



Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 17 juni 2021

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

Agenda

- 1) Opening and Confirming the Agenda
- 2) Draft Minutes OV FSR April 30th, 2021
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) Faculty Strategic Plan
- 5) Track American Studies
- 6) Humanities in Context
- 7) Diversity and Inclusivity
- 8) State of Affairs
 - a) Corona
 - b) CoH and GSH
- 9) Final Questions and Closing

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Koletzki opens the meeting at 15:01. The council requests for agenda point 7 (Diversity and
2 Inclusivity) to be moved up in the meeting, considering the file holders for this topic might have
3 to leave the meeting at an earlier moment. All attendees agree and the agenda is set:
4

Agenda

- 1) Opening and Confirming the Agenda
- 2) Draft Minutes OV FSR April 30th, 2021
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) Diversity and Inclusivity
- 5) Faculty Strategic Plan
- 6) Track American Studies
- 7) Humanities in Context
- 8) State of Affairs
 - a) Corona
 - b) CoH and GSH
- 9) Final Questions and Closing

2. Draft minutes OV FSR April 30th, 2021

6 The meetings attendees go over the minutes from the past OV page by page, Van De Graaf
7 requests Senchi to clarify that it is the physical UvA buildings that meet standard protocol in the
8 the following sentence on page 7 under agenda point 7 (210530): “She explains that there isn’t an
9 issue with the availability of accommodation for people with a disability, but rather that they’re not
10 informed enough about the facilities and options that are already there.” Senchi responds that she will
11 make the necessary edits. Subsequently, the attendees go over the action list and discuss the following
12 points
13

14 *200511-02 The Directeur Bedrijfsvoering discusses the topic of vegetarian options, cleaning*
15 *and milk with Cirfood and Facility Services. Furthermore, they’ll look into a*
16 *promotion plan regarding sustainability and waste.*

17 *200917-13 The Directeur Bedrijfsvoering or the DB will report in the next month on the*
18 *developments regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.*

19 *200917-14 The Directeur Bedrijfsvoering will report on the white paper to the council in the*
20 *course of the next month*

21
22 Van De Graaf suggests having a separate meeting to discuss the action points
23 related to the position of the *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering*. Sojo Perez counters that
24 he feels the action points can be scrapped and instead he’d like Van De Graaf to
25 schedule a meeting with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 to discuss any developments
26 regarding the action points. He notes that it’d be more fruitful to have a more
27 integral approach regarding the topic of sustainability and adds that the UvA
28 currently ranks third on sustainability compared to other Dutch universities.
29 Van De Graaf will meet with the FSR FGw 2021-2021 at the start of the
30 academic year to discuss any developments regarding the above mentioned
31 action points [ACTION POINT].

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

- 34
35 *a) (edited 210316) A separate meeting will be scheduled to have an*
36 *open conversation between the board and the council on the Honors*
37 *Program.*

38 Scrapped.

1 210316-01 The board will send over the Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en GSH
2 (mentioned at point 4.5 in the concept agenda CoH & GSH (210211)), after they've
3 checked it for possible sensitive information (taking into consideration the AVG).

4
5 Scrapped.

6
7 210430-01 Regarding the Faculty Strategic Plan:
8 a) The board will work to clarify that in their motivation for
9 partnerships content trumps finance.
10 b) The board will work to clarify and reflect their goals to include a
11 larger variety of students, both in terms of geographical as well as
12 socioeconomic background.
13 c) The board will make a point in the FSP to stress that, first and
14 foremost, the UvA is an on-campus university and digitalization
15 should only be used to support the on-campus experience – not
16 replace it.

17
18 The council and board will try to discuss these action points during this
19 meeting at the Humanities in Context agenda point.

20
21 210430-02 The Directeur Bedrijfsvoering will regularly update the council on any
22 developments as a consequence of the advice by the working group Studeren met
23 een functiebeperking.

24
25 Van Dorp suggests making this action point a pro memorie for Van De Graaf to
26 come back on in October.

27
28 The OV minutes of the 30th of April 2021 are confirmed.

3. Announcements

29 A) Daily Board of the Faculty

30 Weerman informs the council about the *Nationaal Programma Onderwijs* (NPO; transl.
31 National Education Programme) and that it consists of several parts, e.g.: staff, tuition
32 fees, student wellbeing, etc. He explains that the CSR and COR are involved with the
33 general process, but that at the level of the faculty the Daily Board is also working on
34 providing a faculty specific sup-part to the programme. He suggests for the FSR to send
35 over their suggestions concerning the plan to the CSR.

36 37 B) FSR

38 Van Dorp notes that Verheul and Schoots will be absent from this meeting and Sojo
39 Perez and Vieira Ribeiro will have to leave at an earlier moment. Furthermore, Van Dorp
40 would like to take a moment at the end of this last OV for the FSR FGw 2020-2021 to
41 express thanks.

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

4. Diversity and Inclusivity

45 Sojo Perez asks whether this agenda point requires an introduction, Reijnen responds that he
46 would like to give an update regarding this topic. He continues by explaining that they ran into
47 some delay, amongst other reasons, as a result of certain staff members, who were working on
48 the material, falling out due to personal circumstances and/or illness. He explains that they
49 intended to share their findings with the council and the faculty, especially the students who
50 participated in the survey, but that they currently don't have an action plan yet. Therefore,
51 Reijnen would like to have an open discussion on the results first and from there on move
52 forward. Reijnen notes that half of the student respondents indicated that they have physical

1 and/or mental disabilities, that respondents were uncertain of who to contact in case of
2 emergency or other calamities, and that the respondents tend to seek out professional help when
3 needed but that there were also many cases where they rely on their fellow students and
4 teachers. Furthermore, Reijnen notes that they're faced with the task of professionalization for
5 diversity issues. Sojo Perez feels that most of the council's points of attention regarding the
6 results coincide with points Reijnen just mentioned. Sojo Perez enquires about the action plan
7 and the option of adding another action plan to the current one. Reijnen replies that they first
8 need to take time in reviewing the results and he feels including another action plan would be
9 difficult to realise. Sojo Perez feels that the *Studying with a disability*-report and this survey are
10 closely related to each other and urges the board to make the disability issues and the mental
11 health situation a main priority. Furthermore, he observed that the survey results demonstrate
12 that students frequent their study advisors but it doesn't show whether these visits are actually
13 fruitful or helpful; he feels that the efficacy of, for instance, counselling by study advisors should
14 also be explored and could give very helpful insights. Moreover, Sojo Perez feels that the
15 individual results of the survey could serve as discussion topics. Though, he agrees with Reijnen
16 that a discussion and reviewing the results should precede setting up an action plan. Also, Sojo
17 Perez suggests for Reijnen to share the results in English as well as Dutch, Reijnen agrees to share
18 their findings bilingually. Verhave asks whether they would be able to use the results to pinpoint
19 how individual issues affect different programmes, Reijnen responds that it would be possible to
20 have such a breakdown for larger programmes but, considering the respondents' privacy, it'd be
21 more complicated. Though, Reijnen invites the council to explore whether there are differences
22 between the programmes, evaluate the results and look into more detailed information. Sojo
23 Perez wonders whether it'd be possible for the faculty to have a discussion with experts in the
24 field and to set up a preliminary action plan. Reijnen comments that they will start by reviewing
25 the questions, answers with various groups, like the codetermination, then they'll set up a plan
26 and lastly communicate this plan to the faculty. Furthermore, he notes that a larger team is
27 looking over the survey (one of its members being Sanne Klaver). Batelaan suggests having a
28 meeting between this team and the council after the summer; Reijnen agrees [ACTION POINT].

5. Faculty Strategic Plan (FSP) 2021-2026

29 Bombeld thanks the board for the changes they've applied to the document, though she would
30 still like to discuss some matters regarding Humanities in Context, diversity, internationalization
31 and digitalisation.

32 She stresses that the council remains very critical about HiC-programme being mentioned in the
33 plan, they feel that, if HiC is included in the plan, that the council would require the board to (at
34 least) mention that HiC is still a work in progress; especially considering both the OR and FSR
35 have advised negatively on HiC. Weerman retorts that the suggested changes were only
36 presented to him recently via the action points in the minutes and, thus, he had not been able to
37 apply this suggestion by the council. He adds that moving forward he will look into the
38 suggestions.

39 Moving on, Bombeld refers to page 2 of the FSP regarding the partnerships and comments that,
40 as they agreed last OV, academics and content trump finances; she would like to see this idea of
41 'content over money' reflected in the document, for instance, by editing the following sentence:
42 "*Naast de bekende maatschappelijke partners uit kunst en cultuur, beleid en onderwijs, zoeken nu*
43 *ook commerciële partners de geesteswetenschappen op, als reservoir van hoogwaardige,*
44 *international beproefde kennis en methoden."* Weerman notes that they will edit the document to
45 reflect that particular sentiment as well as the other suggested edits in the action points.

46 Continuing, Bombeld explains that in the council's opinion the term '*elite ivoren toren*' as it is used
47 in the document is still too limiting and they would like the board to be more concrete in their
48 conceptualisation in order for the topic to become more crystalized. Weerman counters that the
49 FSP offers a strategy and an introduction to the theme, but that the document isn't meant to
50 include specific plans. He offers the council to provide them with alternative sentences or to
51 explain what they fear by using the current phrasing. Bombeld retorts that it is lacking
52 marginalized perspectives and disregards the role of socio-economic backgrounds. Verhave adds
53 that the narrative regarding the edges of the city is particularly vague. Weerman interjects and
54 confirms whether the council feels that the metaphor is too vague. Bombeld and Verhave feel that
55 the metaphor might be too vague indeed. Weerman comments that he can work with this

1 information and agrees that socio-economic backgrounds are important and should be taken into
2 account in the document as well.

3 Regarding *Diversity I* (page 5, FSP), the council observed that the word 'diversity' has been
4 replaced by 'inclusivity' and that regardless of this change they still feel that a definition of either
5 concept should be included in the document. Bombeld notes that she understands that it is a
6 strategic plan but, regardless, it would benefit from including the definition used in the *Let's Do*
7 *Diversity*-report (also a UvA-document). She stresses that a strategy without definitions or goals
8 lacks necessary concreteness. Weerman asks about the definition used in the report; Reijnen
9 notes that they could indeed work with the definition used in the report and incorporate it.

10 Moreover, regarding *Diversity II* (page 14, FSP), Bombeld refers to the last OV where they
11 discussed suggestions for improving diversity, like: extra funding towards hiring staff with a
12 diverse background, prioritizing PhD candidates from marginalized groups, targeted searches
13 besides an open application procedure. Bombeld suggests including these in the FSP instead of
14 or in addition to the edit the board recently made which refers to stimulating an influx of diversity
15 ("*overwogen worden op welke wijze we de toename kunnen stimuleren*"). Weerman comments how
16 these suggestions are topics of discussion in their own right. He adds that they could include these
17 suggestions merely as examples to give people a sense of what they mean by stimulating
18 diversity. Verhave notes that using these as examples would be helpful indeed and Weerman
19 replies that including them as illustrative examples could certainly be done.

20 Regarding the care for promovendi (page 5 and 6, FSP), Verhave observed that, concerning the
21 attention points, especially the one regarding guidance, the document used to state 'scientific
22 integrity' and 'social safety' but in the recent version 'social safety' had been taken out; she
23 wonders what caused this decision. Zwiep explains that social safety hasn't been removed, but
24 that it hasn't been singled out on the page anymore. Instead it has been singled out in other parts
25 of the text and has become more of an integral part of the document.

26 Regarding digitalisation, the council wonders where the board draws the line when it comes to
27 digitalisation whilst taking into account the difference between online learning and digitalisation.
28 The council stresses that they would like this difference to be made apparent in the FSP.
29 Furthermore, during the previous OV, the board agreed that they should emphasize that the UvA
30 is an on-campus university; the council would like to see this sentiment included in the FSP. Van
31 Wesemael comments that this is a valid point and can be done.

32 Concerning internationalization, the council comments that the document now speaks of the
33 distribution of international students across the university and they wonder what the board
34 means by this. The council and Reijnen both remember discussing some examples of this process
35 during the previous meeting but Reijnen admits they are unsure how to achieve this exactly.
36 Though, they are discussing and brainstorming ideas in various groups. Moreover, Reijnen
37 stresses that they aren't in the process of internationalization; he clarifies that the UvA is already
38 an international university, rather they are looking to create more balance for international
39 students. As of yet, they don't have concrete examples to realise this but he would like to continue
40 having a discussion on this process. The council notes that the document should also state that
41 the faculty also supports students pursuing working lives inside the Netherlands and that it
42 currently focuses too much on a career outside the country. Weerman notes that the figures also
43 say that students pursuing a career in the Netherlands are very common.

44

6. Track American Studies

45 Batelaan, as a sidenote, clarifies that he's also part of the OC History which approved of the
46 decision to dissolve the track. Though, he asks the board to guarantee that the decision won't
47 negatively affect students, courses and staff members. Reijnen responds that they're not in charge
48 of what might happen, but it is his understanding that as a result of this decision there won't
49 change too much. They will still need the staff members and considering there still is a Master in
50 American Studies it is highly unlikely that they'll be letting staff members go. Moreover, Reijnen
51 even sees an opportunity for them to attract even more students.

52

53 *Sojo Perez and Vieira Ribeiro leave the meeting*

54

1 Batelaan stresses that in the future, regarding these processes and decisions, he would like OCs
2 to be notified in a much earlier stage so they can have a fruitful discussion with the OPD. Reijnen
3 agrees with this statement and comments that this is stipulated very clearly to the responsible
4 parties. Reijnen adds that this point has also been discussed with Samuël Kruizinga and that he,
5 too, agreed this would've been better for the proceedings. Reijnen explains that Kruizinga is
6 relatively new to this position and therefore certain procedures which more experienced core
7 staff members perhaps take for granted might not have been made abundantly clear to him.
8 Furthermore, Batelaan underlines that the OCs play an formal role in this process and urges the
9 board to remind them of this important part they play. Reijnen agrees with Batelaan's remark
10 and comments that the FSR including this statement in their advice would help communicate this
11 point clearly to all involved parties.

7. Humanities in Context

12 Reijnen introduces the subject by explaining that the letter the board sent out to the council was
13 meant as a first response to their advice. He observed that the council had quite an extensive list
14 of comments and that the first response is meant to highlight how the process will unfold as a
15 consequence of this advice. Reijnen understands that the council feels they can't give a solid
16 positive advice without knowledge of the details they've requested; he acknowledges their points
17 of critique and will use an extra year of preparation whilst including the FSR in the process. The
18 task of continuing development will be handed over to a new team – Jan Don will step aside -,
19 which includes the teachers that will be giving the courses. Furthermore, the teams will have to
20 work on the specializations and the construction of the programme, e.g. the propedeuse-major
21 structure, as well as clarifying the particular audience the programme will be developed for.
22 Therefore, Reijnen would like to use this meeting as an opportunity to set up the parameters so
23 the team can be instructed and continue development and their work. He stresses that it is
24 necessary for the *Cultuurwetenschappen* staff to be briefed on the bilingual or monolingual
25 structure of their programme for them to continue their work. Verhave interjects and expresses
26 her confusion; she wonders if the board is asking the council for their stance on the language
27 change after they recently received the council's negative advice. Reijnen counters that they're
28 asking something different, namely: they are asking the council to provide rough guidelines
29 regarding the programme's structure, e.g. the possibilities for a propedeuse-
30 major/monolingual/bilingual structure. Currently, they're not asking the council to provide them
31 with a detailed language change advice. Though, he comments that the FSR can advise on the
32 programme again in a later phase but more broadly. Verhave retorts that for the council the
33 situation regarding HiC hasn't changed, nor has any more information become available.
34 Therefore, she feels wary of discussing, for instance, bilingual structures considering they've
35 recently brought out a negative advice on this topic. Without new information, Reijnen's request
36 feels like a conflict to Verhave. She reiterates that it feels impossible for the council to look at the
37 continuing process as a blank slate when considering the years they've already spent working on
38 this subject. Reijnen responds that they need to take the teams into account in this situation and
39 that they are looking to them for guidelines so they can get to work on very concrete matters; in
40 order to continue their work they require knowledge of what kind of students they'll be providing
41 for: students that are trained in the propaedeutic year/international students/Dutch
42 students/etc. Verhave counters that the council takes issue with the fact that they've never
43 received a consent request for the BA Global Cultural Studies, only a request concerning the
44 language change which falls under the HiC-umbrella. She continues that the teams can continue
45 working on the BA Global Cultural Studies once the council receives a language consent request
46 solely for the BA Global Cultural Studies. Reijnen explains that Global Cultural Studies won't be a
47 bachelor but a major. Verhave again stresses that dissenting to a language change only to approve
48 of a structure that encourages the language change during this meeting feels unjustifiable to her.
49 Reijnen answers that he interpreted the dissent letter to state that the council has very valid
50 concerns about the language change but that they wouldn't be opposed to the general idea of a
51 language change. If this interpretation is wrong, then perhaps they should be having a very
52 different conversation. Reijnen asks the council if they disagree with a bilingual bachelor or if the
53 FSR disagrees with the way they are planning to set up the bilingual bachelor. Verhave replies
54 that they currently feel like a completely Dutch programme isn't provided or considered as an
55 option. Reijnen retorts that this isn't a matter of their personal opinion but that it simply won't

1 be realistically possible. Verhave answers that perhaps they misunderstood or underestimated
2 the board's intention with their primary response letter, regardless of how hard this is for the
3 council, they feel what Reijnen is asking them now is too big of a decision to make just so the
4 teams have something to work with. Currently, the council feels they are unable to provide
5 guidelines until all HiC letters are answered. Van De Graaf interjects that this council statement
6 creates a double bind: the council doesn't have enough information to provide guidelines and the
7 board is unable to give more information without the teams having guidelines to work out the
8 details. Verhave counters that a lack of information isn't their only issue, they also have
9 fundamental issues when it comes to HiC. Van Wesemael then asks whether the council would
10 agree to the team continuing their general work on the subject, to which Verhave replies that
11 generally they're not opposed to the team continuing development unless they will continue
12 developing the currently suggested structures. Reijnen again stresses that the staff requires
13 concrete answers to continue their efforts, especially considering the setting is already very
14 complex due to its openness and flexibility. Weerman asks to what extent the council feels it is
15 problematic to give the staff the opportunity to continue working on drawing up a major- and/or
16 bilingual structure and if they should arrange a separate meeting to discuss these particular
17 structures where they determine with the council what the council will allow and won't allow the
18 team to work on regarding these same structures. Verhave also wants to discuss the content of
19 their advice letters. Weerman agrees to discuss the content of the letters and proposes to focus
20 especially on the elements of a major- and bilingual structure. The council and the board will have
21 an on-site meeting where they discuss the FSR's HiC letters, especially regarding the major- and
22 bilingual structure, in order to determine parameters for the team to continue working on the
23 development of HiC [ACTION POINT].

8. State of Affairs

A) Corona

24 Weerman notes that the council is probably aware of the impending flexibilization of
25 the Corona measures. Weerman is hopeful for September to bring them a fresh
26 university programme which will consider the position of international students;
27 currently, Van Wesemael adds, they're working on a scenario where they'll have on-
28 campus lectures with exceptions being made for international students who are
29 hindered by COVID travel restrictions. Batelaan asks if they're planning to optimize the
30 building capacity to make sure they'll use the 20% of space that is available to them.
31 Reijnen notes that, of course, now they have more knowledge and facilities to deal with
32 these circumstances than in the past years – he feels confident that they'll be able to
33 more in the upcoming academic year. For now, the board is assuming an on-campus
34 academic year starting September.
35
36

B) CoH & GSH

37 The council refers to agenda point 3.1 regarding the *colloquium doctum* and enquires
38 what the new regulations entail and what they discussed at this point. Reijnen explains
39 that the *colloquium doctum* is arranged at the central level but exceptions regarding the
40 colloquium are arranged at the faculty level. Reijnen continues that some of these
41 regulations were very outdated, he continues explaining that the UvA's very restrictive
42 concerning the arrangements for the *colloquium doctum* but that it is their
43 understanding that the *colloquium* could possibly serve as a great tool to open the
44 university up to those who might have taken up different career paths but still have the
45 competence to study at the academic level. They would like a structure that will allow
46 them to continue a discussion on this subject (also involving professional learning and
47 continued education after graduation) in the following year.
48

49 The council asks about agenda point 3.2 regarding the programme changes. Van
50 Wesemael explains that this concerned a technical issue regarding on-campus
51 organisation.
52

53 Finally, the council enquires after agenda point 4.2 regarding the use of extra funds, the
54 board explains that the program directors are currently handling how to disperse the
55 quality funds and thus the best practices weren't discussed.

9. Final questions and closing

1 Weerman and Van Dorp express their appreciation for the attendees and thank everyone for their
2 efforts in the past year. The meeting is closed at 16:52.

3

Pro memori

- 1
2 200511-01 The dean makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so that the
3 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 210617-01 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will update the council in October regarding any
8 developments as a consequence of the advice by the working group *Studeren*
9 *met een functiebeperking*.

Action list

- 12 ~~200511-02~~ The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* discusses the topic of vegetarian options,
13 cleaning and milk with Cirfood and Facility Services. Furthermore, they'll look
14 into a promotion plan regarding sustainability and waste.
15 ~~200917-13~~ The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* or the DB will report in the next month on the
16 developments regarding a sustainability policy at the UvA.
17 ~~200917-14~~ The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will report on the white paper to the council in
18 the course of the next month
19 ~~201208-03~~ Regarding the subjects for the *Bestuurlijke Agenda*:
20
21 ~~b)~~ (edited 210316) A separate meeting will be scheduled to have an
22 open conversation between the board and the council on the
23 Honors Program.
24
25 ~~210316-01~~ The board will send over the *Jaarverslagen examencommissie CoH en GSH*
26 (mentioned at point 4.5 in the concept agenda CoH & GSH (210211)), after
27 they've checked it for possible sensitive information (taking into consideration
28 the AVG).
29 210430-01 Regarding the Faculty Strategic Plan:
30 d) The board will work to clarify that in their motivation for
31 partnerships content trumps finance.
32 e) The board will work to clarify and reflect their goals to include a
33 larger variety of students, both in terms of geographical as well as
34 socioeconomic background.
35 f) The board will make a point in the FSP to stress that, first and
36 foremost, the UvA is an on-campus university and digitalization
37 should only be used to support the on-campus experience – not
38 replace it.
39
40 ~~210430-02~~ The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will regularly update the council on any
41 developments as a consequence of the advice by the working group *Studeren*
42 *met een functiebeperking*.
43 210617-01 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will meet with the FSR FGW 2021-2022 at the
44 start of the academic year to discuss any developments regarding the following
45 topics:
46 a) UvA catering: vegetarian options, milk, cleaning;
47 b) Sustainability policy at the faculty/UvA, a promotion plan
48 regarding sustainability and waste, the White Paper.
49 210617-02 Regarding the Diversity and Inclusivity-survey, Reijnen will have the team
50 overseeing this process schedule a meeting with the FSR FGW 2021-2022 after
51 the summer.
52 210617-03 Regarding Humanities in Context:
53 The council and the board will have an on-site meeting where they discuss the
54 FSR's HiC letters, especially regarding the major- and bilingual structure, in

1
2

order to determine parameters for the team to continue working on the development of HiC.