should be when the allotted time to announce results is not adhered to. It is already going to be part of the psychology OER.

The FSR's reformulated advice, as per the negotiations, is to add the following, *"In exceptional cases, when the results of the examinations are not announced in the stipulated times mentioned in Article B5.6, the program director determines the course of action that is to be taken. In case of the results of a partial exam, the director makes sure the results of the exam are announced as soon as possible and that students are updated by the course coordinator through Canvas about when that will be. The director is responsible for making sure late announcements of results only happens in cases of force majeure (Dutch: overmacht). In case the results of a course are not announced at least 10 working days before the resit, the course coordinator consults with two people: 1) the chair of the Program Committee, or the*

College director and 2) the student chair of the Program Committee, or the Board of Studies student (Dutch: Ombudsstudent) about the best possible solution. Students may file an appeal with the examination committee if, despite all measures taken, the grades are communicated late, and the decision made is deemed unsuitable. The exam committee ultimately decides on the suitability of the decision made.”

The FSR has several reasons for the addition. They understand the argument that the deadlines are rarely breached. This issue has been brought up a number of 4 to the FSR in the past three years. They believe that it happens often but goes unreported. This year, such an incident took place at Political Science. The FSR was told that the solution to this issue may be to hire more staff; however, in the FSR’s opinion hiring more staff will not ensure that the deadline will be met, personal issues, crisis etc. could still cause results to be announced late.

Although they trust the programme director to make the right decision, having input from the student representatives is useful. Additionally, teachers will most likely know a few days ahead that a deadline is not met, thus the process could start earlier.

The council agrees, as long as the programme committee looks at the matter afterwards. Additionally, the FSR believes that students should be able to file an appeal with the examination committee when a breach of the deadline occurs, and the measures taken to resolve it are deemed unsuitable.

OWI

Richard van der Wurff responds that good thought has been brought to the issue. He agrees that it is problematic when grades are announced late.

He agrees to most of the proposal. He is hesitant about the idea that there is a discussion with the course coordinator, the chair of the Programme Committee, or the College director and the student chair of the Programme Committee on what needs to be done if the results are not announced on time, it complicates and lengthens the process too much. It would be the best way to go ahead to have the programme director discuss with staff on why this happened and how it will be solved and to evaluate how this can be prevented in the future.

Richard adds that a good alternative may be that the course coordinator should ask for advice or even agreement from the examinations board about how to proceed in a specific situation, as long as it is taken up with the programme committee afterwards.

Richard agrees to leave in the part about the students' right to appeal.

Richard thanks the FSR for the collaboration, he is satisfied with the solution as written below.

OER Political Science

Article B.5.6 Determining and announcing results College Social Sciences

1. At the CSS the maximum time period for determining results is 15 working days.
2. In exceptional cases, the programme director can permit deviation from this time period until 20 working days. When this occurs, the students will be informed.
3. In specific cases – e.g. with respect to units of study required for the BSA – the programme director may decide that the final result must be determined within ten working days.
4. The result for an interim examination must be announced at least 5 working days before the next interim examination.

5. In the event of a resit, the result must be announced at least 10 working days before the possible resit.
6. The course manual states the manner in which and when students can inspect their graded work.
7. A group session for inspection also contains the possibility for individual discussion. In case of a scheduled group session, individual inspection can only be arranged under special circumstances.
8. In exceptional cases, when the result is not announced within the periods mentioned in Article B.5.6.4 or B.5.6.5, the programme director determines the steps to be taken.
9. In the event that B.5.6.4 is at issue, the programme director ensures that the results are announced as soon as possible and that the students are informed by the course coordinator via the digital learning environment when this will happen. The programme director is responsible for ensuring that late publication of the results only takes place in the event of force majeure. In the event that Article B.5.6.5 is at issue, the course coordinator consults with the program director and the Examinations Board about the best possible solution. The student may lodge an appeal with the Examinations Board if the student does not agree with the chosen solution, despite all measures taken. The Examinations Board ultimately decides on the suitability of the decision taken

OER Psychology

Article B.9.3. Determining and announcing results

1. The examiner determines the result (= mark) of a written exam or test as soon as possible, but in any case within ten working days. The examiner submits the necessary information to the Programme Administration so that the mark can be registered. This maximum also applies to partial exams. Deze nakijktermijn geldt ook voor deoltoetsen. (Exception: summer resits, then the maximum is twenty working days. The programme director can decide differently in exceptional circumstances.) Results must be announced at least 10 working days before the next partial exam or resit.
2. In exceptional cases, when the result of the examinations are not announced in the stipulated times mentioned in Article 9.3 paragraph 1, the program director determines the course of action that is to be taken. In case of the results of a partial exam, the director makes sure the results of the exam are announced as soon as possible and that students are updated by the course coordinator through Canvas about when that will be. The director is responsible for making sure late announcements of results only happens in cases of force majeure (Dutch: overmacht).
In case the results of a course are not announced at least 10 working days before the resit, the course coordinator consults with two people: 1) the chair of the Program Committee, or the College director and 2) the student chair of the Program Committee, or the Psychology Board of Studies student (Dutch: Ombudsstudent) about the best possible solution. Students may file an appeal with the examination board if, despite all measures taken, the grades are communicated late and the decision made is deemed unsuitable. The examination board ultimately decides on the suitability of the decision made.
3. A student may submit a request for reassessment to the examiner. Subsequently, within six weeks of the announcement of the result, the student may lodge an appeal with the

Examinations Board. In addition, the student may lodge an appeal against the way in which the result was reached with the Examination Appeals Board (COBEX) within six weeks of the announcement of the result. A request for reassessment does not affect the time period for lodging an appeal.

Dean

The dean adds that the point is that there are different concerns that different students have. You can never decide the date of an exam based on consultation with the students, as they will have conflicting interests.

Introduction of Article B7.3.3 (Bachelors) and Article B6.2.3 (Masters) in Social Sciences: the inclusion of the additional paragraph on social safety.

FSR

The FSR agrees with the inclusion of this article in the OER and is happy about the collaboration. The FSR hopes that during the next year the new FSR finds it useful to include this article in the other domains as well.

Jurian Glas and Annette Freyberg-Inan exit the meeting.

5. Subject 2: HST

Dean

In the FSR's previous consent four points were brought up, composition of teaching staff, curriculum structure, future prospects of HST bachelors students and housing. These questions were answered, the dean wonders whether the FSR has comments on their answers. The dean hopes that by providing new information the FSR will alter their consent to be non-conditional. The dean understands that the FSR was not prepared to have this discussion.

The housing of the programme is something that is very difficult to predict right now. The university will ensure that there is room for good interactions between students and staff members. But because the programme will most likely start in more than a year, it is difficult to decide what housing the programme will have. They are currently looking into building JK which will be renovated, this is the location the faculty has in mind for HST. The dean asks the FSR to drop the housing condition.

FSR

The stance of the FSR was that there were three points and unless the FSR sees the three points implemented the wording conditional cannot be removed from the consent.

The FSR has not answered as they were waiting for more details about the progress. Concerning the corona situation right now, giving updates will aid the council in revising their original advice. The council would like to receive the information tomorrow. They cannot fully reply to the issue brought up as they are not prepared, and no recent internal discussions have been had.

There is a fourth condition in the advice which is the composition of the teaching staff. The FSR was expecting to receive a plan of senior staff and junior lecturers before the summer of 2020, they understand a delay may take place due to the corona crisis.

The FSR thanks Richard for the updates. Regarding the master programmes, the FSR's only concern is if the students meet the entry requirements for the masters. Regarding teaching, the FSR is not only interested in the distribution of senior and junior lecturers, not specific names. The council wonders whether the on-site inspection by the ministry of education took place and if it did, how it went.

The FSR thanks the dean and Richard for the information. The FSR will discuss this during their PV and revise their consent.

Richard van der Wurff

The faculty has been working on the programme despite the corona crisis. The curriculum committee and different sub-committees have still been meeting.

The exit qualifications and the learning trajectories are finalized. 80% of the content of the courses is finished. The programme for semester 1 and 2 of the first year is ready. Semester 3 and 4 are almost ready. Only the 6th semester is still up for discussion, the largest component of this will be the graduation project; additional courses in this semester are being discussed. Richard was planning on submitting a draft report for the TNO to the dean next week. He can send the FSR information later today.

Richard's expectation is that the first condition will be dropped by the FSR, he believes the structure of the programme has been well thought out.

Regarding admission to the master's programmes. No examinations board of a master's programme can formally agree beforehand with the admission of students. The examinations board/admissions committee may be able to say more about it once they've seen the whole programme of HST, -but even then, it is their autonomy to decide who can join and who cannot. The faculty has been looking at the content of the schakel programmas (pre-Master's programme). The students are able to fulfil the same requirements as some of the schakel programmas. Richard can personally guarantee that students will be admitted to master's programmes, but the admissions committees cannot.

Some names of people who Richard would like to work for the programme have been picked, but Richard cannot disclose their names as the people are unaware that he would like them to work for the programme. He cannot start talking to them until he is sure the programme will start.

The initial accreditation was planned for September, to qualify it needs to be certain that the programme will be offered. If the NVAO decides that there are requirements such as teaching and exit criteria that are lacking the programme will not go ahead.

The aim is to have five 'docenten 3' (Experienced lectures with a PHD) & professors from the different faculties who through the lectures will contribute to the teaching. Thus, he expects the level of the staff to be similar or higher than that of the other programmes.

Richard van Der Wurff exits the meeting.

6. Subject 3: Social Safety

FSR

The FSR has come up with a more concrete proposal. The first workshop will take place before the end of the academic year, between the 15th and 26th of June. The second will take place in October. The FSR would like the dean to send out the invitations, they want the invitation to

be sent twice. So, the second invitation can be sent directly to the new boards. The FSR will send an email to the dean with a draft of the email to be sent to the boards, a week before it should be sent. The workshops can continue online.

The first online workshop will take place in the mid or end of June, the invitation should be sent at the end of May. The second workshop will take place in October and the invitation will be sent in June.

The FSR would like the dean to emphasise the importance of participating in the workshop.

The FSR would like for this to take place every year unless the feedback from the boards is negative.

Dean

The dean agrees it would be good to have an evaluation about the appreciation and interest after the first two workshops. The dean agrees that as long as it's free and the feedback is positive the workshops will take place every year.

7. Subject 4: Housing

FSR

The FSR thinks that keeping students away from the upper floors damages the community. Members of the FSR went to every floor in the BC building to see what signs there were. Most floors had signs that said no students were allowed, the exceptions were spaces for Sociology and Anthropology.

When talking to students and staff the FSR found that at the floors where students were allowed there were a lot of positive interactions between all parties. The other floors were almost empty. The FSR believes it to be nice to have more interaction on the other floors and spaces. Tom Verhoek said that when students were first allowed on those floors there were no restrictions at all which led to noise complaints. Even on the floors where students are allowed, restrictions are in place, the FSR's proposal is that the same restrictions are put in place on the other floors. These include, for example, students are supposed to keep noise to a minimum, students are not allowed to be there during lunch breaks and that staff have the ability to send students away if they feel like they are damaging the work atmosphere.

At Child Development and Education there was no sign and there were no people.

Dean

The dean states that there are no physical barriers to prevent students from coming to the upper floors. The dean thinks it is good that there are students around the departments, it provides a lively atmosphere and the possibility to interact with one another. She agrees that the signs stating that students are not welcome are not friendly. She is unsure of why these are in place.

The dean understands the proposal and thinks the intentions are good. She wants to talk to the department chairs first to find out why these signs were put up. She thinks it would be better to make the environment more restricted rather than hanging up signs.

The dean proposes that she talks to the department chairs and comes back with their answers. The dean finds it important that the staff members have a big say in what goes on in their environment. The dean should be able to come back to this in the next OV.

Commitments

- The dean will talk to the chairs of Political Science, Child Development and Education, Communication Science and Human Geography, Planning and International Development.

8. Any other business

FSR

The FSR would like to discuss the elections. No one is running for the Communication Science department. Considering the seat distributions across the programmes, in the best-case scenario, there will be 7 people elected democratically (there are twelve seats available). There are 14 candidates running for the FMG. The small number of candidates running for student council is an issue for the FMG and the science faculty.

The canvas announcement informing students that they could sign up to be a candidate was useful, but because it was late, multiple parties had submitted their list already. Alex adds that after the elections it may be useful to re-evaluate the seat distribution.

There is a new party at the faculty, 020 Together, there are 2 people running from their party and both are from political science. Their three topics are: housing, careers, and inclusion.

9. Questions and closing

Arend closes the meeting at 15:48.