Minutes of the *Plenaire vergadering* of the CSR on the 16th of January, 2019

Jamie van den Berg, Kseniia Golub, Alex Gritsay (11:22-12:51), David Nelck (11:58), Omar Seleim (11:25-12:57), Ivanna Slipets (until 12:51), Malou Sprinkhuizen, Blink Ujjin (from 11:06), Liesanne van Veen, Roeland Voorbergen;

Absent: Sofie ten Brink, Casper Colenbrander, Michele Murgia, Sujet Hashemi Shams;

Guest(s): Iris Kingma *Central student assessor* (11:05)

Tamara van den Berg *Ambtelijk secretaris*;

---

Concept agenda

1. Opening
2. Mail
3. Adapting the concept minutes
4. Checking the action list
5. Announcements
6. Updates DB & taskforces, delegates, central student assessor
7. Setting the agenda
8. Raad van Advies [*confidential*]
9. OV: recap
10. Education & Accessibility
11. UvA-Q
12. Sustainability: Travel
13. Letter ASO – Student participation
14. Committee van Rijn
15. Manifesto – Utrecht University
16. Sustainability: Catering
17. Model-OER
18. W.v.t.t.k. / Any other business
19. Input requests: FSR’s / Media
20. Evaluating the PV
21. Questions + closing the meeting

---

1. Opening

*Roeland opens the meeting at 11.01h and welcomes the participants.*

2. Mail

*The council discusses the in- and outgoing mail.*
3. **Adapting the concept minutes**

Setting the minutes is postponed until next week.

4. **Checking the action list**

*The action list gets updated.*

-- Blink Ujjin and Iris Kingma enter the meeting. --

5. **Announcements**

None.

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

*The written updates are discussed briefly.*

- FSR-FNWI is investigating whether it is beneficial to remove devices from the front rows of lecture halls due to the ways in which the use of devices affects study results and has a negative impact on the focus of students during their classes. This will be evaluated after finishing the pilot. Ivanna says that UvA-research already has proved that the use of devices does not affect study results. Blink says it has been tested as well at the FEB.

7. **Setting the agenda**

*The agenda is set with changes.*

Raad van Advies is moved down on the agenda.

Evaluation weekend is added to the agenda.

8. **OV: recap**

*The CSR goes over the course of the OV CSR-CvB d.d. 15-01-2019.*

-- Alex Gritsay enters the meeting. --

9. **Education & Accessibility**

*The CSR discusses their vision on (selective) education.*

Roeland asks why the comments from O&O were not included in the meeting piece. As Alex only received these comments last night, Roeland reiterates the points made during the O&O meeting.

-- Omar Seleim enters the meeting. --

**Section II** – Roeland states that the phrase indicating that the university should make more use of selection seems to imply that the UvA should apply more selection overall, while the council would only have agreed to consider different ways of selection for programs that are already making use of selection criteria. Alex disagrees and suggests considering to apply selection for educational programs that are open at the moment but have been growing over the last years. Ivanna supports this proposal. As there is disagreement within the council, this point will be discussed further in the O&O-meeting.

**Section II** – Roeland suggests removing the section that regards entrance tests and providing a realistic image of programs, as the UvA already offers a Matching procedure. Alex disagrees. The draft text will be discussed in O&O again before continuing the discussion in the PV. *(action)* Alex stresses that he will defend implementing selection (or at least further exploring the possibility).
10. UvA-Q
The CSR discusses improving the system of feedback and evaluations in UvA-Q.
For the meeting piece, Omar didn’t include sections of previous minutes but did provide a summary of the past discussions.
Roeland asks which information is after the results of the UvA-Q evaluations are gathered. Omar explains that anonymized course evaluation reports are published on Canvas. Omar suggests promoting this to inform students about the provided information and the outcome and follow-up of their feedback. Malou says that teachers are requested to respond to the evaluation and says this should be published as well. The problem is that teachers do not always fill these evaluation forms. Blink agrees that publishing the response of teachers would incentivize students to give feedback as it increases the chance that things are changed. Tamara stresses that privacy concerns and extra workload for staff should be considered and discussed with the COR. Alex is in favour of asking teachers to write a report for publication on the student Canvas page.
Roeland asks how likely it is that the proposed changes in UvA-Q will be made or whether a commitment from the CvB is needed. It is suggested to check whether the rector agrees with the CSR proposed plans. This will be discussed during the IO. (action)

Liesanne asks how much time gathering the results of mid-term evaluation costs. Alex says that standardized digital tests take little time. Omar stresses that negative feedback should be addressed during a course and not after finishing the course. This would also incentivize students to fill the final evaluation forms. Blink suggests holding a mid-term evaluation after the 3rd week of a block in order to improve the course in time. Omar says that this eliminates the option of questions about the exam. Roeland says that the mid-term evaluation doesn’t need to deal with exams but should focus on the classes instead. Roeland suggests creating a mid-term evaluation with more room for input (open text box sections) besides a couple of multiple-choice questions. Omar explains that the mid-term evaluation should be short and simple, and therefore with limited open space as well. The goal of the mid-term evaluation and publication of evaluation reports is to give students insight in the feedback and ways that the feedback is used for improving a course or study program.
Iris suggest the council to consider ways in which students give feedback, what the effects of open-sections in evaluation forms are in feedback and how the feedback will be used for annual performance talks of teachers. Alex stresses that the feedback systems differ per program and faculty. Alex suggests organizing feedback sessions with a small student delegation per course. Omar says that this happens at the FEB in soundboard groups. Blink questions whether discussions in sub-groups are practical to organize.
The setup of course evaluations and feedback in UvA-Q will be discussed in O&O. (action)

11. Raad van Advies [confidential]
The CSR decides which members from CSR17-18 to appoint for the CSR’s advisory council.
-- David Nelck enters the meeting. --
The CSR decides to appoint Sasha Borovitskaja and Mees van Rees to the CSR’s Advisory Council. (decision)

12. Sustainability: Travel
The CSR gets informed about the set-up for a vision on sustainable travel and discusses co-signing the letter from the FSR-FMG about sustainable travel.
Blink suggests following the comment of Sofie: writing a letter/document as CSR in which the input of all FSR’s is included. Jamie suggests not signing the letter as some council members do not agree with
all the aspects of the letter. Jamie suggests referring to the aspects that the CSR agreed to in their own vision document. Alex suggests signing the letter despite small disagreements with the content. The FSR-FdR indicated that they would agree to sign most parts of the letter. The FSR-FNWI will not sign the letter due to tone. Malou stresses that the CvB has agreed to work out a travel policy and therefore the CSR can take this up as the speaking partner of the CvB.

Roeland suggests discussing the option of using the setup of the letter for further discussions with the CvB if the FSR-FMG would agree with this. This could help the CSR in asking the CvB to implement a travel policy on the short term. David says that the FSR-FMG can still send the letter if they prefer so, without harming the work of the CSR. Blink agrees and stresses that the CSR should not discourage FSR’s to send a letter. Roeland and Malou are in favour continuing to work on a travel policy via different channels if the FSR-FMG agrees. Roeland stresses that it is important to show that the CSR is not opposed to creating a sustainable travel policy. Malou says that if the FSR-FMG decides to send the letter the CSR could still informally show their support for the plans in a meeting with the CvB. Due to the recent collaboration on this matter, co-signing the letter would not be necessary. Alex is dissatisfied that the FSR-FMG came with the proposal without first contacting the CSR while they are the conversation partner of the CvB.

Iris asks whether the CSR has informed the FSR-FMG about the recent discussions on sustainability in the meeting with Jan Lintsen and during the OV. The council stresses that this is the role of the delegate. The council criticizes the tone of the letter and the limited arguments that are provided. Next week a final decision about co-signing the letter will be taken after the CSR discussed their concerns with the FSR-FMG. David and Roeland contact Casper and the FSR-FMG about the CSR’s view on co-signing their letter on sustainable travel policy. (action)

13. Letter ASO – Student participation

The CSR discusses co-signing the letter from ASO about student participation and board years.

David is pessimistic about the possibility of changing policy by sending the proposed letter. Roeland stresses that boards of study associations have recently been having more trouble in finding (suitable) candidates. This relatively new problem deserves attention. Malou says that the letter might reach the general public and opposition, even if the minister does not directly change the existing policy. Alex asks whether the letter is opposing the current loan system. Malou explains that this is the case since students’ financial situation differs from several years ago. Not all students have the financial means to take up a function in a medezeggenschap board or student organization. Alex disagrees that the loan system is the main problem that caused this decline in applications. Jamie says that it might not be possible to find hard evidence supporting this despite the noticeable problems that boards have to find candidates. Alex says this is due to the increase of student bodies in general, but Jamie disagrees and says that organizations are abolishing themselves. Alex says that the installed loan system is not necessarily a bad system. Jamie says that the combination with the working pressure has a negative effect on students. Roeland stresses that the letter deals mostly with the issue of student participation and is not taking the loan system as its main focus. Roeland tells that ASVA proposed setting up an interview with a student board which is facing problems in finding candidates and therefore is threatened in their existence. This would help to create media attention for the problems. Jamie asks which organizations decided to co-sign the letter. Roeland will check this. (action)

14. Committee van Rijn

The CSR discusses which input to give to the financial committee Van Rijn.
• Universities should be given more money per student.
• When setting the budget the number of students in relation to budget should be considered.
• Investigate whether the current funding is sufficient for universities.
• Counter financial incentive for internationalization

-- Alex Gritsay and Ivanna Slipets leave the meeting. --

• Technical universities should not be granted relatively more funding than other universities.

15. Manifesto – Utrecht University

The CSR discusses co-signing the UU manifesto on working pressure and the quality of education. Sofie suggested asking the COR whether they would be willing to sign the manifesto. Jamie will do this. (action) Roeland asks whether the decision of the COR to sign the manifesto should affect the CSR’s decision. Malou suggests re-considering support if the COR does not sign, but David says that the responsibility of signing the manifesto should lie with the COR. David stresses that dismissal and appointment laws have changed over the last years and asks whether the number of temporary contracts are mostly an effect of this new legislation. Jamie agrees that these changes have contributed to the number of temporary contracts but adds that universities are known to have relatively many employees on this contract basis. Jamie indicates that he might attend the symposium “Lang leve de tijdelijke docent?!” that is organized by the University Utrecht on January 23.

-- Omar Seleim leaves the meeting. --

16. Sustainability: Catering

The CSR gets informed about the set-up for a vision on sustainable catering. Malou suggests making meat-free meals the default for staff lunch or dinner as an alternative to making the university meat-free. Liesanne asks whether making the default option vegetarian instead of vegan would be a proper first step as well. Malou would prefer the default to be vegan but agrees that it is worthwhile as a first step. Roeland asks whether the caterer has made commitments with regard to the sustainability of food (production). David explains that it was agreed in the tender that all products are grown or gained from local businesses. David will check what has been committed to during the tender of in discussions with medezeggenschap afterward. (action)

17. Model-OER

The CSR gets informed about the proposed changes to the model-OER. The CSR will soon receive a request to implement technical changes in the model-OER. Jamie asks for an elaboration on article 4.7a. Malou explains that students can file a disagreement to follow courses on ethical ground, such as tests on animals. Roeland explains that due to a change in the law, top sports has also been listed as a possible ground for BSA-compensation. Jamie agrees with Sofie that the proposed changes should have been sent to CSR earlier. He suggests not accepting the technical changes. Malou suggests working on proposed changes and implementing the updated model-OER from next year. Roeland says that is not possible to fully revise the model-OER within the short time that is left before the faculties will start the procedure for the OER in February. Roeland suggests accepting the proposed changes and setting the moment for the next full revision.
Jamie is against the implementation of technical changes. Malou wants to refrain from accepting the changes and thereby delaying the full revision with another year. Blink and Jamie say that the CSR cannot agree with the proposed changes as they were not informed timely and therefore had not enough time to get knowledge of the model-OER. Malou stresses that this means that the exhaustive list of BSA-dispensation would not get updated, which negatively affects students. Roeland suggests inviting Nancy ten Brink for the O&O meeting to explain the changes. (action)

18. Evaluation weekend
The CSR discusses the last preparations for their evaluation weekend.

19. W.v.t.t.k. / Any other business
None.

20. Input requests for the FSR’s:
• Liesanne asks whether other FSR’s received the request for advice about the faculty plans for the Quality Agreements. The FSR-FdG did not receive the request yet despite the upcoming GV-discussion about the Quality Agreements.

21. To the media
Nothing.

22. Evaluating the PV
The CSR evaluates the course of the PV and the quality of the meeting pieces.

23. Questions + closing the meeting
• Iris asks whether the CSR is taking up the points raised in the Folia article about study delay and the Profiling Fund. This will be discussed in O&F. (action)

Roeland closes the meeting at 13.30h.

Decisions
D190116-01 The CSR decides to appoint Sasha Borovitskaja and Mees van Rees to the CSR’s Advisory Council.

Action list
190116-01 O&O discusses the draft vision of the vision on Education & Accessibility.
190116-02 The DB asks the rector during the IO for her views on the CSR’s plans for improving the UvA-Q evaluation system.
190116-03 O&O discusses the setup of course evaluations and feedback in UvA-Q.
190116-04 David and Roeland contact Casper/FSR-FMG about the CSR’s view on co-signing their letter on sustainable travel policy.
190116-05 Roeland includes a list of co-signers of the letter about student participation in the decisional meeting piece for PV190123.
190116-06 Jamie forwards the UU-manifesto to the COR and asks whether they support this.
190116-07 David checks what commitments the caterer made with regard to sustainability during the public tender contract or afterward.
190116-08 Tamara schedules an additional meeting with Nancy van den Brink to discuss the proposed changes to the model-OER.
190116-09 O&F discusses the Folia article about study delay and the Profiling Fund.
190109-01 Omar contacts Wagamama to set a limited menu for the FSR’s dinner within the budget.
Omar informs the FSR’s about the set up for the dinner and the deadline for registration.

The committees discuss which parts of the CSR-goals can be worked out further for informative and promotional purposes.

PR sets up the CSR year calendar in a way that is suitable for promotion.

The DB discusses the option of changing the PV meeting time.

Omar writes a discussion meeting piece about UvA-Q for PV190109 and includes the section from the PV-minutes about the earlier discussions and conclusions.

Casper asks Mariska Herweijer for more information about the existing partnerships between the UvA and high schools (in Amsterdam).

Alex works out the sections from the selective education document including descriptions, pros and cons, and possible follow-up steps.

Blink asks the chair of the Raad van Advies to acquire which RvA-members will stay on and who want to step down to make room for new members.

O&O discusses the follow-up steps for the Numerus Fixus Psychology and the update from the meeting with Ingmar Visser.

Casper contacts Mariska Herweijer about the regulations for exam rooms, as discussed in GALOP.

O&F discusses the option of updating the regulations of the complaints committee.

PR considers, with help of the council, which documents, text or parts of the website need translation through the CSR-budget.

O&O discusses the evaluation of the UvA Health Week.

Omar checks whether the international promotion of faculties and programs has been fully stopped.

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, that the CSR is working on, should be raised in the media.

All DB-members send their updates before Sunday 20.00h. 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 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.

Blink organizes individual coffee moments with all council members to discuss the council work and input on the evaluation weeks.

The committee chairs make sure that the responsibility for the meeting piece becomes clear during the committee meeting.

The committee chairs keep their OV-planning up to date and fill their OV-planning in the printed calendar in CREA 1.16.