

REC A, Room A0.04  
Nieuwe Achtergracht 166  
(020) 525 3446  
fdr@studentenraad.nl  
studentenraad.nl/fdr

Date Monday 14 January 2019  
Time 15:00 – 17:00 uur  
Location A7.65  
Contact person Anne van den Bergh  
E-mail fsr-fdr@uva.nl

Present: Anne van den Bergh, Anna de Koning, Ginger Mooren, Guillano Payne, Alexander Gritsay, Minh Quan Bao Nguyen, Latif Sleibi, Svedha Krishnaraj, Vanessa Romeijn.  
Absent: Anna Schröder, Felix Wolthuis Scheeres, Jinane Araqi.  
Guests:  
Secretary: Myron Warta

### **Agenda**

#### **1. Opening of the meeting**

Anne opens the meeting at 15:05h.

#### **2. Setting the agenda:**

##### **a. January 21, 2019 GOV: OER Proposals (accepted & rejected – NB Soeharno’s OER proposal); Note on Inclusivity; NSE Report; Education Year Plans.**

Anna de Koning asks which proposals were in the document that was send to the board. Anne states that the document holds all the proposals that are considered by the board. Ginger states that it is in the overview proposals. Anne states that the individual forms were send to José and are called OER wijzigingsvoorstellen, these can be found in the email. Anne states that she would like to go over every OER proposal that the FSR proposed. Ginger asks if the FSR should discuss the proposals from the board.

#### **Dutch bachelor OER**

Anne states that the OC stands critically towards the mandatory English proposal. Ginger states that the OC will probably advice negatively towards the proposal. Anne states that students from the Dutch bachelor can go to the English masters. Anne states that, in her opinion, the English courses within the bachelor are not sufficient enough for having good understanding of English. Quan states that there is a concern in the masters about the English threshold and he believes that it is good to raise this point during the GOV.

Anna de Koning states that she will help Anne during the GOV on this point. Anne states that Nollkaemper is in favor of this proposal, but that the FSR will have to convince the OC. Anne states that English should be

included in more courses within the bachelor, for example International Public Law. Anne states that there are two main arguments against this proposal. First that it can be confusing for students in the bachelor. Secondly that Dutch law does not support the English content.

Ginger states that there can be an elective course in English for international law. Alex states that the board has accepted the proposal and he does not see the purpose of raising this point during the GOV. Anne states that she would like to know how the board feels about the proposal with regards to the attitude of that the OC has towards it. Anna de Koning states that the FSR could ask the board for help in convincing the OC of this proposal. Alex states that there should be a separate OC meeting. Anne states that this meeting has to take place before the 21<sup>st</sup> of January.

Anne states that Nollkaemper is not in favor of the proposal of earning EC's for internships. Guilliano states that Nollkaemper said that it is hard to give an internship a specific amount of EC's. Ginger states that the internship could function like a 'coschappen'. Anne states that Nollkaemper stated that there are programs like ALF, ALP, Law clinics and the Togaminor. Alex states that Radboud could help Nollkaemper with finding a system to reward internships with EC's.

Anna de Koning states that there has been negativity against the extracurricular activities of students from the board. Guilliano states that there are students who do not want to do a master but would like to partake in an internship and extend their study to do this. Anna de Koning asks when an internship could take place during the bachelor. Anne states that this could take place during the minor time. Anne asks the FSR if this point should be discussed during the GOV. The FSR states that this point should be discussed. Alex states that within PPLE an internship awards the student with 6 EC. Guilliano states that 6 EC is worth 7 weeks of studying, but that an internship could not get to the level of working hours. Svedha states that most internships are for two months and there is no time for studying during that period. Students in PPLE have stopped their study for that period and extended their study time. Svedha states that within PPLE there are less people to talk to for confirming the internship counting 6 EC. Anna de Koning states that there should be a discussion about how an internship could fit in the curriculum but not push the proposal. Anne states that she agrees with Anna de Koning.

Alex asks if there are proposal from the board that can be used in this discussion. Anne states that there is a proposal on the amount of days for reviewing the exams from 15 to 14 days. The OC is also against this. Anna de Koning states that this proposal from the board is due to the outcome of the NSE. Guilliano states that he does not know if this will pressure teachers extra. Ginger states that teachers have said that they need the 18 days. Latif states that some courses have weekly assignments that have the 15 days as a revising period. Anna de Koning states that shortening of working days to revise an exam is not good as leverage. Svedha states that regarding the internship proposal it is better to have a positive discussion. Anna de Koning states that it is better to stay friendly to the other university bodies. Alex states that with the discussion of the English language, student internship and working hours of teachers it is better to win on the proposal of internship. Anne states that during the GOV it is best to open the discussion about the English language in the Dutch bachelor and the internship.

## **Dutch Masters**

Guilliano states that he brought up two things during the meeting about the Dutch Masters. First the study material should be announced a month ahead instead of one week. The argument against this was that this pressures the teachers. The second point that was raised was the mandatory classes because students cannot choose between different times. Anne states that if a course does not have a practical component in it then it will be a mandatory class. Guilliano states that he had a class that had a practical component in it. Anna de Koning asks if this practical component was useful to him. Guilliano states that the practical component was not useful and he believes that if there would be more choice of hours the mandatory presence would not form a problem. Ginger states that an evening course could offer a solution. Anne states that the board is against this, because the UvA is a university where students need to attend classes that are given by the institution itself.

Guilliano states that the lack of choice in classes for master students can turn negatively for the university. Ginger states that during the GOV it can be brought up as a point of concern instead of a discussion. Alex states that there should be a line drawn between mandatory lectures and tutorials, because the tutorials are beneficial for the students. Anne states that the students want to be present at the tutorials, but that there should be given more choice of when a student can participate in it. Guilliano states that flexibility in tutorials should be a point that the FSR should strive for. Anna de Koning states that she disagrees with Guilliano, because for the smaller master programs it is impracticable to cater for every student. Anne asks the FSR if this matter should be brought to the GOV because there is lack of consent. Guilliano states that it does not have to be brought to the coming GOV.

Ginger states in the Dutch Masters the application for exam go from a week to two days before the exam this has not been answered to by the board. Guilliano states that he will discuss this OER topic with Anna Schröder and Ginger before the GOV. Anne states that she would like that all the OER topic groups will go over all the accepted and denied proposal to write an advice and send this before Friday.

Quan states that in regards article 4.5.4 that was proposed by the board of an extra examination is decreasing the rights of the students and the OC confirms this. In regards to article 8.5.4.3 the facility request can only be accepted by the dean and the OC would like to see that this should be changed to 'the dean with other university bodies..'. Quan states that this point should be brought up during the GOV.

## **PPLE OER**

Alex states that there are two points that he would want to bring forward during the GOV. Alex states that the first point is the follow up classes were the first class needs to be passed to partake in the second class. Alex states that there should be a choice of leaving this rule or better executing this rule because it is not followed correctly as we speak. Alex states that the quality of education is of importance here. Anna de Koning states that this can hurt the student if the faculty does not give exemptions. Alex states that exemptions are given fairly easy. Alex states that he would like to raise this point during the GOV, but only after the meeting with

Radboud. Alex states that the second point he would like to raise during the GOV is the lecture recordings that should be made available earlier before the exam week. Alex states that he has send some questions to Radboud. One in regards to shortening the period of reviewing the made exam from six weeks to 20 days. Svedha states that in regards to the request of revising your exam, that this should be made possible online. Secondly the request of changing the grade obtained can only be done during the review session or during an official request.

Anne states that she would like to appoint people that will be responsible to bring OER topics during the GOV. Anna de Koning will defend the OER bachelor and Anne will be back up. OER Masters English will be defended by Quan and be backed up by Latif. Alex will defend the OER PPLE and be backed up by Anna de Koning.

### **Soeharno's proposal**

Anne states that Salomons rejected this proposal because it was too broad to accept.

### **NSE**

Anne asks who will discuss this point during the GOV. Anna de Koning will discuss this point if needed.

### **Annual plan for education**

Alex states that he will do the annual plan for PPLE. Ginger and Vanessa indicate that they will take up the annual plan for the Graduate School of Law. Guilliano and Felix will do the annual plan for the College of Law.

### **The Note Inclusivity**

Quan states that he would like to discuss this point during the GOV.

#### **b. Q&A Session OER (BA + Masters) Recap**

#### **c. FMG Sustainable Travel Policy Letter (Vanessa)**

Vanessa states that in her opinion the FSR should support this letter because the policies of other universities include a green list policy for teachers. Vanessa states that there is a point in the letter on online courses and lectures that will benefit the environment. Vanessa states that the UvA is working on sustainability and that this letter can be beneficial in completing the goals for sustainability.

Alex states that he agrees to the letter, but that it needs to be changed on several points that he finds unfair towards the university. Alex states that he would like to add to the letter that the university reaches out to students on this topic and that this should be emphasized. Alex states that on the last page it is said that direct flights should be taken instead of connecting flights. Alex states that direct flights will raise the costs of the university. Svedha states that this indicates that budget will be used for more expensive flights. Anna de Koning states that she feels that some points are not realistic when looked at the schedules of teachers and

should not be on the Orange list. Alex states that the contribution that is asked in the letter is questionable. Alex states that the Orange list is not enforceable and should not be taken too heavy. Vanessa states that she understands the points that are raised in this discussion and that she will ask questions about these points in the letter.

Alex states that he would like to see these points changed in the letter:

- Third paragraph second page – remove the sentence or add a new one.
- University shares the research and findings.
- Intercontinental flights: bears greater costs and is not realistic.
- Paragraph on the contribution from teachers is too excessive.

Anne asks if the FSR should vote on the letter now or wait for the revised letter. The FSR indicates that this will be done on another moment.

**d. CSR Selection and Accessibility Proposal (Alex)**

**e. OC Meetings – Updates**

Anne asks Guilliano if he could be present at the coming OC meetings. Guilliano states that he will not be possible to attend the OC meetings during the day. Vanessa states that she will replace Guilliano. Ginger asks Guilliano if he would like to be present at the meeting about social safety. Guilliano states that he would like to attend this meeting.

**3. To Dos**

TD's:

- 190114: At least three council members will attend the OER Q&A
- 190114: The sustainability dossier will reply to the FSR FMG email re: the sustainable travel policy letter
- 190114: 2-3 council members will set up an informal meeting with the board to discuss social safety at our faculty
- 190114: Felix and Guilliano will get in touch with Yacintha Habicht (OC) to set up a meeting regarding the JB and availability of study places – **contact has been made and there will be a meeting.**
- 190114: All council members will send in PV agenda points

**4. Other updates**

Latif states that he will get in touch with Lisa Schmidt to give an interview about diversity and inclusion.

**5. WVTTK**

**6. Closing of the meeting**

Anne closes the meeting at 16:55h.

