



Conceptverslag van het overleg tussen de Raad van Toezicht en de Centrale Studentenraad, gehouden op 6 juni 2018

Van de zijde van de Raad van Toezicht: Marise Voskens (voorzitter RvT), Edith Hooge (lid van de RvT met het bijzonder vertrouwen van de medezeggenschap), Arne Brentjes (secretaris RvT);

Van de zijde van de Centrale Studentenraad 2017-2018: Sasha Borovitskaja, Jern Ken Chew, Quinta Dijk, Pim van Helvoirt, Bram Jaarsma, Michele Murgia, David Nelck, Loraine Smith;
Afwezig: Guido Bakker, Sofie ten Brink, Atma Jyoti Mahapatra, Kjeld Oostra, Sebastian Proos, Mees van Rees, Teo Todercan;

Van de zijde van het College van Bestuur: Karen Maex (rector magnificus), Geert ten Dam (voorzitter CvB), Moataz Rageb (Studentassessor-CvB), Mariska Herweijer (bestuurssecretaris);

Verslag: Tamara van den Berg (ambtelijk secretaris CSR)

Agenda

1. **Opening en vaststellen agenda** // Opening and setting the agenda
2. **Vaststellen verslagen d.d. 22 mei 2017 en 1 december 2017** // Approving the minutes of May 22, 2017, and December 1, 2017
3. **Mededelingen** // Announcements
4. **Midterm review Instellingsplan** // Mid-term review Strategic Plan
5. **Toegankelijkheid** // Accessibility
6. **Studentbetrokkenheid** // Student involvement
7. **Tussentijdse terugblik van de CSR op academisch jaar 2017-2018** // Interim review of the CSR on academic year 2017-2018
8. **W.v.t.t.k.** // Any other business
9. **Rondvraag en sluiting** // Questions and closing the meeting

1. Opening and setting the agenda

Ms Voskens opens the meeting at 14.00h and welcomes all participants. The approving of the concept minutes is moved to the end of the meeting.

2. Announcements

Ms Voskens asks the CSR for their opinion about the open letter that the CvB sent to minister Van Engelshoven (OCW) and the committee of Education, Culture and Science. Van Helvoirt considers it a positive development that the CvB sent this letter.

3. Midterm review Strategic Plan

Ms Voskens asks the CSR for their opinion about the mid-term review of the Strategic Plan. Borovitskaja, Van Helvoirt and Jaarsma took part in the meetings that were organized in preparation for the midterm review. They state to be positive about the process and the first draft of the review.

KPI's – The CSR has questions about the status of the KPI's that were not updated in the midterm review. The CSR conveyed to the CvB that it would be useful to set a KPI on student engagement despite the qualitative aspects of the topic. The CSR also suggested including more examples of community building and a vision on sustainability

in the Strategic Plan and, subsequently, in the Institutional Plan for 2021-2026. Furthermore, the CSR highlights two aspects of the mid-term review: the importance of diversity in education, for example by considering different methods for presenting knowledge, and secondly, maintaining a balance between research and education.

15 **Research & valorisation-** Borovitskaja, Smith, and Murgia emphasize that, depending on the area of research, a link between businesses and research might negatively impact the independence of research and hence the university's theoretic academic educational need. Van Helvoirt says that this might be different for beta-studies. Murgia suggests considering valorisation in terms of social or cultural merits instead. Ms Hooge asks whether this applies to links with non-profit or governmental organizations as well. For Murgia, this is the case, but Borovitskaja states that this differs between research areas. The RvT witnesses that valorisation is already being considered in this broad sense and is linked to both the regional community and national society. Van Helvoirt and Borovitskaja are positive about the UvA's involvement in the Amsterdam Metropolitan Area but suggest to consider the inequality within Amsterdam as well. Murgia points out that too much focus on societal impact may further blur the distinction between universities and Hbo's which nowadays seem to engage more widely in research.

20 **Other suggestions -** The RvT asks which points of the mid-term review flagged up to the CSR. Van Helvoirt warns against increasing work pressure at the decentral level when cutting overhead costs. Borovitskaja notes that the NSE was taken out of the Dutch document but is still mentioned in the English version. The CSR is against the reference to the NSE as the survey is inadequate as a measure of student satisfaction.

25 **Internationalization -** The RvT asks the CSR about their view on internationalization. Chew explains that language changes should only be implemented to benefit the quality of education and in a sustainable manner. The CSR is involved in the Taskforce International Classroom, which deals with topics such as language policy and internationalization. The CSR is positive about this procedure, although it would be preferable to include students from OC's or study associations as well.

30 The CSR will discuss their questions and recommendations about the mid-term review Strategic Plan with the CvB during the OV of June 19th. Generally, the CSR is positive about the procedure for the mid-term review, the roundtable discussions and the involvement of students. The CvB asks whether the CSR would like to apply the same procedure for updating the Strategic Plan; the council is in favour.

4. Accessibility

35 **Transition programs -** Murgia states that transition programs are important for the accessibility of the university and therefore should be facilitated.

40 **Honours programs -** The CSR and CvB are discussing the setup and quality assurance of the honours programs. The CSR proposed making the courses (more) accessible to all students and giving the OC's consenting right regarding the entry requirements for specific courses.

45 **BSA -** The CSR believes that the BSA can add to the pressure on students, which is problematic in the societal context of burnouts and the general pressure on young people to perform. The CSR awaits the evaluation of the BSA.

50 **Diversity -** The CSR expresses their discontent with the fact that not all faculties have appointed a Faculty Diversity Officer (FDO) yet. Van Helvoirt and Murgia add that not all FDO's are compensated 0,2 FTE for their work. The rector explains that the dean of the FGw is taking this up with the FSR-FGw. Van Helvoirt says that the CvB could do more to support the diversity network and policies, despite the opposition within the university. The RvT asks the CSR about their expectations of the Diversity Officers. Murgia and Smith are of the opinion that the recommendations from the Diversity Report should be followed and that the FDO's need to be compensated for their work. Murgia also proposes organizing a periodical meeting between the Diversity Team and other parties such as the *medezeggenschap*. Jaarsma adds that a cultural change in the organization could be established by creating more awareness about diversity. Murgia stresses that this is not only to be considered in an international



55 context but within the Netherlands as well. Smith suggests creating a budget for organizing events or bottom-up initiatives related to diversity. The CvB explains that this funding is available in the budget of the CDO. Van Helvoirt suggests promoting the education network OPeRA that reaches out to secondary schools. The CSR stresses that generally the work that is being done in relation to Diversity should be made more visible to the academic community. Meanwhile, the CSR acknowledges the current investment in physical accessibility of premises.

5. Student involvement

60 Dijk explains that student involvement is one of the shared goals between the CSR and CvB. This is important as student involvement also touches upon accessibility, mental health, internationalization, the Strategic Plan, and the academic institution. For the CSR, the notion of *studentenbetrokkenheid* relates both to student engagement and student involvement while concerning both students and (non)academic staff. Ms Voskens points out that community building can be done on different scales and asks the CSR for their vision. Dijk explains that the sense of
65 community is often stronger within the classroom or in a program, but less strong at the institutional level.

Ms Voskens asks whether the CSR sees a role for Blended Learning in community building and the demand for student engagement. Dijk says that the project is not worked out concretely enough yet to indicate how Blended Learning could practically contribute to strengthening the community. Jaarsma stresses that the need for community building would increase when students increasingly follow their lectures online.

70 Dijk explains that the CSR worked on different files to improve student involvement: the UvA's language policy, the position of first-year-students in OC's, the visibility of the *medezeggenschap*, the governmental structures of the university and the position of the University Forum. The CSR and CvB are together working on a plan to improve the student involvement within the university. The rector indicates that during the academic year 2017-2018, the CvB considered the position of international students and the international classroom. The
75 proposal is to consider student engagement in a broader sense during 2018-2019. This could also benefit the voting turnout for the council elections. Murgia says that the organization of OC-elections needs to be evaluated.

6. Interim review of the CSR on the academic year 2017-2018

The RvT asks the CSR to look back on the academic year 2017-2018 and their work in the student council. Chew notes that the energy level dropped during the year and that working in different settings (e.g. working sessions) can help to work more productively while increasing student engagement. Van Helvoirt regrets that the FSR-FdG and FSR-ACTA were not (always) represented in the CSR, which means that their views could not be
80 incorporated in the CSR's decisions. Borovitskaja states that the language change to English was the biggest challenge for the CSR and still needs to be discussed for the GV. Murgia says that the CSR was rather unstable, switching members throughout the year while not all council members took their responsibilities. Jaarsma states that the CSR's internal structure of taskforces caused a lack of overview and a lot of workload for the delegates.

85 Jaarsma states that within a one year timeframe, the student council cannot achieve much, despite the number of hours that all council members invested in it. Jaarsma and Van Helvoirt disagree whether the CSR achieved enough of the goals they set for themselves at the start of the year. Jaarsma says that the UvA could help prospective council members to form more realistic expectations and gain knowledge of the limitations of the council work. The CSR agrees that a year in the *medezeggenschap* is a valuable experience that teaches different
90 things about education, finances, management structures, and working environments.

Chew acknowledges that the CSR's annual change of composition might cause problems for the staff that works together with student council members. The RvT acknowledges that it takes time to find one's way in the organization and culture of the university. Chew suggests increasing student involvement by hiring involved and experienced students for working groups or projects.

7. Approving the minutes of May 22, 2017, and December 1, 2017

95

- The minutes of the WHW-meeting RvT-CSR on May 22nd, 2017 are set.
- The minutes of the WHW-meeting RvT-CSR on December 1st, 2017 are set after correcting the list of attendants.

8. Any other business

None.

9. Questions

None.

10. Closing the meeting

100

The CSR and RvT express their appreciation and satisfaction with the discussions and collaboration during the past year. The RvT stresses the importance of getting input from students and the relevance of the bi-annual meeting with the CSR.

Ms Voskens thanks all meeting participants for their contribution and closes the meeting at 15.30h.