Minutes of the *Plenaire vergadering* of the CSR on the 3rd of October, 2018

Jamie van den Berg (from 12:05), Casper Colenbrander, Ksenia Golub (from 11:06), Alex Gritsay, David Nelck (until 12:50), Omar Seleim (11:05-12:53), Ivanna Slipets (from 11:06), Malou Sprinkhuizen (from 11:12), Blink Ujjin (until 13:16), Roeland Voorbergen;

Absent
Sofie ten Brink, Michele Murgia, Sujet Hashemi Shams, Stijn Tesser;

Guest(s)
Moataz Rageb *Centrale Studentassessor* (from 11:02);
Tamara van den Berg *Ambtelijk secretaris*;

---

**Concept agenda**

1. **Opening**  
   *Roeland opens the meeting at 11.00h and welcomes everyone.*

2. **Mail**  
   *The council discusses the in- and outgoing mail.*

3. **Setting the concept minutes**  
   The concept minutes of PV180926 will be set next week.
4. Checking the action list

The action list gets updated.

5. Announcements

- Roeland gives a verbal update on the ISO meeting of September 11th where the ISO year plan and an overview of the funds of the Quality Agreements at the different Dutch universities was discussed. The UvA seemed to do relatively well, and was one of a few universities spending the funds largely on a decentral level.
- Alex, Blink and Omar met with a delegation from the Kings College student union and discussed medezeggenschap, the go-governing model, the legal framework, student council elections and student housing.

6. Updates DB & taskforces, delegates, central student assessor

The written updates are discussed briefly.

7. Setting the agenda

The agenda is set with changes. Added: Letter from the FSR's.
Student mail is moved down on the agenda.

8. P.C. Hooftuis occupation [confidential]

The council discusses the recent occupation of the P.C. Hooftuis occupation and the CSR’s statement which was included in the mail to students and employees.

Roeland writes a draft statement about the recent occupation of the P.C. Hooftuis and sends this for an editorial round from Monday, October 8th to decide about it during PV181010. (action)

9. Letter from the FSR's

Background - Alex says that a very critical letter about the CSR’s decision to subsidize a part of the travel costs to the International Youth Forum in Minsk is circulating amongst the FSR’s. Roeland explains how the letter originated in the FSR-FGw without being discussed in the PV of the FSR-FGw. Alex says these sort of disagreements should be discussed informally before sending out a formal letter; this would help to avoid misunderstanding and to possibly bridge differences. David says that the FSR’s are represented in the CSR via delegates and should not otherwise interfere with CSR matters.

Content of the letter - Blink disagrees with linking the CSR’s internal budget with the UvA’s educational budget and budget cuts at a national level. Blink disagrees that sending a delegation conflicts with the UvA’s internationalization policy and aims. Alex points out different discriminatory points of the letter (i.e. the portrayal of Belarus, the history of the USSR and the political statements made).

Follow up - Blink suggests organizing a Q&A to discuss the CSR’s decision and provide information, and to do so by formal letter. David suggests sending an e-mail to the FSR’s, informing them of the CSR’s decision and budget. Roeland suggests sending an e-mail which explains that it has come to the CSR’s attention that there is a disagreement and that the CSR can provide information and justify the decision that was made. Alex urges the delegates to stop the process before the letter is sent out.

Roeland and Blink write an e-mail to the FSR’s about the circulating letter on the International Youth Forum in Minsk and send this for an editorial round to the council before sending it out. (action)
8. Student mail

The CSR decides about the new mail system for students in Office365 as was discussed in GALOP.

The questions about the FdG will be asked in the project group. The FSR-FMG has no comments. The FSR-FGw does not see the benefit of the obligatory student e-mail. The FSR-FNWI concluded that the current e-mail system is also obligatory and therefore does not strongly oppose.

**Voting proposal:** The CSR decides to support the first draft of the project on switching the UvA student mail to Office 365.

- In favor: 4
- Against: 1
- Blanco: 2
- Abstain: 4

The voting proposal is not adopted.

The council asks for a re-vote as some members want to change their vote.

**Voting proposal:** The CSR decides to support the first draft of the project on switching the UvA student mail to Office 365.

- In favor: 7
- Against: 1
- Blanco: 3
- Abstain: 1

The voting proposal is adopted.

9. Student assessor

The CSR discusses the function and application procedure of the central student assessor.

**Voting proposal:** The CSR is in favor of appointing a central student assessor for 2019 with the option to reject all candidates.

- In favor: 11
- Against: 0
- Blanco: 0
- Abstain: 1

The voting proposal is adopted.

Composition of the BAC - Malou suggests filling 50% of the BAC. Roeland asks whether this would be CSR appointed students or CSR-members only. Alex is in favor of giving priority to CSR-members but asks whether it would be better to have non-CSR-members only. Blink only wants CSR-members in the BAC. Malou and Kseniia say that asking for ‘CSR-appointed-members’ might lead to the CvB demanding that non-CSR-members take place as well.
**Voting proposal:** The CSR decides to push for having 50% of the BAC for the central student assessor to be students appointed by the CSR.

- **In favor:** 6
- **Against:** 1
- **Blanco:** 1
- **Abstain:** 4

The voting proposal is adopted.

Alex wants to discuss the composition of the CSR’s delegation in the BAC further and whether it would be better to have only non-CSR members in the BAC. This will be discussed next week.

**Function description** – Malou asks why the job description is available only in Dutch and questions whether international students are and should be excluded from applying for the function.

10. **Quality Agreements**

The CSR discusses the startnotitie Kwaliteitsafspraken.

**Weighed/unweighted distribution of the funds**

David says that the *medezeggenschap* has consenting rights on the *startnotitie* in which it is decided whether the funding is divided weighed/unweighted. Roeland says that, according to ISO, the plans can be agreed on during the entire year of 2019. Roeland questions why the GV is being pushed to finish the plans before the end of December 2018 as the *sectorakkoord* doesn’t demand this and the conditional funding will be paid later. Roeland will contact Frank Zuijdam about this. (action) Jamie asks whether this might be depending on the early appointment with the NVAO; Roeland questions whether this could possibly be delayed as the unconditional, regulated budget will be given to the UvA regardless.

**Current council stances**

Jamie is still in the middle but leans towards unweighted. Malou and Ivanna are most likely in favor of weighted funding, but their FSR’s still need to decide. David, Casper, Alex, Blink, Kseniia, and Roeland are in favor of unweighted funding. David says this the student numbers should be calculated while only considering the Dutch numbers who lost their *studiefinanciering*; Alex and Roeland disagree with this.

The difference between for the faculties between the funding being distributed weighted/unweighted is depending on the factor and will be calculated by Cees Kleverlaan for the upcoming GV. Malou asks whether biomedical science would be allocated as medical; this is not certain.

-- David Nelck leaves the meeting. --

The council discusses whether intensive education with a lower amount of students costs more overall or should be compensated more. Malou says that not all beta sciences are more expensive as they do not all require expensive equipment. Jamie explains how a part of the subsidy for medical studies comes via the hospital. Roeland says that improving education by offering trainings to staff would costs the same at all faculties. Malou and Jamie say that the differences in salaries between faculties should be considered. Jamie adds that professionalizing the teaching staff also demands compensating for these hours. Alex says that at some faculties, the costs for intensifying are higher and that the list of projects is more extensive. Roeland says that his is decided upon in the faculties. Alex finds it important to consider what is prioritized within the faculties.

-- Omar Seleim leaves the meeting. --
Malou asks why the weighed/unweighted model makes a distinction in paying the faculty per student or ECT. Roeland explains that the allocation model is calculated based on ECTS; this is supposed to be a more reliable system to calculate the number of students participating in the programs. Nevertheless, Roeland says that the number of students might be more closely related to the number of study grants that are being compensated for.

11. GALOP

*The CSR prepares for the GALOP meeting on October 4th.*

**Thesis database** Jamie explains how the faculties all use different systems for registering and archiving theses, such as DataNose, Pontifex, Drive, and OnStage. There is also a difference between the systems automatically processing the theses or the faculties doing so manually. The current proposal that is being discussed in GALOP is to standardize the system, workflow and archiving of the theses. The separate systems (i.e. DataNose, OnStage) will be linked to the central system; this means that the workflow for the faculties will not change. Alex asks whether privacy issues have been considered. Malou and Jamie are inquiring this with Jeroen Goedkoop and in GALOP.

**Time compensation for students with functional limitation.** Roeland says that it is important that students with functional limitations are able to ask for extra time during their exams. Jamie explains that currently there are differences between the faculties in how much extra time students are granted. Casper asks whether this regulation will be included in the OER; it will be incorporated in the model-OER part b. Malou asks whether harmonizing this compensation will also negatively affect students who will get less compensation. Alex asks which proof students need to provide; Roeland explains that this proof can be obtained via psychologists and student deans.

12. Study success 2.0

*The CSR gets informed about the Study Success 2.0 report.*

Roeland explains that the Study Success report 1.0 listed 20 points of attention of which 10 points were worked out into concrete recommendations in the report Study Success 2.0. Casper suggests looking into the differences between the reports and what was left out. Roeland says this concerns mostly points that evaluated the current status and no concrete recommendations.

--- Blink Ujjin leaves the meeting. ---

Alex disagrees with recommendation 4 about the way of planning tests. He says that the most objective way of measuring students’ progress is through exams - not class assignments.

Malou stresses that the CvB considers the Study Success 2.0 report important. The CSR can consider which recommendations to take up in their discussion with the CvB. Roeland suggests going over the recommendations in O&O to see which points might be taken up. **(action)**

13. W.v.t.t.k. / Any other business

- **Dean appointing procedure** The FSR-FMG has asked the CSR to consider the appointing procedures of the deans. This will be taken up in O&F. **(action)**

- **Working groups Quality Assurance** The CSR discusses who will take up the position in the three working groups in which the COR and CSR can take place. The preliminary outcome is: Teacher professionalization (Alex, *if it can be in English*), Educational facilities (Casper), Teaching Learning Centers (Malou). Roeland will inform Frank Zuijdam about the CSR’s delegation. **(action)**

- Casper explains that an application which helps to write statements exists and is easy to use.
14. Input request from the FSR’s
None.

15. To the media
• Photo of the CSR meeting with the Kings College delegation.
• Statement about the occupation (when finished).

16. Questions
• Ivanna asks who is joining her to the CoBo in Utrecht. There is no interest from within the council.

17. Ending
Roeland closes the meeting at 13.28h.

Decisions
D181003-01 The CSR decides to support the first draft of the project on switching the UvA student mail to Office 365.
D181003-02 The CSR is in favor of appointing a central student assessor for 2019 with the option to reject all candidates.
D181003-03 The CSR decides to push for having 50% of the BAC for the central student assessor to be students appointed by the CSR.

Action list
181003-01 Roeland writes a draft statement about the recent occupation of the P.C. Hoofthuis and sends this for an editorial round from Monday October 8th to decide about it during PV181010.
181003-02 Roeland and Blink write an e-mail to the FSR’s about the circulating letter on the International Youth Forum in Minsk and send this for an editorial round to the council before sending it out.
181003-03 Roeland asks Frank Zuijdam for more information about the visit of the NVAO and the deadline in December 2018 for the Quality Agreement funds as was discussed with ISO.
181003-04 O&O goes over the recommendations of Study Success 2.0 to see which points might be taken up by the CSR.
181003-05 O&F discusses the appointment procedures for deans.
181003-06 Roeland informs Frank Zuijdam about the CSR’s delegation in the three working groups following from the Quality Agreements funds.
180926-01 The committees discuss the (possible) shared goals from PV180926 and make a proposal for PV181010 PV181002.
180926-02 The DB discusses how to spread the workload of writing a year-plan outlining the CSR’s goals for 2019-2019.
180926-03 PR works out the organization of the KeBo (location, date, and practicalities).
180926-04 Tamara asks Mariska Herweijer whether Miek Krol can be invited for PV181016.
180926-05 Malou asks Miek Krol for an update on her meeting with Mariska Herweijer about the position of council assistants.
180926-06 PR works out the different proposals for events during 2018-2019 and schedules suitable moments for these events.
180926-07 Roeland asks LOF whether they have more information about the discharging of the former chair of the LSVb.
180919-03 Alex writes a follow-up meeting piece to discuss including public voting records in the minutes of the CSR.
180919-05 O&F discusses whether they will send a delegate from the O&F committee to the working group on Schakelbeleid together with the file holder from O&O.
Roeland and Sujet write a short update about the ISO working group on September 11th.

Alex checks with Loraine whether the meeting discussing the tenders for the new cleaning contract succeeded.

The delegates ask their FSR’s for input on the transfer of the UvA-student mail to Office365 as was discussed in GALOP.

O&O composes an overview of the current status of faculty diversity officers, the FTE and the involvement of FSR’s in the procedure.

Pro memorie

The DB is strict about nazendingen and being present in time.

A double check on the spelling and grammar should be done for all communication. Committee chairs have the final responsibility in this.

The committee chairs notify the PR-taskforce after their meetings which files should be raised in the media.

All DB-members send their updates before Sunday 20.00h and write their updates linked to all specific files of the committees. Delegates send their updates before Wednesday 09.00h.

Alex, Roeland, and Sujet take good care of the plants.

The committee chairs make sure that everyone gives proper feedback in their committees about the work, steering and soundboard groups, and they make sure the documents are saved on the P-drive. Council members archive all their documents in the P-drive.

The committee chairs oversee the diverse division of speakers for the OV.

The DB oversees a proper balance between small and large files in the PV.

The delegates check whether the agendas, minutes and letters of the FSR’s are being published online.

Council members try to take care of expressing their opinions and give arguments for their standpoints.