



Dhr. Prof. dr. F.P. Weerman
Kloveniersburgwal 48
1012 CX Amsterdam

Spuistraat 134
1012 VB Amsterdam
(020) 525 3278
fsr-fgw@uva.nl
studentenraad.nl/fgw

Datum 12 oktober 2020
Contactpersoon Zazie van Dorp (Voorzitter)
Bijlage(n) 0
Betreft **Memo Kwaliteitsafspraken**

Ons kenmerk 20fgw021
Uw kenmerk 00

Dear Dean, dear Fred

This memo refers to our last conversation in regard to the Kwaliteitsafspraken. With the hopes to keep the conversation going, hereby we give you our feedback on your proposal referred to as memo 1 (200623) and memo 2 (200626). After our feedback you will find our suggestions as to what to spend a section of the money on.

Feedback on memo 200623 aanvullende memo besteding kwaliteitsafspraken

In the ideal situation every course would be oriented by the research of the UD that gives this course, but usually courses at the faculty are curriculum based.

1. *“Bij het opstellen voor het profiel voor nieuwe UD-posities die uit de kwaliteitsmiddelen gefinancierd worden, wordt de afstemming tussen onderwijs en onderzoek nauwkeurig bepaald zodat beide zo goed mogelijk verbonden zijn, ten nutte van zowel onderwijs als onderzoek. Om dit te waarborgen wordt bij het opstellen van het profiel voor deze vacatures advies ingewonnen bij de meest direct betrokken OC.”*

For this point we think that instead of advice the board should be looking for consent of the OC's. We briefly discussed with the dean that advice requests are not taken seriously in many instances, and we think the OC's input here is vital, thus having consent right

would ensure their input is required and implemented. The dean fears that this would trump the flow of implementation.

2. ***Bij de werving van deze UD's zit vervolgens een studentlid van de OC in de selectieadviescommissie.***

We think this is a good idea, and we would like to keep it that way.

3. ***Om, ook buiten de master, in meer algemene zin de koppeling tussen onderwijs en onderzoek te versterken en op deze wijze onderzoeks intensief onderwijs beter in de praktijk te brengen wordt het Teaching & Learning Centre FGw (TLC FGw) gevraagd beproefde opties en suggesties voor de integratie van onderzoek in het onderwijs op een rij te zetten. Daar kunnen ook opties bij horen om in gestandaardiseerd onderwijs voldoende ruimte te creëren voor een docent om zijn onderzoek als leerzame en inspirerende showcase te gebruiken.***

We would like to know how the board plans to smoothly integrate this with the TLC since during this crisis period their workload should be oriented in assisting teachers to ensure a standard quality of education while in the online platform. There should also be a concrete date on when this list will be created and finished.

4. ***Deze lijst wordt voorgelegd aan opleidingsdirecteuren, OC's en facultaire medezeggenschap om een gezamenlijk gesprek op gang te brengen over het zichtbaarder maken van onderzoek in ons onderwijs.***

We think this point should be more concrete. How will the communication take place with the programs and the teachers of said programmes? What is the goal of having these conversations? How will the decision making and their implementation take place and who will make the final decision?

5. ***Het TLC FGw wordt gevraagd opleidingen of docenten die hun onderwijs willen herzien, te ondersteunen.***

This seems to be a good idea overall but again, like point 3 we worry about the correct implementation of this while neglecting other vital areas. Of course, these suggestions are going to be *asked*, so the TLC will have the last word on this matter

Feedback on 200626 kwaliteitsimpuls door intensivering aanvulling

Feedback page 1:

Midterm review: there should be more space for interim steering or adjustments. There should be an overview published every year of the spendings and implementation of said spendings per program.

Goal 1:

This goal is still very vague, the connection between education and research is still not clear enough here. The changes made do not explain a concrete adjustment to improve research intensive education.

Goal 2:

The changes made to this goal have improved it.

Goal 3:

“The CoH and GSH want to expand and improve student counseling. Half of the resources still available will therefore be used for this. We primarily opt for study counseling that suits the academic character of the university. This means that with student counseling we want to have an emphasis on personal development and making the right academic choices. In order to align education with science, we prefer to have student councillors with a scientific background. In addition, half of the resources as mentioned before will be invested in student councillors with a scientific background; student councillors that are also scientists in their field. Furthermore, a limited expansion will be needed on appointing study advisors and student councillors from wp(?). More study advisors will be needed due to internationalisation and rising pressure to perform.” (p. 3)

Tutors are not named explicitly and even after the extra study advisors that were implemented our faculty is still not reaching the recommended amount of 1 study advisor per 750 students.

Feedback on alternative spending proposals:

Alternative 1; supporting personnel:

The FSR FGw is of the opinion that hiring supporting personnel does not solve the problem that is present in student guidance and does not address the concerns of the FSR FGw of the funding not going to proposals that will directly help students and improve their education.

Alternative 2; teachers without research time:

As the connection between education and research is not always very clear enough, it would be preferable that this alternative is added into the proposal of funding solely UD's. This being said, we do also understand the worry of the bachelor/master distribution.

General feedback:

As FSR FGw we cannot agree with the proposal of funding UD positions with a 40/60 ratio. Nevertheless, we would be positive if the funding fully supports education with new UD's. We think that there is too little proof and research on the direct correlation between research time and improvement of education. Teachers usually do improve their teaching through research but because of curriculum focused education their research is difficult to integrate in class. That is also why the FSR FGw is positive on working on a policy that can improve this as discussed in Memo 1. Memo 1 has the possibility of solving this disconnect, or at least improving it but we cannot estimate at this point how much the policy will solve, and we are concerned about how this policy will be implemented per program. Therefore, we suggest giving consent power to OC's. Furthermore, it is our concern that funding more UD's does not correlate with the goals of NVAO and the OCW, as well as the students' expectations.

Our proposal for a section of the money:

It is important to remark that the Ministry speeded up the delivery of *Kwaliteitsgelden* to help universities during these times of crisis. Thus, the following options consider how this money can be invested to help students who have been affected. On the one hand by the global pandemic and on the other by previous structural issues that FGw needs to solve to upkeep the quality of education, which for now, remains to be online. It was said by the fDB in the most recent meeting that Corona is expected to not pose an issue in the near future, which is worrying since we have seen what an impact it has on students and most probably will have in the near future. We are not saying that the *Kwaliteitsgelden* must be spent on issues directly related to corona, but we are of the opinion that it would be shortsighted not to consider it in the plans.

1. We think that mental health is a very pressing issue and will keep being present during Corona. Students right now are for the most part not able to see and meet with other students in person. Additionally, the daily hours spent on Zoom, Microsoft Teams and Canvas, can be overwhelming from time-to-time. This is because the social aspect of education has been lost almost entirely, especially for the students who do not live in or near the city. Online education not only causes these issues. It also puts the student through a lot of pressure if they are not used to managing their time well, and the university has implemented little to no guidance with this. We therefore think that appointing more lecturers, a faculty-level student psychologist and giving students a free subscription to USC (the UvA sport facility) can help with improving student health and student contact.

2. We think that the fDB cannot speak of a sustainable investment, when they have no guarantee what will happen with the UD's when the money runs out. Therefore, we would prefer the fDB to also mention the scenario of what will happen when *Kwaliteitsgelden* has been spent. This situation also relates to our first point.
3. Students are missing out on having a quiet space to study on campus. We think that it might be an option to use the *Kwaliteitsgelden* for investing in 1) smaller classes (less students in class) and 2) bigger study spaces for students → the Posthoornkerk for example.
4. Some students might not be able to pay for their own work-from-home equipment (laptop, router). We think that a part of the *Kwaliteitsgelden* can help with providing the equipment.
5. Lastly, we want to be included in all facets of the implementation process.

We thank you for reading this memo and look forward to our follow-up conversation on this topic.

Yours sincerely,

On behalf of the FSR FGw,



Zazie van Dorp

Chair FSR FGw