



Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 29 oktober 2020

Present	David Batelaan, Subu Choudhury, Lotus Friede, Sara Kemper, Gerard Nijsten, Carlos Reijnen, Tammie Schoots, Gabriel Sojo Perez, Zazie van Dorp, Liesje Verhave, Robbert Verheul, Fred Weerman, Marian Wilts
Absent	Nelson Addo, Olaiya Aro, Kauthar Bouazzati, Chimira Obiefule, Irene Zwiep
Guest	Melle Koletzki (Technical Chair)
Secretary	Angelina Senchi

Agenda

- 1) Opening and confirming the agenda
- 2) Draft minutes OV FSR
 - a) 18th of June
 - b) 17th of September
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) State of affairs
 - a) Corona
 - b) CoH
 - c) GSH
- 5) Budget plan FGw 2021 (file: budget plan FGw 2021)
- 6) Social Safety (file: reaction letter DB unsolicited advice social safety)
- 7) Tijdpad OERen (file: planning OER'en 21-22)
- 8) Memo questions FSR (file: Memo Overlegvergadering 29 oktober 2020)
- 9) Final questions and closing

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Koletzki opens the meeting at 15:04.

2 Whilst confirming the agenda Van Dorp suggests to plan a break before the Social Safety topic.

3 The board, council and technical chair agree to this suggestion. The agenda is confirmed.

2. Draft minutes OV FSR

4 a) 18th of June

5 Koltezki enquires whether he's correct by stating that there have been some
6 developments regarding these minutes after last OV's postponement of the confirming
7 of the minutes. Weerman notes that he thought the council and the board came to an
8 agreement and, after the applied edits, the current text is good. Van Dorp agrees saying
9 that the final document sent in by Wilts is indeed the correct version. Koletzki suggests
10 to not go over them page by page and confirm them as they are at that moment. There
11 are no objections to this by the council or the board.

12 b) 17th of September

13 Before Koletzki goes over the document page by page, he briefly explains the etiquette
14 he would like the attendees to adhere to during the fully digital meeting. While they go
15 over the individual pages of the minutes, Weerman notes that there is a spelling
16 mistake on page 14 in line 38: the word *instemmingsplan* should be changed to
17 *instellingsplan* and explains that this is the plan for the university or the institution for
18 the next five years. Senchi indicates that she will apply the change to the document.

19 Pro Memori:

20
21 *200511-01 Weerman makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so
22 that he FSR can advise on this.*

23 Weerman notes that this is part of the agenda.

24 *200618-01 The DB informs the FSR about Proctoring and the use of it.*

25 Van Dorp notes that this point should be striped.

26 Action List:

27 *200511-02 Vaessens will add the promotion of Humanities with Dutch high school
28 students (other than the ones who have a N&T profile).*

29 Weerman explains that this point is also taken up later on in another
30 action point regarding the CoH Yearplan and suggests to combine the
31 action points as one point.

32 *200511-02 Nijsten discusses the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning and milk
33 with Cirfood and Facility Services.*

34 *200511-03 Nijsten looks for a promotion plan for sustainability and waste.*

35 Points 200511-02 and 200511-03 could also be combined according
36 to Koletzki. Nijsten notes that due to the pandemic he hasn't been
37 able to fulfill these points and they can, therefore, stay on the list.

38 *200917-04 Reijnen will send over attachment 6 from the agenda concerning point
39 4.4.5. Tweetaligheid en meertaligheid in MA opleidingen on the GSH
40 agenda (2nd of July 2020).*

41 Reijnen explains that this document was solely a discussion starter
42 with no content of importance and the discussion, as he indicated



- 1 during the previous OV, didn't take place either due to a lack of time.
2 He Reijnen notes that there's virtually nothing to send or debate. He
3 indicates that it will be on the agenda in the GSH's next meeting.
4 Koletzki suggests to scrap the point for now and possibly get back on
5 it during another meeting. There are no objections.
6 *200917-06 The FSR will follow up with the DB on whether a decision regarding*
7 *online education in the second semester has been made.*
8 Attendees nod their heads but there is no further indication to scrap
9 or keep the action point.
10 *200917-07 The DB will spend more time on the promotion of humanities to Dutch*
11 *high school students.*
12 *200917-08 The DB will write a response letter to the negative advice by the FSR*
13 *concerning the CoH Yearplan.*
14 *200917-09 The DB sends over a plan regarding digital education in the next*
15 *semester.*
16 *200917-10 The DB sends over more information regarding Humanities in Context.*
17 *200917-11 The DB sends over more information regarding 7-7-4.*
18 *200917-12 The DB will set up an addendum to the CoH Yearplan that reflects the*
19 *comments made in the negative advice by the FSR.*
20 Points 200917-07, 200917-08, 200917-09, 200917-10, 200917-11
21 and 200917-12 will be combined and serve as sub-points to an action
22 point regarding the CoH yearplan, as suggested by Weerman and
23 Wilts, in order to improve comprehension. Van Dorp agrees to
24 clustering the points but clarifies that they cannot be scrapped from
25 the list, because they haven't been completed yet. Reijnen adds that
26 the response to the council's advice is on its way and that he's fairly
27 certain it can be scrapped from the list during the next OV.
28 *200917-13 Nijsten or the DB will report in the next month on the developments*
29 *regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.*
30 Nijsten comments that, unfortunately, there is nothing new to report.
31 *200917-14 Nijsten will report on the White Paper to the council in the course of the*
32 *next month.*
33 Nijsten comments that they're still waiting for the publication of the
34 White Paper and, as soon as it is published, it will be sent to the
35 council and they can further discuss it.

36
37 The minutes of the 18th of June and 17th of September are both confirmed.

3. Announcements

38 A) Daily Board of the Faculty

39 Weerman relays that Zwiép and Addo will be absent during this meeting and notes
40 that he and the council discussed that the board is currently working on getting a
41 successor for Thomas Vaessens and that they're optimistic of it leading to a good
42 outcome. Nevertheless, Weerman shares that they'll be needing some time and he
43 expresses his hope of coming up with a proposal very soon. Weerman refers to an
44 email he's sent past Monday [in the week of the OV] where he informed the FSR of the

1 appointment of the Ad Interim Director; he indicates that the current meeting will be
2 Nijsten's last one and he hopes to have a new director as quickly as possible. Also
3 mentioning that these procedures are currently already happening. Jos van Geel shall
4 function as the director in the meantime.

5 **B) FSR**

6 Van Dorp announces that Aro and Obiefule won't be attending this meeting.

7 Koletzki briefly makes some points regarding his role as technical chair during the online
8 meeting, like his inability to read body language from the screen, looking into the camera for the
9 duration of the meeting and the etiquette he mentioned earlier in the meeting,

4. **State of Affairs**

10 **A) Corona**

11 Weerman will begin with some general remarks on the pandemic and Reijnen will
12 continue with more detailed information. Weerman notes the rising number of Corona
13 cases in the region and the effect that has on the amount of staff present in the
14 buildings, explaining that most of them are working from home and they have
15 indicated they prefer to not risk traveling to Amsterdam. On campus there aren't
16 special restrictions yet, which means the on-campus regulations will remain as they
17 were. They have established plans for the next term and Reijnen will fill the council in
18 on the plans for the coming term.

19 Reijnen has discussed the future of education considerably with the Program
20 Directors and will continue to do so. He notes that no final decisions have been made
21 yet, due to the complexity of the matter but there is a general storyline starting to
22 form. He has observed, like the FSR also indicated, that students need to be in contact
23 with the university in order to be able to study. This point has been communicated
24 with the Program Directors and they agree with it. Reijnen explains that the
25 realization of this in daily life is a rather complex matter and hard to organize. He
26 offers examples, like the availability of staff, differences between students' desires and
27 needs. The general idea is for the faculty to offer more on-site education, taking into
28 account the difference between programs. He explains that they would like to make
29 full use of the 20% capacity in the buildings, as per the government restrictions, that is
30 available to them; Program Directors have informed Reijnen that this will be hard to
31 realize due to previously mentioned complications. He mentions the alternative of
32 organizing hybrid education, where some students are on-site and others join the
33 lecture digitally from their home with online differences. He notes that it seems like a
34 good option, but it simultaneously creates a difference between the students'
35 experiences: online and in-class. He adds to that by saying that it also triggers or forces
36 teachers to return to their former way of teaching, which might cause them to focus
37 more on their in-class students and less on the online attendees. Reijnen does believe
38 that there are viable solutions to these complications, but these require more careful
39 consideration. He feels that fully online courses urge teachers to rethink their didactic
40 methods. Yet, the disadvantage of this being only online presence. He briefly
41 summarizes the points he's just made about hybrid tools, the struggle to organize and
42 the prevention of differentiation between students and the complete use of the 20%
43 building capacity. He adds that they're looking into options for creating more study



1 spaces so students have the ability to get their work done and are in contact with the
2 campus.

3 Koletzki summarizes that the CoH and GSH are working hard on future education
4 during the pandemic.

5

6 **B) CoH**

7 Reijnen doesn't have any further general statements on this topic. He mentions that the
8 developments on Humanities in Context (HiC) will be discussed in another separate meeting
9 with the council.

10 **C) GSH**

11 Reijnen explains that the GSH is currently in the last very rounds of program evaluations with
12 the national reaccreditation of the programs. He mentions programs like the Research masters,
13 Archaeology, History, Arts & Culture and Religion studies. Here they're also looking into how
14 they are working out in an online setting, which, at first glance, according to Reijnen, seem to
15 work out pretty well.

5. Budget plan FGw (file: budget plan FGw 2021)

16 Koletzki briefly introduces the agenda point and enquires if the board has any further
17 introductory remarks. Nijsten notes that they have sent the *begroting* [budget, red.] and this
18 didn't include the *1 Oktobertelling* [1st of October Count, red.] which dives into the amount of
19 credits, students and diplomas that have been gained over the course of last year. The result
20 only came in the week before the OV and he relays that they had more credits and diplomas
21 than they previously expected, which he considers good news. He further indicates that this
22 means they'll be having an additional budget and this leads to a *begrotingsresultaat* [budget
23 result, red.] of approximately two million euros [ca. €2.000.000] for the next year.

24 Schoots thanks the board for the way they addressed certain issues in the budget and
25 explains that they plan to go over the budget in two parts. Schoots will go into topics related to
26 the pandemic and Sojo Perez will go into continuous issues. First, she refers to page 15 - on the
27 topic of the *Coronaknelpunten* [Corona Bottlenecks, red.] - where it is described that there'll be
28 an increase of 5FTE on the budget which will be devoted to *Voorzichtigheid* [precaution, red.];
29 Scots wonders how much of the half million euros [€500.000, red.] will be spent on the 5FTE
30 and what the board means by *Voorzichtigheid*. Nijsten explains that due the abundance of
31 technical terms he'll continue his explanation in Dutch. Nijsten indicates *dat de werkdruk voor*
32 *docenten naar aanleiding van de pandemie hoog is, onder andere omdat zij hun methode van*
33 *onderwijzen hebben moeten aanpassen en zich eigen hebben moeten maken. Om die reden, en*
34 *omdat ze verwachten dat dit in de eerste helft van 2021 nog steeds het geval zou zijn, heeft het*
35 *bestuur besloten dat zij extra tijd en ruimte moeten krijgen om dit 'ombouwen' te bewerkstelligen;*
36 *dit is de 5FTE* [translation: the increased workload for professors due the pandemic, in part, because
37 they've had to adapt their teaching methods and get used to them. For this reason, as well as their
38 expectance for the continuance of these adaptations for the first half of 2021, the board has decided that
39 they [the teachers] should be granted the time and space to establish the changes necessary; this is the
40 5FTE]. Nijsten continues by explaining why they used the term *Voorzichtigheid*: *in de tekst*
41 *wordt aangegeven dat zij omwille van voorzichtigheid dit ook voor de daaropvolgende jaren*
42 *hebben opgenomen. Ze hopen dat er op dat moment geen sprake meer is van een pandemie, maar*

1 hebben voor de zekerheid dit bedrag vastgelegd in de begroting [translation: the text indicates that
2 for the sake of precaution they have applied this for the following years as well. They hope there
3 won't be an ongoing pandemic at that point, but to be sure they decided to incorporate the funds in the
4 budget]. Koletzki briefly summarizes and translates the points made by Nijsten. Batelaan
5 comments that Sojo Perez, the other file holder for the budget, doesn't understand Dutch.
6 Therefore, Batelaan would like the answers to be in English. He notes that it would be okay to
7 use the terminology in Dutch, but that they prefer the discussion to be mostly in English. Nijsten
8 agrees and Koletzki offers to help translate if this should cause any difficulties. Schoots
9 reiterates, asking how much of the half million euros will be spent on the 5FTE. Nijsten clarifies
10 that 5FTE is the half-a-million. Schoots notes how digital education will become more important
11 due to the pandemic and refers to page 43 where she reads out a section about quality control,
12 Office 36 and the further development of Canvas. She reminds the board of system's
13 malfunctioning on the 20th of October [2020, red.] and stresses the importance of an adequately
14 functioning system; she asks the board the amount they plan to spend on the digital testing of
15 Canvas and whether they can provide an explanation as to why they believe this amount will be
16 enough. Nijsten indicates that he's not clear on what she means by her question and asks if she
17 could clarify, perhaps by relaying the page she's discussing. Schoots points Nijsten towards page
18 43 where price increases are discussed and she repeats her questions: how much, specifically,
19 do you think you're going to spend on digital testing and on the Canvas page? And why do you
20 think this should be spent on these two things? Nijsten once more admits that he doesn't
21 understand what Schoots means and goes on by explaining that page 43 shows the amount of
22 money that is spent on *centrale diensten* [central services, red.], like the university library or IT
23 services. The amount of money spent on the *centrale diensten* is on the basis of agreements that
24 the UvA has with these particular services. He comments that it is difficult for him to relate this
25 topic to the exact question she poses to him. Schoots understands Nijsten's remarks as there
26 being agreements between central services and the board and rephrases her question. She asks
27 if the board can give the council insight into the agreement and how the board has come to the
28 arrangement of spending the funds on central services. She further clarifies that she would like
29 to know how much money is being invested in the digital environment. Nijsten explains that it
30 is a rather technical issue and that she is welcome to the information that demonstrates how
31 the sum has been made. He offers to provide this information later on. Wilts jumps in and
32 explains that this page shows the costs that the faculty makes as a contribution to the central
33 services. To clarify: the faculty is not responsible, nor do they host Canvas or the other systems;
34 this is arranged on the central level and, therefore, the faculty can't prevent these systems from
35 crashing or make them function better. Yet, they are, of course, willing to look for and provide
36 the information relating to the cost increase of the central services. Koletzki asks if this is what
37 the FSR would like: insight into the *digitale leeromgeving* (DLO) [digital learning space]. Schoots
38 mentions that this indeed what she meant. Wilts stresses that the *digitale leeromgeving* isn't
39 arranged by the faculty, but that it is arranged university wide and she believes the
40 conversation regarding whether it is functioning accordingly should be between the Centrale
41 Studentenraad (CSR) [Central Student Council, red.] and the College van Bestuur (CvB)
42 [Executive Board, red.]. Wilts stresses that the faculty board isn't in charge of these issue.
43 Schoots comments that she understands what they mean, but rather her question is about
44 making sure that these points are adequately funded. She continues by confirming whether the
45 board is willing to commit to providing insight by how these agreements have come about and
46 making sure the funds will be sufficient. Koletzki summarizes: taking into consideration that it

1 is a central issue, could the daily board provide insight in the budget regarding the *digitale*
2 *leeromgeving*? Schoots adds that they want to know how this agreement was established.
3 Nijsten answers that they can give insight into the amount spent on the *digitale leeromgeving*.
4 He continues that it is a central UvA system and that the faculty can show the council how much
5 they have to pay for those services. Schoots responds that she doesn't need to know the logistics
6 of it, but she would like to know how the conversation goes. As well as the normative idea
7 behind the amount of money spent on the digital education; especially, because due to the
8 pandemic it will be become more important. She further explains that she isn't inquiring after
9 the inner workings of it but more insight into normative explanation about why a specific
10 amount is going to the digital learning environment. Koletzki asks Nijsten if these points stated
11 by Schoots are possible. Nijsten apologizes and responds that he is unable to answer her
12 question and offers to discuss it later, perhaps after their meeting. He explains that he is not
13 sure whether he correctly understands what she's been saying. Koletzki offers to make it an
14 action point for the board to provide the insight into the amount spent on the DLO and to
15 organize a meeting at a later date to discuss the normative idea and agreement behind the
16 budget, specifically for the DLO **[ACTION POINT]**. Weerman responds, directing his comments
17 to Schoots, to explain that the faculty pays a fixed amount, for instance, per student for all sorts
18 of central support and this is not specific to the Humanities faculty. Schoots interrupts
19 Weerman and comments that should the Daily Board want to school her on how the budget
20 works she is open to have a conversation about this, but for now she would like to know how
21 this construction has come about. She notes that this is why they agreed to have a meeting as
22 well as provide insight. Koletzki offers to end the discussion there to prevent the repetition of
23 the same questions and reminds everyone to not let the discussion become too heated.

24 Schoots introduces her next point concerning digital education for future years and
25 refers to the research study '*College in tijden van corona: een tussenbalans*', which states that 6%
26 of respondents is unable to follow education online due to a lack of facilities and 17% of the
27 respondents expressed that they don't have an adequate study space. Schoots continues by
28 saying that she would like for the board to conduct more thorough research to locate current
29 problems and to, based on these findings, designate a set amount of money in the budget for
30 them to appeal to – so, these issues can be addressed. Nijsten thanks Schoot for her
31 observations and responds that they have discussed this topic during a previous session. He
32 agrees and notes that she has made a valid point; there are problems for certain groups of
33 students to have follow their studies under these circumstances and he proposes to add a
34 paragraph in the risk chapter and acknowledge the point the council makes. He notes there are
35 two possible actions that can be taken: first, to realize more study spaces. Second, to explore on
36 the UvA level what the possibilities are concerning, for instance, *leenlaptops* [laptops on loan,
37 red.] and other facilities that will enable to students to follow their studies. He stresses that this
38 is something which can be explored, but that it isn't possible to have a fixed amount of money
39 reserved for it – this, because it's uncertain how much money this will be. Only after this
40 exploration, on the central level, and ultimately the decision-making there can be decided how
41 much the UvA will invest. Schoots responds that she would like to see more research being done
42 on the faculty level and garner information on where humanities students are encountering
43 problems, then have a conversation and look into the option of having designated funds for this.
44 First, she would like to know if more thorough research could be done on the humanities level.
45 Reijnen suggests to ask study advisors to check in with the students about the problems they're
46 running into. Currently, they already do this with tutors concerning the *Bindend Studieadvies*

1 (BSA) [Binding Study Advice, red.] and he offers to do a similar exercise with the study advisors
2 to garner an idea of what the problems are students are running into. He adds that they might
3 not be able to fix all problems; there are certain financial and legal limitations. Yet, he thinks it'd
4 be good to make such an inventory. He explains that a similar exercise has happened with the
5 study advisors before the summer and he's willing to check what came out of it and whether it'd
6 be relevant to do something like it again. Koletzki summarizes that Reijnen is willing to ask the
7 study advisors to check with students about their at-home education environment. Reijnen
8 agrees, saying he's willing to look into what students are running into while receiving online
9 education at home, he feels that it 'd be good to know, like Schoots said, what their students [at
10 the Humanities faculty, red.] are running into [ACTION POINT]. Schoots agrees to this plan but
11 wonders if the board could also agree that the conclusions from this research should be
12 translated to the budget. Schoots hypothesizes that this would then mean that after these
13 conclusions have been reached and the problems haven been determined they could use the
14 budget to tackle these problems. Nijsten comments that they should explore and see what
15 comes out of it. He notes that should they agree that there is an issue that needs to be tackled
16 they will do so. He simply cannot name a specific amount of money. Schoots is content with the
17 answers provided by Reijnen and Nijsten.

18 Sojo Perez asks regarding, the *Coronaknelpunten* and the incidental costs, whether
19 they could provide the council with a more specific breakdown of the incidental costs and how
20 they are translated to the *Coronaknelpunten*. He notes that it is doesn't have to happen during
21 this meeting, but they would simply like to know how the half million euros will be spent.
22 Reijnen explains that the *knelpunten* refer to unexpected things in daily life; the things they
23 cannot predict for the coming semesters. He gives an example of the language studies and
24 problems they run into now these students are no longer going abroad for a semester and they
25 are obliged to offer a them an alternative program to fill the gap; these are the kind of problems
26 this money would go to. Sojo Perez suggests for the board to include the following in their
27 response to the advice the council will be sharing soon. Namely, the way incidental costs are
28 translated to the *Coronaknelpunten* and other ways the incidental costs could possibly be spent
29 – like the problems students are currently facing. The board agrees to send the council a written
30 reply on this topic [ACTION POINT].

31 Sojo Perez would like to briefly go into some points that the council had advised on in the
32 previous year and showed recent developments in the current budget. The FSR would like to be
33 part of the process of how the link between research and education will be achieved, as was also
34 discussed in another meeting.

35 Sojo Perez wonders about the breakdown of the funds designated for creating a sustainable
36 humanities faculty. Considering that it is rather unclear what the money is spent on exactly,
37 Sojo Perez says he currently can't conjure up the exact amount of money that was stated in the
38 budget. Nijsten comments notes that it is 2.8 million euros [€2.800.000]. At this point in the
39 meeting Sojo Perez runs into some technical difficulties, Kemper offers to round up the point
40 Sojo Perez was trying to make – everyone agrees. Kemper explains that in last year's positive
41 budget advice by the FSR the council asked about the Sustainable Humanities Plan and a vision
42 of what this would entail. They asked to have this vision before September 2020, but, as of yet,
43 they haven't received one and wondered if they could receive it before the end of this year
44 [2020, red.]. Nijsten agrees to this proposal [ACTION POINT].

45



1 Koletzki offers to start the break at 16:55 and pick the rest of this agenda point up after the
2 break.

3

4 Sojo Perez goes into the Diversity Officer and the Diversity Budget and how the council had
5 asked the board to communicate to the students the requirements and eligibility of these topics.
6 He asks if and how this request by the council was followed up. He notes that he believes that
7 Reijnen would provide them with more details about how this money would be spent and
8 explains that he would like to see this point reflected in the budget or elsewhere. Sojo Perez
9 continues that there is some confusion on how exactly this money is issued. Reijnen responds
10 that, like he explained last year, the money that is on the budget is additional. It entails a
11 working budget for diversity, which they've also used last year, but Reijnen notes that he would
12 have to check what this was used for last year. He continues by explaining that the regular
13 budget is mostly based on education related activities and it has also been used from a diversity
14 angle, which isn't visible in the smaller amount. He recounts that some money from the
15 Diversity Budget was spent last year, for instance, on workshops. Koletzki asks if there is a
16 central breakdown for this too. Reijnen notes that it is a working budget with a fixed amount of
17 money, but considering it is a working budget it isn't planned in advance what the money will
18 be spent on. He admits that, indeed, they don't use this budget as much as they would like to
19 and they plan to do this differently with the current budget. The nature of the Diversity Budget
20 only allows for them to look back on it in retrospect to see what has been done instead of
21 planning it out beforehand. Sojo Perez wonders if, in order to improve the way this particular
22 budget is spent, it would be necessary to have an account of what they would spend the money
23 on this year and ask if they can have insight into the expenses this year to improve the way they
24 tackle this budget. Reijnen agrees to this **[ACTION POINT]**. Sojo Perez dives into the topic of
25 internationalization and the promotion of the Humanities to the Dutch students, similar to the
26 council's request for the *CoH Jaarplan* [CoH Yearly Plan, red.], and whether there is any plan in
27 place to prevent student drop-outs and addressing the internationalization problem within the
28 faculty. Reijnen is confused about the mentioning of drop-outs in combination with drop-outs.
29 Sojo Perez clarifies that in the risk paragraph the faculty admits that its dependence on
30 international students is an issue and he would like to know whether there is anything, besides
31 the plans from the CoH yearly plan, that would lead to more promotion of the faculty to Dutch
32 students and how they'd prevent drop-outs as a consequence of the pandemic. Reijnen admits
33 they do depend on international students and - should they lose these - there should be an
34 alternative plan. Reijnen notes that, for instance, Humanities in Context is one of the answers to
35 address this issue and, looking at the pandemic, it requires the faculty to take a closer look at
36 study guidance and make sure the students that are *in* the programs to *stay* there and enable
37 them to study effectively. Regarding the communication of this to students, as well as,
38 advertising their programs, Reijnen suggests to have a lengthier discussion on these topics
39 some other time. Sojo Perez will make an appointment with Reijnen to further discuss this topic
40 **[ACTION POINT]**. Regarding Humanities in Context, the council would like to have more clarity
41 on how the 250 thousand euros [€250.000] allocated to HiC would be spent - like a plan or
42 breakdown. Reijnen will provide the council with the plan or breakdown, that currently focuses
43 mainly on preparing for the program. He notes that the preparation is fairly concrete and not
44 general as Koletzki implied. Sojo Perez asks if he could have that breakdown as soon as possible
45 - Reijnen agrees **[ACTION POINT]**. Sojo Perez thanks the board for their answers.

6. Social safety (file: reaction letter DB unsolicited advice social safety)

1 Koletzki briefly introduces the topic and asks if any other introductory remarks should be
2 made. Weerman relays that the letter consists of three parts: one, where they give an overview
3 of how the council's reaction could be used in the period they're heading into; two, a summary
4 of the actions that are being considered or already put in place; finally, the part that focuses on
5 the prevention of calamities. It is about what they can do when things go wrong and how they
6 can improve the existing procedures, but also about how they can prevent things from going
7 wrong. They want to look into how the university and, in particular, the faculty can become a
8 safer place. He adds that the plan is to work in stages and they're currently relaying information
9 on this first stage; he continues that he would like to ask the council how they feel about this
10 idea.

11 Verhave would like to begin by responding in a general fashion. She touches upon the
12 subject of the council's suggestions for the complaint structure and notes that it is regretful that
13 the council didn't receive sufficient feedback on the suggestions that were made. Therefore, she
14 would like to know why the board decided to not respond to these particular suggestions.
15 Weerman explains that they'd set up a general reaction and notes that in nearly all of the cases
16 he considered the council's suggestions very useful for the new procedures. He points out that
17 the procedures are UvA general procedures and they will have discussion on that at the central
18 level as soon as the external committee has come out with their report - he notes that this
19 committee has also been asked to give their advice on the complaint procedure. He comments
20 that he supports the suggestions made by the council and, from the faculty's perspective, there
21 should be a university-wide procedure - not something that is only done at the faculty level.
22 Weerman continues that they'll be bringing these suggestions, together with the council, into
23 the discussion they'll be having at university level in order to improve the procedures. The
24 faculty will be taking over the council's suggestions. Verhave asks if the board knows when the
25 external committee's report will be shared. Weerman recounts that the FSR was invited to offer
26 their suggestions to the board and possibly the committee too; he expects the report to be
27 shared by the end of the month - within a couple of days. Verhave asks about the working
28 groups mentioned in the reaction letter and if they've already started meeting. Weerman
29 exclaims no and explains that the board would first like to know from the council whether they
30 like the approach of the proposed working groups and then - together - fill in the working
31 groups. Verhave notes that the council does like the idea of the working groups, but because the
32 plans currently aren't very detailed, content-wise. She agrees that the structure makes sense
33 and has previously proven to be effective, but she has some difficulty agreeing to these plans
34 solely on structure - especially, because content is of vital importance regarding this issue. The
35 council has difficulty giving feedback on these plans and suggests that, in order for them to give
36 sound advice, they'll be needing more details. Like, the kind of content discussed in the working
37 groups and the subplan within the working groups. Weerman relays that they gave a general
38 idea of what they think should be done and notes that the council's advice, in this regard, is also
39 most welcome. Weerman dives into the subject of dependency relations between teachers,
40 students, groups, etc. and they would like to analyze and gather up a picture of what the risky
41 aspects are, for instance, around the domain of education. Here they'd be considering different
42 perspectives, like the student perspective, teacher perspective or even the perspective of
43 Program Directors. This would help them to determine, not only, the more evident issues but
44 also map out the and analyze the so-called gray zone - where certain issues, about what is and
45 what isn't problematic, might not be clear to everyone. Weerman explains that this process



1 would entail the first stage of the method and after, when they've established a certain report
2 detailing these topics, the board would like to convene with the four domains and decide
3 together on what kind of actions and policy would be necessary to address these risks – to
4 balance or circumvent them. Verhave's initial response that for these working groups it would
5 be important to have a good mix of people participating, including the FSR, and that they should
6 be led by an external party – not teachers of OPDs, because these would already set the tone for
7 the meeting. Furthermore, people participating in these working groups shouldn't be doing this
8 in their free time. She suggests to, for instance, compensate them with something like a bol.com
9 gift card. Lastly, she asks if the council could be part of these working groups. Weerman
10 responds that this could be an option, but he'd like her to consider the following point: the FSR
11 plays the role of judging the results of these groups and creating new policy or helping to
12 formulate policy might be at odds with this role. Weerman agrees the groups should be
13 heterogeneous. He feels that a member of the council could, of course, join these groups, but
14 Weerman would suggest these members to do so on an individual basis and not as a council
15 member in order to maintain the integrity of the council's role as judge of the results and
16 proceedings. Weerman also agrees that it would be a good idea to provide participants with
17 some sort of support, although not a salary in hours. He notes that they should demonstrate that
18 the issue is important to them and external support for the groups would be good. Verhave
19 specifies that she believes that the groups should be led by an external professional in social
20 safety, because she feels this would be the most productive. Weerman agrees and explains that
21 this is exactly what the board had in mind too. Verhave further remarks that she doesn't expect
22 hours to be given, except for when an external party is hired, but she prefers to have some
23 financial substitute for the participants – especially, because talking about these issues requires
24 a lot of energy and they shouldn't expect them to do this on a free basis. Also, because it is very
25 much necessary for these groups to be a safe space and providing them with financial support
26 will aid in creating this safety. Weerman agrees it should be a safe space; they can't offer a
27 salary, but might give them a symbolic compensation. Verhave mentions the example of bol.com
28 gift card again. Van Dorp briefly explains the introduction sessions on social safety she's had at
29 her philosophy courses and learned that this is part of their program's policy; she wonders
30 whether this policy is faculty wide. Weerman notes that this is the result of the first measures
31 established on this topic and he's happy to learn it worked out well in Van Dorp's case, but that
32 they're evaluating and waiting to see how it works out in other courses. Weerman feels that it
33 should become part of all the programs at the university. Reijnen will look into having an
34 evaluation procedure for this issue during his next meeting with the program directors
35 **[ACTION POINT]**. Van Dorp notes she hopes this works out and will be continued year after
36 year.

37 Verhave asks about the option of an external *Vertrouwenspersoon* [fiduciary, red.]
38 instead of a person within the faculty - like a teacher. Weerman replies that the matter of
39 *vertrouwenspersonen* is currently handled at the central level but they're also still awaiting the
40 advice of the external committee on this topic, like the need for an external fiduciary or the need
41 for possibly more fiduciaries. Weerman would like to point out that everyone is free to pick a
42 *Vertrouwenspersoon* of their own choosing and aren't bound by their own faculty, this is also
43 why he believes it'd be good to have a lot of fiduciaries. Considering people might have a vast
44 array of reasons for needing to find a particular person to talk to about these issues.

45 Finally, Verhave notes that experiences like Van Dorp had at her philosophy course
46 aren't necessarily at every course at the faculty. She would like to see this become a faculty wide

1 policy and – should this already be the case – it might be wise to check whether the programs
2 actually live up to this. Also, should the board want their advice on the plan in the letter, the
3 council does really need more details to provide sound advice. Verhave notes that structurally
4 they are in favor of the plan, but more details – like Weerman’s idea about the analysis of the
5 gray zone – in writing would help the FSR’s formulation of further advice and suggestions.
6 Weerman notes that suggestions, like the ones Verhave mentioned before, are most welcome
7 and he wouldn’t mind also discussing these during the TTOs.

7. Tijdpad OERen (file: planning OER’en 21-22)

8 Friede refers to an email sent by the council that contained a response to the time path sent to
9 the council. She explains that the council has, several times now, received a request from the
10 board that didn’t grant the council the normal six-week response time. Today, she would like to
11 make sure the board is reminded of the response time the council should be getting as well as
12 offer their perspective on why they don’t feel the *Deurendichtbijeenkomst* [Closed Door Meeting,
13 red.] is the right process for confirming the OERen. Reijnen explains that there seems to be a
14 rush to the time path, but he would like to clarify that in actuality it is quite a lengthy time path
15 until the actual decisions are made. Reijnen explains that the six weeks are related to the formal
16 proceeding of the council getting a formal proposal to advise on a topic, but the procedure of the
17 OERen is spelled out in a different way; considering all partners and participants of the process.
18 He explains the procedure of the OERen is broken down into loads of small steps, which seems
19 time consuming. Friede explains the difficulties of having this big file, which takes a lot of time
20 and effort, handed over at the start of the academic year, when the council is just getting started
21 and the council members are all studying and have exam weeks, and then only be provided with
22 a very small time-window. She explains other councils have run into the same problem and
23 proposes that if they can’t ensure a change in the timeframe being offered this year to, at least,
24 grant next year’s council some respite and grant them the six weeks instead of four for their
25 primary response. She dives into other scheduling conflicts, like the deadlines for the OCs
26 preventing them to consult the FSR in an adequate fashion. She explains that both the council
27 and the board are reliant on other partners and this should be considered in the time path.
28 Reijnen explains that the time path is a very precise and complex mechanism and delays or
29 extensions have a big impact on the rest of the schedule which could postpone the decision
30 making to a very undesirable point in time. He advises Friede to regard the time path as a way
31 for them to have the right opportunities at the right time to provide input. Friede agrees that
32 currently they’re already too far along in the process of the OERen, but that, for now, they’d like
33 to have the concession that next year the council will be granted six instead of four weeks for
34 their primary response. Friede notes that if Reijnen considers this to be too difficult to
35 otherwise give the council the opportunity to consult on the time path itself earlier in the year.
36 Reijnen agrees. Weerman cuts in that the timing of the OERen is very difficult and offers that
37 after this year’s proceedings the council and board come together to evaluate how they’ve
38 experienced the procedure and discuss where more time can be gained or where the process
39 can be improved – in order to help out the next council concerning the procedure of the OERen.
40 Friede asks if they would then be involved with the creation of the time path for next year.
41 Weerman reiterates that the board and council evaluate after this year’s proceedings how the
42 time path could be improved in terms of organization and time management. Weerman isn’t
43 sure whether it can be done better, but perhaps the council will provide them with useful
44 insights the board hadn’t considered yet. The DB will involve the FSR in the evaluation of the



1 time path of the OERen and in the time path for next year, right after the current OER has been
2 decided on.

3 Regarding the *Deurendichtbijeenkomst* the council has noticed over the past two years
4 that it isn't the ideal way of establishing the OER and has previously commented on this as well.
5 Especially, because of the lack of time available related to this meeting. Friede also expresses
6 her concern about the convening of a large group during the pandemic; obviously meeting
7 physically would cause certain complications, but also an online meeting poses its own
8 complexities. Reijnen notes that he sees her point, but he also can't think of an alternative that
9 could work. He explains that both the board and the council run into the same things, as do the
10 other partners. They all have little preparation time and have to think on their feet, therefore it
11 is required for all the parties to prepare. Friede responds that the council and other parties have
12 previously expressed their discontent about these procedures and there is a lack of control
13 between what is being discussed during the meeting and what will eventually be put to paper
14 by the board. The council is not provided – nor are some of the OCs – with the opportunity to
15 carefully look over the articles and decide whether agree or disagree with what is stated in the
16 document and, Friede notes, this is the right of the *medezeggenschap* parties to be granted the
17 opportunity for careful consideration. This way the board might infringe on this important
18 function of the council. Reijnen responds that he understands the difficulties Friede expressed,
19 only he negates that the meetings are chaotic. Friede disagrees with this negation. Weerman
20 cuts in and remarks that previous meetings have been extremely successful and Rijk van Beek
21 had commented that he was very content with the organization of the meeting. Weerman
22 argues that a completely new proposal and the formulations of compromises should be sent
23 right away, or as quickly as possible, after the *deurendichtbijeenkomst* to the involved parties –
24 OR, FSR, etc. This way the partners should have enough time and means to make an informed
25 decision. For OR this would mean an advice request and for the FSR an consent request. Friede
26 asks if the FSR would still have the opportunity to send a negative response after the
27 *deurendichtbijeenkomst*. Weerman notes that they remain within their right to do so, but the
28 council does have to consider that this is also a collaboration and the board and the council are
29 partly dependent on each other. He explains that it would be very unhelpful to have a very
30 fruitful and positive meeting only for the party to turn around and act contrastively. Friede asks
31 if they will only receive the complete changed version or only the newly formulated points
32 discussed during the meeting. Weerman believes they will receive the entire document in an
33 Excel-file. Friede reiterates that the council would like to receive the changed OER A and format
34 B and then give consent on it after the *deurendichtbijeenkomst*. Weerman notes that her request
35 is now broader than her initial request. Friede disagrees and repeats her request once more.
36 And adds that after the meeting they will receive a written request to which they can give a
37 written response on which they'll either consent or not. Weerman reacts he's unsure of what
38 she's actually referring to now, but in terms of the official *voorgenomen besluit*, this cannot be
39 the case – because with a procedure of six weeks, this would mean it'd be too late. Friede notes
40 that they'd be willing to then take less than six weeks and have a smaller response time. She
41 explains that they simply don't feel comfortable consenting during a *deurendichtbijeenkomst*,
42 she notes that what they say during the meeting won't result in a 180-turn after the meeting –
43 but they don't like officially consenting to the points in a setting like that and would rather have
44 an official consent request after the meeting, even if this means they'll have less time to
45 respond. Weerman notes the discussion is only about a limited number of things that still need
46 discussing; it's not an entire list of things – this would indeed be problematic. Weerman says

1 that they trust the council to not change their mind about the things they agreed upon during
2 the meeting after they receive an overview of the formulations. Friede, again, explains the
3 problem the council has with consenting officially during the meeting and their preference for
4 having a written formal consent letter. Koletzki offers that the council would be 'intending'
5 [intending, red.] during the meeting and not 'consenting'. Weerman will try to work with that
6 and offers to take the council's remarks under consideration. Wilts notes that last year the
7 board also sent the Excel-file with the conclusion of the *deurendichtbijeenkomst* to all
8 participants together with the decision of the DB after they'd finalized the OERen and she notes
9 that the DB can definitely send the complete Excel-file before the OERen are finalized. This way
10 the council can check if they recognize what is stated in the file and consult the column devoted
11 to the *deurendichtbijeenkomst* for a careful description of what will be the outcome for the
12 OERen after the meeting. And they'll send the Excel-file as quickly as possible after the meeting.
13 There are no objections to this offer by Wilts. Weerman adds that the other remarks by the
14 council will be taken into consideration by the board as well.

8. Memo questions FSR (file: memo overlegvergadering 29 oktober 2020)

15 Due to the lack of time Batelaan suggests to receive a written response by the board in answer
16 to the questions in the memo. Weerman proposes to discuss the answers during the next TTO
17 or even doing it now. Batelaan notes they'd prefer a brief written response over discussing
18 them now or at TTO. Van Dorp adds that half a page maximum would be sufficient, this way it
19 won't take too much time and the council can still have a written response. Weerman agrees.
20

9. Final questions and closing

21 No final questions are posed, Koletzki thanks Nijsten for joining this last meeting. Koletzki
22 closes the meeting at 17:04.

23

Pro memori

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

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

Action list

200511-02 Vaessens will add the promotion of Humanities with Dutch high school students (other than the ones who have a N&T profile).

200511-02 Nijsten discusses the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning and milk with Cirfood and Facility Services. Furthermore, he'll look into a promotion plan regarding sustainability and waste.

~~200917-01 The DB will reread the OV minutes from the 18th of June 2020 and underline the parts that according to them should be made confidential.~~

~~200917-02 The DB will send over their plan regarding social safety to the FSR within a week.~~

~~200917-03 The DB will send over the general information from the Crisis Monitor and the course evaluations for the FSR to look over.~~

~~200917-04 Reijnen will send over attachment 6 from the agenda concerning point 4.4.5. *Tweetaligheid en meertaligheid in MA opleidingen* on the GSH agenda (2nd of July 2020).~~

~~200917-05 The FSR will inform the DB which members will be joining the Guidance Committee 7-7-4.~~

200917-06 The FSR will follow up with the DB on whether a decision regarding online education in the second semester has been made.

200917-07 Concerning the CoH Yearly Plan, the DB (or more specifically: Reijnen) will work on the following subjects:

- a) Spending more time on the promotion of Humanities to Dutch high school students (other than the ones who have a N&T profile).
- b) Writing a response letter to the negative advice by the FSR concerning the CoH Yearly Plan.
- c) Sending over a plan regarding digital education in the next semester [second semester 2020-2021, red.].
- d) Sending over more information regarding Humanities in Context.
- e) Sending over more information regarding 7-7-4.
- f) Setting up an addendum to the CoH Yearly Plan that reflects the comments made in the negative advice by the FSR.

200917-13 Nijsten or the DB will report in the next month on the developments regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.

200917-14 Nijsten will report on the white paper to the council in the course of the next month

~~200917-15 Nijsten and Sojo Perez will hold a meeting to discuss the status of the white paper and the ongoing discussion regarding the sustainability officer.~~

- 1 ~~200917-16~~ — ~~Sojo Perez reaches out to Zwiép to discuss options concerning sustainability~~
2 ~~and research.~~
- 3 201029-01 Regarding the Budget Plan 2021:
- 4 a) Nijsten (Directeur Bedrijfsvoering) will provide insight into the amount
5 of money spent on the *Digitale Leeromgeving*.
- 6 b) Nijsten (Directeur Bedrijfsvoering) and the FSR FGw will set up a meeting
7 to discuss the normative ideas and agreements behind the budget
8 (specifically for the *Digitale Leeromgeving*).
- 9 c) Reijnen will conduct research via the study advisors to determine what
10 problems Humanities students run into regarding online education.
- 11 d) The Daily Board will send a written reply that includes a breakdown of
12 the incidental costs, how they translate to the *Coronaknelpunten* and
13 other ways they might be put to use.
- 14 e) The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable
15 Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.
- 16 f) Reijnen will provide insight into the expenditure of this year's Diversity
17 Budget.
- 18 g) Sojo Perez will set up a meeting with Reijnen to discuss the advertising of
19 the Humanities faculty and prevention of drop-outs.
- 20 h) Reijnen will send over a breakdown of how the 250 thousand euros
21 [€250.000] will be spent in preparation for Humanities in Context.
- 22 201029-02 Reijnen will check with the Program Directors how they feel about the option
23 of having an evaluation procedure in place to check on how they experience
24 new measures concerning social safety being applied in their programs (like,
25 but not limited to, an introductory discussion).