

What's up with the nomination of the College van Bestuur / Executive Board?

In April the chairperson of the College van Bestuur (CvB; executive board; board of directors that deals with the general management of both the Uva and the Hva), Louise Gunning-Schepers, left the board because of an unfixable breach of trust with the academic community. In January Rector Magnificus and deputy chairperson Dymph van den Boom's term ends. For this reason the Raad van Toezicht (Rvt; supervisory board) started a selection procedure for new members for the College van Bestuur.

This proceeded so far as follows:

- *Louise Gunning quits.*
- The RvT appointed Dymph as interim chairperson.
- The Centrale Studentenraad (CSR; central student council) had to insist on the procedure being transparent by suggesting that there would be a public hearing of one or more of the candidates. They also wanted a member of the CSR, a member of the Centrale Ondernemingsraad (COR; Central Works Council), a member of the Centrale Medezeggenschapsraad of the HvA (CMR; representative advisory board), a dean and a domain chairperson to be a part of the confidential committee. And finally, they wanted transparent and straightforward communication throughout the procedure on what would happen next.
- The CSR, COR and CMR organized a discussion at the Maagdenhuis to acquire input from the academic community on the nomination procedure.
- Based on the outcomes of the discussion, the CSR, COR and CMR wrote advice towards the RvT on the nomination procedure. In this was written among other things that *first* there had to be drawn up, together with the academic community, a list of characteristics *based upon which* the RvT should write the vacancy. In this advice was also written that: the COR, CSR and CMR should get access to the profile; at least 1 CSR member, 1 COR member, 1 CMR student-member and 1 CMR staff member should be a part of the selection committee; and that there should be a presentation for the academic community *before* the actual nomination. In the selection board to select the Rector Magnificus there should be at least 2 members of the COR, 2 members of the CMR, and 2 member of the CSR.
- On the 9th of July the RvT determined the nomination procedure including the following things: in the first half of 2016 at the latest there should be proceeded towards the nominating, the profile should be drafted in cooperation with the advisory boards and these will get the right to consultation on the final profile, part of the selection committee will be 1 member of either the CSR of the COR, 1 member of the CMR, 3 members of the RvT, a dean and a domain chairperson (HvA), there will be an external selection agency that will assist the selection committee, there will be *confidential* conversations with the candidates, the chosen candidate will be presented to the advisory boards via *confidential advice*, and the candidate shall only *after* the nomination present him/herself to the academic community. With this, the RvT ignored the most important parts of the advice by the advisory boards.
- The CSR didn't agree with this and wanted to send an open letter on the 2nd of September, however, before they got the chance to do this they were asked by the RvT for a talk. Suddenly there appeared a press release on the UvA website stating that the RvT adjusted the procedure together with the CSR: right of consent on the profile will be given and in both selection committees there will be four

member of the advisory boards, as was proposed in the first advice written by the COR, CSR and CMR. *Humanities Rally is happy with this inclusion, but is however wondering why this wasn't included in the first place. Also, it's unclear what more the CSR wanted and how the negotiations on this proceeded in the conversation the RvT insisted upon.*

- On the 4th of September the RvT presented two concept-profiles without their having been a possibility to gather input from the academic community.

- On the 24th of September, under a lot of time pressure, the CSR organized a discussion on preferable characteristics for the two profiles. The period to do this was so short, that it could not be organized in cooperation with the COR and the CMR. Also, the Communication Section refused to send an email to all students to inform them on the existence of this meeting.

- During the discussion it became clear that people did not yet agree with the procedure and among other things wanted the candidates to be presented before the nominations.

- Three of the Facultaire Studentenraden (FSR; faculty student council) pointed out to the CSR that they were not listened to enough and that they got an unsatisfactory amount of time to gather input from their faculty. Within the CSR there has been decided to request the RvT for more time to improve the nomination procedure. This request will be send to the RvT around the 30th of September.

- On behalf of the action groups and the FSR's the CSR send a letter on the 9th of October to the RvT requesting more time to consult the academic community and to revise the nomination procedure. *What happened to this proposal is unclear, but the procedure is still ongoing without any amendments.*

- On the 14th of October the COR organized a meeting to consult the staff on preferable characteristics for the profiles. And again the procedure was up for discussion.

- On the 20th of October the RvT presented two profiles for a new chairperson and a new Rector Magnificus.

Even though there have repeatedly been indications from the UvA's academic community that the present procedure is not acceptable, the RvT seems to put such a pressure on the advisory boards that they don't have a choice but to agree to the procedure the RvT wishes to be realized.