



## **Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 8 december 2020**

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

### **Agenda**

- 1) Opening and confirming the agenda
- 2) Draft minutes OV FSR October 29<sup>th</sup> 2020
- 3) Announcements
  - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
  - b) FSR
- 4) State of affairs
  - a) Corona
  - b) CoH and GSH
- 5) Strategic Narrative Humanities in Context (attachment)
- 6) Overview *Bestuurlijke* [transl. Administrative] Agenda (attachment)
- 7) Report External Committee Social Safety (attachment)
- 8) Memo FSR *Bedrijfsvoering* [transl. Business Operations] (attachment)
- 9) Final questions and closing

## 1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Koletzki opens the meeting at 09:01

2 Van Dorp suggests to swap agenda points after some comments from Weerman and Wilts the  
3 council and board agree that it is unnecessary to change the order of the agenda. Koletzki sets  
4 the agenda.  
5

## 2. Draft minutes OV FSR October 29<sup>th</sup> 2020

6 The council and board go over the concept minutes from the 29<sup>th</sup> of October page by page.  
7 Senchi remarks that she has changed the date stated in the title of the document, explaining that  
8 it was incorrect. Weerman clarifies that “*In Oktobertelling*” on page 5 should be changed into “*1*  
9 *Oktobertelling*”. Later, on page 13 Weerman comments that “*vooringenomen*” should be  
10 “*voorgenomen*”. Senchi nods in acknowledgment will make the necessary adjustments to the  
11 minutes.  
12

### Action List:

13  
14 *200511-02 Vaessens will add the promotion of Humanities with Dutch high school*  
15 *students (other than the ones who have a N&T profile).*

16 Van Dorp suggests discussing this action point with the cluster of the  
17 rest of the CoH action points. Weerman agrees.

18 *200511-02 Nijsten discusses the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning and milk*  
19 *with Cirfood and Facility Services.*

20 Sojo Perez wonders if the new Director of *Bedrijfsvoering* [Jos van  
21 Geel, red.] could indicate whether he is planning on working on the  
22 action points, initially directed towards Gerard Nijsten, in the coming  
23 period. Koletzki suggests discussing this at a later moment. Sojo  
24 Perez offers to do so during the agenda point regarding the memo.  
25 Weerman agrees. Action points related to Gerard Nijsten are  
26 therefore skipped during this part of the meeting.

27 *200917-06 The FSR will follow up with the DB on whether a decision regarding*  
28 *online education in the second semester has been made.*

29 Van Dorp indicates that this point can be scrapped. Action point is  
30 scrapped.

31 *200917-07 Concerning the CoH Yearly Plan, the DB (or more specifically: Reijnen)*  
32 *will work on the following subjects:*

33 *a) Spending more time on the promotion of Humanities to Dutch high*  
34 *school students (other than the ones who have a N&T profile).*

35 Van Dorp refers to a letter from the fDB which indicates there is  
36 a person that constantly works on the topic. She notes that she  
37 feels this is too vague and suggests for a delegation of the FSR to  
38 meet up with Suzanne Adema to discuss how the faculty is  
39 working on the promotion of Humanities. Reijnen agrees that  
40 this is a good idea and that he, too, would like to attend the  
41 meeting.

1 The FSR will set up a meeting with Suzanne Adema and Carlos  
2 Reijnen to discuss the promotion of Humanities at Dutch High  
3 Schools **[ACTION POINT]**.

4 *b) Writing a response letter to the negative advice by the FSR  
5 concerning the CoH Yearly Plan.*

6 The action point is scrapped.

7 *c) Sending over a plan regarding digital education in the next  
8 semester [second semester 2020-2021, red.].*

9 The action point is scrapped. Van Dorp implores the board to  
10 send over new documents when the board has them.

11 *d) Sending over more information regarding Humanities in Context.*

12 The action point is scrapped.

13 *e) Sending over more information regarding 7-7-4.*

14 Van Dorp indicates that they haven't received information on 7-  
15 7-4 and she asks the board if they can tell the council when the  
16 *begeleidingscommissie* [transl. guidance committee] will start.  
17 Wilts explains that she will be sending over the information very  
18 very shortly.

19 *f) Setting up an addendum to the CoH Yearly Plan that reflects the  
20 comments made in the negative advice by the FSR.*

21 Van Dorp refers to the email sent by the council where they  
22 stated that they do not accept the board's letter as addendum.  
23 She explains that the purpose of an addendum is for it to be  
24 added to the original document and sent to the other involved  
25 parties. She notes that unless the council sees a formal  
26 addendum, which is also sent to the other involved parties, they  
27 won't be giving a positive advice. Reijnen suggests editing the  
28 text a little bit and making it an addendum which is also sent to  
29 the other parties .

30 Van Dorp notes that she doesn't have any remarks on the text,  
31 merely that the document should function as what the council  
32 and board agreed upon. Reijnen agrees.

33 *201029-01 Regarding the Budget Plan 2021:*

34 Sojo Perez indicates that most of the following points haven't  
35 happened. Weerman suggests setting up a meeting with Jos van Geel  
36 and Youssef Achahbar to discuss the remaining questions now  
37 Nijsten no longer Director *Bedrijfsvoering*. Koletzki notes that the  
38 sub-action points could perhaps be discussed during the next  
39 meeting. Sojo Perez agrees.

40 *a) Nijsten (Directeur Bedrijfsvoering) will provide insight into the  
41 amount of money spent on the Digitale Leeromgeving.*

42 *Sojo Perez indicates that this hasn't happened. Weerman suggests  
43 to set up a meeting with Jos van Geel and Youssef Achahbar to  
44 discuss the remaining questions.*

45



#### 4. State of Affairs

##### 1 A) Corona

2 Weerman yields the floor to Reijnen. Reijnen explains that they agreed with the  
3 Program Directors that they'll keep working on more on-site education, considering  
4 the restrictions. For instance: not all the buildings and their capacity are available, the  
5 difficulty of getting all teachers and students in one place). He explains that the  
6 intention remains to use the space that is available, even more so than they've done in  
7 the past semester. Another intention or wish for them is to have better communication  
8 and more social interaction. He continues that it is possible to communicate online but  
9 and have social interaction, but that it comes with its own set of difficulties. The plan is  
10 to put more effort into arranging online education in a more social format to improve  
11 interaction between students and teachers. He explains that the focus has partly  
12 shifted to the exchange of knowledge being qualitative as well as fun. Currently they're  
13 looking to arrange this in the online environment, but, in case the restrictions change,  
14 they would also do this with on-site education. He continues that they involve  
15 teachers, *studieloopbaancoördinatoren* and study advisors to make these interaction  
16 improvements. He refers to Yolande Spoelder from the Teaching & Learning Centre  
17 who has come up with a variety of ideas and options regarding this topic. He expresses  
18 that he is very hopeful for the next semester.

##### 19 B) CoH & GSH

20 Reijnen gives the council the opportunity to ask questions.

21 Verhave suggests to first go over the agendas and, considering the agendas are quite  
22 old (5<sup>th</sup> of November 2020 and 24<sup>th</sup> of September), continue with a brief update of  
23 current proceedings. Reijnen agrees. Verhave refers to the GSH agenda (24<sup>th</sup> of  
24 September) and asks about an update regarding agenda point 1.7. "*Meet your Mentor-*  
25 *Programma*". Reijnen explains that most Program Directors responded  
26 enthusiastically regarding this university wide project and he, too, as diversity officers  
27 is positive about it. He relates that for the students that are involved in the program it  
28 seems to be successful.

29 Verhave refers to the combined agenda (CoH and GSH) from the 5<sup>th</sup> of November and  
30 asks about agenda point 3.1. "*Commissie Evaluatie Honoursprogramma FGw*". Reijnen  
31 explains they need an evaluation procedure for the non-program-based honors  
32 courses. Previously the courses were evaluated, but only now do they have an official  
33 committee to oversee this process. He explains that it is an evaluation procedure  
34 directed at the individual courses in the honors program. Reijnen offers to send out a  
35 list with the members of this particular committee. Verhave accepts the offer. Reijnen  
36 will send over a list with the members of the *Commissie Evaluatie Honoursprogramma*  
37 *FGw* [ACTION POINT]. Continuously, Verhave refers to agenda point 3.9. "*Update*  
38 *aansluiting vo/wo (door Suzanne Adema)*" and asks what was discussed. Reijnen  
39 explains that Adema regularly attends the meeting to provide them with updates  
40 regarding ongoing projects. Reijnen informs the council that there is a new initiative  
41 for students to become an assistant to high school teachers; a project that would  
42 provide students with insight regarding the high school's inner workings and that  
43 would improve contact between the university and high schools. Lastly, Verhave  
44 refers to agenda point 4.3. "*Aandacht voor diversiteit in het curriculum*" and asks  
45 Reijnen if this is connected to an email that was sent out to the OCs regarding the

1 creation of a course about diversity and inclusion. Reijnen says Verhave's statement is  
2 correct. He explains that it is a short-term outcome of the discussion, but he plans to  
3 have a larger discussion about diversity in order to improve diversity at the faculty. He  
4 explains that the agenda point functioned as a discussion starter. He explains that  
5 together with the Program Directors they've decided to back two courses concerning  
6 diversity (two at the Bachelor level and two at the Master level). These courses would  
7 be co-financed; meaning that the CoH and/or GSH provide half of the courses and the  
8 programs would have to match the other half. The deadline for sending in course  
9 proposals is in the next week and they already received quite some proposals.  
10 Furthermore, Verhave asks if there are any current topics Reijnen could inform the  
11 council about. Reijnen answers that they will be discussing Corona as well as the thesis  
12 organization on the bachelor level after they received an advice from the Exam  
13 Committee on this topic. He explains that there is some difference in the approach in  
14 preparation of the thesis between different programs; the plan is to develop a policy  
15 concerning this issue.

## 5. Strategic Narrative Humanities in Context (attachment)

16 Weerman makes some introductory remarks. He mentions that the board will be sending out  
17 certain proposals that will fall under the umbrella HiC; the FSR will mostly be involved in  
18 proposals concerning the Bachelor. He explains that they felt it'd be useful to write down the  
19 ideas behind HiC, this way the council could grasp the inspirations behind the decisions that are  
20 being made concerning the program: an ideological backbone. He felt that it'd be good to make  
21 these ideas explicit by pouring them into a mold in the form of a document. Weerman offers the  
22 council the opportunity to ask questions.

23 Kemper refers to the sentence "*Dat geldt wél voor de voorstellen die hieruit voortkomen, zoals*  
24 *specifieke programmavoorstellen ten aanzien van onderwijs, onderzoek, valorisatie en*  
25 *infrastructuur.*" in the last paragraph of the attachment. She explains that according to the  
26 timeline they are set to receive the proposals by January 2021 and she informs the board that  
27 the council would like to receive a consent request regarding this proposal along with the  
28 consent request for the language change. She asks if that is possible. Weerman explains that,  
29 according to the regulations of the faculty, changes in language and communication require  
30 consent while others it might be advice. Weerman explains that the council will receive all the  
31 necessary information, hopefully, according to the schedule. He explains that some information  
32 has already been shared with the council, like, the language and communication as well as  
33 invitations being extended for the council to participate in discussions regarding the content of  
34 the bachelor program. Before the proposals being sent out in January the FSR and OR will be  
35 given the opportunity to gain some earlier information – a preview – of the proposals. Kemper  
36 refers to an interview in Folia with Jan Don where he explains that *medezeggenschap* will be  
37 contacted to peruse the proposals. She explains that she grasped from this article that the  
38 council would be extended an advice request for the concept plan of the HiC bachelor program.  
39 She feels that involving the FSR early on in this process would be beneficial to all involved  
40 parties, giving them the opportunity to advise timely on the proposal even when it doesn't  
41 concern the final proposal. Weerman explains that for this particular reason the OR and FSR  
42 will be invited to a meeting to preview proposal(s) together with Suzanne Adema, Jan Don and  
43 Carlos Reijnen. Before January 2021 the council will be invited to this preview meeting where  
44 they will learn what they can expect from the proposals. Weerman explains that the council will

1 receive an official advice request after the board has decided, this decision has been planned for  
2 January.

3 Kemper asks if she is right to assume that the council will receive a consent request for the  
4 language change and an advice request for the content of the HiC bachelor program. Weerman  
5 explains that the content will be discussed in the meeting before January and Reijnen explains  
6 that it is the board's intent to have a decision regarding the language change and the program in  
7 January. Reijnen does warn that the program will remain a work in progress and it'll be a while  
8 before 2022 starts, he explains that it will be difficult to formulate a simple advice on this  
9 because the content is still in the draft stage. Though, he is certain they will succeed. The council  
10 and board establish that in, hopefully, January there will be a consent request for the language  
11 change and an advice request regarding the *kaderstellingen* for the curriculum.

12 Kemper asks if the Strategic Narrative is only meant for the OR and FSR or if it will also be used  
13 to inform other parties. Weerman says that they only sent it to the OR and FSR, but should  
14 Kemper have other suggestions for the purpose of the text she's free to share them. Kemper  
15 feels that should the narrative be shared, for instance, with external parties, OCs, other faculties  
16 or on the website that the document should provide more information on the content of HiC as  
17 well as on the *Onderzoeksggebouw*. Weerman understands the points she's made and notes that  
18 the current use of the document is meant for parties that are already more knowledgeable  
19 about the subject. Kemper answers that, should the board share it with other parties than the  
20 OR and FSR, the document should elaborate more on the content of the HiC program and  
21 *Onderzoeksggebouw*. Weerman believes, even though this wasn't the intention of the document,  
22 Kemper has made a good point and acknowledges that the document might be considered  
23 vague to, for example, other OCs. Weerman asks if Kemper agrees that the document serves its  
24 purpose of providing the vision behind HiC. Kemper notes that the council hasn't had the  
25 opportunity to formulate a stance on the document yet and, therefore, she cannot say whether  
26 they agree with it. Weerman would like to find common ground on this subject and suggests for  
27 the council to discuss this internally and communicate their thoughts regarding the document  
28 to the board. The FSR will discuss the Strategic Narrative Humanities in Context in-depth and  
29 share their findings in a formal letter to the fDB [ACTION POINT].

## 6. Overview *Bestuurlijke* [transl. Administrative] Agenda (attachment)

30 No introductory remarks are made. Verhave notes that she doesn't have any comments on the  
31 topics themselves, but rather some questions about the reasoning behind them. She refers to  
32 the subject of the "*Honoursprogramma*" and the mention of meetings being held between the  
33 board and the council. She proposes to have a meeting on this subject in January before the  
34 discussion of the OER B starts. Reijnen clarifies that the agenda subject is about  
35 *kwaliteitsborging* and refers back to earlier in the meeting when they discussed the evaluation  
36 committee for the honors courses. Reijnen is unsure whether it is necessary for that particular  
37 subject [*kwaliteitsborging Honors Program*, red.] any further discussion would be required. He  
38 suggests for the FSR to have a look at how the evaluation committee will be assembled and if  
39 they feel that it will be capable of handling the task. He feels that discussing the program itself is  
40 not on the list, but rather its ongoing evaluation. Reijnen explains that the council and board  
41 agreed that he would send over the structure of the evaluation committee for the FSR to look  
42 over and provide commentary. Verhave indicates that she would be interested in having a  
43 discussion on the *kwaliteitsborging* as well as a discussion on the honors program itself. She  
44 asks when Reijnen expects for the evaluation to be finished. Reijnen explains that the course

1 evaluation is an ongoing process and, he guesses, the planning is for the committee to review,  
2 revise and evaluate the courses of the past year - by the end of the year. Reijnen notes that he is  
3 open to having a larger discussion and that it is also necessary. Only, he does feel that having  
4 this discussion within the context of the OER would not be a good idea. The discussion is too big  
5 and has different stakes, he notes. He offers to have such a discussion later in the year, possibly,  
6 around springtime. At the central level questions about the position of the honors program are  
7 also being asked, Weerman adds. He goes on explaining that the faculty, the university and the  
8 *Vrije Universiteit* organize the honors program together. He suggests for the council to contact  
9 the CSR and discuss the topic at the central level to see how the honors system should continue.  
10 Verhave thanks Weerman for his suggestion and offers to still have a meeting on this so they  
11 can gather and exchange information and provide the student perspective for the board to take  
12 with them in the central discussion. Reijnen agrees to having a meeting about the honors  
13 program in general and suggests for it to be included as a subject in the *bestuurlijke agenda*  
14 **[ACTION POINT]**. Furthermore, Reijnen refers to the *kwaliteitsborging* and proposes for the  
15 FSR to first go over the evaluation structure of the honors program and to only schedule a  
16 separate meeting if the FSR has any comments on it. Verhave agrees to this.  
17 Secondly, Verhave refers to the subject "*Inrichting 8-8-4*" and the earlier discussions they've had  
18 on this subject. She notes that in order for the guidance committee to be able to set up a  
19 valuable report, the guidance meeting committee should've met as soon as the first week of the  
20 new yearly design passed. As of yet, the committee hasn't convened or started. She asks if the  
21 board can tell the council when the committee will start and why it hasn't started yet. Wilts  
22 explains that she hasn't had the time. Wilts will send over the 8-8-4 Guidance Committee's  
23 assignment and ensure that the committee will meet up soon in the new year **[ACTION POINT]**.  
24 Sojo Perez also has some questions. He refers to the subject "*Studeren met een functiebeperking*"  
25 and the advice sent out by the working group *Studeren met een functiebeperking* has sent the  
26 board on this subject; he asks the board what they plan they work on regarding this issue and  
27 what their thoughts are on the council's advice. Wilts suggests to put the subject on the agenda  
28 for the next OV [February 4<sup>th</sup> 2020, red.], Sojo Perez agrees to this. During the next OV  
29 [February 4<sup>th</sup> 2020, red.] the council and board will discuss the advice sent by the working  
30 group *Studeren met een functiebeperking* **[ACTION POINT]**.  
31 Sojo Perez refers to the subject "*Diversiteit en internationalisering*" and the reform of English  
32 language requirements for MA education. He asks if there will be change regarding the  
33 requirement being focused on the institute the student previously attended rather than the  
34 geographical area the student hails from. Reijnen explains that the requirements will stay intact,  
35 but the discussion would rather be about how the faculty will deal with the language  
36 requirements, for instance: what students should have to prove their language skills. He  
37 explains that there is a national- and UvA format that describes if a student has followed their  
38 education in any of the listed countries they aren't required to provide additional proof of the  
39 language skills. He explains that they are working on editing this list, because it sends out the  
40 wrong message and creates boundaries for possible future students. They plan on broadening  
41 the scope so fewer students will require a language test. On MA level this is being accomplished  
42 very well, whilst at BA level they are still tied by university guidelines. He remains confident  
43 that at both levels they'll succeed.  
44 Sojo Perez refers to the subject of "*Sociale veiligheid*" and asks if there are concrete plans in  
45 place regarding the working groups and how the board plans to assess the risk of dependency  
46 per domain, like GSH and CoH. Weerman answers that most councils are positive about the

1 working group approach, except for the OR. They still show hesitations and therefore the board  
2 is working with the OR to make sure they feel comfortable with the working group approach  
3 before making any further steps in that regard. Verhave notes that the FSR is happy with the  
4 working groups and looks forward to receiving more information so they can give their  
5 feedback. Weerman explains that if the OR does not agree to the working groups the board will  
6 continue their effort in tackling this issue; the board is adamant about finding a method  
7 everybody is content with.

## 7. Report External Committee Social Safety (attachment)

8 Van Dorp starts the discussion with an opening statement where she refers to the open letter  
9 the council has sent to the board. The letter demonstrates the arguments for the council's  
10 stance on the subject of social safety. The council agrees with the suggestions made by the  
11 external committee and would like to focus today on three main improvement points:

12 Firstly, Van Dorp asks the board to start a faculty wide external investigation regarding the  
13 complainants' cases to learn from what has happened and evolve. Weerman reacts that the  
14 board agrees with the external report's findings. He agrees that an external investigation is  
15 necessary to not only understand the 'how' of the situation but also the 'what'. He states the  
16 process of this external investigation has already started. He describes that it would serve as a  
17 fact-finding mission, in part, to offer closure so the involved parties know exactly what  
18 happened opposed to only knowing how it happened. Van Dorp notes that she is happy to hear  
19 about this.

20 Secondly, Van Dorp mentions the necessity of having a standard procedure in the event of  
21 complaints that concern social safety: immediately setting up an external investigation and  
22 suspending the lecturer of teaching duties until the investigation has been completed. She notes  
23 that she is interested in what the current procedure looks like. Weerman explains that he, as  
24 well as others involved in the procedure, tried to stick as close as possible to the complaint  
25 procedure that was in place at the UvA. He comments that he doesn't want to defend the  
26 procedure, but to draw conclusions from it. Namely, that something is wrong with it. Opposed  
27 to what the UvA procedure dictates, the external committee notes the requirement of an  
28 external investigation and he, too, feels that it should be incorporated. Furthermore, he believes  
29 there should also be more specifications on when to start an external investigation. For  
30 instance: for small issues an external investigation doesn't always have to be necessary.  
31 Weerman goes on by saying that the current complaints committee doesn't have the means or  
32 staff to do research. He believes that some of the external investigation parts could also be  
33 incorporated more into the university and its complaints committee, like: legal advice and  
34 psychological support. He states that the general opinion remains that, until an adequate  
35 complaint procedure is arranged at the UvA, an external investigation should always be set up  
36 regarding such [social safety, red.] cases. He notes that he also wants to guarantee adequacy in  
37 the UvA procedure. Van Dorp is glad to hear this and offers to stay in contact regarding the  
38 instatement of a different standard procedure and adds that in the case of social safety the size  
39 or amount of the complaints shouldn't matter for launching an external investigation. She feels  
40 that having an independent party investigate is useful for both the accused and the accuser and  
41 could, for instance, prevent a 'witch hunt'. Weerman agrees that independent fact-finding by  
42 specialists is important, but he reiterates that some of the support should be available at the  
43 university itself and not an external bureau. He believes that having such knowledge available

1 within the organization when an initial signal comes to the fore they can handle quickly. Van  
2 Dorp agrees with Weerman's statement.  
3 Lastly, the council would like to receive a written and concrete plan to tackle social safety from  
4 the fDB this year. In this plan the board will describe how they plan to implement the  
5 recommendations made by the external committee. Furthermore, the council would like to have  
6 a meeting with the board to go over this plan together. Weerman explains that they are obliged  
7 to adopt the committee's findings regarding the complaint procedure. Yet, the complaint  
8 procedure is managed at the central level. Therefore, he suggests for the board and the council  
9 to cooperate and bring his experiences and the FSR's perspective to the Executive Board who'll  
10 then decide on the general procedure at the university. Van Dorp agrees that the council and  
11 board should work together and suggests for the board to set up a written document that states  
12 their plan in tackling this issue and where the board describes where they could use the  
13 council's help and where they feel confident they can do it themselves. Weerman explains that  
14 they should learn from what has happened and be as concrete as possible regarding the  
15 complaint procedure and check what the council will and board will both bring in on this topic.  
16 He explains there are two things that should happen: improving the complaints procedure and  
17 preventing calamities from happening – also looking at dependencies and involved risks, like at  
18 smaller programs. They should have a plan for improvement and a plan for prevention.  
19 Weerman suggests to have a separate meeting on how the board and council can cooperate on  
20 this point [social safety, red.]. Van Dorp suggests having a written response on what the board  
21 wants to meet about and how they want to make a change and then have a meeting. The fDB  
22 and FSR FGw will have a meeting on the topic of Social Safety; in preparation for this meeting  
23 the fDB will set up document which will entail: the goal of the meeting, a plan for change  
24 (improvement procedure & prevention cases) and how the council and board will cooperate  
25 **[ACTION POINT]**. Weerman indicates that he has some personal conclusions that he'd like to  
26 share with the council; Van Dorp suggests that, should he want to, these personal conclusions  
27 could also be shared in a separate meeting. The FSR FGw and Weerman set up a separate  
28 meeting where Weerman can share his personal conclusions **[ACTION POINT]**.

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

29 Sojo Perez welcomes Jos van Geel as a new member of the fDB and suggests to first go over the  
30 question in the memo before addressing the action points concerning Gerard Nijsten's previous  
31 role as Director of *Bedrijfsvoering*. Van Geel refers to the questions in the memo and explains  
32 that due the temporary nature of his role as ad-interim director he is unable to answer all of the  
33 questions. He adds that his function is mostly focused on processes rather than content, even  
34 though he agrees that content is important as well. In answer to the questions he informs the  
35 council that working ad-interim speaks to him due to the amount of excitement he derives from  
36 and gets to put into a shorter time span. In answer to the second question he explains that  
37 *medezeggenschap* is important because gaining a good many perspectives aids in creating good  
38 policy. When moving on to the third question he explains that it is difficult to answer due to the  
39 temporary nature of his position, instead he shares some of his personal experiences and  
40 visions regarding sustainability. Examples like: planting trees, not driving a car or not traveling  
41 by plane. He believes that it'd be best to leave important decisions regarding sustainability and  
42 the faculty for the predecessor (sic.) [successor, red.]. In answer to the fourth question he  
43 explains that he will be involved with the White Paper, but is currently unsure what his actions  
44 will be except for those left to him by Gerard Nijsten. To wrap up the agenda point the council



1 and Jos van Geel decide to discuss the remaining action points in the meeting between the FSR  
2 and Van Geel and Achahbar. As a final remark Sojo Perez asks Van Geel to keep him in the loop  
3 on important topics.

## 9. Final questions and closing

4 During the final question round Kemper asks why course registration for electives has  
5 been moved to a separate date from the main courses. Reijnen explains that this could be the  
6 case for courses that function both as an elective and a mandatory course, this ensures  
7 *hoofdvakstudenten* get the spot they are entitled to. Kemper explains that her question doesn't  
8 concern electives that function the way Reijnen has described. Reijnen answers that the  
9 reasoning for postponing the registration date for courses that are solely electives eludes him at  
10 this point. He notes that he will look into it and inform the council once he has the information.  
11 Reijnen will look into the why elective courses (that aren't mandatory for *hoofdvakstudenten* to  
12 attend) have a different registration period than the rest of the courses **[ACTION POINT]**.  
13 Kemper explains that the different date isn't necessarily a problem, but the lack of  
14 communication on this topic has caused some insecurity among students that are trying to plan  
15 their next semester.

16 The meeting is closed at 11:04.

17

## 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.

~~200917-06 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).

- The FSR will set up a meeting with Suzanne Adema and Carlos Reijnen to discuss the promotion of Humanities at Dutch High Schools

~~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

201029-01 Regarding the Budget Plan 2021:

a) Nijsten (Directeur Bedrijfsvoering) will provide insight into the amount of money spent on the *Digitale Leeromgeving*.

b) Nijsten (Directeur Bedrijfsvoering) and the FSR FGw will set up a meeting to discuss the normative ideas and agreements behind the budget (specifically for the *Digitale Leeromgeving*).

c) Reijnen will conduct research via the study advisors to determine what problems Humanities students run into regarding online education.



- 1 d) The Daily Board will send a written reply that includes a  
2 breakdown of the incidental costs, how they translate to the  
3 *Coronaknelpunten* and other ways they might be put to use.  
4 e) The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable  
5 Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.  
6 f) Reijnen will provide insight into the expenditure of this year's  
7 Diversity Budget.  
8 g) Sojo Perez will set up a meeting with Reijnen to discuss the  
9 advertising of the Humanities faculty and prevention of drop-  
10 outs.  
11 h) Reijnen will send over a breakdown of how the 250 thousand  
12 euros [€250.000] will be spent in preparation for Humanities in  
13 Context.
- 14 ~~201029-02~~ ~~Reijnen will check with the Program Directors how they feel about the option~~  
15 ~~of having an evaluation procedure in place to check on how they experience~~  
16 ~~new measures concerning social safety being applied in their programs (like,~~  
17 ~~but not limited to, an introductory discussion).~~
- 18 201208-01 Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the *Commissie Evaluatie*  
19 *Honoursprogramma FGW* and the structure of the evaluation proceedings.
- 20 201208-02 The FSR will have an in-depth discussion regarding the Strategic Narrative  
21 Humanities in Context and share their findings in a formal letter to the fDB.
- 22 201208-03 Regarding the subjects for the *Bestuurlijke Agenda*:
- 23 a) The Honors Program will be added as a subject on the  
24 *Bestuurlijke Agenda*.  
25 b) Wilts will send over the 8-8-4 Guidance Committee's assignment  
26 and ensure that the committee will meet up soon in the new  
27 year.  
28 c) During the next OV [February 4<sup>th</sup> 2020, red.] the council and  
29 board will discuss the advice sent by the working group  
30 *Studeren met een functiebeperking*
- 31 201208-04 Regarding the External Committee Report on Social Safety:
- 32 a) The fDB and FSR FGW will have a meeting on the topic of Social  
33 Safety; in preparation for this meeting the fDB will set up a  
34 document which will entail: the goal of the meeting, a plan for  
35 change (improvement procedure & prevention cases) and how  
36 the council and board will cooperate.  
37 b) The FSR FGW and Weerman set up a separate meeting where  
38 Weerman can share his personal conclusions regarding the  
39 social safety issue.
- 40 201208-07 Reijnen will look into why elective courses (that aren't mandatory for  
41 *hoofdvakstudenten* to attend) have a different registration period than the rest  
42 of the courses and why this isn't communicated to the students.