



Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 4 februari 2021

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

Agenda

- 1) Opening and confirming the agenda
- 2) Draft minutes OV FSR December 8th 2020
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) State of affairs
 - a) CoH and GSH
- 5) Follow-up conversation social safety
- 6) Corona
- 7) Final questions and closing

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Koletzki opens the meeting at 09:02. No changes are made to the agenda

2. Draft minutes OV FSR December 8th 2020

2 The council and board go over the concept minutes from the 8th of December 2020 page by
3 page. Senchi remarks that she has changed the closing time from 17:04 to 11:04 and removed a
4 spelling mistake in action point 201208-07.

5 The meeting attendees go over the action points:

6 7 **Action List:**

8 All action points referring to Nijsten will be edited to indicate the function *Directeur*
9 *Bedrijfsvoering* in order to prevent confusion, now he's no longer in that position

10
11 *200917-13 Directeur bedrijfsvoering or the DB will report in the next month on the*
12 *developments regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.*

13 Wilts notes that, currently, there aren't any developments.

14
15 *200917-14 Directeur Bedrijfsvoering will report on the white paper to the council in the*
16 *course of the next month*

17 *201029-01 Regarding the Budget Plan 2021:*

- 18 • *The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable*
19 *Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.*

20 The board indicates that a letter will be sent out in response to
21 the positive advice. This letter will contain what is stated in this
22 action point.

23 *201208-01 Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the Commissie Evaluatie*
24 *Honoursprogramma FGW and the structure of the evaluation proceedings.*

25 Reijnen believes that this has been sent out already, but he will check to make
26 sure this has happened.

27
28 *201208-02 The FSR will have an in-depth discussion regarding the Strategic Narrative*
29 *Humanities in Context and share their findings in a formal letter to the fDB.*

30 Kemper indicates that the council will formally respond in answer to the
31 Strategic Narrative advice request.

32
33 *201208-03 Regarding the subjects for the Bestuurlijke Agenda:*

- 34 • *The Honors Program will be added as a subject on the Bestuurlijke*
35 *Agenda.*

36 This action point will be kept until this particular OV has taken
37 place.

- 38
39 • *During the next OV [February 4th 2020, red.] the council and board*
40 *will discuss the advice sent by the working group Studeren met een*
41 *functiebeperking*

1 The council and board have agreed to postpone this discussion
2 to the following OV on the 16th of February. The action point will
3 be edited to reflect the date change.

4 *201208-04 Regarding the External Committee Report on Social Safety:*

5 a) *The fDB and FSR FGw will have a meeting on the topic of Social*
6 *Safety; in preparation for this meeting the fDB will set up a*
7 *document which will entail: the goal of the meeting, a plan for*
8 *change (improvement procedure & prevention cases) and how the*
9 *council and board will cooperate.*

10 b) *The FSR FGw and Weerman set up a separate meeting where*
11 *Weerman can share his personal conclusions regarding the social*
12 *safety issue.*

13 The board and council will go into the subject during this OV but agree to keep
14 the action points on the list.

15
16 The OV minutes of December 8 2020 are confirmed.

3. Announcements

17 A) Daily Board of the Faculty

18 The board introduces its new GSH Director: Sabine van Wesemael. Weerman also
19 announces that a senior advisor on social safety Marie-Therese Seignette will be
20 starting at the UvA and that, as of April first, Anne van de Graaf will start as the new
21 *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* [transl. Director of Operation]

22 23 B) FSR

24 The council informs the rest of the attendees that Schoots won't be joining today's
25 meeting.

26
27 Koletzki goes over some practical zoom protocols for the duration of the meeting and
28 urges all members to stay on topic. He notes that he is aware of tensions regarding
29 certain agenda topics and will try as best as he can to deflate intense discussions.

4. State of Affairs

30 A) CoH & GSH

31 Batelaan refers to agenda point 3.1. *Voordrachten Excie- en OC-leden via PLAN* and
32 wonders for when, and therefore for which members, this is scheduled. Reijnen
33 answers that it applies for members after the summer break. Consequently, Batelaan
34 refers to agenda point 4.3. *Scriptieproces CoH: advies inzake scriptiewerkgroepen* and
35 asks what was discussed. Reijnen answers that the discussion didn't take place. He
36 continues explaining that there is an ongoing discussion about the BA thesis and the
37 need to have a second reader for grading. He goes on by saying that having more
38 readers requires more effort, but that it has also sparked a more general discussion on
39 what a BA thesis should even look like. Batelaan asks Reijnen to keep him in the loop
40 on how the discussion on the BA thesis proceeds. Regarding the attachment of 4.5.

1 *Inzet kwaliteitsmiddelen 2021-2022*, the council wonders if they can receive this
2 document. The document details how the funds will be distributed across the
3 programs. Wilts also notes that the day after the current meeting the OR and FSR will
4 be attending a meeting to discuss the *Kwaliteitsmiddelen* timeline. The last question the
5 council wants to address regarding the agenda is point 4.6. *Resultaten uitvraag*
6 *voorstellen voor diversiteitsvakken*, Batelaan says that he would like to know what the
7 current developments are regarding the new diversity courses. Reijnen notes that
8 they've selected the courses they want to implement and says that he will send out the
9 details to the council. Furthermore, he notes that even the courses that didn't get
10 selected had some good suggestions that they would like to work with.
11 As a final note Van Wesemael relays that she, as GSH director, attended a long
12 industrious meeting on social safety and that the CoH and GSH have sent out an advice
13 to the Faculty Board.

5. Follow-up conversation social safety

14 Sojo Perez makes some introductory remarks on the topic by referring to the Social Safety
15 meeting guided by Hester Glasbeek, which the council and board attended the week before
16 [January 25, 2021, red.] the current OV. He notes that the council would like to meet up with the
17 new Social Safety advisor, Seignette, as soon as possible and that he would look keep the 'floor'
18 open for everyone in the meeting – board members and councilors – to discuss any further
19 questions related to the Social Safety meeting they had on January 25.
20 Weerman notes that the board in collaboration with other parties, like the OR and OPDs, is
21 working on a plan to tackle social safety and that all information on the subject will be sent over
22 to Seignette. Weerman notes that he was under the impression that the council and the board
23 were mostly on the same page when it came to setting up concrete plans and undertaking
24 appropriate measures. He feels that it is important that these strategies be communicated to
25 Seignette as soon as possible so she can get to work on the subject. Furthermore, he stresses
26 that they should prioritize what should be happening next. Currently they only have ideas, and
27 they should assign a priority level to the existing ideas so they can be developed into concrete
28 plans and concrete measures. He offers for the council to provide their input regarding the plan
29 to tackle social safety, but that the focus shouldn't be on only having a discussion but rather to
30 home in on setting up concrete actions. Van Dorp responds to Weerman's statements by
31 offering to send over all of the council's letters and documents concerning social safety to
32 Seignette. Wilts cuts in to comment that the board had already taken the liberty to send over the
33 council's letters. Sojo Perez refers to a letter the council sent out in June (past academic year:
34 2019-2020) which details concrete actions concerning social safety and notes that they could
35 make sure this letter is sent over to Seignette as well.

6. Corona

36 Weerman introduces the agenda topic by proposing to go over any suggestions they might have
37 for programs, in general, but also to really instill social cohesion. He would also like to take this
38 opportunity to consider suggestions for education in the next academic year as well as long-
39 term ideas, besides only discussing the current situation.
40 Reijnen gives an update about the current situation regarding education and the pandemic. He
41 indicates that they asked programs during the previous semester to look into possibilities for
42 on-site interaction but due to recent Corona regulations and online education possibilities this



1 has been completely overhauled. He comments that they've advised teachers to invest in online
2 education practices to ensure they stay in contact with their students. Furthermore, he explains
3 that Corona-related information is communicated at the very last minute from the national
4 level, which causes a lot of strain for the university considering they have to adapt and overhaul
5 the systems and procedures at the eleventh hour too. Friede asks Reijnen on what the advice
6 they gave to the teachers is based; Reijnen answers that it is based on the national measures.
7 Koletzki enquires whether there are certain *stappenplannen* [transl. step-by step
8 plans/roadmaps] the university could follow. Reijnen is unsure of what Koletzki means and
9 comments that they are simply following the government's instructions. Verhave follows up on
10 the subject and asks whether the board has a plan in place for the next academic year (2021-
11 2022). Reijnen answers that they haven't. Verhave then comments that the council believes it
12 might be useful to have three to four general plans sketched out for the next year. She continues
13 by explaining that this could help students make a well-informed decision regarding their
14 studies, especially international students. She notes that it doesn't have to be an incredibly
15 detailed plan but that it should be able to give students a general idea of next year's
16 (im)possibilities.

17 Batelaan suggests having a closer look at the things that can be done physically, rather than
18 focusing on the things that can't be done, as an example he gives one-on-one conversations with
19 teachers and students. Verhave also refers to the 2nd and 3rd year students that have a desire to
20 finish their degree but might never have the opportunity to attend classes physically anymore.
21 Kemper follows up Verhave's statement by urging the board to consider that most humanities
22 students haven't physically attended class since March last year (2020, red.) and that these
23 particular students are craving at least one physical class. She feels that it is important for the
24 board to consider and prioritize the students that are in 'need' of these physical classes and for
25 them to acknowledge the financial burden it might cause certain students to extend their
26 studies. Kemper briefly touches upon the subject of how much a bachelor finished under the
27 current circumstances might be worth. Weerman responds to this by noting that in terms of
28 results there isn't much of a difference between these academic years and the past ('normal')
29 academic years. He asks Kemper how exactly she would measure the worth of a Bachelor.
30 Kemper replies and explains that measuring can't be done only by looking at the students'
31 grades, but that they should also look at the method of examination, the way courses are being
32 taught, excursions that are(n't) being organized – she comments that it's hard to quantify it. She
33 ends her explanation by saying that the results might be similar but that doesn't mean
34 education is.

35 Weerman stresses that they're truly looking for concrete steps they could take. Verhave
36 responds and refers to the lack of a possibility to entertain informal discussions, group
37 homework sessions (that aren't part of a group assignment) and class participation; she
38 suggests creating settings for students where they could partake in such interactions. Friede
39 follows up and says that students who, for instance, need to do archival work currently can't
40 acquire the practical skills necessary and worthy of their diploma. Choudhury notes that it
41 would be wise to incorporate (online) walk in hours for teachers and students, especially
42 because without the physical aspect of large 200 student courses there isn't a moment where
43 you can quickly chat with your professor before, during or after class – except via email. Sojo
44 Perez offers that in his experience the online lectures are trying to mirror the physical classes,
45 whereas he believes that they should be looking into how they could bring more value to the

1 online setting. He urges the board to really make the most of online education – to look at the
2 possibilities it offers, so very different from the possibilities physical lectures offer.

3 Another suggestion by Verhave is to split the traditional lectures up into smaller groups and
4 into smaller time frames, considering digital education tires people (students and teachers) out
5 more quickly. Furthermore, she feels that regarding the scheduling of classes they should
6 consider the number of classes they serve students with on one day. Batelaan follows up by
7 noting that the workload and -pressure is really high, also due to an increase in deadlines; he
8 suggests limiting the amount of deadlines. Kemper notes that she finds leniency regarding the
9 circumstances vary per course and that, ideally, she would like to see a cost-free year for
10 students, even though she realizes the near impossibility it poses. In her personal experience,
11 she explains, it feels like she has been paying a fine: paying a lot of money and not getting too
12 much out of it.

13 Van Wesemael thanks everyone for their suggestions and briefly summarizes some of the points
14 that have been made by the councilors. Weerman also thanks the councilors and would like to
15 continue the brainstorm by focusing more on social cohesion.

16
17 *Break*

18
19 Continuing with the theme of social cohesion, Friede offers that study associations could play an
20 important role in organizing activities to improve social cohesion – she notes that unfortunately
21 they haven't been granted the opportunity to meet up to do so and that they could use the
22 board's support. Weerman comments that he's spoken to some of the study associations and
23 that they mentioned that they'd be focusing on online activities due to government restrictions.
24 Verhave comments that a lot of people are starting to tire from all of the online activities and
25 that it might be better to invest in organizing very small-scale physical activities – she refers to
26 the initiative UvA Walks. Furthermore, she notes that supporting studies, in terms of staff and
27 finances, to help them organize interactive moments could be beneficial, taking into account
28 that not all programs have their own in-house study association. Kemper adds that some study
29 associations are also with fewer people and could use the extra input. Addo cuts in and
30 mentions that ALPHA is looking into making more funds available to make activities more
31 attractive and to involve more teachers and students.

32 Choudhury suggests organizing frequent interdisciplinary (group) counseling sessions on a
33 faculty level where students can vent about the issues they run into. Van Wesemael responds to
34 the previous remarks made by Kemper, Verhave and Addo by saying that they will address the
35 topic in their next meeting, but that they could possibly divert newly hired student assistants
36 towards aiding study associations in their endeavors to improve social cohesion. Reijnen
37 wonders if it'd be possible to have a letter or an advice drafted by the council, which Reijnen
38 and Van Wesemael could use to strongly get these suggestions across during their meeting on
39 this topic. He notes that they need to make quick progress on this. Weerman suggests having
40 Senchi draw up a list of suggestions the councilors have made in the meeting and that she sends
41 over the suggestions before they meet on the issue of education during Corona. Senchi responds
42 that she'll discuss the list with the council's DB-members and after she'll send it over as quickly
43 as possible **[ACTION POINT]**.

44 Batelaan offers for them to look into the possibility of using 'sneltesten' [transl. rapid tests]
45 when organizing gatherings at the university, like: lectures, activities and exams. On the other
46 hand, Verhave asks if the board has any idea of how many students might be dropping out or



1 prolonging their studies. Reijnen answers that he doesn't know, nor has he gotten any worrying
2 signs from the study advisors or tutors about this. Batelaan offers that they could reach out to
3 first-year students to check how they feel about the issues they've been discussing at this
4 agenda point. Weerman offers that they could add a question about it in the questionnaires they
5 send out every six weeks to students. Several councilors express that students are maybe not
6 too keen on filling out questionnaires, but that it might be good to promote the questionnaires
7 more if they do decide to use it. The board thanks the council for its suggestions and vouches to
8 keep them in the loop on the topic of Corona.
9

7. Final questions and closing

10 Kemper poses a question by the OC Literary Studies; they wonder if they could receive more
11 feedback on the suggestions they made regarding the OER, even when these are not added to
12 the OER. Also, they would like for the board to see how these suggestions, like introducing more
13 frequent breaks and better scheduling of classes, could possibly be incorporated in another way
14 when they are, indeed, not included in the OER. Reijnen notes that they addressed this issue
15 already in the meeting they had on the OER. Friede explains to him that they were dissatisfied
16 with how the discussion proceeded during the meeting and, therefore, didn't feel like they were
17 taken seriously.

18 Another question by Kemper. She refers to the *Universiteitskwartier*, the delay in the OMHP
19 design and the New University Library, and notes that she was wondering about the Singel
20 library possibly being used for education for the duration of three years and how this might
21 affect students; she asks the board what their view is on the situation. Weerman responds that
22 he feels her question is somewhat rhetorical and that, of course, the board isn't pleased about
23 these developments but that they will try to overcome them with the support of the Executive
24 Board. Kemper asks if they think this will impact the student applications and how they plan on
25 overcoming this. Weerman reassures Kemper by saying that it is a simple fact that the new
26 buildings are necessary and that they will make sure that the temporary locations will be up to
27 par. To close up he comments that they will continue this discussion, concerning the
28 *Universiteitskwartier*, at the executive level.

29

30 The meeting is closed at 11:02.

31

Pro memori

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

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 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will discuss 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.

~~200917-07 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) Sending over more information regarding 7-7-4.~~

~~e) Setting up an addendum to the CoH Yearly Plan that reflects the comments made in the negative advice by the FSR.~~

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

200917-14 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* 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.~~

~~d) The Daily Board will send a written reply that includes a breakdown of the incidental costs, how they translate to the *Coronaknelpunten* and other ways they might be put to use.~~

e) The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.

~~f) Reijnen will provide insight into the expenditure of this year's Diversity Budget.~~



- 1 ~~g) Sojo Perez will set up a meeting with Reijnen to discuss the~~
2 ~~advertising of the Humanities faculty and prevention of drop-~~
3 ~~outs.~~
4 ~~h) Reijnen will send over a breakdown of how the 250 thousand~~
5 ~~euros [€250.000] will be spent in preparation for Humanities in~~
6 ~~Context.~~
- 7 201208-01 Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the *Commissie Evaluatie*
8 *Honoursprogramma FGW* and the structure of the evaluation proceedings.
- 9 201208-02 The FSR will have an in-depth discussion regarding the Strategic Narrative
10 Humanities in Context and share their findings in a formal letter to the fDB.
- 11 201208-03 Regarding the subjects for the *Bestuurlijke Agenda*:
- 12 a) The Honors Program will be added as a subject on the
13 *Bestuurlijke Agenda*.
- 14 ~~b) Wilts will send over the 8-8-4 Guidance Committee's assignment~~
15 ~~and ensure that the committee will meet up soon in the new~~
16 ~~year.~~
- 17 c) During the next OV [March 16th 2020, red.] the council and board
18 will discuss the advice sent by the working group *Studeren met*
19 *een functiebeperking*
- 20 201208-04 Regarding the External Committee Report on Social Safety:
- 21 a) The fDB and FSR FGW will have a meeting on the topic of Social
22 Safety; in preparation for this meeting the fDB will set up a
23 document which will entail: the goal of the meeting, a plan for
24 change (improvement procedure & prevention cases) and how
25 the council and board will cooperate.
- 26 b) The FSR FGW and Weerman set up a separate meeting where
27 Weerman can share his personal conclusions regarding the
28 social safety issue.
- 29 201208-07 Reijnen will look into why elective courses (that aren't mandatory for
30 *hoofdvakstudenten* to attend) have a different registration period than the rest
31 of the courses and why this isn't communicated to the students.
- 32 210204-01 Senchi will send over a list with the FSR's recommendations regarding
33 (digital) education in times of Corona.