



*Facultaire*  
**Studentenraad**

RECHTSGELEERDHEID

Nieuwe Achtergracht 166  
REC A 0.04  
(020) 525 3446  
fdr@studentenraad.nl  
studentenraad.nl/fdr

Datum 11 maart 2019  
Tijd: 10:30-12:00  
Contactpersoon: Myron Warta  
Email: [fsr-fdr@uva.nl](mailto:fsr-fdr@uva.nl)

Locatie REC A7.23

Anna Schröder, Anna de Koning, Ginger Mooren, Alexander Gritsay, Minh Quan Bao Nguyen, Jinane Araqi, Vanessa Romeijn, Svedha Krishnaraj, Radboud Winkels, José Brugman- Augustijn, Jan Dijk, Benjamin van Rooij, Arthur Salomons, Andre Nollkaemper (decaan) en Alaa Khalifa.

Afwezig: Anne van den Bergh, Guillano Payne, Latif Sleibi, Felix Wolthuis Scheeres.

Voorzitter: Anna Schröder

Notulist: Myron Warta



UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM

---

## Agenda

### 1. Opening en vaststellen agenda

Council member Schröder opens the meeting at 10:38h.

### 2. Mededelingen

Council member Schröder states that she will be chairing this meeting because council member van den Bergh is unable to be present.

Radboud states that he will have to leave the meeting earlier. Council member Schröder states because Radboud will have to leave the meeting earlier, that point five on Workshops social safety will be switched with point four on update research master.

Council member Schröder states that Brugman- Augustijn has stated that the unsolicited advice in regards to EMO I can be discussed after point three. Nollkaemper states that this matter is an urgent one and should therefore be discussed in this meeting.



### 3. Definitief instemmingsverzoek bestuurlijke regeling PPLE

Council member Araqi states that the FSR did not have sufficient time to read the document that was sent by the board in depth. However, the FSR has preliminary questions regarding the instemmingsverzoek.

Council member Araqi states that the FSR firstly would like to know how the decision-making and staff participation would be organized. Will there be an OR specific to PPLE and if so how will this be organized.

Council member Araqi states that the FSR would secondly like to know if there will be a constant funding from the three faculties to PPLE.

Council member Araqi states that the FSR lastly would like to have a clarification about article 4. The FSR would like to know what the differences are between lecturers, teachers and academic staff.

Radboud states that this document has been discussed extensively with the FSR and OR in the past. Radboud states that the staff and students from PPLE do not have a separate Medezeggenschap. Radboud states that this was an idea for the students in the past, but because of the FSR this did not happen. Radboud states that the Medezeggenschap for students is arranged through the FSR. For the staff this is the OR of the faculty of Law. There is no specific body for PPLE.

Radboud states that the budget of PPLE comes from either the Ministry of Education in The Hague or the students. There is no separate capital flow. Nollkaemper states that there is a footnote to this, because the FEB, FdR and the board of the University paid the initial investment for PPLE.

Council member Araqi asks what the difference is between academic staff and teachers. Radboud states that the academic staff is the lecturers and tutors. Nollkaemper states that article 4 provides that PPLE has on the one hand tutors and lecturers who are part of PPLE. On the other hand there is academic staff from other parts of the university, for example from FMG or FEB. Nollkaemper states that article 4 (1) refers to tutors and lecturers employed by PPLE and (2) refers to professors from other faculties.

Council member Schröder asks if there are further questions regarding this topic. Nollkaemper states that the board will need an instemming from the FSR at one point. Nollkaemper asks the FSR if there will be an additional round within the FSR where this consent will be discussed. Council member Araqi states that the FSR will discuss this.

#### 4. EMO I.

Council member Gritsay states that he is thankful, that the board is willing to discuss this urging topic at this meeting. Council member Gritsay states that the FSR does not feel that the current arrangement that are being made in regards to the examination of EMO I will meet the needs of the students. The students have fallen victim of the mismanagement of the examination. Council member Gritsay states that the FSR has given two options that could be used to solve it. Firstly, the rescheduled mid-term examination will take place on the 14<sup>th</sup> of March. However, students will be given an opportunity to participate in a resit mid-term scheduled for a later date. The final exam will take place as planned and count for 55% of the final grade. Secondly, the second mid-term examination will be cancelled and the final exam will assess the content of both first and second halves of the module. The final exam will weigh for 80% of the final grade and with a further 20% coming from the continuous in-class assignments. Council member Gritsay states that the FSR prefers the first option.

Nollkaemper states that normally topics like this should not be on the full agenda of the FSR, but that these should be discussed during an informal meeting. However because of the urgent nature of this matter it can be discussed here to look for a solution. Nollkaemper states that if a solution cannot be found in this meeting it should be done outside the meeting.

Winkels states that he is surprised about the letter. Winkels stated that he had a meeting with the FSR earlier last week. In this meeting the matter was also discussed extensively. Winkels states that he postponed the deadline for an assignment in a course that is parallel to the exam. Winkels states that he thought the matter was settled and therefor was surprised that a letter was send to the dean. Winkels states that both proposals will not be beneficial for the students. Besides that it also does not fit into the policy of PPLE. Continuous assessment is part of PPLE to give continues feedback to students about their learning and to keep them studying. Therefore removing a midterm to the end of the course is against this policy and the rules of the examinations board. Winkels states that postponing the midterm will not be executed. Winkels states that he does not see a problem in moving the midterm eight days later, because students had studied for it. Winkels states that the timeslot of the exam is on the same time as that there was a course for that class. Therefore a problem of attending this midterm is not an issue. Winkels states that moving all the material of the midterm to the final exam will create a high burden for students. Winkels states that because of the reasons above the proposals of the FSR are unreasonable.

Council member Gritsay states that the informal meeting with Winkels was an inquiry meeting before the FSR had its PV. During the PV the FSR made its stand in this matter. Council member Gritsay states that the proposals will help the students, because with a new examination some students cannot attend the exam because of medical appointments. Council member Gritsay states that therefore the burden on students will increase. Winkels states that the preparation of students for the midterm is not an issue in this matter. Winkels states that the students that have a medical appointment are a matter for



---

the examinations board, because it involves individual cases. These students can ask for special circumstances.

Council member Schröder states that she will close this discussion, because this is not the proper venue to solve the matter at this moment. Nollkaemper states that this matter needs to be resolved and that he will connect with Winkels to assess the possible alternatives later today or tomorrow. Council member Gritsay states that the student were unable to contact the examinations board because they were on vacation and unreachable until today, three days before the planned exam. Council member Gritsay states that these students were advised by the student councilor to not take part in the exam and attend their medical appointments and do a resit, that would count 90% of their grade. Council member Gritsay states that this is not a favorable option in the FSR's opinion. Winkels state that these are matters for the examinations board and should not be discussed in this meeting.



## 5. Workshops social safety

Council member Nguyen states that this topic is discussed for several months now. Council member Nguyen states that the FSR has heard about the workshops from Our bodies/our voices at PPLE and that these should also be present at the Law faculty. Council member Nguyen states that he has contacted the students that organized these workshops and these are organized on part of the chief diversity officer (Anne de Graaff). Council member Nguyen asks if the board is willing to organize workshops like these for the faculty as a whole.

Nollkaemper asks if these workshops are for students. Council member Nguyen states that it concerns the workshops for students. Nollkaemper states that the board is open to organizing these workshops. Nollkaemper states that he prefers to see evaluations on student experiences at the workshops.

Van Rooij asks if students get EC points for these workshops. Council member Nguyen states that the workshops are extracurricular. Van Rooij asks how many students attend these workshops. Council member Nguyen states that there were three workshops and that over twenty students attended these. Council member Nguyen states that the overall experience of students about these workshops is positive.

Van Rooij states that in the law school an informal group is started for first generation students. The group consists of eighty people and organizes activities that are aimed at diversity and law. Van Rooij states that if workshops were organized it would be good to contact this group.

Nollkaemper asks Winkels when there will be an evaluation made of these workshops. Winkels states that at the end of the academic year there will be an evaluation. Winkels states that the workshops were partly sponsored by PPLE, but also found other sponsors. Council member Nguyen asks if there is a budget at the faculty for organizing these workshops. Nollkaemper states that there is a budget for these workshops. Nollkaemper states that next academic year these workshops can be began if the evaluations have been read.

Council member Araqi states that these workshops are not reserved for first generation students. These workshops open the conversation for students and send a signal to open this topic for discussion. Nollkaemper states that social safety and diversity are separate topics, but do connect at certain points.

## 6. Update research master

Nollkaemper states that the research masters are nation wide discussed in favor of the sector plan. There is a commitment of all the law faculties in the Netherlands to have eighty students coming out of the research-based masters in six years. Nollkaemper states that there was a meeting between the law faculties and there are three options.

The first option is a traditional research master that already was present but was too costly. To avoid that scenario the plan is to work together with other faculties. The second option is a regular master with on top of that a 30 EC additional research component. The third option is new and involves a two-year T-shape lawyer master. Nollkaemper states that it is interesting that students that did not do a law program like PPLE or AUC can do a two-year program on top of that and get civiel effect. Nollkaemper states that these students do not have to do the schakelprogram. Nollkaemper states that the first assessment will be made in three weeks. Nollkaemper states that a proposal from the university side will have to be made by mid May.

Council member de Koning asks if the board would like to pursue all three options. Nollkaemper states that the board does not pursue all three options, but that these are nation wide options. Nollkaemper states that it is considered to open the research component of the two-year master for students that come out of the law curriculum. Council member de Koning asks if the board is in favor of option three. Nollkaemper states that from a national perspective, option three will benefit the diversity at the university.

Council member Schröder asks if many students will choose option three solely to get civiel effect, without focusing on the PhD component. Nollkaemper states that option three will form broadly educated lawyers, which is the goal of the program. Van Rooij states that the graduates that will choose option three will be different from other students because they are broader educated. Therefore they can take a challenge and will choose for the research component in the master and not solely for the civiel effect. Besides that there are not many PhD places for students. Making a program for only creating PhD students will bring back the old problems from the research masters. Van Rooij states that students need to be educated broadly to have a good career path. Van Rooij states that the students that will partake in this program will do the research component as well.

Council member Nguyen states that the T-shape lawyer comes from students that have done interdisciplinary studies, but the problem that might arise is that they lack the necessary knowledge to do research at a PhD level. Van Rooij states that the T-shape will be opposite. The student starts broad and then moves to law. Van Rooij states that in order to get civiel effect a student has to go through all types of law. This will be the same in this program. It will start broad and will focus gradually, but then on a master level.

Council member Nguyen asks if the board will expand to the interdisciplinary masters as Law & Finance that are already being offered or will it specifically focus on the research masters. Nollkaemper states that all master programs should be research intensive. Nollkaemper states that on top of that, the 30 EC extra could focus on research could be opened up for master students that do Law & Finance.

Council member Schröder asks how these new options will solve the problems that



---

research masters created. Nollkaemper states that the problems were finance and the amount of students. Nollkaemper states that most law students prefer to do a normal master instead of a PhD. Therefore the group will always be small. However with the options that are presented this will be different group. Nollkaemper states that a program as presented in option three will be appealing for students from PPLE or AUC. Moreover it can attract students from other parts of the country and make a continuing stream of students.

Council member Schröder asks what the timeframe will look like. Nollkaemper states that in regards to the time frame there have to be asked preliminary questions. Besides that, if it is a new program it will have to go through aggregation and Medezeggenschap Nollkaemper states that option two or three are up for choosing. Nollkaemper states that the FSR and the board will have a preliminary discussion on this topic before mid May. Nollkaemper states that it is a nation wide commitment that in six years all universities will have delivered 80 students with a PhD level. Nollkaemper states that the FSR will be informed on the process. Nollkaemper states that this will be an agenda point for next meeting.

## 7. Honours

### a. Positie van de Zuidas binnen honours

Council member de Koning states that the council has heard that the students at honours would like to see more diversity within the program in terms of the firms that they get in touch with. Council member de Koning states that students would like to see more modules and assignments aimed on the governments or NGO's. Council member de Koning states that the Law Hub is a good step forward. Council member de Koning states that this matter also plays in ALF and ALP. Council member de Koning asks if the board sees the same trend towards the Zuidas in the program.

Nollkaemper states that he sees a different trend that focuses more on the social part of the law. Nollkaemper states that he is aware of the historical connection with the Zuidas and that this is not desirable to have it as a dominant feature in honours program. Nollkaemper states that he has spoken to Soeharno (coordinator honours) and he made clear that many honours students do not want to work at the Zuidas. However the program can use a rebalancing. Nollkaemper states that he will take this matter up in the discussion with Soeharno. Nollkaemper states that the university is making a social profile in the law bachelor and master that is diverse.

Khalifa asks how the university incorporates the social component into the program, because she has not experienced it in her master. Nollkaemper states that the social profile of the law school should be visible in all programs. However this is not the case as yet, but with the Law Hub, this is changing.

Van Rooij states that the master profiles will be examined and questions as: why do students choose this master and why would employer offer jobs to these students. Van Rooij states that even in corporate law there are rules that have to take into account regulation regarding the public. Van Rooij states that there is a limitation, because the board cannot dictate them what to tech. Council member Schröder states that actual Zuidas firms organize events for honours students at their companies and this creates an unfair advantage towards the public sector and smaller firms because the latter lack the budget to do this. Council member Schröder states that there should be an opportunity for the public sector and smaller firms.

Council member Schröder states that the FSR would like to be involved with the evaluation of the master programs. Van Rooij states that he is content to hear that the FSR would like to be part of these evaluations.

### b. Openstelling honoursvakken voor niet-honours studenten

Council member Schröder states that the FSR would like to see the master classes and rhetoric classes be opened up for regular students, for as far there are places available.

Council member Schröder asks what the board feels about this proposal.

Nollkaemper states that by design of the groups, these are full. However the question can be if these courses can be offered to regular students. Council Member Schröder states that the opportunity should be given to regular students to attend the mater classes and participate in the rhetoric class. Salomons states that the courses on rhetoric are open for regular students. Council member Schröder states that there are no places for regular students in the course. Salomons states that it can be discussed with Soeharno if there can be an extra class. Nollkaemper states that the honours students have separate working



---

groups throughout the courses of the bachelor. Nollkaemper states the board can ask Soeharno if it is possible to open up the class on rhetoric. Salomons states that the master classes are open for regular students. Salomons states that students can write an email to the organization to take part in it. Council Member Schröder states that these master classes are not visible for regular students.

Council member Schröder states that the FSR would like to write an unsolicited advice about honours and the council's stand on it. Nollkaemper states that before drafting the advice the board can provide more information about honours and the criteria for students that participate in it. Council member Schröder asks if the topic of honours courses that are not evaluated by an OC against certain university rules that can be discussed. Nollkaemper states that the board does not know that at this moment, but will inquire.

#### **8. W.v.t.t.k.**

#### **9. Rondvraag en sluiting**

Gritsay asks what the next steps are, that the FSR can take in regards to the EMO I exam. Nollkaemper states that he will inform himself about this matter and connect to Winkels to respond to the FSR later today.

Gritsay asks if the board could provide the FSR with UvAMatching evaluation.

Gritsay states that the FSR is content with the plan of the new council room. Gritsay states that the FSR is looking forward to the Deaner.

Schröder closes the meeting at 11:42h.

#### Actiepunten

**AP 161219-01 Nollkaemper houdt de FSR op de hoogte van de HRM discussie.**

#### Besluitenlijst

**150928-01 Zodra er meer informatie is over de minoren wordt deze met de FSR besproken.**

#### Pro Memorie

**150420-01 Nollkaemper zegt toe dat zware afspraken met de medezeggenschap niet in de zomer zullen worden gemaakt. De zomer houdt in half juli tot en met 1 september.**

**160208-01 Voorstellen voor de OER moeten voor de deadline van het bestuur worden opgestuurd (1 oktober).**

**160606-02 Het bestuur houdt de FSR op de hoogte omtrent besluiten over REC-A.**

