



Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 17 september 2020

Nelson Addo, Olaiya Aro (online attendance), David Batelaan, Subu Choudhury (online attendance), Lotus Friede, Sara Kemper, Gerard Nijsten, Chimira Obiefule, Carlos Reijnen (online attendance), Tammie Schoots, Gabriel Sojo Perez,

Present Zazie van Dorp, Liesje Verhave, Robbert Verheul, Fred Weerman, Marian Wilts

Absent Kauthar Bouazzati

Guest Melle Koletzki (Technical Chair), Jan Don, Suzanne Adema

Secretary Angelina Senchi

Agenda

- 1) Opening and confirming the agenda
- 2) Draft minutes OV FSR 18th of June 2020
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) Stand van zaken
 - a) Corona
 - b) Humanities in Context (HiC)
 - c) CoH (file: agenda Raden CoH and GSH june)
 - d) GSH
- 5) Yearplan CoH (file: negative advice FSR, yearplan CoH)
- 6) Sustainability Officer (file: unsolicited advice FSR)
- 7) Final questions and closing

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Melle Koletzki opens the meeting at 15:02

2. Draft minutes OV FSR 18th of June 2020

Minutes:

2 Before going over the minutes page by page, Weerman notes that he would like to make a
3 general remark concerning the minutes of the previous OV [18th June 2020, red.]. He states that
4 he believes that it was discussed it would be entirely confidential. Therefore, he would like the
5 minutes to stress that they are confidential. Especially considering some parts of the meeting
6 are directly related to confidential files. He agrees that the report was well done, but that it is
7 important for the document to state that it is a report for the board and the FSR only and thus
8 shouldn't circulate. Verhave responds to Weerman, saying that she is of the opinion that before
9 the OV they'd all come to the agreement that the OV would not be confidential. Weerman reacts
10 saying that this is unfortunate and continues that the FSR is free to mention what they want, but
11 due to his role he has to stick to certain rules. Which means that certain things can be relayed to
12 the council confidentially, but that such things can't circulate freely within the faculty. Weerman
13 turns to Verhave to enquire what the problem would be, commenting that for them it would be
14 visible and can be used. Van Dorp responds that transparency is very important and she
15 suggests that, should Weerman like to, it would be possible for them to look at parts of the
16 minutes that might be harmful to the victims and to make those confidential. She continues
17 explaining that she does believe people should be able to have access to these minutes.
18 Weerman replies that he thinks that could be an alternative and they would actually like to
19 reread the minutes and clarify what from their perspective, because of the juridical position
20 that he's in, can be said publicly or not. He proposes the option to highlight or underline these
21 parts. Koletzki offers to make this an action point to which Weerman agrees. The DB will reread
22 the OV minutes from the 18th of June 2020 and underline the parts that according to them
23 should be made confidential. **[ACTION POINT]**.
24
25

Pro Memori:

26
27 *200511-01 Weerman makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so that he*
28 *FSR can advise on this.*

29 Weerman notes that this is something he does before every meeting and will
30 do so again for this one.

31 *200618-01 The DB informs the FSR about Proctoring and the use of it.*

32 Weerman and Wilts both respond noting that a letter has already been
33 written.

Action List:

34
35 *200501-04 Nijsten visits the contemplation room in PCH to see where there is place for*
36 *improvement.*

37 Nijsten responds that he has done this and responds to Koletzki's question
38 about there being place for improvement by saying that there is indeed. The
39 action point is striped.

40 *200501-08 Nijsten talks to Maria Hagen about communication about the contemplation*
41 *rooms.*

42 Koletzki assumes that this relates to the previous action point, Nijsten agrees.
43 The action point is striped.



- 1 200511-02 *Vaessens will add the promotion of Humanities with Dutch high school students*
2 *(other than the ones who have a N&T profile).*
3 Weerman notes Vaessens is absent and suggests that Reijnen might know
4 what has been done by Vaessens. Reijnen responds saying he would have to
5 check this.
- 6 200511-02 *Nijsten discuss' the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning and milk*
7 *with Cirfood and Facility Services.*
8 Nijsten explains he hasn't been able to work on this yet, due to the COVID-
9 crisis.
- 10 200511-03 *Nijsten looks for a promotion plan for sustainability and waste.*
11 Nijsten relays that he has had the same problem with this action point as with
12 the previous one.
- 13 Koletzki announces the minutes shall be confirmed during the next OV.

3. **Announcements**

14 **A) Daily Board of the Faculty**

15 Weerman states he has one announcement, namely, that Gerard Nijsten will be leaving
16 them as of November 1st and that they hope there shall be a new director as quickly as
17 possible. He notes that they are starting the procedure for this right now and that
18 they're currently in talks with the executive board. They do foresee, however, that
19 there won't be a new director immediately November 1st and there will probably be an
20 intermediate construction until the new director will arrive. He is discussing this with
21 the executive board as well. He goes on expressing the hope of the Daily Board to
22 make the intermediate period as short as possible and to have a new director as
23 quickly as possible.

24 **B) FSR**

25 Van Dorp explains the FSR has one short and general announcement. She states that
26 even though during this OV social safety isn't on the agenda, the FSR 2020-2021
27 considers this topic as one of the core issues to improve and pay attention to this year,
28 Especially, as a council that stands for the protection of students. Therefore, the
29 council wants to clarify that they support all points formulated by the previous FSR on
30 social safety. The council agrees with their criticism on the issue as a whole and with
31 the case that went to the NRC. Van Dorp states they look forward to receiving the
32 document Weerman has informed them about.

33 Weerman replies that he appreciates that they point this out directly. He adds that for
34 the Daily Board the issue of social safety is a crucial one and that they have a plan
35 ready. He mentions it only needs some slight touches to finish it up; they could send it
36 to the OR but they'll probably send it to the FSR already this week, so it can be
37 discussed. Koletzki asks if this should be made an action point. Weerman agrees and
38 expects it will already be handled before the minutes are ready. The DB will send over
39 their plan regarding social safety to the FSR within a week **[ACTION POINT]**.

40 Aro announces she shall only be present for the first hour. Koletzki announces that he
41 will be chairing the meeting and introduces himself for those unfamiliar with him.

4. Stand van zaken

1 A) Corona

2 Weerman explains that the numbers are rising and that they are expecting a press
3 conference coming Friday. They expect that this might have consequences for their particular
4 region. However, this is still uncertain. He suggests to discuss what is happening now. He
5 explains that during last year it was decided that the backbone of all education at the faculty for
6 this term should be online. So that it'd at least be possible – in the corona situation- to follow
7 courses, even if you're ill or in quarantine. His impression is that this is going well in general. He
8 invites Reijnen to say more on the subject. Weerman goes on saying that he also has the
9 impression that they've been trying to organize on-site education and that this, in general, has
10 also been going relatively well. He specifies saying that they still have to get used to the ad hoc
11 way some of these on-site meetings take place; he continues that this can create some
12 uncertainties but that, nevertheless, his impression remains that things are going well. Another
13 impression he has is that the circumstances have been quite heavy on teachers and that he's
14 unsure of whether they can maintain this situation, but that they're trying to do it as well as
15 possible. Weerman gives an update on the situation in the buildings for now; saying there is
16 signage created by Facility Services and that there too his impression is that things are going
17 quite well. He notes that when there aren't a lot of people in buildings, sometimes people don't
18 use the one-way directions. Yet, in general things are going well and that the buildings aren't
19 being overused. He notes they're even under the percentage that is allowed, which has thus
20 created the opportunity to do the ad-hoc extras. Weerman adds that these are general
21 statements and invites Reijnen to relay more information on this topic at the moment.

22 Reijnen takes over complimenting Weerman for nicely outlining the context. Reijnen states
23 that what seems to be going rather well is teachers teaching, which is hard as Weerman already
24 explained. He explains that it is quite difficult to redesign courses in a way best suited for digital
25 education; adding that it not only takes time but also a different didactic approach. He goes on
26 by telling that they've set up an extensive support team for these activities and that this seems
27 to be going rather well too. He notes that a lot of questions come in and a lot of help is being
28 offered. He continues that they've been attracting student assistants to help out the programs,
29 but – still – it remains a work in progress. This he'll expect to stay a work in progress for the
30 rest of the semester. He also mentions that they'd feared, like other universities, that the
31 number of new students would collapse. For example, because of gap years. Reijnen notes that,
32 actually, they have attracted more or less the same number of students as last year in both
33 Bachelor and Master programs. The only difference being that they've now attracted more
34 Dutch students than normally - this used to be a declining group of students – and less
35 international students. Overall, he says, that he's very pleased that students have still found
36 their way to the UvA regardless of the disappointment in education that they need to offer to a
37 certain extent. He continues with the topic of redesigning courses, saying that online education
38 is primarily being offered. The courses that are being held on-site are those that are necessary
39 to do in real-life or on-location; these are the practical courses that, for instance, require strong
40 collaboration. For example, in certain professional masters. These are only a limited amount.
41 Besides this, they've instructed all programs to make sure that enough teacher-student and
42 student-student contact is being maintained via extracurricular activities. Relatively, designing
43 a fully online or on-site course is rather easy in comparison to the tough job of creating a solid
44 combination of the two: creating a sort of hybrid education. It is really hard, but at the same

1 time it is required. He explains that they can only work as a university if they can meet each
2 other and interact with their students. Which is tough when there's a screen between them. The
3 online backbone is necessary, due to the crisis, but they still want a certain amount of campus
4 life – which is the major challenge. According to Reijnen, good ideas are needed because the
5 current situation will probably not go away in the next few months.

6 Koletzki asks if there are any other points. Weerman redirects saying that they expect to
7 make decisions quite quickly about the situation in the next term. He continues saying that
8 everyone is probably wondering what the situation will be later on; for instance, when one is
9 abroad. He would like everyone to know they'll be deciding on this rather quickly so everyone
10 will know what to expect.

11 Friede asks if there is a procedure for this. Weerman answers that the Crisis Committee of
12 the university, so the Executive Board, will try to formulate something that is valid for the entire
13 university. He continues saying they will come up with a particular sort of strategy which he
14 guesses, given the situation – like a lack of a vaccine – and the time that will pass, that people
15 next term people could still be partially dependent on online education in order to follow their
16 courses. He relays that this is his personal opinion though.

17 Van Dorp enquires if there has been a specific evaluation of online education in the past
18 semester and, if so, whether it will be published. Weerman responds that there is a general form
19 of evaluation: The Crisis Monitor. Which gives a view, albeit general, on how students and
20 employees experience all sorts of aspects of the crisis. He offers that this is something the
21 council could have a look at. Wilts notes she will send over a link to the Crisis Monitor.
22 Weerman adds the monitor is being updated regularly and that at the course level there are also
23 evaluations. Reijnen jumps in to explain that there are particular questionnaires regarding
24 Covid, which are currently being updated to better reflect questions about education and the
25 experiences students have with online education. These could then be used to see how they'll
26 move forward. The course evaluations, which have happened at a central level too, have had the
27 questions of the questionnaires updated to include questions about how online education has
28 worked out during a course. This information will also be used in the next weeks to see if
29 lessons can be learned from this, he adds. The DB will send over the general information from
30 the Crisis Monitor and from the course evaluations for the FSR to look over **[ACTION POINT]**.

31 Kemper enquires, regarding international students, if similar measures will be taken next
32 term to ensure all education will be available online as well as partly physical. Taking into
33 consideration people might not be able to make it to the Netherlands. Weerman replies saying
34 this decision still has to be made and they're still speculating. He thinks they might be going in
35 that direction, but it is still uncertain. It depends on the other faculties and what the Executive
36 Board thinks as well. Weerman asks Kemper whether she has a specific stance on it and
37 implores her to speak on it if she wants. Kemper replies that her personal preference would be
38 for it to be available online, but not necessarily that everyone is obliged to follow it online.
39 Meaning that everyone unavailable to physically attend can also participate from home.
40 Weerman replies that they need to remain understanding of the teachers and that they cannot
41 expect them to do things twice.

42 Aro wonders if a date can be set to announce when and if the physical education will take
43 place next semester. Weerman replies that he would love for it to happen next week, but that
44 he isn't in charge of this and that it depends on what a lot of other people think. He mentions, as
45 far as he is concerned, it should happen as quickly as possible. Reijnen adds that there isn't a
46 procedure yet, but there is agreement, also among the Executive Board, that they have to move

1 really quickly on this topic and so he expects this to be within the next few weeks. Weerman
2 acknowledges that it is indeed urgent. Aro responds saying they could follow up in two weeks.
3 Weerman expresses that he hopes so **[ACTION POINT]**.

4
5 Koletzki wonders if they'll continue on with the next agenda point, considering the
6 presentation by Van Don isn't due to start for another 15 minutes. They agree to skip over point
7 4.B. and continue with 4.C. for now.

8 **B) Humanities in Context (HiC)**

9 Adema notes that Jan Don will be doing the presentation and Weerman mentions that he,
10 at the request of Van Dorp and Don, shall be giving an introduction on the subject.

11 Weerman introduces the project before Don takes over and continues with his
12 presentation on Humanities in Context.

13 After the presentation Verhave mentions that the DB minutes from the 12th of May 2020
14 state that the initial proposal for the CROHO label, regarding the HiC bachelor, would not pass
15 through the efficacy test. Therefore, she is wondering how the current program would be
16 changed and whether the FSR might receive the new proposal. Weerman replies saying that
17 they're not sure yet. Their first impression, at this time, is that it won't be easy to get a real
18 CROHO agreement from this committee. At the same time, it's still unclear. Because the minister
19 herself, in earlier stages, already suggested that this [HiC, red.] is an interesting and necessary
20 option. Weerman continues saying they will meet with her this month and talk about the
21 subject again. Yet, even if it would be the case that there would be a separate, new, sort of
22 CROHO label they can, nevertheless, do this within the CROHO labels they already have.
23 Meaning within the existing programs they possibly don't need an additional new CROHO label.
24 According to Weerman it is also a quite bureaucratic procedure before one gets the agreement.
25 Therefore, it might be the case that they start in that way and later on they will be going for an
26 additional new label. Verhave reacts by saying that in the minutes it was, kind of, stated that the
27 new plan, for sure, would go into the existing programs. Weerman says she's right. Verhave
28 continues by asking if there will be another attempt to get a CROHO label. Weerman responds
29 saying they are still trying to see what the best strategy is. He says that if the minister is in favor
30 of this it might help, but it is still really dependent on who will be saying what.

31 Schoots first wants to know what role the labor market will be playing within the plan and,
32 second, that there has been talk about putting a lot of external input and interdisciplinarity into
33 this [HiC, red.] and she wonders how they'll make sure the fundamental character of humanities
34 won't be changed. Don responds to Schoots by saying that they do want to have a clear
35 humanities perspective in all the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary issues that they
36 address. Therefore, the first year, basically the propaedeutic year, is a sort of condensed version
37 of a huge humanities training. There will be some things imported from social sciences and
38 natural sciences, but it will be clear that they'll start from a humanities perspective. They raise
39 humanity students because that is what they are, he says. The difference is that sometimes
40 they'll step into the position of social scientists or natural scientists and see it with their view or
41 their focus, which will enable them to: better communicate with these kinds of people; work
42 better in teams and empower them in a different way from what is currently being done. This is
43 his answer to Schoots second question, he continues by responding to her first question. He
44 says that at a certain point, when they'll be a little further in development, their idea is to go to
45 prospective employers and see what they think about the program. This means all kinds of



1 stakeholder in the city of Amsterdam – *midden in de stad* [in the middle of the city, red.] –
2 museums, different institutions and maybe some companies. Don explains that they'll be asking
3 them what they think of the program, what they think of the people that come out of the
4 program, if they could use them and if they'll be valuable in their organization. This is one of the
5 plans, he adds. Schoots would like to follow up his answer with another question, namely: how
6 will they make sure corporate influence won't affect the curricula? And how will they make sure
7 corporations will want to have something to say in our education in general? Don responds by
8 saying that they are the ones that develop it and that they can listen to the input, and they'll find
9 it valuable, but as scientists we'll ultimately decide what will and won't be in the program.
10 Schoots reacts that she would like to stress that it currently seems like it would create a
11 dependency between the university, companies and corporate life. She stresses that they
12 shouldn't go into dependent relationships with companies or any corporate interest. Don
13 replies that this isn't the way they see it either. Rather they want to make sure that the
14 problems that different stakeholders, outside the university and the faculty, are somehow also
15 being met or recognized by the people in their program. He notes that they shouldn't stay too
16 much in the ivory tower. He adds that if they want to be more diverse and attract other types of
17 students it'd be good to leave their offices, metaphorically speaking, and to see what is out
18 there.

19 Sojo Perez notes that he really appreciated the general introduction and that it brought
20 him to a question, that could also be regarded as more of an individual concern, namely: how
21 would HiC affect the periphery? This meaning the other programs in humanities, that perhaps
22 are smaller or have courses that do not have a direct connection to the city or, aren't considered
23 by others, to be tied to current relevant issues. He would like to know if HiC is part of a bigger
24 plan that includes smaller programs into these connections and themes of relevancy for the
25 humanities. Also, from the perspective of non-HiC studies. Weerman responds that he would
26 like to stress that it is not the intention to take away from or spoil existing programs. This is not
27 the idea. Should things work out like that, it'd mean an entirely different sort of humanities
28 would have been built. This is not the idea, he repeats. Weerman continues saying that he can
29 imagine how courses, like the ones mentioned by Sojo Perez, might actually fit either bachelor
30 or master elements in a HiC-line program. This way it could actually work in both programs.
31 Weerman mentions he does see an option here. He reiterates that it is not the intention to take
32 away or spoil anything about the existing structure, but the point is that if existing courses
33 could play a role in building these options that would be nice. He continues that if, alternatively,
34 what is built here could somehow inspire existing programs that would, of course, also be
35 interesting. Sojo Perez follows up and likes to know if the existing courses and programs will
36 have the same relevance and importance as HiC. For example, not that HiC becomes thrice more
37 relevant than the other programs and the courses could only lend their relevance from being
38 part of HiC, instead of having their very own intrinsic worth. HiC might not have the same or as
39 fitting a view to smaller programs as some might think, Sojo Perez points out. Weerman
40 responds by saying he thinks that they won't be setting up a program that is suddenly very
41 much non-humanities. The entire idea is to start from a humanities perspective. He clarifies that
42 they're currently discussing challenges, but the actual starting point is in – for instance:
43 literature, linguistics – any of the humanities that they have. Don agrees and adds that, for
44 example, narration or narratives is a buzzword in all sorts of domains and who else than
45 somebody with an expertise in literature would be an expert in narratives, narration and how
46 stories work. That is the true humanities perspective and their expertise. Sojo Perez asks if he

1 then can conclude that they hope for things to organically piece together. Could it be said the
2 faculty won't actively have, for instance, committee meetings with people from other disciplines
3 about how they'll be fitting into the whole thing. He wonders if it will be organically formed or if
4 they will be showing initiative in this regard. Don responds that he can imagine different types
5 of cooperation. The most distant one being that, perhaps, students following the HiC program
6 do courses in social science or natural science at some point in their career. This is one. Another
7 one, is building a course together with people from another faculty and this might be a more or
8 less, as Sojo Perez said, organic way. Making everyone realize they're all working together on a
9 particular program. For instance, with a sustainability issue more disciplines than just social
10 and natural science need to collaborate on the subject. Perhaps, creating a truly
11 interdisciplinary course around such a theme.

12 Kemper enquires about the *wereldcafés* [world cafes, red.] that didn't happen or, at least,
13 weren't open to students. She wonders where the student input Don had been talking about
14 would happen. She, especially, wonders about where they would find the prospective students,
15 *de studiekeizers*. Don answers that they'd planned a, so-called, HiC-athon in the second week of
16 October for which they planned on inviting high school students, class 5 and 6 VWO students,
17 but it won't take place due to the Corona situation. They do plan to have interviews with grade
18 4, 5 and 6 VWO students around the same date somewhere in October. He adds that they'll also
19 be interviewing visitors of the Bachelor Day, which will enable them to interview approximately
20 20-30 *studiekeizers*. Simultaneously, they are also interviewing their current students; those
21 that have already chosen a particular program but possibly have a wish list and are willing to
22 share what their ideal program would look like. Kemper asks whether, regarding the current
23 students, everyone could join these interviews or if they're looking at a specific group. Don says
24 they're basically just asking around to see who would help them out. And says, by all means, she
25 is invited.

26 **C) CoH (file: agenda Raden CoH and GSH june)**

27 Kemper mentions she has a question about agenda point 3.1. on the CoH agenda. She
28 wonders if it'll be possible to get an update on double degrees. Reijnen answers yes and tells
29 her that Thomas Vaessens used to be in charge when this topic was being discussed and,
30 therefore, Reijnen cannot speak for all these matters. Reijnen states the update was that the
31 faculty remains very much interested in making double degrees more accessible to its students.
32 However, there are a lot of practical issues that prevent such a structure from being set up for
33 the entire faculty. The discussion during the board meeting was about whether it'd be feasible
34 to set it up as it was initially designed. Part of that is also due to financial issues. He explains
35 that for a student there is only once student funding available. Thus, the government offers
36 funding for a student only once; regardless of whether a student takes 10 programs, there is
37 only one program that gets financed. He continues by explaining that this means you only pay
38 for one program and the other ones are essentially for free, which garners a certain cost effect
39 as well. Reijnen concludes that if the double degrees get designed efficiently they're still
40 considered attractive. Also, financially attractive. He continues saying that this, at least, is
41 where the discussion was at this summer. He shares that he also feels that he should reevaluate
42 what his thoughts are on the issue; he still believes strongly that it is an important form of study
43 for them. He goes on saying that this is, kind of, how humanities work. He refers to the
44 presentation they'll be having on Humanities in Context and how it explains exactly what the
45 idea is behind a double degree construction: you take a humanities program and connect it to



1 another program. He says it is a different way of approaching the same topic. He finishes by
2 saying they'll definitely be coming back to this topic this year and that to him it is an important
3 issue. Kemper responds to Reijnen's by asking him to clarify whether the practical issues are
4 mostly financial ones. Reijnen clarifies that it is definitely financial, but also other issues. He
5 gives an example of how at the program level there are complications in looking at how far one
6 can actually go in cross listing elements in programs. He adds to that by saying that, for
7 instance, the double degree construction means that they'll lower the amount of credits one
8 needs for the second program or for the two programs together. So, one doesn't take 180
9 credits twice. Instead, they'll lower or connect the elective space from the two programs. Or to
10 go even further: use certain courses for the other degree. This is the current idea for it to be
11 efficient, otherwise one could already do double degrees. Reijnen explains that this is where the
12 interesting idea of the discussion starts: to see how far one can go in that regard and what kind
13 of courses could be exchanged. This too, he believes, is rather tough. Within humanities it is
14 fairly easy but it gets interesting and more complex when one connects, for instance,
15 mathematics and sociology. Koletzki yields the floor to Verhave who wonders whether the
16 double degrees could be offered in a more structural and official way and if that'd mean
17 students would have to pay double the tuition fee, because it's not financially viable for the
18 university. Reijnen reacts that he doesn't believe that is the way to go about it nor that it is
19 legally possible to do so in the Netherlands. One cannot pay the tuition fee twice. So Reijnen
20 doesn't believe that would be a smart approach, nor is he in favor of such an approach. He feels
21 that this would mean that they would have misunderstood the way education should be
22 organized. Verhave reacts to Reijnen's remarks that she simply wanted to double check what
23 his views were on this.

24 **D) GSH**

25 Van Dorp notes that she would like to know what was discussed regarding agenda point 2
26 about the concept for a protocol on appropriate behavior or what the aim was of this. Reijnen
27 responds that this point was in response to the discussions they'd had on social safety matters.
28 He explains this was one of the first council meetings after the events and that they'd decided
29 that it'd be wise to move quickly and take up a stance to a certain extent. He remarks that things
30 have to be done really differently in the future and that at this moment there is also an urgent
31 feeling that something has to be done. Thus, they came up with the idea to start programs this
32 year – the plan was to invite all teachers in courses that involved new students like first year
33 master and bachelor students but also in elective courses – with a conversation about how we
34 should behave and what the correct form of communication is in our programs. Reijnen
35 continues explaining this task has been given to a small work group, who will be setting up a,
36 kind of, instruction guide for teachers which they can use in their first courses. He adds that he's
37 heard from quite a few courses that this has already been put to practice successfully; they
38 didn't necessarily use a checklist to check off what should and shouldn't be done, but rather
39 they had a discussion to see how everyone felt about certain types of behavior. Reijnen ends by
40 saying this is the first step in making the faculty a social safe space.

41 Van Dorp responds by noting she thinks this is really good and she asks if this is a plan that
42 the faculty will keep on doing, like next year and the year after that. She expresses that it is
43 really important to keep this conversation going. Reijnen agrees and notes that it was indeed
44 the idea to keep doing this next year too. Also, possibly more activities or different courses.

1 Weerman adds that this will also be incorporated in the program that he has mentioned earlier
2 in this meeting.

3 Verhave would like to point to agenda point 4.4.5. on the GSH agenda concerning
4 bilingualism in Master education and requests the attachment, number 6, to be sent over to the
5 council. Reijnen respond that he, in fact, can't remember what it was. He explains the GSH
6 agenda was really long and that sometimes the last agenda points get dropped, which was the
7 case during that particular meeting. Therefore, the agenda point hasn't been discussed yet. He
8 will check for the attachment and notes that he thinks the document was a discussion starter.

9 Reijnen will send over attachment 6 from the agenda concerning point 4.4.5. *Tweetaligheid*
10 *en meertaaligheid in MA opleidingen* on the GSH agenda (2nd of July 2020) **[ACTION POINT]**.

5. Yearplan CoH (file: negative advice FSR, yearplan CoH)

11 Weerman offers to briefly explain to the new FSR the procedure they are currently in
12 regarding the plan. He explains a plan was made by the college and that the FSR gave a negative
13 advice, which implies that they should have a talk together to share their ideas. This talk was
14 planned in June, but at that moment social safety was discussed. Hence, there wasn't time to
15 discuss it and currently the situation is that they will now be discussing the negative advice.
16 Weerman adds that Vaessens used to be responsible for the plan, but now Reijnen has taken on
17 this task. Then, Reijnen steps in to say that he now has the position and he agrees with the
18 general outline of this plan. He expresses that he feels that this is the plan they should move
19 ahead with. Though, he states, that he has looked over the comments that the FSR had on the
20 plan and observed that most of the comments are about unclarities in the plan; he refers to
21 phrases that are being used and things that are left very generic, whilst in real life they are
22 actually very specific. He feels that, to a certain extent, they are editing remarks. He shares that
23 there are two things that can be done. Either to come up with an entirely new plan and redesign
24 the plan according to what is in the negative advice; he feels that this would take quite a lot of
25 time, not only would the plan have to go back to him but also to the team of program directors
26 who are also involved with this. Instead, Reijnen would like to propose to find out whether they
27 could live with the general outline of the plan. To agree on the basic content. And if they can live
28 with this, then stick with the plan as it is and reach agreement on the other things that the
29 council has mentioned. Things that are important to the council, but might be in the sidelines of
30 or are the extras to what the plan is really about - in order to reach agreement upon this. He
31 adds that when they reach agreement in a meeting such as this one it would also be official.
32 Then they accept that it would be an addition to the yearplan and that this is what they intend
33 to do in the next year. It would also be something they could point out to the board in order to
34 say that these are the things they had agreed upon and that they would like to see the results.
35 He summarizes that this would be his personal suggestion; to look at the year plan in its content
36 and the way it was intended. If they can find agreement upon that, to then leave it as it is and
37 reach extra agreement on any of the additions there might be. He feels that most of the
38 comments are text matters; a matter of editing the text to a certain extent. This would be
39 Reijnen's solution and he is proposing this, not because he's new, but, more importantly,
40 because they've already entered the year the plan is about. He worries they could easily lose
41 three months with this process, especially if it has to be sent back to the program directors as
42 well. He feels no one would benefit from this. He asks how the council feels about this as a
43 starting point. Van Dorp responds that the council didn't only have textual remarks and
44 wonders how, if they'd have a separate meeting to make additions, they would plan on making



1 it legally binding. She expresses that would be very important to the council, because, for
2 instance, one of the things that was said in the negative advice was the action point that Reijnen
3 didn't know about, regarding the promotion of humanities to Dutch high school students; also
4 mentioned by Weerman, according to Van Dorp, was a decline of humanities students. She
5 reiterates that the council wanted more promotion of humanities to E&M and C&M high school
6 students. It was an action point and she still wants this to happen. Also regarding 8-8-4, now
7 implemented as 7-7-4, she mentions that she has heard from students that a lot of compromises
8 have been made about some policies. For this the council would still like to receive an advice
9 request. She continues with physical education and how the council would like to have a plan on
10 how to proceed with this, also because this cannot be moved to next year. She ends her
11 statements with the remark that, when things need to be added, the council would like to know
12 how a meeting can be set up for it to be legally binding to make sure things will really happen.
13 Reijnen responds by saying that the things she's mentioned is exactly why he has come up with
14 the idea. He feels the things mentioned are important to him as well, especially with online
15 education and a redesigned year structure - like the contact free week, which doesn't only apply
16 to humanities but is a general policy. He feels they've mentioned smart things that could be
17 done, but at the same time they aren't very specific to the overall strategy of the College of
18 Humanities. He proposes to make an agreement about what is necessary in this next year, or
19 few years, and do the additions beyond the limits of the year plan. The new teaching structure
20 currently has a faculty wide strategy and Reijnen would suggest to make agreements about this,
21 and if they want to have extras they can do so in meetings like the OV. Instead of changing the
22 plan itself. He stresses that it is a plan specific to the College of Humanities, not an overall plan
23 of what is necessary in a faculty. He proposes to determine right now what is really important,
24 so these can be added to the action list and be made official in the minutes. Perhaps they can
25 currently decide on the topic. Van Dorp responds that, should they continue like this, the council
26 still wants a written response to the negative advice where they come back on all the points that
27 have been mentioned [ACTION POINT]. She would also like for the minutes to state, perhaps as
28 an action point, that more time will be spent on the promotion of humanities to Dutch high
29 school students [ACTION POINT]. She would like a plan regarding digital education [ACTION
30 POINT]; more information on Humanities in Context [ACTION POINT] and 7-7-4 [ACTION
31 POINT]. All the points she has mentioned she would like to become an addendum to the yearly
32 plan, because these were the comments that can't be considered textual [ACTION POINT]. She
33 states they do want an agreement on this and demands to receive extra information. Reijnen
34 responds by saying that this feels like a good idea, he would like to make an exception for the
35 things she has mentioned that aren't specific to College of Humanities issues. He feels that it
36 would make sense to him to do things as she has suggested. Reijnen wants to add that there
37 already exists a faculty structure that evaluates the new teaching structure and he feels it'd be
38 inefficient to do things twice. Reijnen asks Weerman what the status is on that. Weerman
39 replies by saying that they're still looking for two members to join a committee, also regarding
40 the 7-7-4 structure. Weerman also agrees it'd be a good idea to create an addendum. According
41 to Weerman, the things mentioned can be written down and the issue would then be settled.
42 Van Dorp reiterates that it should be an addendum and that she disagrees with Reijnen on
43 certain points not being specific to the College of Humanities. She stresses that what is
44 discussed is about the yearplan for the college and, therefore, she believes it should be an
45 addendum to it. She adds that members have already been selected to join the guidance
46 committee and the council will email the board about this. She again reiterates it should be an

1 addendum to the CoH yearplan. Reijnen responds that he is open to that, yet he doesn't
2 understand the formal implications of it. He summarizes that the general underlying idea would
3 be that there's a yearplan, that the council finds in its content correct and necessary for the
4 college, but there are still additional things that need to be addressed. He expresses that he
5 would be very happy with this and he believes the program directors would agree. Koletzki
6 concludes that this would mean that there will be a written response in the form of an
7 addendum that reflects the points made by the FSR in their letter.

8 Verhave notes that she feels confused about the remarks made on the textual edits. She
9 explains that they weren't necessarily content related, but rather to clear up some confusions;
10 for instance, about agenda making. She asks if they mean to not change the textual comments.
11 Reijnen clarifies that he isn't unwilling to do so, but that, if the intent is to redesign the yearplan,
12 it would take a long time and he feels this is inefficient - taking into account that a lot of things
13 have changed and other things are on people's minds, also in terms of Corona and the current
14 new reality. He adds that he's trying to look for new ways to do things more efficiently. Which is
15 the reason he has opened the discussion as he's now done. He's open to explain things that are
16 in the text and that this can be put into writing in the form of a written response. He personally
17 feels that it could be left like that in terms of efficiency. This way the council can have a clear
18 reading on the remarks that have been made and the key issues that have been pointed out and
19 can become additions. He reiterates that he isn't unwilling to change the yearplan, but that he's
20 rather trying to look at ways that can speed up the process because the year has already started.
21 He explains that if the plan is changed it has to go back to the program directors and they have
22 to reacquaint and feel comfortable with the new plan. Especially, because it is their plan and
23 they have to do it. Reijnen explains that he simply has the overview and the program directors
24 are in charge of what has to be done; which takes time. He does feel they'd be on board with this
25 train, but if there are other ways it would have his preference. Verhave responds that she also
26 agrees with a written response and the addendums towards the yearplan, but she still likes to
27 point out that the textual comments, like the ones on HiC being an example for flex-studying and
28 double degrees, could give the wrong impression: like HiC being an already existing program.
29 She uses the example of HiC to demonstrate how a textual edit can also be very important and
30 mentions that she agrees with the problem of time. Reijnen proposes to come up with a solid
31 written response to the plan with an additional list of things that still need to be done next year.
32 He adds that if the council doesn't feel comfortable with that or feels that isn't enough they will
33 move on from there. He feels very certain that they can produce a good explanation of the
34 things mentioned in the text. Koletzki concludes that a good addendum will be written. The FSR
35 will inform the DB which members will be joining the Guidance Committee 7-7-4 **[ACTION**
36 **POINT]**.

6. Sustainability officer (file: unsolicited advice FSR)

37 Sojo Perez introduces the subject, mentioning that the unsolicited advice was already a
38 subject during a previous OV where they had certain agreements regarding sustainability, like:
39 changing the menu, vegetarian options, etc. The council had decided to expand on this topic and
40 be more specific as to why they would want a sustainability officer. Sojo Perez mentions that
41 the council hasn't received a reply on this meeting piece and he wonders if the board, Nijsten,
42 has read it. Nijsten replies that he has read it and did even more than this. Sojo Perez would like
43 to know if the board is still interested in the idea and if they'd be willing to meet halfway.
44 Nijsten thanks Sojo Perez for the letter that was sent and says that it is unfortunate the council



1 hasn't received an answer yet. He explains that he has had a discussion with two council
2 members, Tjibbe Valkenburg and Rijk van Beek, regarding this letter. He tells that, even though
3 there isn't a written response yet, it doesn't mean that he underestimates the importance of
4 sustainability. On the contrary, he mentions it is truly of growing relevance for the faculty and
5 university at large. He relays that he had a very fruitful meeting on the 24th of June with these
6 two council members, where there was good open discussion and exchange of views. However,
7 the meeting didn't result in clear conclusions. Therefore, he is still not very convinced of the
8 necessity of an officer as is described in the letter. Furthermore, there has been a development,
9 which is partly why he hasn't replied to the letter yet, of a sustainability policy at the UvA which
10 is moving very fast. Nijsten relays that a few days ago they received the first draft of a, so-called,
11 white paper in which an outline is given on this sustainability policy for the UvA. He explains
12 that this draft is the first draft and is currently still being discussed in the board of the deans
13 and the directors of the university. He mentions there is still a lot of work that has to be done on
14 this draft and, thus, cannot be shared yet with the academic community. However, Nijsten is
15 certain that in the near future it will be shared. He explains that the white paper will become a
16 very useful framework for them and for exchanging ideas. Moreover, Nijsten was glad to read it
17 because it addresses a lot of points made earlier by the council. He explains that the advantage
18 of the white paper is that it provides a framework in which they can discuss the points made in
19 the letters, amongst them the sustainability officer. He continues that there are plans to use the
20 framework for the faculties, in order to set up a faculty policy on sustainability. He supposes
21 this would happen this autumn and winter and he would love for the council to have a
22 discussion with them about the content of this framework and for the faculty program on
23 sustainability. He delves into how he is not very convinced that the sustainability officer in the
24 way as it is described now, based on Dartmouth, is the right way to handle it. The day before,
25 Nijsten mentions, there was a UvA discussion on the sustainability officer together with all the
26 faculties and none of them were enthusiastic about the officer yet. Nijsten suggests to wait on
27 the results of the UvA discussion on the sustainability officer and, more importantly, to not
28 discuss the sustainability officer as an independent topic. He feels it is really part of the broader
29 sustainability policy of the faculty and he thinks it would be a good idea for the council to join
30 them in this discussion. Sojo Perez is glad to hear about the white paper and notes that this
31 would be something the university would commit to in a legal way as well. Nijsten responds
32 that the paper is quite concrete already, even though it needs some tightening and
33 improvements and, therefore, some time. But he believes that soon it could be used as a
34 framework. Sojo Perez asks if there is an exact timeline for when it will become available.
35 Nijsten replies that he doesn't know how long the discussion will continue on the UvA level, but
36 they will make sure to report to the council in the course of the next month **[ACTION POINT]**.
37 Sojo Perez asks whether he is correct to assume there are two things here: the white paper as a
38 sustainability policy and the officer which would take some more time. Nijsten corrects him by
39 saying that there is a smaller and separate discussion about the sustainability officer, but it is
40 actually part of the broader policy on sustainability. He adds that everyone at the UvA at large
41 agrees that it is a really important issue for, not only years, but decades to come. Sojo Perez
42 proposes to hold a meeting as soon as more will become known about the white paper and the
43 discussion **[ACTION POINT]**. He also stresses that, regarding the sustainability officer, in the
44 future the university might be entering into partnerships at a faculty level and that it could be
45 important to have an unbiased position available as a check and balance when it comes to such
46 decisions. Sojo Perez continues by saying that from a student and core humanities perspective it

1 would be nice to develop a position or a certain set of tasks that could have influence on this
2 topic from an unbiased perspective.

3 Van Dorp asks Nijsten that if he doesn't like to have a separate position whether it might be
4 an option for the council to have a conversation with people to talk about the profile of the
5 person that will fill Nijsten's position - to look for someone that will focus on sustainability in
6 different ways. She continues explaining that, this way, more could be implemented and still fall
7 under his and, then, the other person's position. Nijsten responds by saying he'd like to
8 approach it the other way around. He suggests to set up the UvA and faculty framework and
9 from that framework they can determine if and how a sustainability officer fits in. As of yet it is
10 unclear what the finished policy will look like and to a certain extent, Nijsten explains, they are
11 dependent on this. He reiterates that he isn't unwilling to discuss the position but he would like
12 to have the discussion the other way around. Van Dorp understands that he would like to do it
13 the other way around, but asks if it wouldn't be a good idea to establish that whatever comes
14 out of the central discussion will be discussed with the person who will fill his position. She
15 enquires if it'd be an option for the council to discuss what comes out of the central level with
16 the replacement so it can also be implemented on a faculty level. Nijsten reacts that he doesn't
17 fully comprehend what Van Dorp is saying, he continues that there isn't an officer yet nor has
18 there been established what this person's tasks would be. It is impossible to appoint somebody
19 to become the sustainability officer, because it is still unclear what this person is supposed to
20 do. He explains this is why they first have to develop a policy to provide a framework. Koletzki
21 asks Van Dorp to specify what she means. Van Dorp says the echo of the zoom call might have
22 caused her to mishear what Nijsten's been saying about the discussion that is going on. She
23 understood there was a central discussion about sustainability in general. Nijsten explains there
24 are two discussions happening; one about the policy of sustainability being developed by the
25 UvA and the smaller discussion at the faculty level about the solution of a sustainability officer
26 for implementing faculty policy on sustainability - of which they're still uncertain. Sojo Perez
27 asks if it is policy to wait for the central decision, because, as was also said in his letter, it might
28 also be an opportunity for the faculty to show initiative. Nijsten replies by saying that all
29 faculties need the framework on the UvA level, because a lot of the sustainability points are
30 related to the central services they have and names facility services and housing as examples.
31 He continues that the moment they get the framework, then they'll have the freedom to make
32 their choices and take up their positions within that framework. He finishes by saying this will
33 be the discussion they'll lead this autumn or early winter, as soon as the UvA framework is
34 ready and that this too would take up one or two months. He asks if, perhaps, Weerman knows
35 more about the timeline. The faculty can make the policy their own and show initiative, as they
36 should, as soon as the framework is done. Weerman makes a final note by saying that there are
37 discussions going on regarding HiC, where sustainability could play a role and the council could
38 play a role too. He mentions the, so-called, *instellingsplan* [institution plan, red.] where there
39 will be a theme on research sustainability; he suggests that this is where a discussion could be
40 held with Zwiëp. He would like the council to know that they have to wait, but that they can
41 already say something more and do something if they want. Sojo Perez asks to possibly make it
42 an action point to meet with Zwiëp about research and sustainability for the insights she might
43 have **[ACTION POINT]**. Weerman says, that as a faculty, they would like to play a role regarding
44 this theme too. Nijsten thanks the council for its letters and says he really appreciates their
45 input on this important topic.



7. Final questions and closing

Closed at 17:05

1 No final questions are posed or remarks made. Koletzki closes the meeting at 17:05.

2

Pro memori

- 1
2 200511-01 Weerman makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so that
3 he FSR can advise on this.
4 200618-01 The DB informs the FSR about Proctoring and the use of it.
5

Action list

- 6 ~~191210-04~~ The DB sends the FSR all important (and available) documents regarding
7 internationalization.
8 ~~200501-04~~ Nijsten visits the contemplation room in PCH to see where there is place for
9 improvement.
10 ~~200501-05~~ Nijsten talks to the Diversity Officer fo gather advice on making the rooms
11 more inclusive.
12 ~~200501-07~~ Nijsten will initiate a meeting with Kirli and Lenz.
13 ~~200501-08~~ Nijsten talks to Maria Hagen about communication about the contemplation
14 rooms.
15 ~~200511-01~~ The DB informs the FSR about Proctoring and the use of it.
16 200511-02 Vaessens will add the promotion of Humanities with Dutch high school
17 students (other than the ones who have a N&T profile).
18 200511-02 Nijsten discusses the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning and milk
19 with Cirfood and Facility Services.
20 200511-03 Nijsten looks for a promotion plan for sustainability and waste.
21 ~~200511-04~~ Nijsten will reach out for an appointment with Verhave and Van Beek about
22 sustainability.
23 200917-01 The DB will reread the OV minutes from the 18th of June 2020 and underline
24 the parts that according to them should be made confidential.
25 200917-02 The DB will send over their plan regarding social safety to the FSR within a
26 week.
27 200917-03 The DB will send over the general information from the Crisis Monitor and the
28 course evaluations for the FSR to look over.
29 200917-04 Reijnen will send over attachment 6 from the agenda concerning point 4.4.5.
30 *Tweetaligheid en meertaligheid in MA opleidingen* on the GSH agenda (2nd of
31 July 2020).
32 200917-05 The FSR will inform the DB which members will be joining the Guidance
33 Committee 7-7-4.
34 200917-06 The FSR will follow up with the DB on whether a decision regarding online
35 education in the second semester has been made.
36 200917-07 The DB will spend more time on the promotion of humanities to Dutch high
37 school students.
38 200917-08 The DB will write a response letter to the negative advice by the FSR
39 concerning the CoH Yearplan.
40 200917-09 The DB sends over a plan regarding digital education in the next semester.
41 200917-10 The DB sends over more information regarding Humanities in Context.
42 200917-11 The DB sends over more information regarding 7-7-4.



- 1 200917-12 The DB will set up an addendum to the CoH Yearplan that reflects the
- 2 comments made in the negative advice by the FSR.
- 3 200917-13 Nijsten or the DB will report in the next month on the developments
- 4 regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.
- 5 200917-14 Nijstenw will report on the white paper to the council in the course of the next
- 6 month
- 7 200917-15 Nijsten and Sojo Perez will hold a meeting to discuss the status of the white
- 8 paper and the ongoing discussion regarding the sustainability officer.
- 9 200917-16 Sojo Perez reaches out to Zwiép to discuss options concerning sustainability
- 10 and research.

