



Notulen Overlegvergadering FSR-FGw 2020-2021 23 september 2021

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Present | Julia Ballak, Juliet Hondtong, Sara Kemper, Ciprian Piraianu, Tea Svendsen, Anne van de Graaf, Carlos van Eck, Sabine van Wesemael, Sara Verveer, Froukje Vroom, Fred Weerman, Marian Wilts |
| Absent | June Ouwehand, Farah Malash, Jelle Mars, Carlos Reijnen, Irene Zwiep, Mikayla Vieira Ribeiro |
| Guest | Zazie van Dorp (Technical Chair) |
| Secretary | Angelina Senchi |

Agenda

- 1) Opening and Confirming the Agenda**
- 2) Draft Minutes OV FSR June 17th, 2021**
- 3) Announcements**
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) Restart Higher Education**
- 5) Alcohol Policy (attachment)**
- 6) State of Affairs**
 - a) CoH and GSH (attachment: recent agenda's CoH & GSH)
- 7) Final Questions and Closing**

1. Opening and confirming the agenda

1 Van Dorp opens the meeting at 14:06 and introduces the goal of the meeting as well as the
2 communication protocol she'd like the attendees to adhere to: raising one's hand for the floor to
3 be yielded to you and a hand signal for requesting a direct response to statements being made
4 during the meeting.

5 The council and board have no comments regarding the agenda; consequently, Van Dorp sets the
6 agenda:

Agenda

- 1) Opening and Confirming the Agenda
- 2) Draft Minutes OV FSR June 17th, 2021
- 3) Announcements
 - a) Daily Board of the Faculty
 - b) FSR
- 4) Restart Higher Education
- 5) Alcohol Policy (attachment)
- 6) State of Affairs
 - a) CoH and GSH (attachment: recent agenda's CoH & GSH)
- 7) Final Questions and Closing

2. Draft minutes OV FSR June 17th, 2021

7 Van Dorp takes the meeting's attendees over the previous OV's minutes page by page. Senchi
8 comments that she's added Vieira Ribeiro to the list of attendees on the first page of the
9 document. Subsequently, the board and council go over the list of pro memorie and actions.

Pro memorie

10
11
12
13 200511-01 The dean makes a short summary of the important points on Corona so that the
14 FSR can advise on this.

15
16 ***Weerman and Kemper feel it would be best to keep this point as long as***
17 ***COVID-19 still affects university life.***

18
19 201208-01 (edited 210430) Reijnen will send over a list with the members of the
20 *Commissie Evaluatie Honoursprogramma FGw* and the structure of the
21 evaluation proceedings.

22
23 ***One of the attendees note that on the central level there is also on ongoing***
24 ***conversation regarding honours. Kemper notes that, as CSR delegate, will***
25 ***keep track of the developments.***

Action list

26 210430-01 Regarding the Faculty Strategic Plan:
27 a) The board will work to clarify that in their motivation for
28 partnerships content trumps finance.
29 b) The board will work to clarify and reflect their goals to include a
30 larger variety of students, both in terms of geographical as well as
31 socioeconomic background.
32 c) The board will make a point in the FSP to stress that, first and
33 foremost, the UvA is an on-campus university and digitalization
34 should only be used to support the on-campus experience – not
35 replace it.
36
37

1 **Weerman notes that the board has decided on the FSP and included the**
2 **comments. Kemper thanks them for incorporating the council's suggestions**
3 **and asks for the action point to be scrapped.**

4
5 210617-01 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will meet with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 at the
6 start of the academic year to discuss any developments regarding the following
7 topics:

- 8 a) UvA catering: vegetarian options, milk, cleaning;
9 b) Sustainability policy at the faculty/UvA, a promotion plan
10 regarding sustainability and waste, the White Paper.

11
12 ***The board has sent out date options for a meeting and the***
13 ***council replied with their preferred date. Though, both the***
14 ***board and council acknowledge that there must be a mistake***
15 ***in the date option. Senchi will reach out to the secretariat to***
16 ***schedule a better moment. The board and council agree that***
17 ***the goal of the meeting should be to have an open discussion***
18 ***on the matter.***

19
20 210617-02 Regarding the Diversity and Inclusivity-survey, Reijnen will have the team
21 overseeing this process schedule a meeting with the FSR FGw 2021-2022 after
22 the summer.

23
24 ***Kemper asks Senchi to schedule this meeting and add it as an action point.***

25
26 210617-03 Regarding Humanities in Context:
27 The council and the board will have an on-site meeting where they discuss the
28 FSR's HiC letters, especially regarding the major- and bilingual structure, in
29 order to determine parameters.

30
31 ***The board informs the council that they will send out a letter based on the***
32 ***follow-up meeting the FSR and fDB had over the summer in approximately***
33 ***two weeks, which details what they believe was the outcome of the meeting.***
34 ***The council asks for this action point to be scrapped.***

35
36 The OV minutes of the 17th of June 2021 are confirmed.

3. Announcements

A) Daily Board of the Faculty

37
38 The board announces Reijnen's and Zwiep's absence during the meeting. Furthermore,
39 Weerman notes that for future meetings they are looking into getting a more suitable
40 room.

B) FSR

41
42
43 The council announces Vieira Ribeiro, Malash, Mars and Ouwehand will be absent,
44 whilst Piraianu will join the meeting halfway and Verveer will leave the meeting shortly
45 before the break.

4. Restart Higher Education

46 Weerman introduces the topic. He explains that the campus has been reopened as a consequence
47 of the new COVID-19 policies, though still adhering to certain restrictions like facemasks and
48 social distancing. Though, the recent press conference informed the public that the remaining
49 restrictions for higher education might be lifted. Currently, the university is awaiting a
50 government document which details what measures should be taken regarding the pandemic and
51 the reopening of higher education. Nevertheless, the faculty plans to continue their strategy for
52 this block in order to prevent confusion. Weerman notes that changes might occur for the

1 upcoming blocks and term. The faculty will also continue their strategy from the start of the term
2 regarding students who aren't able to join on-site for medical reasons. Moreover, there are issues
3 concerning ventilation and the booking of rooms. People are working together with Facility
4 Services to resolve these issues as soon as possible. Van De Graaf adds, regarding the issue of
5 overbooking, they've instructed teachers to help resolve the issue, for instance: using attendance
6 lists. The ventilation system at OMHP and PCH is faulty and they're currently on a waiting list for
7 repairs, which causes a delay in resolving the issue. This means that rooms that aren't properly
8 ventilated are out of use. Subsequently, Facility Services will closely monitor the air quality in the
9 rooms. Though, other faculties are dealing with similar issues.

10 Kemper notes that they are happy to see students back on campus. She wonders what the faculty
11 staying their strategy means for the 75 people capacity, Weerman replies that they will adapt it
12 where possible and refers to the study Media and Culture. He adds that when it is possible to book
13 a room for more than 75 people they can and otherwise they will continue lectures as they've
14 been given now (e.g. hybrid), noting as well that they have to consider the logistics. Van Wesemael
15 also comments that this [ed. the strategy regarding the capacity] will be changed for the second
16 block.

17 Regarding examination policy the council asks whether the faculty is allowed to have rooms
18 exceeding the student limit, Van Wesemael nods in agreement. Nevertheless, most Program
19 Directors have decided upon online examinations.

20 Kemper notes that the council has received a number of signals from students about the
21 *casuscommissie* being too slow, which leads to feelings of insecurity among students regarding
22 their credits. Van Wesemael responds that she is astonished by this message, especially
23 considering only twenty people have applied for it [ed. exemption]. Van Wesemael comments
24 that she'll be meeting with the *vraagbaak* and will enquire about the issue. Additionally,
25 Weerman wonders whether these signals were received before the start of the term or after,
26 commenting that the number of applications were quite low, and it seemed they were handled
27 well. Van Wesemael asks the council to send over concrete information and questions regarding
28 these signals so she can discuss them with the *vraagbaak* [ACTION POINT]. The council also
29 wonders who is responsible for informing the teacher of the exemptions and the need to set up a
30 hybrid class. Noting instances where implementations seem lacking and students have to ask
31 their teachers for hybrid education or teachers unwilling to offer hybrid education. The board
32 comments that if any of these issues arise the Program Director(s) should be informed and
33 provide help. Weerman also urges the council to share concrete information regarding, so they
34 can raise the issue with the committee and they can learn from their mistakes.

35 Regarding hybrid education, Svendsen asks who is responsible in the case of technical
36 malfunctions resulting in students missing the information shared during a lecture. Weerman
37 comments that the teacher should give instructions regarding the shared information. Students
38 and teachers can work together to look for ways to resolve the problem, i.e. ad hoc solution.
39 Svendsen asks whether the board could provide teachers with instructions on how to resolve
40 technical issues. Weerman believes they could share instructions via the Program Directors in
41 order to tackle the problem. Van De Graaf adds that people also need to get used to things getting
42 back to normal again, which also means getting used to finding 'old' solutions. Though, in the case
43 of exemptions and technical issue they can perhaps use pandemic-related education methods.
44 Kemper notes that some students are obligated to follow their lectures online due to the 75
45 people rule and offers for Van Wesemael and Reijnen to explicitly instruct the Program Directors
46 to make sure teachers check their recording [ACTION POINT].

5. Alcohol Policy

47 Weerman gives an introduction to the topic. He explains that the board currently sent over the
48 policy document in order to share personal impressions, what the council believes is important
49 or what the council wants the board to consider – not yet to gain a council statement. He informs
50 the council that the board is currently also consulting other parties on the subject and, after, the
51 board will draft the final policy. He explains that which is perceived as normal, like having alcohol
52 in certain settings, might not be so much and shares how alcohol could impact health, social safety
53 and inclusion and how they've already received signals that such settings can feel exclusionary.
54 The idea of the policy is to share that alcohol should be absent in education settings and/or during
55 the promotion of education.



1 The council shares that they, indeed, don't have an official stance on the alcohol policy. Though,
2 they wonder whether the covenant for study associations (mentioned on page 5) has been
3 finalized yet. Van De Graaf nods yes and the board clarifies that they do make a distinction
4 between events related to study associations and events related to education. The agreement is
5 still a draft and hasn't been signed. Furthermore, the legal team is still perusing the draft
6 agreement to check whether it clashes with the policy. The board also stresses that they won't be
7 using the document to forbid the university community but to nudge them. Van De Graaf notes
8 that she hasn't laid eyes upon the covenant either. The board also adds that the council won't
9 have to sign the covenant.

10 Moving on, the council enquires how the board plans to involve the study associations, student
11 organisations and the central council regarding the alcohol policy. Weerman mentions that they'd
12 like to gather input, for instance, by having discussions with them on the topic – similar to the
13 one they are currently having with the FSR FGW. The council wonders whether these discussions
14 will also happen once the policy is finished and the board is ready to start implanting it. Weerman
15 responds that, once they've come to the point of concrete measures and implementation, they
16 will propose it for a discussion with the students and teachers again. The council refers to the
17 covenant and wonder if the board will be using it to involve these other parties. The board
18 explains that study associations are 'their own boss'; the faculty is not in charge of what the
19 associations do, they're in charge of university education. Van De Graaf notes that, sometimes,
20 the faculty collaborates with the study associations, but the board clarifies that the faculty
21 perceives them as a separate entity when it comes to whatever the associations plan in their own
22 time. Furthermore, Wilts clarifies that the policy document is a dual one, consisting of: one part
23 concerning education related events within Humanities Faculty and – perhaps – other faculty
24 related events; and another part, provided for context, regarding the decision by the Executive
25 Board. The faculty will provide their own interpretation of the policy within the framework of the
26 Executive Board's general decision.

27 Van De Graaf is curious to know how students perceive an alcohol policy and asks the council to
28 shed some light on this. The council hasn't decided yet on a general stance. Though, Kemper adds
29 that opinions do seem to vary on the matter. Moreover, the council wonders whether the board
30 plans to encourage the FSR, similar to how the Executive Board plans to encourage the CSR, to
31 set up initiatives to raise awareness. It is suggested that they could decide on not serving any
32 alcohol at education and/or faculty events. The board stresses that they would like to learn from
33 the FSR's input and suggestions, but the council, on the other hand, is interested to learn what the
34 board has planned. The board notes that, given the health implications of alcohol and scattered
35 opinions concerning the subject, they mostly plan on discussing the topic first to gauge how the
36 faculty community feels. Vroom asks whether it is their experience for students to have an issue
37 with alcohol being served. Hondtong, in her personal experience, hasn't encountered situations
38 where students have felt uncomfortable or pressured when alcohol was being served. Mostly,
39 people seemed very open to also talk about different approaches to alcohol consumption (or lack
40 thereof). She's, however, interested to know what problems are being experienced due to the
41 current situation regarding alcohol at the faculty. The board informs the council that Reijnen has
42 worked on the document in terms of diversity and notes that they've received signals of negative
43 experiences regarding alcohol at faculty events. Vroom suggests asking students how they feel
44 about the issue and using the received information to improve the situation: take inventory of
45 students' opinions and experiences in order to learn and improve.

46 Van Eck wonders what caused the board to draw the line at 17:00 o'clock for alcohol
47 consumption. Weerman replies that it is based on office hours and regulations at other
48 universities. Subsequently, Van Eck explains that the university is a controlled environment and
49 refers to the soft landing and students finding their way at the campus socially; he wonders how
50 the board would justify students possibly forgoing the faculty events and replacing them for off-
51 campus ones. Weerman refers to a recently published Folia article where a similar argument was
52 raised; Weerman counters that the university should be setting an example. He elaborates that
53 currently we perceive the ready availability of alcohol as the norm in our community and that
54 they must consider whether they should challenge this norm and become frontrunners regarding
55 this theme, without turning this supposed change into a dogma. Van De Graaf draws a comparison
56 between alcohol consumption and the act of smoking, which for a very long time was perceived
57 as normal - even fashionable - and currently, by way of implementation in small incremental

1 steps, is being banned. Nowadays, the public feels more susceptible to this and feels it's the
2 sensible and responsible action, whereas before there was more aversion.
3 The council observed that 'awareness' seems to be one of the keywords in the document and they
4 wonder how the board plans to go about raising this awareness. Weerman replies that, for
5 instance, they'd have discussions and set up campaigns. Van De Graaf adds that a communication
6 plan is already in development. Weerman, like Van De Graaf, also draws a comparison to smoking
7 and notes that they should possibly take the lead regarding this theme. However, Vroom
8 interjects that this comparison shouldn't be made so easily and stresses that smoking is
9 considerably more harmful than alcohol. Van De Graaf adds that the harm is indeed in the
10 problematic use and overconsumption of the substance. Therefore, Vroom suggests they should
11 perhaps make a clear distinction between the consumption and overconsumption of alcohol.
12 Another suggestion mentioned is to send out a survey or share an email address in the newsletter,
13 asking students for their opinion on alcohol (over)consumption or entailing more general
14 questions. Weerman agrees that this would be a good idea. Van De Graaf and Weerman suggest
15 setting up a meeting with Maria Hagen, the head of communications, to discuss what kind of tools
16 they could be using to gauge student opinion [ACTION POINT]. Considering Reijnen has already
17 collected information regarding the issue of alcohol consumption at the faculty, they suggest he
18 sends this information so the council can use it in preparation for their meeting Maria Hagen
19 [ACTION POINT].
20

6. State of Affairs

21 A) CoH & GSH

22 Van Wesemael notes, referring to the agenda, that the meeting took two hours but they
23 only came around to discussing two subjects: working method UDs and education
24 during Corona. Kemper refers to the June agenda (3.3. *Tijdpad wijzigingen*
25 *opleidingsaanbod*) and asks what they discussed. Van Wesemael notes that this doesn't
26 entail any changes to the programmes themselves and that she's willing to send over
27 the timepath.

7. Final questions and closing

28 Ballak wonders if it would be possible to have another meeting on the alcohol policy, Weerman
29 notes he is fine with having another and adds that there is still plenty of time for more discussion
30 on the subject [ACTION POINT]. Van Dorp closes the meeting at 15:32.

31

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

- 10 ~~210430-01~~ ~~Regarding the Faculty Strategic Plan:~~
11 ~~a) The board will work to clarify that in their motivation for~~
12 ~~partnerships content trumps finance.~~
13 ~~b) The board will work to clarify and reflect their goals to include a~~
14 ~~larger variety of students, both in terms of geographical as well as~~
15 ~~socioeconomic background.~~
16 ~~c) The board will make a point in the FSP to stress that, first and~~
17 ~~foremost, the UvA is an on-campus university and digitalization~~
18 ~~should only be used to support the on-campus experience — not~~
19 ~~replace it.~~
20 210617-01 The *Directeur Bedrijfsvoering* will meet with the FSR FGW 2021-2022 at the
21 start of the academic year to discuss any developments regarding the following
22 topics:
23 a) UvA catering: vegetarian options, milk, cleaning;
24 b) Sustainability policy at the faculty/UvA, a promotion plan
25 regarding sustainability and waste, the White Paper.
26 210617-02 Regarding the Diversity and Inclusivity-survey, Reijnen will have the team
27 overseeing this process schedule a meeting with the FSR FGW 2021-2022 after
28 the summer.
29 (edited 210923) Senchi will reach out to Reijnen to ensure this meeting is
30 scheduled.
31 ~~210617-03~~ ~~Regarding Humanities in Context:~~
32 ~~The council and the board will have an on-site meeting where they discuss the~~
33 ~~FSR's HiC letters, especially regarding the major and bilingual structure, in~~
34 ~~order to determine parameters for the team to continue working on the~~
35 ~~development of HiC.~~
36 210923-01 Regarding the *Casuscommissie*:
37 a) Kemper will send over concrete information and questions
38 regarding signals of tardiness and insecurity over ECs caused by
39 the *casuscommissie*. Van Wesemael will use this information to
40 discuss it with the *vraagbaak*.
41 210923-02 Reijnen and Van Wesemael will instruct the Program Directors to make sure
42 teachers check whether the lectures are being recorded properly.
43 210923-03 Regarding the Alcohol Policy:
44 a) The council will contact Maria Hagen to set up a meeting to
45 discuss what tools they could use (e.g. surveys, newsletters, pop-
46 ups) to gauge student opinion on the (over)consumption of
47 alcohol.
48 b) The council will ask Reijnen to share his findings regarding issues
49 with alcohol consumption at faculty events with them, in
50 preparation for their meeting with Hagen.
51 c) The council and board will schedule an additional discussion
52 regarding the Alcohol Policy.