

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

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

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

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting

Domenico opens the meeting at 17:03

2. Setting the agenda:

a. Elections (Thomas)

Thomas states that there is this fair-play agreement between the parties for the election campaigns. These were discussed last Friday, and usually most parties then sign them, this is on a voluntary basis. There is one party, 020, who already stated they will not sign, and they have since then been involved with some unpleasanties in a very personal case with a candidate of another party on Instagram. Thomas states there is possibility for the FSR to callout parties like this who have not signed the agreement, he was wondering what the council would think of this. He is afraid that by letting this slide, it would set a dangerous precedent.

Domenico states that he believes it is their right not to sign it, it is voluntary after all. If we were to take these kind of agreements more serious we should make them official and for example withdraw funds if parties still do not sign.

Rogier also sees the issue, but that we should stick to an objective opinion. As long as it is not mandatory, we cannot force anyone. Clemens agrees, and adds that respect is indeed important, but that the FSR is not part of this “contract” so it would be strange to intervene. Robert agrees, he states that the agreement in general is initiated by the CSR, but then it is up to the parties.

Rogier proposes the idea of positively highlighting the parties who did sign the agreement, that is less intrusive. There is general consensus on this.

Thomas brings up another point related to the elections as well. This is on onsite campaigning, the CSB seems to be okay to let this continue. He finds this as a problem because it would mean parties would have to put people

at risk of getting corona. Thomas therefore proposes to ask the CSB to reevaluate and block any form of onsite campaigning.

Rogier also states that he cannot speak for his party right now, because his party (DVS) also has people as other faculties and he has not heard all sides to the story. This is also one of the reasons why we cannot try to tackle the problem at just the FdR, then parties might still campaign at other FSRs and parties that are only at the FdR are being put in a disadvantaged position. Therefore, we must try to create a uni-wide basis for the argument, and then contact the CSB. He also states that the elections are only 1.5 weeks away, so everything must happen ASAP.

Thomas agrees with Rogier's points, but states that we must make sure the CSB takes the final decision, because otherwise we come back to some parties not signing the fair-play agreement.

Rogier then proposes to text all heads of FSRs and let representatives talk to their parties to try to form a broader basis for the argument, and then to send a more collective email to the CSB expressing the concerns. There is general consensus on this proposal.

b. Sustainable travel policy (Domenico)

Domenico states the topic was debated at GOV last Monday. It became clear that it does not exist. However, Domenico does like the proposal that was made in 2019, and proposes to work this out and put it up to the faculty board. Then, they could implement this at faculty level at least. Clemens raises the idea to also make it applicable for students, Thomas adds that the council could look at applying it to study associations, but this will be very difficult to implement.

Robert as O&F chair and the FSR-FdR's go-to-sustainability-guy states that he is very busy right now, but will start on a proposal in 2 weeks.

c. Proctoring at Ondernemingsrecht (Domencio)

Domenico states this issue was just discussed with Salomons. For this course, it was determined that there was so much fraud in the first exam, they will do a proctored exam for the resit. This seems unfair. Furthermore, there seems to be a conflict of interest because the lecturer (Roest) is also the chair of the exam committee.

Rogier mentions that the substance of exams need to be the same according to the OER. However, a couple of years back the board argued against seeing the surveillance form as part of the substance. Salomons in line with this stated that the substance had not changed

Thomas states that this idea seems odd, since those who did commit fraud either got caught or got away, but those who just failed will not be as likely to commit fraud now. He states he thinks the council should be activist on these kind of topics to protect students.

Rogier has two things he thinks are relevant for that proposal. First of all, students should first appeal to the EC and then the FSR should jump in. Secondly, we must wait for some more information on the topic since it has been announced more details will be announced soon. Also, he states he would be interested in knowing what the EC sees as 'a lot' of fraud, he thinks they might be willing to release those numbers. So he is a bit more careful, but he agrees with Thomas that the council should try to ask questions about this affair. Domenico states that we can do that at the OV if we would want to ask the board.

Vincent asks how the fraud was done and traced because it was an open-book exam. Rogier and Thomas state stories of IP addresses being found after which exams were compared.

Domenico states that with the novelty of online exams, and the fact that it has a future, it is important to look at the procedure of how all these things are being done.

Rogier proposes to send a letter to the EC expressing the concerns deriving from the issues, and ask them specifically for an explanation on why they are changing it without making it a very normative letter. There is general consensus on this.

Thomas has an additional point on this topic. He is afraid that the exam committee is not proportionally handing out punishments, such as 6 months suspensions. As an example, he states that for smaller onsite fraudulent behaviour a student would just be suspended from that course that year.

Olaf agrees with Thomas, he is also concerned that an IP is too little proof, especially if your roommates are students too or you live in student housing.

Rogier states that he has very different experiences. From the stories he has heard and the things he has seen, the EC indeed has a lot of discretion and power, but they handle it quite well. If you are brought before them, you are suspected of fraud and they will assess your case. It could very well be that you get off with a warning if your case is less clear cut. Because of these nuances, he believes the FSR should be careful with making big statements.

Domenico agrees, if there are procedural things that must be changed (especially again with online education), we should look at that, but the council should not get involved with individual cases we have little knowledge about. Thomas agrees, but also states that he thinks the FSR should keep an eye on potential problematic patterns to identify such structural issues as soon as possible, also because very little about these cases/hearings is public.

Olaf states that he thinks if students actually committed fraud, it does not seem odd to him that they are properly punished. Thomas agrees that in some cases the punishment is indeed proportionate.

Rogier states it is hard to make concrete plans, it looks like the EC is doing their best. Domenico adds that for now it is hard to take real steps so he proposes to put it aside for now, but keep an eye on cases of serious unfair treatment. There is general consensus on this.

d. Contemplation room (Robert)

Robert states that at the GOV, the topic was discussed and the board will look at a multi-purpose room. He states that we must think about if we agree, but Assamaul (the file holder) is not here right now. Domenico states that we might already have consensus, and that he will look at this. Otherwise we can discuss it at another PV. Rogier proposes that two people from O&F contact the OR, and work with them on a concrete proposal because it has been discussed a couple of times by the council. Robert states he likes that idea and he will do that and make sure people are on this before next PV.

e. Advertising self-testing (Robert)

Robert states that as of now a banner is placed at all canvas pages informing students about their testing options. Furthermore, he hopes on more action by the board but it feels like it might be lacking from what was discussed at the GOV. The O&F committee will propose physical banners as well. A general consensus is reached on that any ideas of more ways to spread information are welcome.

f. Zachte knip (Thomas)

Thomas received a complaint from a student about the change in the 'zachte knip' compared to last year. Last year, it was possible for bachelor students who had missed up to 15 EC due to corona in the second semester to already start their masters, even if those 15 points included their thesis. This year however, students may also miss 15 EC, but they must have finished their thesis.

There is general consensus on that this is something to bring up at the OV, and O&O can pick it up. The question will simply be what the reasons for this change were, and why the FSR was not informed.

3. Other updates

a. Salomons meeting

Domenico states that Jane, Rogier and himself just had a meeting with Salomons on onderwijsvernieuwing, specifically the electives going down from 30 to 15 EC in the bachelor creating problems for minors. Salomons said they will look at some other faculties, but there seems to be little room to move around with courses (such as the one on sustainability)

Furthermore, Rogier states Salomons said that most minors are not 30 points anyways, and that further related issues will be on the students. They are however willing to look at possibilities for students to do half a minor. However already a problem has appeared with a tax law minor which is quite rigid and 30 points. They are looking at trying to tie this into possibly tying parts of it into the bachelor, but Salomons also stated that tax law is a separate faculty, and therefore it is not the highest priority of the FdR to fix this.

Rogier also states that they discussed new courses such as 'moot court' and that Jane asked some questions on the 'vaardighedenlint' (skills development) for clarification. In general, it was a fruitful meeting.

4. WVTTK

a. Seminar 'What's the Future of Lectures?'

Daniel states we received an invite for this seminar which will take place after exam week. Those who are interested can apply by clicking on the link of the email that will be forwarded after the PV.

Rogier adds that this is in fact a topic the board did not allow the FSR to be a part of for a long while, even though this seems something that has the council's interest. He has however managed to hopefully get the FSR involved in the upcoming year.

5. Closing of the meeting

Domenico closes the meeting at 18:48

6. Action list

- Thank those who signed the fair play agreement on instagram
- Contact other FSRs and parties on their thoughts on onsite campaigning, then try to send a collective email to the CSB expressing the concerns ASAP.
- Work on a proposal for sustainable travel policy (when Robert has time)
- Send an email the exam committee on why they changed the surveillance method and expressing our concerns
- Contact the OR for a collaboration on the contemplation room proposal
- Ask the board for an explanation on the issues with the 'zachte knip'