



Facultaire Studentenraad

RECHTSGELEERDHEID
UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM

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

Date: January 13, 2020
Time: 10:30 – 12:00
Location: REC A, Room A7.23
Contact person: Tara Olsen
E-mail: fsr-fdr@uva.nl

Present: Yoav Weinberg, Roos Creyghton, Aashish Pradeep, Sebastiaan Saelman, Samir Bougrina, Tara Olsen, Nina Hol, Fabian van Hal, Rogier Simons (FSR)
Mireille van Eechoud, Arthur Salomons, José Brugman-Augustijn, André Nollkaemper, Radboud Winkels (Faculty Board)

Absent: Kataryzna Niedzwiecka, Emma Verhulp, Guido Bakker (FSR)
Jan Dijk, Benjamin van Rooij (Faculty Board)

Guests:
Secretary: Jeyanth Sithamparappillai

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting

Councilmember Olsen opens the meeting at 10.35. She asks if the board has any updates. The board has no updates.

2. Annual plans (final concept)

- College of Law

Councilmember Simons states that in the document it stated that the Active Learning Space will have been in use for one full year and he would like to know if the current constructions in the rooms on the 3rd floor will lead to significant changes. Salomons states that the ceiling is being changed and some equipment will be added.

Councilmember Simons asks about the “taaltoets” in the bachelors. He asks if the students from outside of the regular bachelor program (AUC, schakelstudenten PPLE and WEP) need to make the taaltoets as well.

Salomons stelt dat dit een goede vraag is en hier nog niet over nagedacht is. De taaltoets staat in het OER-wijzigingsvoorstel en hier is nog geen specificatie opgenomen. Salomons stelt dat hier nog specifiek naar gekeken moet worden. Raadslid Simons stelt dat de FSR heeft gesproken met

een AUC-student en stelt dat er wel behoefte is aan een dergelijke taaltoets voor de schakelstudenten.

Salomons states that this is a good question and that this issue had not been thought of before. This taaltoets as stated in the OER amendment proposal has no specification included. Salomons states that this is still being looked at specifically. Councilmember Simons states that the FSR has spoken with an AUC student and states that there is a need for such a language test for the linking students.

- **Amsterdam Graduate School of Law**

Councilmember Hol states that the document was clear. She states that the FSR would like to know more about the boot camp. Van Eechoud answers that the boot camp is for the teaching staff of the Amsterdam Law Practice program. She states that this boot camp is set up for the special needs for the program as well as favourable for the tutorials.

- **PPLE College (web lectures evaluation, page 8)**

Councilmember Olsen states that the document was clear as it was discussed before in previous meetings. She states that the FSR would like to know if the courses for next semester are chosen for the web lecture pilot and if so, which courses these are. Winkels states that he had contact with the course coordinators. He will follow up with them and let the FSR know which courses are chosen for web lecture recordings.

3. Faculty Annual Plan (final concept)

Councilmember Van Hal has three questions regarding the Faculty Annual Plan:

- 1) To decrease the pressure for teachers, the document states that some unnecessary courses will be taken away. The FSR would like to know if the courses that will be removed from the program have already been chosen? And if so, which ones?
- 2) “Activerend leren”. In section 1 sub a, Onderwijsvernieuwing, it is stated that there will be more active learning. He states that the FSR cannot see this topic in the rest of the document. He asks if the active learning space on the third floor was part of it, and if so, why it is gone? He also asks what the concrete steps will be on active learning?
- 3) Section 5: “Executive education”. Councilmember Van Hal asks what is meant with the phrase ‘leven lang leren’ and what the concrete measures are that will be taken.

Nollkaemper states that compared to ten years ago a lot of courses have been reduced. He states that this has to do with financial reasons because more courses demand more teachers. He also states that the reduction of courses is connected to the onderwijsvernieuwing. Nollkaemper states that there must be a good balance between the interest of students and the financial model and a coherent program. Van Eechoud states that you should have coherent programs as well in the LLM programs. She states that the offer of courses was

influenced by the expertise of the teaching staff. She states that it is important that they should look critically to the LLM programs and not set up the programs because of the staff's interest.

Nollkaempers states that students will be more active during their courses and that is why active learning was brought in. He states that an example of this is the Amsterdam Law Firm and the Amsterdam Law Practice. He would like to develop this faculty-wide.

Nollkaemper states that the executive education (leven lang leren) has a goal not just to educate students from bachelors and masters but also people from in their 30s, 40s and 50s. He states that professionals are also a part of this 'leven lang leren', they can learn throughout their whole career.

Nollkaemper states that on the theme of sustainability a paragraph was added in the new Faculty Annual Plan. This was done per request of the FSR from last year.

4. Concept Blauwdruk Onderwijsvernieuwing FdR UvA Onderwijsvernieuwing

- **Uitstroomprofiel**
- **Goals of the project**
- **De Onderwijsvisie (bachelors (ex PPLE) and masters**

Councilmember Bougrina asks how the core team would like to receive the feedback as stated on page 3. He would also like to know what the exact role is of the FSR during the process of the onderwijsvernieuwing.

Salomons stelt dat het aan de FSR is om te bepalen wie er allemaal deel uitmaakt van het kernteam. Salomons stelt dat de FSR zelf mag bepalen hoe de feedback wordt gegeven en hij zou deze feedback graag in januari 2020 willen hebben. Raadslid Bougrina vraagt tevens wanneer de FSR meer bestanden krijgt. Salomons antwoordt dat de stukken naar het mailadres zullen worden gestuurd die de FSR heeft opgegeven bij het kernteam.

Nollkaemper vraagt aan de FSR of de werkwijze die nu gehanteerd wordt bevredigend is voor de FSR. Raadslid Hol antwoordt dat een volmondig antwoord nog niet gegeven kan worden, omdat de samenwerking pas net op gang komt. Zolang de FSR de stukken krijgt van het kernteam en feedback kan geven, is dit prima. Raadslid Simons stelt dat de FSR in eerste instantie dacht dat de FSR ook de vergaderingen zou bijwonen. Salomons stelt dat het veel tijd zou kosten als de FSR ook de vergaderingen zou bijwonen. Hij stelt voor dat alle partijen eens in de twee maanden bijeenkomen. Raadslid Simons accepteert dit voorstel.

Salomons states that it is up to the FSR to determine who is part of the core team. Salomons states that the FSR may decide how the feedback is given and he would like to receive it by the end of January 2020. Councilmember Bougrina also asks when the FSR will get more files. Salomons replies that the documents will be sent to the email address that FSR has provided to the core team.

Nollkaemper asks the FSR whether the method currently used is satisfactory for the FSR. Councilmember Hol replies that a comprehensive answer cannot be given at this time, as the current method is still in development. As long as the FSR receives the documents from the core team, and has a feedback

opportunity, the FSR is satisfied. Councilmember Simons states that the FSR initially thought that the FSR would also attend the meetings. Salomons answers that it would take a lot of time if the FSR also attended the meetings. He proposes that all parties meet once every two months. Councilmember Simons accepts this proposal.

5. OC selection procedure (reaction from the OC's)

Councilmember Olsen states that FSR appreciates the reaction from the OC and that they took the time to look at their proposal. She also states that the FSR understands that the OC knows best whether a change might work or not. As long as they will follow the rules and that even re-occurring candidates go through the same selection procedure, it is fine with the FSR.

Councilmember Olsen states that the OC stated in their reaction that the FSR is “traditionally not as active”. She asks whether this has to do with the selection procedures or speaking about such things. She states that the FSR will be more active during the selection procedure. She states that the FSR will set up a meeting with the OC.

Nollkaemper states that this is fine and it is good that the FSR will discuss this with the OC.

6. Master student feedback on LL.M. International Trade and Investment Law (grading)

Councilmember Weinberg states that a month ago the FSR got a visit from two International Trade and Investment Law students. They were upset with many different aspects of their LLM. He also states that the complaints seemed very reasonable. Councilmember Weinberg states that the students wrote a letter with their complaints including recommendations for the LLM. He also states that the letter is backed by more than the two students who wrote the letter.

Councilmember Weinberg states that most of the points in the letter are relevant to the Program Committee rather than the faculty board. He states that the FSR would like to point out two points of interest that are quite important.

Firstly, the students experienced a form of grading which goes against the OER rules. They either received a 0, 6 or 10 for an assignment. The students were not told that they would be graded this way and they found this very unclear. Councilmember Weinberg states that the FSR believes that grading should be a transparent process. He also states that the OER has standards to achieve transparent grading but unfortunately this form of grading did not adhere to the standards.

Secondly, he states that there were also problems with the tuition payment. Some students had consequences for their legal status as a foreign student in the Netherlands due to these problems.

Councilmember Weinberg states that the FSR was shocked after reading the letter from the master students. He proposes that the Program Director of the Masters has a meeting with the students. Councilmember Weinberg states that regarding the program-specific issues, it is best to have a meeting with the Program Committee. Councilmember Weinberg states that the board should take these complaints seriously.

Nollkaemper states that till now this LLM was a well-functioning master program and is surprised by the letter from the students. On the payment issue, he states that this will be discussed on UvA central level as this is a procedure handled on a central level. Nollkaemper states that he spoke with the Program Director of this LLM. He states that the Program Director will meet with these students who sent the letter.

Van Eechoud states that she received this letter as well. She states that the problems are addressed with the persons who are involved in these issues. On the grading, she states that this is being discussed with the Exam Committee. She also states that these issues will be discussed with the teachers who are in this LLM program. She states that these actions hopefully will prevent something like this happening again.

Councilmember Hol states that those gradings go against the rules of the OER and she asks if the gradings will be changed. Van Eechoud states that this will be discussed with the Exam Committee. She and Salomons also state that grading from 1 to 10 is the standard and 0 is not possible as a grading.

7. To Dos

- **20200131 Winkels will inform the FSR which courses are chosen for the web lecture pilot.**
- **20200131 The FSR will send their feedback on the “Concept Blauwdruk” to the core team.**

8. Other updates

9. WVTTK

Councilmember Olsen states that she emailed if the Christmas lights could be turned off when the university is closed. This did not happen. She states that the lights should be turned off during the night. Winkels agrees with councilmember Olsen and he will discuss this with Nils Mevius for the coming year.

Councilmember Olsen has some points on the ‘spreekgestoelten’ in the lecture halls. The logo of UvA is not clear on the spreekgestoelten or some of it is missing. Nollkaemper states that he will look into this.

10. Closing of the meeting

Councilmember Olsen closes the meeting at 11.04.

Attachments

- **200113_2a Jaarverslag 2018-2019 & Jaarplan College of Law 2020-2021**
- **200113_2b Jaarverslag 2018-2019 & Jaarplan AGSL 2020-2021**
- **200113_2c Bijlage Jaarverslag 2018-2019 & Jaarplan AGSL 2020-2021**
- **200113_2d PPLE Annual Report 2018-2019 and Annual Plan 2020-2021**
- **200113_3 Faculty Annual Plan**
- **200113_4 Concept Blauwdruk Onderwijsvernieuwing FdR UvA**
- **200113_5a Memorandum GOV20192028**
- **200113_5b PC Chairs position on selection procedure**
- **200113_6 Recommendations ITIL; UvA**

Disclaimer: The *translated* part of the minutes is not binding.