



## Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 4 november 2021

Present	Julia Ballak, Juliet Hondtong, Sara Kemper, Farah Malash, June Ouwehand, Ciprian Piraianu, Carlos Reijnen, Tea Svendsen, Anne van de Graaf, Froukje Vroom, Fred Weerman, Marian Wilts
Absent	Jelle Mars, Irene Zwiep, Sabine van Wesemael, Mikayla Vieira Ribeiro, Sara Verveer, Carlos van Eck
Guest	Zazie van Dorp (Technical Chair)
Secretary	Angelina Senchi

### Agenda

- 1) **Opening and Confirming the Agenda**
- 2) **Draft Minutes OV FSR September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021**
- 3) **Announcements**
  - a) **Daily Board of the Faculty**
  - b) **FSR**
- 4) **Alcohol Policy (attachment)**
- 5) ***Klankbordgroep* ('sounding board') Social Safety (attachment)**
- 6) **Temporary Faculty Social Safety (attachment)**
- 7) **Hybrid Education (attachment)**
- 8) **State of Affairs**
  - a) **CoH and GSH (attachment: recent agenda's CoH & GSH)**
- 9) **Final Questions and Closing (*including OC- and student questions*)**

## 1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Van Dorp opens the meeting at 15:03.

2 The council and board have no comments regarding the agenda; consequently, Van Dorp sets the  
3 agenda:

### Agenda

- 1) Opening and Confirming the Agenda
- 2) Draft Minutes OV FSR September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021
- 3) Announcements
  - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
  - b) FSR
- 4) Alcohol Policy (attachment)
- 5) *Klankbordgroep* ('sounding board') Social Safety (attachment)
- 6) Temporary Faculty Social Safety (attachment)
- 7) Hybrid Education (attachment)
- 8) State of Affairs
  - a) CoH and GSH (attachment: recent agenda's CoH & GSH)
- 9) Final Questions and Closing

## 2. Draft minutes OV FSR September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021

4 Van Dorp takes the meeting's attendees over the previous OV's minutes page by page.  
5 Subsequently, the board and council go over the list of pro memorie and actions.

### Pro memorie

6  
7  
8  
9 201208-01 (edited 210430) Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the  
10 *Commissie Evaluatie Honoursprogramma FGw* and the structure of the  
11 evaluation proceedings.

12  
13 ***The council and board discuss whether they would like to keep this point as***  
14 ***part of the action list or as a reminder. Reijnen feels the point could remain***  
15 ***a part of the pro memorie, but requests for the phrasing to be generalised.***  
16 ***Weerman adds that honour will also be discussed among the***  
17 ***onderwijsdirecteuren. Then, Kemper notes that the CSR will also be***  
18 ***discussing this topic and that she agrees with Reijnen that the point can be***  
19 ***generalised.***

20  
21 ***New formulation: Reijnen will update the council on developments***  
22 ***regarding the honours programmes and the structure of its evaluation***  
23 ***proceedings.***

24  
25 210617-01 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will update the council in October regarding any  
26 developments as a consequence of the advice by the working group *Studeren*  
27 *met een functiebeperking*.

28  
29 ***Van de Graaf notes that they've done a quick scan regarding the way***  
30 ***communications is currently being distributed, considering the advice***  
31 ***commented on communication elements. Van de Graaf notes that here's***  
32 ***easy access to information regarding studying with a disability. Yet, in***  
33 ***autumn the board is planning to look into more actions regarding the***  
34 ***points mentioned in the advice. Kemper indicates that she would like to***  
35 ***keep this point on the list to continue regular updates on the subject.***  
36 ***Weerman responds that they could set up an action point describing that a***  
37 ***delegation will meet separately on this topic. However, Wilts notes that the***  
38 ***board has planned to pick this subject up after the first block, but there's a***  
39 ***possibility it might extend into the next calendar year. Kemper counters***

1 **that the topic could perhaps be scheduled for another OV or that they wait**  
2 **until they have more clarity on the subject. Instead, the board and council**  
3 **agree that the reminder should be edited to refer to the next calendar year**  
4 **instead of October.**

5  
6 **New formulation: The Directeur Bedrijfsvoering will update the council in**  
7 **2022 regarding any developments as a consequence of the advice by the**  
8 **working group Studeren met een functiebeperking.**

## Action list

9 210617-01 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will meet with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 at the  
10 start of the academic year to discuss any developments regarding the following  
11 topics:

- 12 a) UvA catering: vegetarian options, milk, cleaning;  
13 b) Sustainability policy at the faculty/UvA, a promotion plan  
14 regarding sustainability and waste, the White Paper.

15  
16 **The board and council agree that the action point can be**  
17 **scrapped entirely.**

18  
19 210617-02 Regarding the Diversity and Inclusivity-survey, Reijnen will have the team  
20 overseeing this process schedule a meeting with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 after  
21 the summer.

22 (edited 210923) Senchi will reach out to Reijnen to ensure this meeting is  
23 scheduled.

24  
25 **The council had a meeting with Reijnen regarding how this survey ties into**  
26 **the Alcohol Policy but, as of yet, a meeting dedicated to this specific topic**  
27 **hasn't taken place.**

28  
29 210923-01 Regarding the *Casuscommissie*:

- 30 a) Kemper will send over concrete information and questions  
31 regarding signals of tardiness and insecurity over ECs caused by  
32 the *casuscommissie*. Van Wesemael will use this information to  
33 discuss it with the *vraagbaak*.

34  
35 **Kemper notes she will pick this up. Van de Graaf asks whether they received**  
36 **any new signals and Kemper replies that they haven't for this block.**

37  
38 210923-02 Reijnen and Van Wesemael will instruct the Program Directors to make sure  
39 teachers check whether the lectures are being recorded properly.

40  
41 **The board and council agree that the action point can be scrapped.**

42  
43 210923-03 Regarding the Alcohol Policy:

- 44 a) The council will contact Maria Hagen to set up a meeting to  
45 discuss what tools they could use (e.g. surveys, newsletters, pop-  
46 ups) to gauge student opinion on the (over)consumption of  
47 alcohol.  
48 b) The council will ask Reijnen to share his findings regarding issues  
49 with alcohol consumption at faculty events with them, in  
50 preparation for their meeting with Hagen.

51  
52 **The board and council agree that the sub-action point can be**  
53 **scrapped.**

54

- 1 c) The council and board will schedule an additional discussion  
2 regarding the Alcohol Policy.  
3

4 ***The board and council agree that the sub-action point can be***  
5 ***scrapped.***  
6

7 The OV minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> of September 2021 are confirmed.

### 3. Announcements

#### A) Daily Board of the Faculty

8 Weerman announces that they shared an update on the pandemic in the *Nieuwsflits*,  
9 concerning the reintroduction of certain measurements on the 6<sup>th</sup> of November 2021  
10 (e.g.: the wearing of facemasks and staff members having to work from home fifty  
11 percent of the time). He hopes these will be the only measurement and expects that the  
12 next press conference won't yield any more consequences for the university. Moreover,  
13 his impression is that things are going quite smoothly – especially considering the  
14 circumstances – and that most teachers and programs are able to continue as much as  
15 possible.  
16

17 Furthermore, Weerman announces the absence of Zwiép and Van Wesemael during  
18 this meeting.  
19

#### B) FSR

20 Kemper announces the absence of Vieira Ribeiro, Mars, Van Eck and Verveer.  
21

### 4. Alcohol Policy

22 Svendsen starts by thanking Reijnen for their insightful meeting on the policy, which also clarified  
23 the board's main point of having no alcohol in formal educational settings. Yet, there are still some  
24 questions that remain, for instance: regarding student engagement and policy implementation.  
25 The council would like to know the current status of the policy. The board responds that the  
26 overarching policy is set to start in January [2022, ed.], but that, at this moment, there aren't any  
27 instructions available for the faculty. Also, the faculty is still in the process of asking for input. The  
28 council wonders whether there is a set deadline for the implementation, to which the board  
29 responds that timewise the implementation is set to be in line with the central level policy.  
30 Moreover, the council would like to know whether any changes have been applied to the policy  
31 since their discussion on the topic during the previous OV (September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021); no changes  
32 have been made. Regardless, Weerman comments that the board is set to make a decision on the  
33 Alcohol Policy in December. Svendsen asks the board what is expected from the council regarding  
34 the implementation of the policy. Reijnen indicates that he isn't sure, but Weerman cuts in that –  
35 first - they would like to have the council's opinion, and, in terms of implementation, the board  
36 hopes the council could be an example. Weerman adds that there won't be any policemen running  
37 around; however, they would like to make the policy known. He continues that the program  
38 committees will have a discussion on the implementation of the policy on the program level, but  
39 that isn't necessarily something the council will be tasked with. Piraianu refers to their meeting  
40 with Reijnen and notes that they agreed that it's mostly the mentality regarding alcohol, and not  
41 the alcohol consumption itself, that should be highlighted; he wonders how the board will make  
42 sure this is clearly reflected in the policy itself. Reijnen responds that introductory activities are  
43 important meeting points where they can share that alcohol isn't allowed on certain occasions  
44 and that they can entertain discussions with PCs to raise awareness on the topic. Reijnen stresses  
45 that the discussion within teams and with student are vital for establishing how they plan to  
46 tackle the policy. Their most important goal is to nurture awareness and the council feels this  
47 should be formulated in the policy. Piraianu explains that the council would be able to structure  
48 their ideas and stance more clearly in a formal advice and mentions some of the suggestions the  
49 council has regarding the policy (e.g.: increased availability of alcohol-free beverages). The board  
50 indicates that they aren't asking the council for an advice letter but that they are, of course, free  
51 to share one. In order for the advice to be taken into consideration, before the board makes its  
52 decision, they would like to receive the advice by the end of the month [November, ed.]. Weerman

1 adds that people aren't very aware of how alcohol affects inclusion, as opposed to how it affects  
2 social safety, and they (the board and teachers) would be especially interested to learn how they  
3 could tackle that issue. Weerman notes that any examples and suggestions are most welcome.  
4 Referring to Piraianu's point about mentality being the issue and not the consumption per se,  
5 Weerman notes that for some people it would be easier to understand from a health-perspective  
6 whilst others relate more to explanation from an inclusivity-perspective.  
7

8 The council will send the board an unsolicited advice regarding the alcohol policy before the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
9 of December 2021 [ACTION POINT].

## 5. *Klankbordgroep* ('sounding board') Social Safety

10 Weerman introduces the subject briefly and concludes that the board would like to install a group  
11 that is able to check whether their proposals, regarding social safety, are actually feasible.  
12 Ouwehand asks whether the FSR will also be included in this *klankbordgroep*, Weerman answers  
13 that they won't be included in the group considering they're already included in the process. He  
14 adds that the group would function as an extra check and that the council will be asked for advice  
15 on the matter. Ouwehand counters that the group will have two student members, which,  
16 according to the council, should be one FSR member and one other student. Weerman responds  
17 that providing the council with this seat would be vacuous, considering the FSR already has its  
18 chances to provide their stance on the proposals. Moreover, he adds that he wouldn't be opposed  
19 to the council's involvement, but he questions whether it aligns with the intention of  
20 *klankbordgroep*. Ouwehand clarifies that the council was glad to receive the document, but  
21 stresses again that they would like one council member and one student to join the group.  
22 Weerman interjects that the group isn't focused on policymaking and, as an example, mentions  
23 that should they propose to publish something on the website, they would first ask everybody –  
24 including the FSR – for their comments and then they would ask someone 'from the outside' – the  
25 *klankbordgroep* –, who doesn't have the blind spots the FSR and fDB do, to put in their efforts and  
26 gage the feasibility of the proposal. He stresses again that the sounding board isn't a policy group.  
27 Kemper responds that the council would like to bring their perspective to the group, adding that  
28 this could prove to be useful. Weerman states that the board has heard the council's opinion and  
29 that they will take it with them. Wilts explains to the council that every product concerning social  
30 safety will also be discussed with the FSR, the approach of the sounding board varies from the  
31 council's because it is focused mainly on feasibility. The council counters that they wish the  
32 person in the *klankbordgroep* to form a bridge between the group and the council. Weerman  
33 notes, again, that the board will take it with them.

34 Van de Graaf checks whether the council is clear on the meaning of a *klankbordgroep* (sounding  
35 board), she continues that the group will bring their day-to-day experience and knowledge to a  
36 meeting in an informal setting, where they will get together and see whether things could actually  
37 work. The group doesn't have a representative function, but they are the people who experience  
38 the measures and know how such actions pan out in practice. Hondtong remarks that, in such  
39 groups, the ratio of faculty staff to students is often askew and simply ticking the student-box  
40 might not be enough. Weerman counters that this criticism would make sense when it comes to  
41 policy, but that is not what this group is about. It is about checking and advising on feasibility  
42 which differs from the work of, for instance, a program committee. The council counters that this  
43 subject affects student as much as the staff. Weerman responds that they will think it over and  
44 see how they'll continue.

45 The council also wonders whether the group will evaluate the execution, besides determining its  
46 feasibility. The board explains that this is where the group differs from the board and the council:  
47 the group determines feasibility and the council and board evaluate and/or determine the  
48 executions. Moreover, the council is interested whether the board intends to keep Marie-Therese  
49 Seignette on as the social safety policy officer. The board notes that they will get back to them on  
50 this subject in the next calendar year.

## 6. Temporary Faculty Social Safety

51 The board briefly introduces the subject, indicating that some of the aftercare on previous cases  
52 was poorly handled and that there was unclarity in terms of organisation. Even though the board  
53 foresees that these issues will be improved with new and better social safety policy, they would

1 still like to provide the opportunity for past cases to be granted suitable aftercare. Kemper notes  
2 that the council has some questions regarding the proposed temporary facility, starting with that  
3 they are wondering who will become the trust person. Weerman responds that the trust person  
4 will be an external individual, for instance, from Bereschot. He adds that once the person's name  
5 is known, it will be shared with the council. Kemper refers to the document and notes that  
6 Bezemer & Schubad is mentioned instead of Bereschot. The council continues with a question by  
7 Ouwehand, who wonders whether the board would be open to extending the term for temporary  
8 facility. She explains that the council believes that the current term of six months is too short. The  
9 board feels confident it is possible to handle this process within the set term, considering the  
10 information they have available to them from the *vertrouwenspersonen*, study advisors and the  
11 OR. The board notes they should make sure the facility will be publicized. Ouwehand wonders  
12 whether the six-month term is perhaps a guideline and that after the term they will look at the  
13 cases individually. The board states that it isn't a guideline and explains that if they start January  
14 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021, people will have six months to respond and that it is the faculty's task to ensure facility  
15 is known. Weerman believes it is possible to do so in this timeframe and adds that the term should  
16 also be closed. The council retorts that they understand the need to cap the term, but they would  
17 like to stress that six months is extremely short for such a sensitive subject and that decisions on  
18 these matters aren't made very lightly. Moreover, Kemper points out that the faculty's  
19 communication has often proven to be lacking.

20  
21 *Reijnen leaves the meeting*

22  
23 Weerman points out that the facility is not about new cases, but past ones. Which means,  
24 considering everything has already happened, that there is no need for new fact finding; it means  
25 the closure hasn't been completed (e.g. no apology has been made). Kemper responds that they  
26 are aware of this fact. Regardless, the council still believes the timeframe is too short and that the  
27 board show that they take these matters very seriously by extending the application term to at  
28 least one academic year. The board responds that they will take it into consideration and briefly  
29 mentions that the OR has consenting rights on the matter, and they'll receive a response in two  
30 weeks. Ouwehand cuts in to ask why the OR has consenting rights, whilst FSR isn't even awarded  
31 the right to advise. Weerman counters that this is the law.

32 Furthermore, the council would like to know why the final decision is placed with the dean  
33 instead of the trust person. Weerman explains that the final responsibility should always be with  
34 the organisation itself, therefore the trust person cannot be the final decision maker. Kemper  
35 refers to the possibility of the ombudsperson taking up this role until Ouwehand cuts in to point  
36 out that the board is unwilling to meet the council's three social safety demands. Therefore,  
37 Ouwehand would like to know from the board when they would like to receive the council's  
38 unsolicited advice. The board responds that they would need it before the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November.  
39 Ouwehand confirms whether this is the right date, considering it would be a shame for the council  
40 to give their advice if the board won't take it. The council will send an unsolicited advice on social  
41 safety before the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November 2021, highlighting their demands for a council member to be  
42 part of the *klankbordgroep*, the extension of the application term for the temporary facility, and  
43 for the dean to be replaced as the final decision maker. Van de Graaf notes, in relation to the  
44 advising role of the trust person and the role of the dean as final decision maker, that the board  
45 doesn't request an advice only to ignore it; in essence the decision just lies with the acting organ.  
46 The board reiterates that this route wasn't planned out only to disregard it. The council counters  
47 that perhaps these remarks could be included in the *hardheidsclausule*. The board explains that  
48 the clause isn't about a discrepancy between the advice of the trust person and the dean's  
49 decision, but it's about case inclusion. The council would like the document to include that the  
50 threshold should be very high for the dean to waver from the trust person's advice and that the  
51 dean should motivate the decision. Weerman explains that much of the process is confidential  
52 and they can't simply send out information to the council. Weerman briefly mulls over the idea  
53 of the motivation and continues by stressing that the final responsibility can only lie with the  
54 institution itself and acquiesces that a motivation would be viable in case an advice is ignored –  
55 a situation that shouldn't happen. Kemper confirms whether the responsibility for a final decision  
56 can't be placed somewhere or with someone else. She adds that they really want the dean to  
57 follow the advice and it seems odd to say you want to follow the advice, whilst building in an

1 option to not have to. Van de Graaf and Weerman respond that it isn't juridically possible.  
2 Moreover, Weerman comments that the council should have faith in the dean they've chosen.  
3 Also, he stresses that social safety is incredibly important and that the humanities is currently the  
4 only faculty in the university working on it like this. Ouwehand and Kemper both express their  
5 appreciation for this effort. Kemper goes into the *hardheidsclausule*, the bylaws and the  
6 complaints procedure, but Wilts interjects to explain that the *hardheidsclausule* can't be inverted.  
7 Subsequently, Ouwehand goes into the options of having the trust person informed of the final  
8 decision or having the dean replaced by a faculty ombudsperson. Van de Graaf wonders what the  
9 council's main concern is in this respect. Ouwehand explains that the dean is responsible for  
10 protecting both staff and students and the council would like to prevent a situation where the  
11 dean might be forced to choose between the two. Ouwehand stresses that this isn't a matter of  
12 trust, rather an issue with the dual role the dean has in this situation. Van de Graaf notes that  
13 currently it is actually about aftercare. Whereas Ouwehand notes it is about students in general.  
14 The council will send an unsolicited advice on social safety before the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November 2021  
15 [ACTION POINT].

16  
17 *Break*

## 7. Hybrid Education

18 Piraianu briefly introduces the letter by the CSR and asks the board whether they agree with it.  
19 Weerman notes that some points made by the CSR are being worked on by the board as well. He  
20 explains that, for instance, specific arrangements are being made with the *casuscommissie*, but he  
21 recognises the difficulty with creating them structurally. The CSR's mention of Economics  
22 splitting its large group in two, isn't as easy at the humanities faculty where Media is one of the  
23 few large groups. Though when it comes to hybrid meetings the board is interested to know  
24 whether FSR is under the impression that this is difficult. Weerman feels that their main issues  
25 are technical and that, with improvement of the systems, this will be better. The council indicates  
26 that they're normally opposed to increased digitalization, but they feel, in the context of the CSR  
27 letter, some of the suggestions could be incorporated. The council asks how the board feels about  
28 hybrid education. The board notes that, regardless of the pandemic, the intention should always  
29 be to provide good education where students are stimulated and actively participate. Weerman's  
30 current attitude toward the hybrid education is that it isn't working perfectly, but that they're  
31 willing to experiment with it and see how it might be useful to them.

## 8. State of Affairs

### A) CoH & GSH

32 Reijnen and Van Wesemael are absent, therefore Wilts will look into 4.2 *Ervaringen 884* and  
33 what was discussed before the next TTO. Regarding 4.3 *vierogenprincipe BA-scripties*,  
34 Weerman explains that having more than one teacher assessing a thesis was common  
35 practice for MA theses but not for the BA theses. He continues that sometimes the bachelor  
36 has a different system, where the thesis has multiple facets that require even more people  
37 to evaluate than the 4 eyes responsible for the final thesis assessment. He also mentions the  
38 example of one professor reporting to a group of teachers who, together, make the final  
39 assessment. The board notes the faculty has several implemented procedures which are  
40 dependent on the program.  
41

## 9. Final questions and closing (*including OC- and student questions*)

42 The council sent a memo to the board highlighting the following questions:  
43

44 *"Wat is de stand van zaken omtrent het verbeteren van deeltijdstuderen?*  
45 *Verbeteringen op faculteitsniveau zijn 2/3 jaar geleden toegezegd door*  
46 *een opleidingsdirecteur maar sindsdien is niets meer vernomen."*  
47

48 Weerman notes that Reijnen has indicated it will be on the agenda for the *opleidingsdirecteuren*  
49 In February and that Reijnen can be contacted should there be any questions in the meantime.  
50

1                    *“Wat is de stand van zaken van de evaluatie van de pilot 774? Wat is het*  
2                    *toekomstplan omtrent de pilot 774?”*

3

4 Weerman was informed by the committee’s chair that there is a slight delay due the pandemic  
5 and that they’re planning to incorporate their findings from the first block, which means that the  
6 report will be delivered later than was planned. Currently the report has been scheduled for the  
7 end of November, the fDB will then discuss this report and send their opinion to the council for  
8 future advice. The council should expect to hear from the board in December at the earliest.

9

10                    *“Wat is het protocol omtrent quarantaine/afwezigheid i.v.m. corona omtrent*  
11                    *tentamens, vooral als het kort dag afzeggingen betreft? Als een student*  
12                    *bijvoorbeeld de ochtend van een tentamen verkouden is, waar kunnen zij dan*  
13                    *terecht voor een spoed-verklaring? En hoe wordt er in dat geval omgegaan met*  
14                    *de toegestane hoeveelheid tentamenkansen?”*

15

16 Weerman was informed by Reijnen that current UvA regulations won’t permit extra retakes.  
17 Though, the directors are currently discussing how to tackle a situation where a retake is failed  
18 due to pandemic-related reasons. For now, students are required to do the retake, but they are  
19 looking into possible exemptions. The current regulations count and if a student is also ill during  
20 the retest it might be possible to take additional action.

21

22

23 No more questions are asked. Van Dorp closes the meeting at 16:45.

24

## Pro memori

- 1  
2 200511-01 The dean makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so that the  
3 FSR can advise on this.  
4 201208-01 (edited 211104) Reijnen will update the council on developments regarding  
5 the honours programmes and the structure of the evaluation proceedings.  
6 210617-01 (edited 211104) The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will update the council in 2022  
7 regarding any developments as a consequence of the advice by the working group *Studeren met*  
8 *een functiebeperking*.

## Action list

- 9 ~~210617-01~~ The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will meet with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 at the  
10 start of the academic year to discuss any developments regarding the following  
11 topics:  
12 a) ~~UvA catering: vegetarian options, milk, cleaning;~~  
13 b) ~~Sustainability policy at the faculty/UvA, a promotion plan~~  
14 ~~regarding sustainability and waste, the White Paper.~~  
15 210617-02 Regarding the Diversity and Inclusivity-survey, Reijnen will have the team  
16 overseeing this process schedule a meeting with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 after  
17 the summer.  
18 (edited 210923) Senchi will reach out to Reijnen to ensure this meeting is scheduled.  
19 210923-01 Regarding the *Casuscommissie*:  
20 a) Kemper will send over concrete information and questions  
21 regarding signals of tardiness and insecurity over ECs caused by  
22 the *casuscommissie*. Van Wesemael will use this information to  
23 discuss it with the *vraagbaak*.  
24 ~~210923-02~~ ~~Reijnen and Van Wesemael will instruct the Program Directors to make sure~~  
25 ~~teachers check whether the lectures are being recorded properly.~~  
26 210923-03 Regarding the Alcohol Policy:  
27 a) The council will contact Maria Hagen to set up a meeting to  
28 discuss what tools they could use (e.g. surveys, newsletters, pop-  
29 ups) to gauge student opinion on the (over)consumption of  
30 alcohol.  
31 b) ~~The council will ask Reijnen to share his findings regarding issues~~  
32 ~~with alcohol consumption at faculty events with them, in~~  
33 ~~preparation for their meeting with Hagen.~~  
34 c) ~~The council and board will schedule an additional discussion~~  
35 ~~regarding the Alcohol Policy.~~  
36 211104-01 The council will send the board an unsolicited advice regarding the alcohol  
37 policy before the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December 2021.  
38 211104-02 The council will send an unsolicited advice on social safety before the 23<sup>rd</sup> of  
39 November 2021.