Facultaire
Studentenraad
RECHTSGELEERDHEID

REC A, Kamer A3.12
Nieuwe Achtergracht 166
(020) 525 3446
fse-fdr@uva.nl
studentenraad.nl

7th meeting of the Faculty Student Council of Law

Agenda

Notes by the chair are written in cursive and are part of the agenda and the minutes, after publication.

Date	October 16th 2025 9:00 – 11:00	Location	Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, REC A, Room
Present	Carla Gesell, Alexandra Jurasova, Anastacia Piersma, Eleonora van Koppen, Fabian Que, Tom Scheer, Livni Beck, Angie-lee Kruize, Vincent Nap, Johannes Hüttner	Absent	Danial Haider
Guest			
Online		Secretary	Anouchka van Wier

1. **Opening of the meeting**
   9:14
2. **Setting the agenda**
3. **Action-list**

Action-list

Who?	What?	When?
Everyone	Subtopics discussion Gaza	ASAP

4. **GOV recap**
   - Carla will reach out to Candida and Mireille regarding the agenda process. The agenda will henceforth be sent out one week in advance. The agenda should be made clearer and more structured.
   - The attendance policy was included in the previous agenda.
   - Carla will chair the next GOV meeting.
   - Members are encouraged to propose ideas for the Round of Tables.
   - Fabian asked Anouchka to make a very clear minutes with a to do list to keep them accountable
5. **Delegate Update**
   Vince reported several updates:
   - A previously confidential issue concerning the Gaza letter has now been clarified. The faculty will not pursue new collaborations and is reviewing existing ties, though legal aspects complicate this.
   - There has been pushback on offering Dutch language courses.
   - Regarding the Gaza scholarship, commitments have been made to secure funding, though logistical challenges remain.

- The Model OER file (normally revised every five years) has not been updated in seven years due to the WIB currently in the chambers. Negotiations have begun to start revisions, focusing on identifying possible changes. Implementation is expected in Q2 2026.
    - Fabian: Asked if there were any specifics about potential amendments.
    - Vince: Replied that the process is still in preliminary stages.
        - Fabian also suggested adding example questions and answers to practice exam materials, similar to what is already available in the Law Faculty, noting that this could be beneficial for PPLE students as well.

6. **Gaza / Palestine**
    a. **General stance** - *10 min*

    Person: The Council should not take a political stance, as the issue does not directly relate to education or faculty policy. Such matters fall under the Central Student Council. The Faculty has no current ties with Israeli institutions.

    Noor: Disagreed, arguing that Council members are elected representatives with political perspectives. Students expect them to take moral positions, including condemning acts such as genocide.

    Wytze: Emphasized caution, noting that genocide is a sensitive legal term and has not been declared by any judicial institution (e.g., ICC).

    Vince: Clarified that while council members may belong to political parties, the Council's mandate concerns academic, not global, issues.

    Johannes: Suggested that the issue relates to academic freedom and therefore falls under the Council's scope.

    Vince: Questioned the added value of a separate Faculty statement when the Central Body is already addressing it.

    b. **Universities action** - *15 min*

    i. Ties (current and future), Ethics Committee (has been some inconsistency)

Fabian: Noted that the university already released a statement in June, and no new information was provided.

Noor: Proposed communicating to students that the Faculty has no existing or planned ties with Israeli institutions.

Johannes: Supported reiterating the statement for visibility and transparency, even if repetitive.

Person: Asked for clarification on how such a statement would be presented.

Fabian, Alexandra, Angie-Lee: Agreed on releasing a neutral, factual statement for transparency.

Carla: Reminded the group that the Faculty is diverse in opinions and encouraged a balanced approach. are in unique position, more divided faculty regarding opinions, something important to keep in mind.

Discussion also highlighted confusion about the Ethics Committee's composition and funding. Carla suggested this could be raised by Vince in the CSR, as students might seek greater transparency.

c. **Student Protests** - *15 min*

i. Safety of Israeli and Jewish Students

Person: Supported student protests as a form of expression, provided they do not involve hate speech or property damage. Suggested avoiding protests during exam periods.

Noor: Agreed, emphasizing that protests are historically important, though recent events have seen attention diverted by acts of vandalism.
Vince: Reported that discussions in the OV meeting confirmed the idea of protest registration, this registration will not be mandatory, but helps with security cost coverage. New house rules are being amended, including removing the article on face coverings and religious gatherings.
Carla: Requested Vince clarification on the criteria for risk assessments related to such events.

d. **Do we comment?** - *20 min*

i. Do we strike? / Do we support the strike?

Johannes: In favor of posting a statement supporting the council strikes, also as a symbolic action
Vince: Opposed symbolic gestures, preferring the Council act only on education-related issues.
Person: Reiterated that strikes should be supported only if related to education or policy, not political matters. → Vince, angie-lee and alexandra agree
Tom: Countered that institutional policy includes global ties (e.g., Gaza), and restricting discussion to education is overly narrow. Noor agreed.
Noor: Added that it's difficult to decide now without knowing future strike contexts.
Person: Noted that legality regarding the situation remains undetermined.
Noor: Mentioned that legal rulings can take years; thus, waiting for ICC judgment is not a practical stance.
Person: Replied that scholarly opinions are divided on the issue.
Wytze: Suggested focusing any statement on student safety, especially for Israeli and Jewish students.
Johannes: Added that large-scale strikes affect education and thus fall under the Council's mandate.
Carla: Concluded that while no unified position was reached, the open discussion was valuable, and the topic should be revisited in future PV meetings if relevant.

Vote: On Noor's proposal to release a factual statement clarifying that the Law Faculty has no current ties with Israeli institutions:

- In favor: 11
- Against: 1 (Wytze)
- Abstentions: 0
- Blank: 0

Action: Noor will draft a proposal for the statement.
Person: Requested the statement remain strictly factual and neutral.

7. **Engagement Table**

Johannes reported that the dates and times for the engagement table are finalized (Monday–Wednesday). The banner is expected to arrive tomorrow.

8. **Instagram Photos** → Some people should still send a photo and description
9. **Other points/questions**
10. **Closing the meeting**

10:45

In the case of absence and/or mandate, please send an e-mail to livni.fsr.fdr@gmail.com.

Action-list

Who?	What?	When?
Anouchka	Book room for next block Send When2Meet regarding PV during CoBo week	
Everyone	Invite people to CoBo, general students will be invited	
Vince	Bring the Ethics Committee transparency issue to the CSR	