



Minutes OV FSR and DB FGw 1 May 2020

Fred Weerman, Marian Wilts, Carlos Reijnen, Thomas Vaessens, Freya Chiappino, Rijk Van Beek, Ömür Kirli, Rozemarijn Vissers, Olaiya Aro, Liesje Verhave, Luana Lenz, Gerard Nijsten, Tjibbe Valkenburg, Devrim Aslan, Zazie van Dorp, Gabriel Péres, Roxane Erni

Present

Absent

Guest

Secretary

Irene Zwiép

Emma Kat (Technical Chair)

Nicolle Bötcher

Agenda

- 1 1. Opening and confirming the agenda
- 2 2. Confirmation draft minutes OV 10 December 2019 (Attachment)
- 3 3. Announcements
- 4 a. DB
- 5 b. FSR
- 6 4. Updates
- 7 a. Corona
- 8 b. Proctorio and Corona
- 9 c. CoH
- 10 d. GSH
- 11 5. Kwaliteitsafspraken (Attachment)
- 12 6. Contemplation rooms (Attachment)
- 13 7. Greenpaper clustering OC's (Attachment)
- 14 8. Questions and closing

15 **1. Opening and confirming the agenda**

16 Kat opens the meeting at 13:01. No adjustments to the agenda are made.

17 **2. Confirmation draft minutes OV 1901210 and 200220**

18 Draft minutes: The draft minutes 191210 and 200206 are postponed.

19 Action points: The action list is postponed.

20 **3. Announcements**

21 **a. Daily Board of the Faculty**

22 Irene Zwiep is absent. Weerman suggests to talk about Corona if the time allows it.

23 **b. FSR**

24 Roxane Erni is absent.

25 **4. Updates**

26 **a. Corona:**

27 The board gives the FSR the opportunity to ask questions or provide comments. Liesje says
28 that the FSR should be more structurally involved in the decision making process of the crisis
29 team. The dean says they follow the structure of crisis situations but he is willing to think about
30 ways to communicate better with the FSR – also looking towards the next academic year - and is
31 open for discussions on Corona with the Chair of the FSR and the OR.

32 **b. Proctorio & Corona:**

33 Van Beek wants to know if the Faculty has intentions to use this program this academic
34 year. The dean says that there are none for this year since *Proctorio* is still in the experimental
35 phase at FEB. He is not sure about what comes out of the experiments and the persistence of
36 Corona. He doesn't see good alternatives at the moment. Van Dorp says that in Tilburg the law
37 faculty decides not to use it due to privacy reasons and that the dean could maybe contact them
38 for suggestions. Ari says that at the faculty of Psychology there is set a time limit as an
39 alternative.

40 **c. CoH**

41 Vaessens says the CoH found alternative examinations and he is positive about the delay
42 being minimal for students. The CoH is working on achieving the same learning objectives as
43 before the Corona crisis.

44 **d. GSH**

45 Reijnen says GSH shares some of the CoH challenges concerning Corona. The examinations
46 on the MA was already done in alternative forms. One of the successes GSH had before Corona
47 was concerning the acceptance of language requirements for applicants. This was normally
48 done in a very regional way: students from English speaking languages such as US, Northern
49 Amerika, UK and Australia didn't have to take a language test. The new approach is to open to
50 all English speaking BA degrees.

51 **5. Kwaliteitsafspraken**

52 Weerman points out that the FSR and the DB agree on the general goals of the
53 *kwaliteitsafspraken* but that the disagreement for him seems to be about whether assistant
54 professors should be involved in reaching those goals. He requested the FSR to present other
55 solutions to prevent assistant professors to reach these targets.

56 Van Beek says the disagreement is mainly about spending the funds on the fourty present
57 research time and where this money should come from. The FSR's point of view is that the
58 investments should be funded from the *begroting*. The money from the *kwaliteitsgeld* comes
59 directly from the students due to the *leenstelsel* and therefore, shouldn't be invested in research

60 time via the *tutoraat*. The FSR asked the board for viable funding alternatives as is stated in
61 their advice.

62 Van Beek says that the minister announced that the quality funds must be spent in close
63 consultation with the participation bodies. Nevertheless, for finishing this process in good
64 accordance with *medezeggenschap* the FSR is willing to trade off a positive advice on the
65 *kwaliteitsgelden* for consenting rights on the Faculty Strategic Plan (FSP).

66 Weerman asks how the *kwaliteitsgelden* is connected to the FSP and questions whether
67 there are shared notions. Van Beek says there is none, yet the FSR offers the exchange to reach
68 common ground eventually. Chiappino says that the FSR has the idea there is a lack of influence
69 for them on the *kwaliteitsgelden*. She remembers Weerman that the FSR issued a negative
70 advice and now they feel pressured to change this while no changes has been made. Having
71 consent rights on the FSP lets the FSR have influence on changing other important faculty
72 issues. Weerman doesn't think they shouldn't negotiate on these kind of matters. Vaessens and
73 Reijnen agree with Weerman since both themes seem not to be connected.

74 The FSR sends the advice letter and the suggested FSP tradeoff to the GV [ACTION].

75 Reijnen urges the FSR to work together on the *kwaliteitsgelden*.

76 **6. Contemplation rooms**

77 The FSR drew up a short note about the design of study spaces in the OMHP, which is
78 discussed at a meeting. Lenz sums up the inadequate conditions of the rooms in the Faculty. She
79 suggest opening another contemplation room at OMHP. The second suggestion is to redecorate
80 the contemplation room in PCH and the third one is to improve communications and promoting
81 the contemplation rooms to the students.

82 Nijsten is surprised about the connection the FSR points out between the contemplation
83 rooms and mental health. Furthermore, he didn't knew the contemplation rooms in OMHP
84 closed. He says that the contemplation room has a wider function. Nevertheless, he is satisfied
85 with the suggestions and the written memo.

86 For the third point, making the contemplation room more inclusive, he will talk to
87 Communications about improvements for promoting the rooms.

88 Another point about inclusivity, and religious texts on the walls, Nijsten finds it difficult
89 since there are many groups who are willing to use the rooms and making it available for
90 religious purposes would mean that other groups will be excluded. Kirli asks for an example
91 why providing religious books could be offending for other groups. Nijsten says that this could
92 offend f.e. atheists.

93 The following action points are added to the list:

- 94 - Nijsten asks Facility Services about the reason for closing down the contemplation
95 rooms at OMHP [ACTION].
- 96 - Nijsten re-opens the contemplation room the new academic year. [ACTION]
- 97 - Nijsten visits the contemplation room in PCH to see where there is place for
98 improvement [ACTION].
- 99 - Nijsten talks to the Diversity Officer to gather advice on making the rooms more
100 inclusive [ACTION].
- 101 - Nijsten talks to Maria Hagen about communication about the contemplation
102 rooms [ACTION].
- 103 - Chiappino reminds Nijsten to update the FSR about the contemplation rooms
104 [ACTION].
- 105 - Nijsten initiates a meeting with Kirli and Lenz concerning the contemplation
106 rooms [ACTION].

107 **7. Greenpaper Clustering OC's**

108 Chiappino says that the OC's play an important role at the Faculty and announces that the
109 board can expect an unsolicited advice concerning the clustering. She furthermore says that the
110 clustering is framed as a general OC problem but points out that this doesn't include all OC's. She
111 suggests a more bottom-up approach. She requests more time and information to find common
112 ground about this topic and provide viable solution. The following points are made:

- 113 - The FSR asks the board for a timeline on the clustering.
- 114 - Every OC should be represented.
- 115 - If the clustering will continue, the program committees should be clustered according to
116 program.
- 117 - All OC's should give their consent for the clustering.

118 Reijnen says the discussion needs more time but in general the clustering of the TCR
119 programs is now delayed by one year. The discussions with all OC's will start during this
120 semester. He suggests moving this topic to the end of May due to the size of it. The timeline is
121 not definitive and will be one year further along the road.

122 Concerning representation Reijnen does see the necessity of strong and good
123 representation in programs but he is skeptical about the question if one single representative in
124 an OC means that the whole OC is represented. He says that a good system for the input of the
125 the student and staff population (thus the program itself) is more important than having direct
126 representation since OC's seem to work mostly independently.

127 According to Reijnen allowing the OC's to have consenting rights will be difficult since
128 the clustering will make an end to certain OC's. Therefore he suggests that the collective group
129 that is represented should support the clustering. Van Dorp states that although one
130 representative is not enough, there should be at least one appointed to every cluster. Also, she
131 points out that the OC heads should be compensated for the extra time they will make.

132 Reijnen talks about how some of the OC's are enthusiastic for the clustering and about
133 how giving consent on a Masters level is more complex than it would seem on the first hand. Zazie
134 agrees that the MA track-situation would be more difficult to implement, yet, she wants the
135 Greenpaper to include the consent of the OC's for the BA and therefore make an extinction
136 between BA and MA. Freya adds that at least the majority of the OC's should consent on the cluster
137 and that this should be on paper keeping the sensitivity of this topic in mind.

138 Weerman adds that due to Corona the timeline is open but the intention is that they
139 should be able to reach the discussion to an end before appointing members of the OC's of 2021-
140 22. This is given the fact that elections should be considered. The dean addresses that the purpose
141 of the Green Paper is to get ideas concerning general questions given in the paper. He wants the
142 FSR to reflect on the problems around the OC's in their advice. Chiappino says that the OC's are
143 very divided about the clustering.

144 **11. Questions and closing**

145 The board and the FSR thank each other. Kat closes the meeting at 14:02.

146 **Decisions**

147 -

148 **Pro Memori**

149 -

150 **Actionlist**

- 151 191031-02 Both the board and the FSR will think about solutions for the re-sits.
- 152 191210-03 The FSR makes a list of questions on what they would like to see answered from the board for international students.
- 153
- 154 191210-04 The DB sends the FSR all important (and available) documents regarding internationalization.
- 155
- 156 191210-08 Weerman will discuss offering language courses to the FSR with the Executive Board of the University.
- 157
- 158 200501-01 The FSR sends the advice letter and the suggested FSP tradeoff to the GV.
- 159 200501-02 Nijsten asks Facility Services about the reason for closing down the contemplation rooms at OMHP.
- 160
- 161 200501-03 Nijsten re-opens the contemplation room the new academic year.
- 162 200501-04 Nijsten visits the contemplation room in PCH to see where there is place for improvement.
- 163
- 164 200501-05 Nijsten talks to the Diversity Officer fo gather advice on making the rooms more inclusive.
- 165
- 166 200501-06 Chiappino reminds Nijsten to update the FSR about the contemplation rooms.
- 167 200501-07 Nijsten will initiate a meeting with Kirli and Lenz.
- 168 200501-08 Nijsten talks to Maria Hagen about communication about the contemplation rooms.
- 169