Outcome of consultation meeting FSP 21 sept 2026

Overall question:
How can the Faculty of Science develop into a more recognizable and connected faculty in which fundamental science, technology, education and social challenges reinforce each other over the next six years?

Round 1 – ca. 13.30–14.00
1. Impact of AI on education
2. Community Building at FNWI and ASP
3. Carriereperspective OBP and Teachers

Round 2 – ca. 14.00–14.30
4. Interdisciplinary research and education
5. Role fundamental research and AI
6. Collaboration with external partners

Round 1

1. Impact of AI on Education

- The University of Amsterdam's proactive approach to AI, such as the UvA AI Chat, is viewed positively.
- Students and lecturers need support to learn how to use AI appropriately and effectively in the learning process.
- More time and capacity are needed to redesign courses in response to AI developments; the current allocation of 80 DVM hours is insufficient.
- The faculty should explore the use of personalised AI tutors.
- Research should be initiated into the impact of AI and other technologies on education.
- Attention is needed to ensure that students retain sufficient subject-specific knowledge.
- The faculty should identify the essential skills students need in an AI-rich environment, including critical thinking.
- Educational developments should be aligned with the needs and expectations of the professional field.
- The implications of AI for large-scale education need to be considered.
- The future relevance and design of traditional lectures should be reviewed.
- Introducing small-scale learning elements within larger courses may offer a valuable approach.
- Assessment should be designed to be "AI-proof", while continuing to assess intended learning outcomes reliably.
- Organising more small-scale education will require additional funding.

2. Community Building at FNWI and ASP

- The Deep Tech Day and Science Colloquium were mentioned as useful examples:
- Deep Tech Day had a clear external purpose—showcasing the faculty's work—but also generated valuable internal community building.
- Busy schedules and competing priorities make it difficult for people to participate in community-building activities.

- There is limited awareness of colleagues' expertise, research activities and ongoing initiatives across the faculty.
- Opportunities for exchange, inspiration and collaboration are currently insufficient. Such events can help colleagues discover work and expertise they were previously unaware of.
- A key challenge is how to bring people out of their institutional or disciplinary silos, without creating events that compete with already full agendas.
- The purpose of community building should be made explicit, for example:
    - making expertise easier to find;
    - preventing duplication of work;
    - stimulating interdisciplinary inspiration and collaboration;
    - strengthening connections after the relatively individualised period following COVID-19.
- Both topic-specific and broader events could be valuable: topic-specific sessions can connect people working on shared challenges; broader events can create unexpected encounters and inspiration.
- Possible formats include informal lunch tables, town halls and recurring thematic sessions.
- Predictability in the calendar is important: regular, clearly scheduled events may make participation easier.
- The ASP building offers a strong physical setting for collaboration, but more purposeful occasions are needed to make use of this potential.
- Community building could take place at several levels: within institutes, across the faculty, within the ASP community, and potentially with students and external partners such as companies.
- Potential themes include technology, UvA strategic priorities and topics on which staff want greater input or dialogue.
- Events need clear ownership and follow-up. Participants should know what happens after a session and how ideas can be taken forward.
- AI could potentially support the organisation of events.

3. Carriereperspective OBP and Teachers

- Career development opportunities appear limited across roles OBP, including both technical support and educational support staff.
- There is a need to create more contract opportunities for Lecturer 4 (D4) staff.
- D4 lecturers are highly valuable, but their potential is currently underused because they are given too little responsibility and room to contribute to educational development.
- Lecturers should be entrusted with greater responsibility, particularly in the context of rapid changes driven by AI.
- Career pathways are unclear, for example progression from Lecturer 3 (D3) to Lecturer 2 (D2).
- Staff could be offered more flexible roles that combine different sets of responsibilities, such as education and research, or coordination and policy work.
- There is currently little room for roles positioned between research and teaching, limiting alternative career paths.
- AI may make work less attractive for some staff, as it requires a cultural shift towards a more technical working environment.
- There is a risk that teaching becomes increasingly isolated and that the wider working environment becomes less diverse as AI becomes more prominent.

Round 2

4. Interdisciplinary research and education

- The Faculty of Science and Technology needs a clear interdisciplinary perspective, both within the faculty and in collaboration with other faculties.
- A broader vision is needed on interdisciplinarity, including the future role and positioning of IIS.
- A possible institutional option would be to establish a College of Interdisciplinary Studies.
- The faculty's strategic approach to technology should be further developed: what does technology enable, and what does it require? These are questions that transcend individual disciplines.
- Technology and interdisciplinarity are not in conflict; however, their relationship and mutual contribution should be explicitly articulated in the strategy.
- Collaboration with other faculties requires a more concrete approach, including clarity on how interdisciplinary partnerships will be initiated and sustained.
- Interdisciplinarity as an add-on or from the start.
- Technology has important social and sustainability dimensions, which should be integral to the faculty's approach.
- Specialized minors for Master's students are considered particularly valuable and could support interdisciplinary learning pathways.

5. Role fundamental research and AI

- Fundamental science should retain a prominent role in the faculty's research strategy. Fundamental knowledge is essential for future applications.
- The faculty should continue to protect and strengthen its internationally recognised, world-class fundamental research.
- Collaboration with industry can support fundamental research but requires a careful balance.
- The strategy should distinguish technological research from a narrow focus on Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs). Technological research can be deeply fundamental and focused on understanding phenomena in the world around us.
- AI is increasingly becoming a necessary research infrastructure. Researchers need equitable access to AI tools and frontier technologies to remain internationally competitive.
- AI raises questions about how scientific understanding is produced and validated—for example, whether researchers can adequately interpret and explain the outputs of large language models.
- Physical experiments remain indispensable. The relationship between experimental science, AI and deep technology needs to be clarified rather than framed as a replacement of one by another.
- AI may fundamentally reshape scientific practice. There are concerns about machine problem-solving and an underestimation of human intelligence and expertise. What does the AI development mean for PhD's?
- The faculty should develop a strategy regarding AI.
- Core of the discussion: Safeguard fundamental science while developing a clear, responsible and competitive strategy for AI-enabled research.

6. Collaboration with external partners

- The faculty would benefit from a more proactive lobbying and strategic relationship-management approach, alongside a clearer overall vision for research support, partnerships and valorisation.
- Current support structures are fragmented. Different units—such as RSO, IXA and individual research institutes—use different approaches, and support often depends on personal networks rather than transparent processes and responsibilities.
- The Research Support Office has an important role in improving and coordinating this support, but should communicate more clearly about its services, target groups and points of entry.
- Strategic direction is needed not only when FNWI coordinates a consortium, but also when it participates as a partner in external consortia. Consortium leaders often receive substantial

support, whereas participating partners may receive less. This can be a barrier to joining major strategic projects and accessing large-scale infrastructure, such as national research facilities.

- There is a need for **earlier-stage support**. At present, principal investigators often have to identify opportunities, build relationships and negotiate partnerships themselves, while RSO support may become involved relatively late in the process.
- The faculty should consider whether it is sufficiently **present at tables** where key strategic themes, national programmes and large research collaborations are shaped—and who is responsible for coordinating and maintaining these relationships.
- A possible solution would be a small proactive "**lobby and partnerships team**" to scout new developments and funding opportunities, build and maintain strategic networks, support negotiations and ensure that FNWI is represented in relevant discussions.
- Collaboration with companies should become less cumbersome. Researchers need accessible **legal, commercial and contractual expertise**, particularly at the start of partnerships.
- **Long legal turnaround times** are a recurring obstacle and may cause the faculty to miss opportunities for collaboration with external partners.
- The role of the **Ethical Committee (ACEC**) should be integrated into a clear, timely support process, so that ethical review does not become an avoidable bottleneck.
- FNWI may be missing strategic alliances that comparable "classical" universities have developed with **technical universities**. These partnerships could strengthen access to technology-oriented research, infrastructure and innovation networks.
- The **valorisation** of quantum research was identified as a concrete area where stronger strategic support and external partnerships may be needed (**LABQ and LAB42**).