

REC A, Room A3.12
Nieuwe Achtergracht 166
(020) 525 3446
fdr@studentenraad.nl
studentenraad.nl/fdr

Date: 7 April 2021
Time: 17:00 – 19:00
Location: Online
Contact person: Domenico Ricciuto
E-mail: fsr-fdr@uva.nl

Present: Clemens Schreiber, Alla Molibog, Robert Lange, Rogier Simons, Katarzyna Niedzwiecka, Thomas Owens, Zarah Winter, Assamaual Saidi, Olaf Stolk, and Jane Bhairosingh
Absent: Vincent Loos, and Domenico Ricciuto
Guests:
Secretary: Daniel Kraamwinkel

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting

Katarzyna (Katie) opens the meeting at 17.03

2. Setting the agenda:

a) CSR Update (Assamaual)

Assamaual states the CSR had a short PV because of easter. The main relevant topic was on free female hygiene products, they passed a vote in favour of this idea.

Thomas asks how it is going with the diversity commitment. Assamaual states they had a meeting with the file holders of all FSRs, and they discussed the commitment.

Thomas also asks if Assamaual could get the council access to the documents on the cafeteria budget. Assamaual states he will send these docs.

b) Sustainability whitepapers (Robert)

Robert states that he would like to bring up the sustainability whitepapers at the OV. This was initiated a while back and now there are white papers with five main objectives, and eighteen more concrete action points for faculties on sustainability at faculties and its integration into the studies and research. Robert would like the faculty board on if they have a general plan to implement these ideas and if they have any specific thoughts on the ideas the whitepapers bring up. By this, he hopes that the faculty will create a clear plan on this.

Katie states the council will try to make this an agenda point for Monday's OV.

c) Exchanges (Assamaual)

Assamaual states the CVB is planning on deciding whether the exchanges go through next year or not in about two weeks. Also, in the UCO, one of the CVB said that they are leaning towards cancelling everything. Assamaual states he finds this to be a bad idea, because we should look at the corona situation in September,

not the current one. He also states UvA has already told the international students to be in Amsterdam for September, and if that is the case why should exchanges not be able to go through? The CSR has send a letter to the CVB expressing their concerns and proposing to postpone the decision to make sure the students' best interests are taken into account.

Rogier states he fully supports the letter sent, and today it also came up briefly in his meeting with the board. Salomons and Nollkaemper seemed to believe it will still go through and showed to understand where the students are coming from. Assamaual states he is happy to hear this. He will raise this topic at Monday's OV at the WVTTK. He also states it will also be discussed at the central OV later next week, so it would help if the CSR can say the FdR is behind them on this.

d) Education renewal proposal update (Rogier)

Rogier states there is an urgent matter. He states the FSR was basically the only party that was content with the education renewal proposals. The main concern, coming from the teachers, is that new societal courses without points towards civiel-effect forced students to choose between fundamental courses in the initial proposal. To make sure students follow all fundamental courses, there is now a plan to change the electives. Now, students have 30 points as electives and they can do whatever they want. The new plan is to have 15 of those 30 to be law-specific electives so that the bachelor still meets the civiel-effect requirements, and have the new societal courses. Therefore students would have less freedom in their choice of electives. A more specific problem exists for non-law minors which can very well be 30 points. If a student would want to follow such minor, the student would have to still fill the 15 law-elective points to obtain his bachelor, thereby forcing minor-students to take extra courses on the 180 ECTS standard. Rogier states that his personal problem is not with this structure in general, because he understands why this is now proposed, but that this proposal puts a lot of the responsibility on the students to put in extra work.

Katie states that this is already in place at PPLE, and therefore she can vouch that this structure is feasible, because you can take three courses at once.

Olaf agrees with Katie, students are able to do more than the standard 180 ECTS. However, he also sees the problem of making minors more difficult. He also states that if students could simply take half of a 30 point minor and possibly not do the rest this would solve a big part of the problem. Rogier states that this is dependent on a minor, but we could ask for clarification.

Olaf also raises the question of what alternatives are out there, could the civiel effect points not just be covered by the non-elective courses? Rogier states that this was the initial idea, but as stated this was not accepted by the teachers. Another option would be to shorten the fundamental courses, but the teachers would not be happy with that either. Olaf states he understands this, but also thinks it is rather strange to push the very nature, civiel-effect, out of the basis of the bachelor.

Olaf also states that he is not very clear on what precise implications the new proposal would have. Rogier restates that the biggest implications would be for the minors.

Rogier states that he has to send an email to the board on this topic tonight. He proposes that the council says it understands where the teachers are coming from and that we have a positive attitude towards the new proposal, and that the council also expresses its concern on specifically the minor students and too much responsibility being shifted on them. A general consensus is reached on this idea.

e) PPLE/FDR future (Rogier)

Rogier states there appears to have been some confusion on how the future of PPLE within the FdR would be discussed between the ideas of the FSR and the faculty board. The council was in the understanding an additional meeting to have an open-minded discussion would be held, but the board wants to settle it at the OV on Monday. The board has voiced their idea on keeping the structure the same by means of a memo, and perhaps making some changes within the FSR if that is what the council wants. Alla states that FSR changes can be discussed internally. Robert states he agrees, and asks what happened to the discussion of alternatives and having an open-minded meeting here. He states no alternatives have been properly offered, in the GOV

the idea of a AUC structure was touched upon but to properly discuss this point, alternatives should be properly discussed. Rogier states the council should try to reopen the discussion on structure again, because the memo seems to close it more or less. .Robert adds that the focus should lie on first looking at feasibility, then at desirability and only then the council can come to a conclusion to possible structural changes. Rogier states that the point should be raised in a formal matter, since the council does have the right to consent to the structure. The council reaches a consensus on this. Daniel states this stance will be against the expectations of the board, and the council should take this into account when raising the point. Alla states she will bring up this topic at the OV.

f) Letter on onsite education testing (Katie)

Katie states the council received an email from a student today, with questions about the future plans on opening university and specifically the voluntary self-testing on which this would be based and if online education would still be offered. Rogier states he was also surprised by an interview with Van Dam, where she seemed to have already committed to this idea on the basis of constitutional freedom rights, but that nothing is official yet. The question is raised whether the council is in favour of voluntary testing, or thinks it should be mandatory.

Olaf states he is not sure to which extend this is up to the council, since restrictions are ruled by the government. Rogier states that within the limits of official regulations, the UvA can still decide a lot for themselves as Van Dam's ideas have shown.

Alla states it should be one of the main objectives of raising this at the OV to find out more about what the precise procedure would look like, and if the faculty has any specific plans. Rogier agrees, stating that raising the question on what procedure would look like is the most important thing. He also states he believes the council can only make a statement on in favour or against a voluntary/mandatory plan when such a plan is actually on the table. First, the council should have all the relevant information before making a (written) statement.

Clemens states he does not see the use of making it voluntary. Katie adds that this would be against health rights of those who are taking tests and trying to ensure safety. Furthermore, the educational rights would still be ensured via online class. Thomas agrees, and adds that we should also ask the board for a very clear end of these tests, so that it does not drag on longer than it has to. He also reraises the questions on what the procedure would look like exactly.

After a discussion during which the points above were raised, there is general consensus on this idea to mainly inform at the OV, after which a written statement can be made after the topic being discussed at next week's PV. The topic will be raised at the OV by Katie.

Alla also raises the question of who would carry the costs. Rogier states the government would pay for this.

3. Other updates

Rogier states he has some good news, he received an email from the diploma people that the distribution problem was a general problem, not specific to the FdR. From next week onwards there will be possibilities to get your diploma on all faculties without any difficulties.

4. WVTTK

5. Closing of the meeting

Katie closes the meeting at 18.42

6. Action list

- Discuss the findings made during Monday's OV on the (voluntary) testing to bring back onsite teaching next PV to form an opinion on the matter.