Conceptnotulen Plenaire Vergadering 23 oktober 2023

Aanwezig  Angelina Senchi, Noah Benjamins, Ivar Kracht, Hidde Heijnis, Rembrandt Tip, Carlos van Eck, Giovanni Prins, Sean Berg, Thomas van Beersum.
Afwezig  Teun van Kasteel, Sarah Boll, Huy Le
Gast  -
Notulist  Liesje Verhave

Agenda

1. Opening
2. Mail and action list (15 min)
3. Confirmation minutes (5 mins)
4. Confirmation agenda (3 min)
5. Announcements (1 min)
6. Updates (10 min)
   Chair, vice-Chair, DB-members, and CSR-delegate share updates.
7. Introduction council assistants (5 min) (verbal update)
   The FSR introduces the new council assistants.
8. Deciding CoBo planning and year plan (20 min) (attachment: 1)
   The FSR discusses the plan for the CoBo and the year plan that will be presented.
9. Orientating: OV-preparation: speaker division (15 min) (attachment: 1)
   The FSR the preparation for the OV and speakers for the OV.
10. Deciding: Israel and Palestine conflict (20 min) (attachment: 4)
    The FSR discusses the potential response from the FSR on the UvA communication.
11. PR van de Week (5 min)(mondeling)
    The FSR discusses what they will share on the social media this week.
12. Final points and closing
1. Opening

The PV opens at 11:05

2. Mail and action points (15 min)

The council discusses the email list. We have received invitations for different CoBos. The council will discuss internally who will attend. From the CSR we received an email that we can request an additional budget to plan an evaluation weekend. Heijnis, Senchi, and Verhave discussed this and decided to use this weekend as a training weekend for the new council assistants. They discuss it further and plan it [ACTIONPOINT]. Onkostenvergoeding has been arranged for Prins, but for the new council assistants, it still needs to be arranged [ACTIONPOINT]. The council has also received an advice request regarding part-time studies at the CoH. This will be discussed later. The next email is regarding the CSR funding for any student union sign-up costs for students in the FSR. Next week the FSR will have the OV with the faculty board. The OV-prep will happen during the PV on Monday. There has also been more information received regarding WIB. The law of internationalization in balance. This subject will be a larger and an important discussion in the future. We received a document about thesis evaluations, and we need to decide if we want to ask questions about it during the OV. Prins will read the document [ACTIONPOINT].

The council discusses the action list. Van Kasteel will work on the wandkranten soon. The year plan will be discussed this PV. Tip updates that he was not able to schedule a meeting with Casual UvA, so he will have to collect information regarding the issues of the collective labour agreement in a different way. Tip will let the council know when he finds information he will want to discuss. Verhave will send the availability schedule of the council members on Tuesday [ACTIONPOINT]. The council members will write a personal introduction and send it to Heijnis before Thursday [ACTIONPOINT]. The FSR will discuss suggestions for FSR-budget on the PV of the 8th of November. If there are not a lot of suggestions Senchi would like to use the money for the Yoni collaboration to fund free menstruation products on campus. Prins and Heijnis will discuss internationalization within the faculty but decided to bring this up at the OC meeting. Prins will attend the meeting for the OC’s. A plan for the CoBo will be discussed today.

The technical meeting about the faculty budget is planned today. Heijnis and Senchi will attend.

Senchi will set up a general meeting for the OER with the council [ACTIONPOINT].

3. Confirmation minutes (5 min)

Tip makes a comment that him wanting to join the Decolonial Dialogues @humanities editorial team was not present in the minutes. Verhave adapts the minutes. The FSR confirms the minutes of the 16th of October.

4. Confirmation agenda (3 min)
5. **Announcements**

Senchi tells the council that she is feeling a bit unwell, so she apologizes in advance. Secondly, she wants to wrap up the meeting quickly so the council members can go back to their exams. There are no other announcements. Verhave explains to the new council assistants what the announcement part of the meeting is used for.

6. **Updates (10 min)**

*Chair, vice-Chair, DB-members, and CSR-delegate share updates.*

Senchi had a meeting with Yoni who are very interested in working together with us. Furthermore, she ran into the Diversity Officer, who was also very interested in organizing this at the faculty. The fDB does not want to invest in this project, but the Diversity officer does. The Diversity office wants to invest their budget in the project and make policy on this subject. So Senchi will work together with them on this subject. Yoni will send us a sample package so we can see if students are interested. Senchi also asked the Allard Pierson Museum if they are willing to give students a discount on their current exhibition during the lecture-free week. The VO meeting was scheduled for the previous Friday, OV preparation will be discussed in this meeting.

Heijnis updates that all the council assistants have been selected, and Van Beersum and Berg are also present today.

Benjamins updates that the FSR received emails about two budget supplements from the CSR; one about the evaluation weekend and the other about the student union sign-ups. Furthermore, the CSR voted to support the two petitions for Palestine that have been going around.

Tip was present at multiple protests last week and has been working on a response from the FSR to the Israel-Palestine conflict. This response will be discussed again during this PV.

7. **Introduction council assistants (5 min) (verbal update)**

*The FSR introduces the new council assistants.*

The council introduces themselves to the new council assistants. Van Beersum and Berg introduce themselves to the council.

[ACTIONPOINT] Senchi sets up a meeting with the new council assistants for general training.

[ACTIONPOINT] Senchi will send the new council assistants the *inwerkmap*.

The council takes a break at 11:52.

8. **Deciding: CoBo planning and year plan (20 min) (attachment: 1)**

*The FSR discusses the plan for the CoBo and the year plan that will be presented.*

The council resumes the meeting at 12:05
Senchi asks Van Eck for an update regarding the CoBo. Van Eck notes that there has not been any progress regarding the planning of the CoBo. The draft for the RSVP email has been made. Van Eck also wants to invite all the students from FGw through our social media [ACTIONPOINT]. Van Eck says the council will also need to decide on the plan of action during the borrel and if we want more “traditional” elements of a CoBo, the alcohol policy needs to be decided on. Senchi suggests writing two or three options on how the evening can go and presenting that to the council for discussion on November 8th [ACTIONPOINT]. The location should be decided before the 30th of October. Benjamins will work together with Van Eck on the plan for the evening.Senchi and Heijnis will work together on the Instagram invitation post [ACTIONPOINT]. There can be two posts, a Save The Date post and the actual detailed invite.

Van Eck wonders if Café Diep is a proper location if we want to present the year plan. Senchi responds that she thinks it is not necessary to do a formal presentation regarding the year plan but that we can have a small introduction. She suggests sending the year plan as a document before the start of the CoBo. So that during the CoBo guests can ask questions or discuss it together with the council members. Combining the year plan and the CoBo is also good because then there is a deadline for the year plan. Verhave will send out the CoBo RSVP on Tuesday. Furthermore, she suggests printing out the year plan and bringing some physical copies to the CoBo for guests to read. Van Eck asks if we want to use the information screens in the FGw buildings to share the invitation of the CoBo. Senchi responds that if we want to share the invite on the screens, we will need to contact Bart Gijswijt in advance and make a visual invitation that fits on the screens [ACTIONPOINT]. Van Eck will contact Bart Gijswijt before the 8th of November; and Heijnis will help with the visual.

Tip introduces the year plan to the council. He explains that the council wanted to formulate a communication strategy and that led him to conclude we need a more holistic approach and idea of how we want to relate ourselves to the student body and what achievable goals we could set. Tip has written up an analysis of the student body at our faculty, including social and economic conditions. Tip also wrote about the participatory organs that exist. Including failings and the power dynamics of the organizations. Kracht has expanded on this thematically. Tip explains that this document can be used as a reference in organizing future activities. Senchi asks Kracht and Tip what the council can give input on and what still needs to happen for this document to be finished. Kracht responds that there are two parts to this document. Tip wrote up the analytical frame. The goal from this frame is to a certain extent restructure the university, this implies the council needs to engage with elements from outside of the university. Kracht goes over the different points mentioned in the document. For the point of mental well-being, there is room for discussion on how we understand it. Kracht sees what we call mental well-being is always mediated to some extent in how far people can conform to a social hegemony. Senchi suggests scheduling the final form of the document for discussion on the 8th of November. Senchi asks Kracht which points he and Tip need input on from the council. Tip asks the council if they agree with the thematic approach they took in writing the year plan, instead of putting deadlines on potential FSR plans. Senchi responds that she really likes this approach because this focuses on the year as a whole. Tip elaborates that it has an element of practicality as well because as the FSR we must be reactive to a certain degree, sometimes we do not get to make the discourse or decide the important discussion topics. Senchi adds that we can also not predict when certain topics will be important. For example, when it’s Black History Month or Pride Month, we know it can be a good time to focus on diversity- but other subjects cannot be taken into consideration similarly. Kracht asks the council to give more input on the subject of unions in the year plan, besides inventorying what unions there are and how to contact them. Kracht already came up with an idea of looking at small projects that the FSR can organize where we can collaborate with the unions. Kracht also asks for more input on the
points regarding decolonization. It is a slippery concept, also taking into account the current situation in Palestine and Israel. Kracht would like the council to think about the definition of the concept and how we can implement it. Hybrid education is another point the FSR could do something material for. Kracht, Tip, Heijnis, and Senchi will set up a separate meeting to look at the year plan more in-depth [ACTIONPOINT].

9. **Orientating: OV-preparation: speaker division** (15 min) (attachment: 1)

   *The FSR the preparation for the OV and speakers for the OV.*

Senchi explains that the official preparation for the OV will be next week. Before this official preparation it is good to divide speaker roles so they can come prepared to the next PV. Our technical chair for the OV will be Zazie van Dorp. The minutes of the previous OV are already in the folder. Senchi will be the speaker on the minutes. The council will inform Senchi and Verhave of their presence at the OV by next week [ACTIONPOINT]. Heijnis will be a speaker on the budget advice request. Benjamin will be the second speaker for the agenda point on the budget. Senchi suggests this so he can input his knowledge of the central level budget. Senchi will set up an OV-prep document [ACTIONPOINT]. Furthermore, we need two speakers regarding the CoH part-time studies advice. Heijnis will be the second speaker. Kracht asks what point this is about. Heijnis responds that it is the advice about part time bachelor studies. Senchi adds that the faculty wants to scrap a lot of part time studies and they’re not sure if they will want to bring them back. Kracht offers to be the speaker, but he is not sure if he can be present during the OV. Senchi suggests for him to write the critique and communicate that to Van Kasteel [ACTIONPOINT]. On the agenda point of social safety Senchi will be the first speaker and Benjamin will be the second speaker. Benjamin asks Senchi if it’s still a good idea for him to be a second speaker on the budget agenda point as he does not have time to formulate questions. Heijnis responds that the deadline for the budget is later, but they already scheduled the discussion for the OV. So, we will discuss what we can discuss because the timeline is very tight. Senchi says that she will also be a shadow speaker during the budget agenda point and will help formulating questions as she will be present for the budget meeting later today. She thinks having Benjamin as a second speaker on the budget is a good idea because if the board starts referring to the central budget he will know how to respond. Van Eck offers to plan a separate meeting to discuss the budget of the last two years. As he things the budget will be quite similar. Senchi asks if he can then also prepare some input for the preparation during next week’s PV. The next agenda point is the *bestuurslijke agenda* which includes all the topics that we will be discussing this year. Senchi suggests Tip to take this subject as it is like a year plan of the board. During this we can suggest adding topics to the agenda or skipping topics. Then there are the updates on CoH, GSH and WIB. Senchi will be the speaker on these points. They do not have a stance on WIB yet because they do not know what will happen yet. Once they will put out communication about this the council can start giving their input.

10. **Deciding: Israel and Palestine conflict** (20 min) (attachment: 4)

   *The FSR discusses the potential response from the FSR on the UvA communication.*

Kracht andTip prepared three different statements. Kracht introduces the three different statements and the different levels of critique. As the standard time of the meeting has run out, Heijnis suggests extending the meeting. Heijnis takes over as the chair of the meeting and Senchi leaves the meeting. Tip and Kracht will refine the draft and there will be an email vote sent out. Tip explains that the current statements are all drafts, and they will still need to be finalized. The first statement is the most critical, where we ask for an explicit denunciation of the State of Israel as a colonial settler state, considering the
conflict that has been ongoing for the past 70 years. In this statement there is criticism of how the university
is presenting this conflict, making a reference to how they engaged in the Ukraine/Russia conflict. The
second statement is less critical. The statement is denouncing the violence on both sides. The third
statement is the most centrist according to Kracht. It basically copies the statement made by the CvB which
says we mourn the losses of life and wish for the violence not to continue. This statement does not take on
any political position. Heijnis asks the council if they want to make a statement in general. Tip finds it hard
to say because there is a conflict between acting as a political party and acting as the student council. He is
not against a statement in any case. Van Eck thinks that the statement is necessary now. Especially because
the fDB has now sent an email to all students regarding the conflict, the faculty has made a statement, so it
has become a faculty issue. Prins finds it difficult because he read the minutes of last week and saw that
there is a feeling of unsafety among students who study Hebrew and Arabic. Politically he is for a statement
but as a faculty-student council, he thinks student well-being and social safety should be our main priority.
Therefore, Prins says we should be careful with the statement if we want to have one. He suggests that
instead of making our own statement we can announce support for a certain statement or denounce a
certain statement. Van Beersum says if we take into account safety, this is actually an argument for having
a statement as the FSR. This is because Israel is committing genocide and the UvA is supportive of that
because it has ties with Israeli universities that have a big hand in the occupation and other institutions.
Van Beersum says the CvB has come out against the BDS movement and has said that the pro-Palestinian
chants are dangerous, anti-Semitic, and calling for violence. Furthermore, they have asked security to be on
the lookout for pro-Palestinian students. Van Beersum concluded that if we are in favour of student safety,
we should demand the faculty to speak out but ask them to cut their ties. Kracht agrees with the points made
by Van Beersum. He also responds to Prins that the second statement, explicitly calls for assuring student
safety. Kracht, Benjamins, Heijnis, and Berg are all in favour of making a statement. Prins responds to an
earlier point of Kracht and says that we could include in the statement that students should be respectful
to each other. Jewish or Israeli students also could have lost family members, which does not mean we are
pro-Israel or anti-Palestine, but to emphasize the respectfulness of the students among each other. Kracht
responds that he feels that Prins is aiming at the idea that Jewish students might feel unsafe because they
attach anti-Semitic potentiality to the critique of the State of Israel. He continues that we can be very explicit
in the statement that any critique of the State of Israel is not on par with any form of anti-Semitism. Tip
adds that the nature of the conflict is not religious perse, and it’s usually framed that way to employ
equivalency between the groups and their “irreconcilable differences”, and thus explain the violence. Even
though this is not the cause of this conflict. Prins responds to both Kracht and Tip that religion does play an
important part in this conflict, and it is hard to take away the religious connotations in the conflict. He
elaborates that he thinks it is important to emphasize that students have lost family members or friends,
on both sides of the conflict. Thus, the statement should emphasize respectfulness to individuals who have
lost friend or family.

Verhave asks if the discussion can be concluded with a decision as she needs to leave soon. Kracht suggests
the council to choose between the different statements and then they will make an edited version including
the comments of the council. Tip chooses version one and would like to work together with Kracht on
reworking the statement. Van Eck is in favour of the most critical statement. Prins is in favour of the first
statement, or in between the first and the second – taking into account his earlier comments. Kracht says
he is veering off into position two as he finds it difficult not to denounce the violence that happened on the
7th of October. Van Beersum is in favour of the first statement. He suggests adding the concrete demand of
the university cutting ties with Israeli universities and institutions that support the occupation. He is not in
favour of using frames like “the conflict” or “feelings of unsafety” as it is an occupation and as the university
has mainly acted on Pro-Palestine students. There also have not been any concrete antisemitic incidents happening at the university, but the pro-Palestine protest was already considered unsafe by the university. Benjamins is also in favour of the first statement. He would also like to add a part about the protest that took place last Friday, as the police were called, and the doors were closed. Berg is also more aligned with the critical approach and the statement being critical of the university as an institution. He adds that the university should be a safe space to have these conversations. Heijnis is in favour of a statement in between statements one and two. He wants to make a clear statement that anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism. He also says that making a very radical statement might create a situation of high tension at the faculty. As we have both Arabic studies and Hebrew studies at our faculty. Heijnis says we should condemn mostly Israel both also condemn Hamas even though he does think Israel is the main offender in this conflict. Van Beersum responds that once the university starts to have relations with Hamas, we can say something about it, but the university does have relations with a country that is actively committing genocide. Heijnis summarizes the arguments made by all council members. Kracht says that he will probably make two or three concept drafts again including these points so the council can vote on them. Heijnis thanks the council for staying longer.

11. PR of the Week (5 min)

The FSR discusses what they want to share on social media this week.

12. Final points and closing

The PV closes at 13:24.
### Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voor</th>
<th>Tegen</th>
<th>Onthouden</th>
<th>Blanco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activistenpartij</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De FSR FGw 2023-2024 besluit de brief van de CSR getiteld "Unsolicited advice - third party collaboration 230921" mede te ondertekenen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voor</th>
<th>Tegen</th>
<th>Onthouden</th>
<th>Blanco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activistenpartij</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De FSR FGw 2023-2024 besluit om de inhoud van agenda punt 8 "Relations between the student council and the fDB student" van de notulen 13 mei 2022 zwart te lakken en een voetnoot te plaatsen bij het agendapunt dat het zwartlakken heeft plaatsgevonden op verzoek van het fDB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voor</th>
<th>Tegen</th>
<th>Onthouden</th>
<th>Blanco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activistenpartij</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De FSR FGw 2023-2024 besluit om de brief "support for the unsolicited advice from the CSR regarding third party collaborations" te delen met de CSR.