



Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 30 april 2021

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

Agenda

- 1) Opening and Confirming the Agenda
- 2) Draft Minutes OV FSR March 16th, 2021
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) State of Affairs
 - a) CoH and GSH
 - b) National Education Program
- 5) Faculty Strategic Plan
- 6) *Handreiking* Social safety
- 7) Advice Working Group *Studeren met een functiebeperking*
- 8) Final Questions and Closing

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Koletzki opens the meeting at 11:02. No changes are made to the agenda. Though, Weerman
2 explains that agenda point 4.b. *National Education Program* will entail a Corona update. He
3 stresses that, of course, there is always room to address any additional pandemic related
4 questions.

2. Draft minutes OV FSR March 16th, 2021

5 The meetings attendees go over the minutes from the past OV page by page, Senchi notes that
6 she has edited action list to say *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* instead of 'Nijsten' and that Vieira
7 Ribeiro has been noted as present on the attendee list. Before going over the action list Wilts
8 suggests providing Van De Graaf with context regarding the action points delegated to the
9 *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* so she can sufficiently react to the action points that are still open. The
10 attendees agree with this suggestion. Subsequently, the council and board go over the action list
11 and discuss the following points:

12
13 ~~201029-01~~ ~~Regarding the Budget Plan 2021:~~

14
15 ~~a) The Daily Board will send over a breakdown of the Sustainable~~
16 ~~Humanities Plan before the end of 2020.~~

17
18 Scrapped.

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
24 Reijnen explains that the committee isn't ready yet and that they're still
25 waiting for some program directors to join. He expects the committee to be
26 completed before the end of the year and that during the months of June and
27 July the results will come in for the committee to evaluate. Furthermore, he
28 informs the council that the committee will have fixed members except for the
29 student member who will participate on a yearly basis.
30 This action point will be made a pro memorie.

31
32 ~~201208-02~~ ~~The FSR will have an in-depth discussion regarding the Strategic Narrative~~
33 ~~Humanities in Context and share their findings in a formal letter to the fDB.~~

34
35 Scrapped.

36
37 ~~201208-03~~ ~~Regarding the subjects for the Bestuurlijke Agenda:~~

38
39 ~~a) (edited 210316) A separate meeting will be scheduled to have an~~
40 ~~open conversation between the board and the council on the~~
41 ~~Honors Program.~~

42
43 Kemper notes that Verhave sent out an email to schedule an
44 appointment with Reijnen. He, in turn, replies that he expects to
45 schedule the conversation May.

46
47 ~~b) During the next OV [April 30th 2021, red.] the council and board~~
48 ~~will discuss the advice sent by the working group Studeren met een~~
49 ~~functiebeperking.~~

50
51 Scrapped.

52
53 ~~201208-04~~ ~~Regarding the External Committee Report on Social Safety:~~

1
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~~
6 ~~the council and board will cooperate.~~

7
8 Scrapped.

9
10 210316-01 *The board will send over the Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en GSH*
11 *(mentioned at point 4.5 in the concept agenda CoH & GSH (210211)), after*
12 *they've checked it for possible sensitive information (taking into consideration*
13 *the AVG).*

14
15 Weerman comments that this is on their to-do list and Wilts adds that it only
16 has to be checked for one more point but that it will definitely be sent over
17 soon.

18
19 ~~210316-02 — The board and council schedule a separate meeting to discuss Humanities in~~
20 ~~Context (language change, curriculum and strategic narrative) more~~
21 ~~extensively.~~

22
23 Scrapped.

24
25 ~~210316-03 — The board and council schedule a separate informal meeting to discuss the~~
26 ~~Social Safety Action Plan with Seignette. Furthermore, the council will send over~~
27 ~~their questions and/or/suggestions in a document beforehand.~~

28
29 Scrapped.

30
31 The OV minutes of the 16th of March 2021 are confirmed.

3. Announcements

A) Daily Board of the Faculty

32
33 A brief round of introductions ensues for councilors who haven't met Anne van de
34 Graaf, the new Directeur Bedrijfsvoering, yet. Furthermore, the board informs the FSR
35 that due to health reasons Zwiep will be absent during this meeting and that this could
36 possibly affect the discussion on the Faculty Strategic Plan (FSP).

B) FSR

37
38 Six councilors, including the council chair (Choudhury, Verheul, Van Dorp, Verhave,
39 Obiefule, Schoots), are unable to join this meeting.

40
41
42 Per the usual, Koletzki explains the protocol and etiquette for participating in the
43 online OV.

4. State of Affairs

A) CoH & GSH

44
45 Referring to 3.3. *Vastgesteld Jaarplan CoH 2020-2021*, the council asks if this is related
46 to the negative advice that was sent last year, Reijnen responds that it indeed is. Then,
47 referring to 3.4. *Uitwisselingsstudenten- nieuw aanmeldportal en gevolgen Brexit*, the
48 council wonders how this point ties into the communication students have received
49 regarding the exchanges. The board comments that this concerns a technical issue
50 regarding the way students apply for exchanges. Furthermore, Wesemael notes that
51 the discussion regarding exchange is still ongoing. Regarding 3.7. *Aangepaste Tips voor*
52 *online onderwijs studenten (met aandacht voor sociale veiligheid)*, the board explains

1 that this isn't related to a 'zoom protocol'. Rather, it is similar to the *schrapplijst* that has
2 also been set up for the staff and is related to the council's memo on suggestions for
3 online education during Corona. Concerning 4.4. *Notitie opzet grote onderwijszalen*
4 *Universiteitskwartier*, the council wonders whether this is related to the configuration
5 of the *Universiteitskwartier* and how this will affect lectures. Reijnen explains that it is
6 part of a plan to build larger lecture halls with a flexible setting, this way they can be
7 used for traditional lectures and also be turned into smaller work or lecture spaces for
8 similar or other educational contexts. Upon enquiry by Kemper, Reijnen confirms that
9 these changes will be applied to the OMHP lecture halls, and he adds that he feels very
10 positive about these developments regarding less 'fixed' settings. Batelaan wonders
11 whether the need for flexibility bears any relation to the possibility of hybrid settings,
12 to which Reijnen responds that these plans were set up pre-Corona in order to boost
13 communication and easy adaptability during lectures.
14

15 **B) National Education Program**

16 Weerman explains that a lot is still unclear and, thus, they will stick to the points they
17 know for sure, which are: 1) Dutch and EU students, by government decree, will
18 receive a discount on the tuition fees, 2) UvA's international students will receive the
19 same discount, however this is not a government decree but a UvA specific
20 arrangement and, therefore, it doesn't apply to all Dutch universities. Weerman
21 advises the council to reach out to the CSR to discuss the allocation of the funds the
22 university will receive from the government. Furthermore, the executive board
23 intends to hire more staff at the faculty and currently they are looking into its
24 organizational aspects.

25 Friede enquires about the argumentation for the UvA buildings' capacity preventing
26 students from on-campus education or study-sessions, and she asks whether they
27 have a schedule to organize physical education. Weerman comments that this is
28 unrelated to the national program, but Reijnen responds to Friede's remarks by saying
29 that she is correct that capacity issues aren't at the heart of the issue, rather, he
30 explains, it's the inability to switch up education overnight. Moreover, Reijnen notes
31 that they've invited teachers to look into the possibilities and to use the capacity that
32 is available to them. Van Wesemael adds that they're also considering physical
33 activities for the current block (5). Friede sketches a situation where all members of a
34 student group are present in Amsterdam, and wonders whether they are allowed to
35 have a physical lecture. The board explains that the program director needs to keep an
36 overview of the on-site and online education to prevent inequality between programs,
37 but programs are allowed to meet on-campus if they can. Friede questions whether
38 this has thoroughly been communicated; Reijnen and Van Wesemael feel that it has
39 been communicated well. Kemper wonders whether on-campus education is also
40 encouraged by the board and/or the program directors. Van Wesemael relays that
41 they do, indeed, encourage this, but perhaps they should be more adamant – especially
42 concerning first year students. Reijnen adds that they are especially encouraging the
43 betterment of social cohesion via parallel meetings, activities and presentations. Both
44 Reijnen and Van Wesemael will stress the encouragement of on-campus meetings via
45 email communication and during their next meeting with the program directors.

46 The council implores the board to keep them in the loop regarding the funds that are
47 made available to the faculty and university thanks to the national program.
48 Furthermore, Batelaan refers to an alternative method for on-site education 'bi-
49 modular education', where one lecture is divided over two rooms with a live speaker
50 in one lecture hall and a live feed in the other. Reijnen knows of this method and
51 comments that at UvA it's called hybrid education. He continues that they are also
52 looking into various options but that it hasn't been easy and that it's mostly trial and
53 error. Though, he lauds teachers for their creativity and coming up with solutions.

54 Sojo Perez comments that it'd be good for programs and courses to communicate to
55 their students if there isn't any chance of on-site education for the rest of the year, to
56 prevent students for needlessly getting their hopes up. Wesemael and Reijnen agree

1 that teachers should communicate what they are(n't) working on and perhaps this
2 communication should be increased at the program level.
3 Regarding the university library, Batelaan wonders if it'll be possible to visit the
4 library for study spot without a reservation again. Van de Graaf relays that the
5 university library is working to increase the number available study spots but that
6 these will remain reservation only. She doesn't feel like they'll be stepping away from
7 the reservation system anytime soon, though they have noticed there is a rather high
8 no-show ration which they're trying to decrease via certain measures. Bombeld adds
9 that a measure that has already been implemented is a 'x number of strikes and you're
10 out' system. Kemper notes some students are able to visit the library thrice a week,
11 whilst others are only allowed to visit once a week. Van de Graaf counters by asking
12 whether Kemper perceives vulnerable students being granted more opportunities to
13 visit the library as unequal treatment – 'regular' students can visit once and vulnerable
14 students thrice. Kemper wouldn't qualify it as unequal, but she would like to know the
15 reasoning behind frequency numbers; Van de Graaf will look into this and report back.

5. Faculty Strategic Plan (FSP)

16 Bombeld proposes for Weerman to briefly introduce the topic so they can establish the main
17 points for the discussion. Weerman refers to the cover letter they sent to the council and
18 explains that every university creates a *instellingsplan* and how this ties into faculties having a
19 similar plan on a smaller scale, which is the strategic plan. Weerman would like to use this
20 moment for the council to share their feedback on the first version of the plan so they can apply
21 the comments to finish the draft. Later they will decide on the document, which will then
22 (again) be shared with FSR FGw for them to advise on. Moreover, he comments that the plan is
23 purposefully less detailed and more general because it serves as a long term 'umbrella' plan.
24 Content wise the plan has been divided into education, research and human resources;
25 Weerman believes the council's input regarding education is likely the most important.
26 Bombeld thanks Weerman for his introduction and continues by relaying the council's feedback.
27 She refers to page 3 and 8 of the document and comments that Humanities in Context (HiC)
28 shouldn't be mentioned in the plan as no consensus has been established yet. Also, the council
29 would like to see more of an academic motivation and less financial motivation in the plan.
30 Weerman counters that HiC might not yet exist as a program, but in terms of the overarching
31 strategy and in terms of finance it is very real; he notes that it would be unusual to not mention
32 it, especially considering the Executive Board is thoroughly investing in it. Furthermore,
33 Weerman would like to underline, referring to the partnerships, that content trumps finance.
34 Though, he understands and appreciates the council's suggestion, and they will work to clarify
35 this false perception.

36 Continuing on page 3 and quoting the lines:

37
38 *Door 'midden in de stad' te zien als 'midden in de samenleving' wil de faculteit wegblijven van de*
39 *spreekwoordelijke elitaire ivoren toren, en nadrukkelijk ook de randen van de stad opzoeken. De*
40 *universiteit, en zeker de geesteswetenschappen, hebben een maatschappelijke*
41 *verantwoordelijkheid in het toegankelijk maken van kennis en inzicht en in het opzoeken en*
42 *opnemen van groepen die tot op heden de weg naar ons niet, of minder goed hebben kunnen*
43 *vinden. Om relevant te zijn zullen we de samenleving zowel kritisch moeten bestuderen, alsook op*
44 *de voet moeten volgen. In inhoud, activiteiten, studentenpopulatie en staf zullen we inclusief*
45 *moeten zijn".*
46

47 Bombeld notes that geographically the strategic plan is too limiting and should be edited to
48 reflect inclusivity as well as a plan to include students outside of Amsterdam or those with a
49 different socioeconomic background. Weerman replies that they will work to clarify this matter.
50 Moving on to page 5 Bombeld wonders how the faculty would describe or define diversity and
51 urges the board to include this in the plan. Sojo Perez adds that currently the plan stresses 'all
52 perspectives' but he feels this is not substantial enough and that it should reflect a more
53 concrete commitment to marginalized perspectives. Bombeld suggests that using or referring to
54 the *Let's Do Diversity Report* might help to improve the text. Weerman replies that he is unsure
55 of what the council means and to clarify their issue with the phrasing, Bombeld retorts that
56 their issue is with the vagueness of the phrasing and the use of the word *letterlijk* in the

1 sentence *“Een integrale, inclusieve blik, waarin letterlijk alle perspectieven vanzelfsprekend zijn*
2 *vervat.”*. Weerman explains that this is related to research and to provide academic freedom:
3 giving the opportunity to use all sorts of research as a starting point. Vieira Ribeiro counters
4 that, considering the current political climate, perhaps they shouldn't just attribute it to
5 academic freedom; if the intention is to be more diverse, she suggests not emphasizing
6 academic freedom, but the points described in the diversity report. Weerman comments that
7 diversity might have been used too ambiguously here and could perhaps benefit from
8 specification.

9 Staying on the topic of diversity, now referring to page 14, Bombeld wonders what measures
10 will be taken regarding staff policy to emphasize the importance of diversity and inclusivity.
11 Moreover, the council would like to know whether this would also increase diversity among the
12 staff. Weerman notes that the measures aren't in place yet and he confirms that they intend to
13 have a more diverse staff in more ways than solely gender. In terms of concrete plans to
14 emphasize and increase diversity, Weerman mentions some examples: extra funding towards
15 hiring staff with a diverse background, prioritizing PhD candidates from marginalized groups,
16 targeted searches besides an open application procedure. Though, Weerman suspects this will
17 undoubtedly lead to a discussion. Van de Graaf asks the council what kind of diversity they
18 would welcome at the university, to which they respond they would like to see more
19 socioeconomic and religious diversity as well as more space for black people and people of
20 color – to create a broader diversity scope at the faculty in terms of both student body and
21 teaching staff. Sojo Perez notes that the student population is a reflection of the teaching staff
22 and suggests hiring more from outside the current 'bubble'; to hire more diverse staff is the first
23 step and the student population might subsequently follow. Weerman responds that he will also
24 take this up with the OR to discuss how they feel about it and to test the waters. Sojo Perez also
25 suggests hiring external specialists and experts on biases. Moreover, he believes the faculty
26 could benefit from 'revamping' the programs by diversifying the staff and the curriculum (e.g.,
27 Afro-Dutch Studies). Weerman agrees these suggestions could be important for education, HR
28 and research.

29 Moving on to the topic of digitalization, Bombeld asks where the faculty would draw the line
30 concerning the digitalization of education. Van de Graaf remarks that they must clearly
31 differentiate between online learning and digitalization; she adds that they are quite ambitious
32 regarding the improvement of digitalization tools (e.g., Canvas), but they are less adamant in
33 their intent to further online learning. Van Wesemael cuts in to stress that, as a starting point,
34 they are an on-campus university and digitalization should be there only to support on-campus
35 education not replace it. Kemper comments that she feels the text puts too much emphasis on
36 digitalization and that it might be good to include the point Van Wesemael made. Weerman
37 agrees.

38 Regarding *meertaligheid* (page 9: *“De UvA spreekt in het Instellingsplan uit dat docenten en*
39 *studenten zowel het Nederlands als het Engels beheersen.”*), the council wonders how the faculty
40 plans to realize this. Reijnen responds that the faculty is already ahead of other faculties when it
41 comes to bilingual- and plurilingualism. Furthermore, he explains, teachers are obligated to be
42 able to communicate in Dutch. He feels the challenge might not be with bilingualism, but more
43 with multilingualism and planning that out. Sojo Perez asks if teachers at all levels have to meet
44 the same language requirements, to which Weerman replies that all staff members with a
45 structural position are required to master the Dutch and English language. Though, they are
46 more lenient regarding those that hold temporary positions. Moreover, all staff are provided
47 with the means to acquire these language skills.

48 Concerning internationalization (page 10: *“Onze opgave voor de komende jaren is niet*
49 *hoofdzakelijk om steeds meer internationale studenten aan ons te binden, maar om ervoor te*
50 *zorgen dat we die internationalisering gelijk over de faculteit verdelen en ons hele*
51 *onderwijsaanbod inhoudelijk laten meebewegen met deze nieuwe kansen en daarmee te*
52 *verrijken.”*), Bombeld asks how the board plans to distribute internationalization across the
53 faculty. Reijnen acknowledges that this poses a challenge and refers to how Dutch as a language
54 of instruction might impede international students, though he hopes to move onto a situation
55 wherein international students would be aided in, at least, being able to passively follow Dutch
56 lectures. Kemper questions how extracurricular Dutch language courses will affect international
57 students. Reijnen notes that the courses would be part of the program and credited, but he

1 explains that language acquisition also happens outside the curriculum. He notes that they'd
2 like to offer extra courses for students who would like to improve their writing skills. Kemper
3 asks if there is any financial compensation for students who'd participate in these extra courses.
4 Reijnen answers that currently students receive a discount, but he hopes to offer them freely
5 and partly integrated into the available programs. As a last point Bombeld suggests that more
6 emphasis could be placed on academic career opportunities in the Netherlands, and this
7 currently misses in the text.

6. *Handreiking Sociale Veiligheid*

8 Sojo Perez notes that they're awaiting the revised social safety action plan and asks whether the
9 board has any updates. Weerman comments that the *Handreiking* is an additional part to the
10 action plan which is meant to aid the staff by informing them what concrete actions they should
11 and can take when they receive signals of social unsafety. Weerman comments that they'd like
12 to receive feedback on this extra document. Van de Graaf adds that the document is similar to
13 an instruction guide and stresses that it is also based on the idea that not acting when faced
14 with social unsafety is not an option; the target group for the document is the faculty's
15 employees.

16 The council had overlooked the document as an addition to the action plan and is thus unable to
17 comment on its content during the current meeting. The board and council agree to discuss the
18 subject during the upcoming TTO.

7. *Advice working group Studeren met een functiebeperking*

19 Van de Graaf relays that the advice contains an impressive list of recommendations, the
20 majority of which related to communication and provision information. She explains that there
21 isn't an issue with the availability of accommodation for people with a disability regarding
22 accessibility of the UvA buildings, but rather that they're not informed enough about the
23 facilities and options that are already there. Sojo Perez agrees with this reading of the
24 document. Furthermore, there is room for improvement concerning the physical infrastructure
25 of the university even though they're currently already well within the limits of the legal
26 requirements. Still, Van de Graaf notes, they can definitely look into doing more. As a temporary
27 solution they will currently revisit communication and information provision, also to spare the
28 already overworked staff some of the more arduous improvement tasks such as: checking the
29 physical infrastructure, cataloguing how well-equipped and/or informed teachers are to handle
30 situations concerning disabilities. These intensive tasks are now scheduled to take place in
31 autumn - starting October in the upcoming academic year (2021-2022). Moreover, Van de Graaf
32 notes that they will look into setting up an action plan regarding maturity levels. Sojo Perez
33 thanks Van de Graaf for her efforts and providing the council with a timeline. Van de Graaf will
34 regularly update the council on any developments as a consequence of the advice by the
35 working group *Studeren met een functiebeperking* [ACTION POINT].

8. *Final questions and closing*

36 Batelaan enquires about a meeting between the History OC and the board concerning an advice
37 on UvA Q. Reijnen and Koletzki are both confused about this line of questioning. Upon
38 clarification of the situation by Koletzki who, unbeknownst to the council, was involved in the
39 UvA Q advice; the matter is settled. The meeting is closed at 12:54

40

Pro memori

- 1
2 200511-01 Weerman makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so that
3 the FSR can advise on this.
4 201208-01 (edited 210430) Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the
5 *Commissie Evaluatie Honoursprogramma FGw* and the structure of the
6 evaluation proceedings.
7

Action list

- 8 200511-02 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* discusses the topic of vegetarian options,
9 cleaning and milk with Cirfood and Facility Services. Furthermore, they'll look
10 into a promotion plan regarding sustainability and waste.
11 200917-13 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* or the DB will report in the next month on the
12 developments regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.
13 200917-14 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will report on the white paper to the council in
14 the course of the next month
15 201208-03 Regarding the subjects for the *Bestuurlijke Agenda*:
16
17 a) (edited 210316) A separate meeting will be scheduled to have
18 an open conversation between the board and the council on the
19 Honors Program.
20
21 210316-01 The board will send over the *Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en GSH*
22 (mentioned at point 4.5 in the concept agenda CoH & GSH (210211)), after
23 they've checked it for possible sensitive information (taking into
24 consideration the AVG).
25 210430-01 Regarding the Faculty Strategic Plan:
26 a) The board will work to clarify that in their motivation for
27 partnerships content trumps finance.
28 b) The board will work to clarify and reflect their goals to include a
29 larger variety of students, both in terms of geographical as well
30 as socioeconomic background.
31 c) The board will make a point in the FSP to stress that, first and
32 foremost, the UvA is an on-campus university and digitalization
33 should only be used to support the on-campus experience – not
34 replace it.
35
36 210430-02 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will regularly update the council on any
37 developments as a consequence of the advice by the working group *Studeren*
38 *met een functiebeperking*.