



Conceptnotulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 16 maart 2021

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

Agenda

- 1) Opening and confirming the agenda
- 2) Draft minutes OV FSR February 4th, 2021
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) State of affairs
 - a) CoH and GSH
 - b) Corona
 - c) *Integrale managementrapportage Q4 2020*
- 5) Humanities in Context [changed: 210316]
 - a) Language Change
 - b) Bachelor
 - c) Strategic narrative
- 6) Social safety
- 7) Final questions and closing

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Koletzki opens the meeting at 9:02. When discussing the agenda Van Dorp proposes to edit
2 agenda point 5 regarding Humanities in Context; she would like to discuss the topics mentioned
3 at 5.a. (Humanities in Context: bachelor and language change) as two separate entities. Agenda
4 point 5 is edited to: 5.a. Bachelor, 5.b. Language change, 5.c. Strategic narrative.

2. Draft minutes OV FSR February 4th, 2021

5 The meetings attendees go over the minutes from the past OV page by page, Senchi notes that
6 she has edited the date in the header of the previous minutes. Subsequently, the attendees go
7 over the action list and discuss the following points:

8
9 All action points concerning the Director of Operations [*Directeur Bedrijfsvoering*] will be
10 handled once the new director, Anne van de Graaf, has joined the board.

11
12 *201029-01 Regarding the Budget Plan 2021:*

- 13 a) *The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable*
14 *Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.*

15
16 The breakdown will be incorporated in a letter, set up by drs. Youssef
17 Achahbar, regarding this issue. The council can expect this letter to arrive
18 within approximately two weeks' time.

19
20 *201208-01 Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the Commissie Evaluatie*
21 *Honoursprogramma FGw and the structure of the evaluation proceedings.*

22
23 Reijnen explains that the structure of the committee has been finalized but the
24 committee itself is still missing members. Currently, they are waiting for two
25 OPDs to join the committee. He continues that due to the pandemic they have
26 run into some delay, but he has good hope that the process will be completed
27 soon so he can send over the list.

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

31
32 The council shares that they are working on the formal letter and that they
33 will send it out as soon as possible.

34
35 *201208-03 Regarding the subjects for the Bestuurlijke Agenda:*

- 36 a) *The Honors Program will be added as a subject on the*
37 *Bestuurlijke Agenda.*

38
39 Van Dorp suggests changing the action point into one where the
40 council and the board schedule a separate meeting on the
41 subject of the Honors Program. Reijnen responds that he's
42 willing to have an open conversation on the topic, but he
43 forewarns that big changes regarding the Honors Program will
44 probably be impossible.

- 45
46 b) *During the next OV [March 16th 2021, red.] the council and board*
47 *will discuss the advice sent by the working group Studeren met*
48 *een functiebeperking.*

49
50 The board and the council agreed that they will discuss the
51 document at the next OV. The action point will be edited to
52 reflect this.
53



1 201208-04 *Regarding the External Committee Report on Social Safety:*

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

7
8 Van Dorp comments that she would like to change the action
9 point to one that states that the council will have a meeting with
10 Marie-Therese Seignette where they discuss the state of affairs
11 (*stand van zaken*) regarding Social Safety. Weerman responds
12 that he was under the impression the council already had such a
13 meeting with Seignette. Van Dorp notes that they had an
14 introductory meeting but would still like to have one dedicated
15 to a recent update on the topic of Social Safety.

16
17 201208-07 *Reijnen will look into why elective courses (that aren't mandatory for*
18 *hoofdvakstudenten to attend) have a different registration period than the rest*
19 *of the courses and why this isn't communicated to the students.*

20
21 Reijnen comments that he has sent over contact details to the council and he
22 hopes that this person, who is more knowledgeable about the subject, can
23 answer the council's questions.

24
25 The OV minutes of February 4th are confirmed.

26 3. Announcements

27 A) Daily Board of the Faculty

28 The board has no announcements to share.

29 B) FSR

30 The council indicates that Choudhury, Schoots and Obiefule will be absent during this
31 meeting. Furthermore, two council assistants have joined the FSR's ranks: Sophia
32 Bombeld and Mikayla Vieira Ribeiro. The council and board participate in a brief
33 round of introductions for them to get acquainted with one another.

34
35 Per the usual, Koletzki explains the protocol for the online setting.

36 4. State of Affairs

37 A) CoH & GSH

38 The council refers to agenda point 3.3 *Overzicht sociale veiligheid studenten in het*
39 *onderwijs op UvA-web* on the CoH and GSH agenda (21102) and asks what this entails.
40 Reijnen responds that it concerns an overview for the Program Directors and their
41 team to view how and what is being communicated on the UvA-website. Van
42 Wesemael adds that it showed a set of hyperlinks. Then, the council refers to agenda
43 point 3.4 *Stagereglement eenjarige en onderzoeksmasters herzien* and asks what was
44 changed about the regulations for internships. The board explains that internships
45 couldn't be part of the thesis, the change in the regulation separates the internship
46 from the thesis. Referring to agenda point 3.5 *Aanpassing extra tentamentijd voor*
47 *studenten met een functiebeperking*, Verhave asks what was adapted. Van Wesemel
48 answers that disabled students receive more time to finish their exams; Reijnen notes
49 that this will be implemented UvA-wide. Moving onto agenda point 3.6
50 *Cijferregistratie: ontmoedigen handmatig toevoegen studenten in Canvas* the council
51 asks for more clarification. The board explains that a newly introduced tool enables
52 lecturers to add students to Canvas-pages, but this doesn't automatically add the
students for grade registrations which causes complications. At agenda point 3.7

1 *Update wijziging vergoedingsregeling profileringsfonds duale studenten* the council
2 would like to know what changed here too. The board explains that there is no funding
3 available anymore for these students. When Verhave asks why this is the case, the
4 board explains that this decision doesn't lie with the CoH and GSH but with the
5 *profileringsfonds*. Subsequently, the council asks for a status update regarding agenda
6 point 4.1. *Betrekken studieverenigingen bij (online) studentenbinding*, the board replies
7 that they have been in conversation with ALPHA to make sure different student
8 association, programs and program committees are organizing online and, if possible,
9 on-site activities to further social cohesion at the faculty. Concerning agenda point 4.2
10 *Onderwijs tweede semester*, the council would like to know what the university
11 considers to be 'practical education'. Reijnen responds that at humanities they
12 officially have no practical education, except for the program *Conserving &*
13 *restauratie*. Yet, they are trying to establish which courses lend themselves best for
14 physical education in order to make an informal distinction of what practical entails at
15 the humanities faculty. Reijnen expresses his hope for having some physical classes in
16 the last two blocks of the semester. Kemper enquires what is meant by this informal
17 distinction, to which Reijnen replies that the OPDs are setting up a list of programs
18 that in their expert opinion would benefit tremendously from having physical
19 education (e.g., programs that require group work or some courses in the musicology
20 department). The council asks for clarification on agenda point 4.3
21 *Tentamenvoorziening voor studenten met Nederlands als tweede taal*, Van Wesemael
22 explains that, as they didn't get to discuss this topic at the meeting, the Program
23 Directors will provide input on whether they'd be granting students with Dutch as L2
24 more time on their exams – the board will get back to the council regarding the
25 outcome of this topic. Verhave goes on to ask whether the council also receive the
26 yearly report mentioned in agenda point 4.5 *Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en*
27 *GSH*. Wilts and Reijnen thinks this is possible, but they'd first have to check whether
28 there is any confidential and/or personal information present in the document that,
29 due to the AVG, would restrict them from sending (parts of) it over. The board will
30 send over the *Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en GSH* (mentioned at point 4.5 in
31 the concept agenda CoH & GSH (210211)) after they've checked it for possible
32 sensitive information (taking into consideration the AVG) [**ACTION POINT**]. Verhave
33 then asks about what was discussed at agenda point 4.6 *Scriptieproces CoH: advies*
34 *inzake scriptiewerkgroepen*, to which Reijnen replies that the board of examiners
35 wrote a report on the different approaches regarding the thesis. They plan to discuss
36 this more thoroughly at the upcoming meeting, but that the gist of it is that there are
37 different procedures when it comes to the thesis, for instance, some programs have an
38 introductory course to the thesis while others don't – this could some implications
39 regarding a varying amount of EC accredited to the thesis between programs. They
40 plan to discuss a more uniform approach to the thesis: a standard procedure. Lastly,
41 the council asks what was discussed at agenda point 4.7 *Implementatie verbetering*
42 *scriptieproces GSH*, it is explained that this point wasn't discussed at the meeting. But
43 they'd planned to have a conversation on the idea of students getting one year to finish
44 their thesis: they hand it in before the first of July, when it's insufficient they get
45 another half year to provide a second version.

47 **B) Corona**

48 Weerman updates on the current status regarding the pandemic. He hints at a possible
49 announcement by the government for reopening the university. Yet, he remains
50 skeptical especially considering the grim national statistics on the impact of the virus.
51 Furthermore, they published a list for the staff to help relieve some of the workload.
52 Sojo Perez refers to the government's support plan for higher education and asks
53 whether the university is paying attention to those that might be excluded from this
54 kind of support. Weerman asks if Sojo Perez is referring to international students. Sojo
55 Perez nods. Weerman explains that the current support plan is meant for Dutch- and
56 EU-students and that tuition fees for international students are handled by the
57 university itself. International students cannot rely on the Dutch government's funding

1 and thus Weerman urges to take this issue up with the CSR to discuss it at the central
2 level. He explains that every year the university makes new arrangements regarding
3 the international students' tuition fees and that if the CSR acts quickly they can still get
4 involved in this process. Yet, he notes that when they lower the tuition fee this also
5 means that other parts of the university budget have to compensate for this financial
6 lacuna; he notes that solidarity between Dutch and international students is key in this
7 instance. Sojo Perez comments that he will reach out to the CSR and the committee
8 responsible for establishing the tuition fees. Furthermore, Sojo Perez implores the
9 board to share any information they receive on this topic. Friede refers to the group of
10 Dutch students who are also excluded from government support (those that finish
11 their BA and aren't continuing with a MA program) and asks what the university can
12 do for them. Weerman comments that for this issue they, too, should reach out to the
13 CSR to discuss it at the central level.

14 C) IMQ4

15 In preparation of this agenda point the council sent over the questions in advance. The
16 council and board go over the questions one by one.

- 17
18
19 ○ *"By early November the Inclusion @ FGw surveys were conducted among
20 students and staff. Where are the results of this survey? (5.2.4 page 21)"*
21 *(210312 | email IMR Q4 questions for OV – FSR)*

22
23 Sojo Perez asks whether the results have been published, Reijnen answers
24 that the full results aren't in yet. Currently the data for the students is in but
25 they're still waiting for the staff results and, in the meantime, Letje Lips is
26 working on setting up a report. Reijnen notes that the information will be
27 sent over as soon as possible.

- 28
29 ○ *"Sustainable implementation redesign 8-8-4. Total resources allocated:
30 €100,000. Could you elaborate on what these funds are addressed to exactly
31 and what is its role within the implementation of 7-7-4? (5.5 Voortgang
32 projecten Werkdrukverlaging Page 24)"* (210312 | email IMR Q4 questions
33 for OV – FSR)

34
35 Weerman explains that the money has been made available via the chairs of
36 the departments to aid in the redesign and support teachers in adapting to
37 the change. Sojo Perez comments that there is a lack of regulation on how 7-
38 7-4 is approached. Weerman replies that the regulation and distribution of
39 funds is arranged via the department chairs in collaboration with the
40 *opleidingsdirecteuren*. Kemper asks how the funds were allocated and
41 whether the board, for instance, has a record of where and how the budget is
42 spent. Weerman refers to the department chairs and *opleidingdirecteuren*
43 again and Wilts adds that they didn't burden the staff with an added
44 workload by listing and reporting back on how exactly the funds are being
45 spent. Kemper comments that she is aware of teachers not having received
46 any funds to reprogram their curriculum and that she will take this news of
47 available funds back to the 7-7-4 steering committee.

- 48
49 ○ *"Intensification of education: we are happy to hear that a start has been made
50 and that 17 out of 24 BA's are applying improvements to the didactics of their
51 programs. However, to have a better grasp of how the funds are being used,
52 we would like to receive some concrete examples of the intensification as
53 well as their cost. (Bijlage A, page 34) Verantwoording Kwaliteitsafspraken
54 2020."* (210312 | email IMR Q4 questions for OV – FSR)

1 Reijnen relays that they have been discussing the plans, but, as of yet, they
2 are unaware of how successful the adaptations are. They shall learn of their
3 (un)favorable outcome via the course evaluations and the feedback from the
4 program committees.

5
6 ○ “In relation to the overarching themes of the funds: *onderzoekintensief*
7 *onderwijs, kruisbestuiving met de stad/omgeving en intensivering van*
8 *studiebegeleiding (inclusief tutoraat)*. We would like to know if there will be
9 more efforts to expand the capacity of study advisors, and additionally
10 evaluating the current conditions of study counseling? (Bijlage A, page 35)
11 Verantwoording Kwaliteitsafspraken 2020.” (210312 | email IMR Q4
12 questions for OV – FSR)

13
14 Reijnen notes that he shares and recognizes the council’s concerns. This year
15 the support staff has been reorganized. First, the funds were being
16 reallocated towards the *studieloopbancoördinatoren* and currently they are
17 being routed in the direction of the study advisors and
18 *opleidingscoördinatoren*. He adds that due to this restructuring they
19 accidentally stumbled upon possibly a little more capacity for additional
20 study advisors. Sojo Perez urges Reijnen to update the council once they
21 know the capacity is extended. Reijnen offers to ask those in charge of this
22 process to update them. He also adds that the reorganization has also led to a
23 restructuring of the *tutoraat* and that an update on this could also be useful.
24 Reijnen

5. Humanities in Context (HiC)

A. Language Change

25 The council comments that the language change has been presented as part of the
26 Humanities in Context plans, instead of solely a language change for the BA
27 *Cultuurwetenschappen*. Now, they wonder why the board believes *Cultuurwetenschappen*
28 should be a part of HiC in lieu of *Cultuurwetenschappen* simply being a separate bachelor
29 with English as the language of instruction. Reijnen answers that *Cultuurwetenschappen* has
30 been struggling, while HiC was in need of logistical structuring – also considering the
31 government is unfavorable of setting up new registered programs. Thus, by combining HiC
32 and *Cultuurwetenschappen* they could give the one an influx and the other its foundational
33 structure. Reijnen adds that the process of registering a new program is very arduous –he
34 refers to the process of registering the program Politics, Psychology, Law and Economics
35 (PPLE) – and that they chose to go about a different trajectory to circumvent this issue.
36 Batelaan responds that he is skeptical about the board’s avoidance of the standard
37 procedure and fears that by side-stepping these issues they are welcoming oversights.
38 Batelaan adds that the council is wary of consenting to the language change, because they
39 believe the board might not consider some of the council’s fair criticisms.
40 Furthermore, the council expresses their concern for the small staff of
41 *Cultuurwetenschappen* and the pressure that is being put on them by serving them with a
42 bilingual program which might attract a lot of students, reeducation and a lack of clarity
43 regarding the changes. Reijnen responds that there is still time for them, and that program
44 is currently in development. He urges the council to see it as an experiment where they try
45 to achieve a collaboration between the different languages instead of solely separate
46 traditional Dutch and English tracks. Batelaan worries that international students might be
47 cut off from following Dutch courses, creating unequal opportunities in the bachelor.
48 Reijnen responds that to some extent Batelaan is correct in this, although he is very hopeful
49 that they’ll be able to give students that aren’t proficient in Dutch more tools to participate
50 in, for instance, a bilingual course – one where both languages can interact with one
51 another. Yet, he feels that if they were to have a strictly Dutch or English program, they
52 would lose the benefits of having a more innovative approach.

1 Verhave expresses her concern regarding the timeline. Currently, the plan is to look for
2 students in September whilst they have no notion yet of what the second and third year of
3 the bachelor will look like. Furthermore, at the current pace the developments are moving,
4 to her, it seems unlikely the plans will be finished. She refers to Reijnen calling it an
5 experiment and notes that she worries for possible future students who might be faced
6 with an unfinished plan. Moreover, she stresses the council doesn't have enough trust to
7 believe that everything will work out. Reijnen replies that he wants to know whether the
8 council is excited about this program and if they see its potential. He adds that he consults
9 the council while they're still developing it and that he is curious to know their opinion
10 related to the broad strokes of the program. Batelaan responds that the council isn't
11 comfortable with consenting to unclear plans.

12 Verhave points out that their argument isn't about the plan being incomplete, rather
13 they're concerned about the pathway towards completion. She and Batelaan both refer to
14 signals of the *Cultuurwetenschappen* staff being overworked and that teachers aren't
15 getting the hours necessary to help restructure the program – they fear the boards
16 expectations might be too high. Reijnen comments that they should consider having a
17 conversation on this, because they are in the position to diverge opportunities to prevent
18 such issues. Yet, he notes that they need the codetermination [*medezeggenschap*] to express
19 whether they can continue the project. Without a 'green light' they can't divulge any
20 financial information. Verhave interrupts to say that this argument isn't about making
21 funds available for the staff but about whether the possibility of allocating funds to such a
22 cause even exists.

23 Verheul points out the process of internationalization to which Reijnen replies that the
24 program is considered bilingual and that they hope to bring the Dutch and English track
25 together, especially, in the last year. Reijnen acknowledges Batelaan's earlier comments on
26 the complications that might arise from this but adds that he would like to challenge the
27 old-fashioned structure of having two separate tracks. Verheul refers to legislation that
28 demands a fixed percentage of Dutch as the language of instruction. Reijnen explains that
29 they want to give the Dutch language as much space as possible and that HiC as a new
30 program might actually be unique in doing so, considering most new programs are fully in
31 English. They plan to include Dutch at every level of education – e.g., majors and courses.

32 Weerman comments that it is important to keep the conversation going and to prevent a
33 standstill, especially considering that if they wait too long it would lead to a postponement
34 of the program to 2023.

B. Bachelor

35 Verhave voices her concern of the 24 EC elective space being offered in 'packages'. She
36 wonders whether it is mandatory to choose one of these packages, Reijnen says yes.
37 Verhave continues that the program could cause overchoice, explaining that HiC perhaps
38 presents too many choices (bachelor, track, major, electives, masters, etc.) which could
39 overwhelm students. Furthermore, she believes it might be too soon to force students to
40 decide on their MA in the second year and she also feels that the elective space should be a
41 place for exploration. Constricting them the elective space to master preparation might be
42 stifling, but she also acknowledges that without this constriction and all the other forked
43 roads the students have to traverse in the course of this program 'free' elective space might
44 cause even more of a choice overload. In addition, she comments, the council feels HiC
45 students might not be properly prepared to enter more traditional humanities MA
46 programs, due to the big differences in didactic and assessment methods. The council is
47 also skeptical about HiC's lack of geographical self-awareness and how this will affect the
48 'solving' of global problems. What is more, they are unaware of any practical education, like
49 courses on content creation or other technical elements (e.g., videos, editing), being
50 reflected in the curriculum. Besides the council would like to see the board execute market
51 research to see if it supports their expectations for HiC. Reijnen acknowledges that the
52 council has quite some reservations on this topic and notes that some of these concerns
53 could be tackled before the council sends out their formal advice. He feels that Verhave
54 makes a good point about geographical awareness being an important marker when
55 tackling global issues. Concerning overchoice, Reijnen explains that they'll make sure that

1 there is a good range of masters that would easily connect to the program. Though, he
2 notes that HiC is very flexible and easily connects to a variety of masters – perhaps more so
3 than traditional programs.

4 Kemper comments that she is not opposed to flexibility, but she does wonder whether
5 didactic and/or pedagogic experts have taken a look at the program. Reijnen responds that
6 HiC is a serious project with lots of people working on it and, of course, this has happened.
7 Kemper comments that they expect there to be a lot of interested students but there is no
8 market research to support this claim, she asks if they can explain this dissonance. Reijnen
9 explains the process that has led them to this claim by referring to the team and an external
10 research party analyzing the choices students make to delineate where their interests lie
11 and how the program lines currently need to be filled in and presented to the concerned
12 parties.

13 Taking into account the amount of time they have left for the rest of the meeting the board
14 and council decide to schedule another meeting to discuss this topic more extensively
15 [ACTION PONT].

C. Strategic Narrative

16 Kemper wonders what the board's intention was for the strategic narrative. Weerman
17 explains that the narrative demonstrates the reasoning behind the HiC program at the
18 behest of the codetermination and the governing bodies; that it provides them with a
19 background story – an overarching description or ideological backbone. Kempe notes that,
20 according to her interpretation of the document, the board sees a lack of a relation to
21 society as the humanities core problem and that they believe HiC could form a bridge
22 between humanities and society. Weerman comments that the board doesn't believe that
23 the humanities are detached from society, rather (most of) society believes the humanities
24 don't bear any relation to the environment. He shares that in their perspective the relation
25 between humanities and society might not be clearly presented to those who fund us and
26 those who have aspirations to study with is. Kemper notes that she would like to have an
27 answer to the questions initially posed by the OR, regardless of the narrative being an
28 overarching 'umbrella' document: What students is the program meant for and how do we
29 know that they are actually interested? What academic discourses form the foundation of
30 the program and why can't these be discussed in existing programs? What is the concrete
31 perspective for students in terms of job opportunities and MA programs? Weerman feels
32 that these questions are very relevant, but perhaps are more apt for a discussion on the
33 bachelor. Kemper notes that the topics are related, and that the strategic narrative should
34 also answer these questions. Weerman stresses that the faculty is dependent on larger
35 programs '*stevige schouders*' to tackle the issues of the humanities and guarantee the
36 existence of the humanities faculty rich portfolio of programs. Furthermore, Weerman
37 stresses that the faculty isn't just faced with a financial problem but also to those relating to
38 content. They board and council agree to discuss this topic further at the separate meeting.

6. Social Safety

39 Due to a lack of time the board and council decide to discuss this matter during a separate
40 informal meeting and the council will send over their questions and or/suggestions in a
41 document beforehand [ACTION POINT].

7. Final questions and closing

42 There are no final comments. The meeting is closed at 11:00.

43

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 *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* discusses the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning and milk with Cirfood and Facility Services. Furthermore, they'll look into a promotion plan regarding sustainability and waste.

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

200917-14 *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) The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.

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

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

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

- a) (edited 210316) A separate meeting will be scheduled to have an open conversation between the board and the council on the Honors Program.
- b) During the next OV [April 30th 2021, red.] the council and board will discuss the advice sent by the working group *Studeren met een functiebeperking*

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

- a) The fDB and FSR FGw will have a meeting on the topic of Social Safety; in preparation for this meeting the fDB will set up a document which will entail: the goal of the meeting, a plan for change (improvement procedure & prevention cases) and how the council and board will cooperate.
- ~~b) The FSR FGw and Weerman set up a separate meeting where Weerman can share his personal conclusions regarding the social safety issue.~~

~~201208-07 Reijnen will look into the why elective courses (that aren't mandatory for hoofdvakstudenten to attend) have a different registration period than the rest of the courses and why this isn't communicated to the students.~~

~~210204-01 Senchi will send over a list with the FSR's recommendations regarding (digital) education in times of Corona.~~

210316-01 The board will send over the *Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en GSH* (mentioned at point 4.5 in the concept agenda CoH & GSH (210211)), after they've checked it for possible sensitive information (taking into consideration the AVG).

210316-02 The board and council schedule a separate meeting to discuss Humanities in Context (language change, curriculum and strategic narrative) more extensively.

210316-03 The board and council schedule a separate informal meeting to discuss the Social Safety Action Plan with Seignette. Furthermore, the council will send over their questions and or/suggestions in a document beforehand.