

Minutes ESE School Council 203b (Consultative Meeting)

Date: Thursday 27 March 2025 (Langeveld 2.12)

Present:

Student Council: Quinten de Gruijter (QdG, chair School Council, online), Marijn Bierens (MB), Ismael Lazrek (IL, online), Levi Hunter (LH)

Personnel Council: Twan Dollevoet (TD, online), Marc Gabarro Bonet (MGB), Linda Klaver (LK), Vladimir Karamychev (VK), Adam Rybko (AR, online)

Other participants: Patrick Groenen (PG, ESE Dean), Michel van der Wel (MvdW, Vice-dean of Education), Pilar Garcia Gomez (PGG, Vice-dean Research)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Guests: Josse Delfgaauw (JD, programme director)

Not present:

Francisco Magalhaes Portilha (with notice), Mario van Boven (with notice), Ajay Bhaskarabhatla (with notice), Arnold Kirchyung (without notice), Javiera Alvarez Jimenez (without notice),

SC=School Council

PGFR=Personnel Section of the School Council

SGFR=Student Section of the School Council

UC=University Council

1.1 Opening and approval of the agenda

The chair welcomed Josse Delfgaauw, who joined the meeting as guest and will be joining the consultative meetings in his role as new programme director as of 1 April.

Added agenda point 4.3 Travel Agency Diversity Travel. With this change, the agenda was approved.

1.2 Minutes SC202b and SC203a

The minutes were approved as presented.

1.3 Announcements MT

- PG: the Faculty regulations and Management instructions have been approved by the Executive Board and will go into effect as of 1 April.
- MvdW: the question that was raised by the SGFR regarding the BSA was forwarded to the Examination Board; their reply is shared by MvdW, quoting from the e-mail that 'first-year students who earn 60 credits will automatically receive a positive BSA. For all other cases, the Examination Board assesses each student individually, focusing on their suitability for the Bachelor program. Each case is reviewed thoroughly and treated equally, based on years of experience, ensuring a fair and consistent approach for all students. In its assessment the Examination Board considers factors such as overall grades, study progress, and personal circumstances. If personal circumstances are involved, the Examination Board considers the advice of the study advisor or student counselor. You can find examples of what qualifies as personal circumstances in Article 30, Paragraph 11 of the Teaching and Examination Regulations. In exceptional cases, if a student has performed far below norm but has sufficiently demonstrated that their personal circumstances significantly affected their study progress, the BSA decision may be postponed until the following year'.
- MvdW: three meetings are scheduled within smaller committees: one on 3 April with the Educational committee on a memo on TA's, one with the PGFR on 17 April and one on partial grades, on the 12th of June.
- MvdW: ESE received negative advice on the requested beta financing of Econometrics and decided to file a legal appeal (deadline 22 April).
- MvdW: the NVAO advised positively on the online master; the master starts 1 September 2025.

- MvdW: information was shared with the SC on the decision on Institutional fees. ESE favors the middle option. The UC has formal advisory rights.
- MvdW: the latest update on HOKA/HEQA was shared with the SC. A final report is being prepared and as the update and final report are related, the SC was asked to discuss them together. 2025 will be a transition year and there will be some changes for HEQA: the name changes to BAO (Bestuursakkoord Onderwijs/administrative agreement on education) and the way information will be reported changes, as well as the involvement of the participation. The SC was not yet informed on the changes by the UC; formerly, the UC used to organize HEQA symposiums. MvdW: it is expected that not all the funds will be spent, due to changes in staff and projects that were put on hold. Separate funding is made available for the smarter academic year, which means funding does not have to come from HEQA anymore. MGB wondered what will happen with the money that is left and to make sure it will not be left to expire. MvdW: plans still need to be made where to spend the earmarked reserves on. If there is an expiration date this is not known. The money is earmarked by the government. The HEQA funds come in at central level and some money is reserved before allocating it to the faculties. LK wondered whether staff could ask for funding of projects. A meeting will be scheduled to discuss HEQA further with the Educational committee.
- MvdW: earmarked money has been made available by the government for strengthening the participation. The deadline for proposals is 31 July.
- PGG: regarding the diversified career profiles, the expert groups are at full steam. Information can be found online.
- PGG: the pilot for the mentoring programme is running with seven mentees over different departments; they have been matched, and the trainings are now being scheduled.

1.4 Other announcements

- AKu: last July the SC approved the new perusal policy. It came to the attention of the SGFR that not all courses follow the perusal policy. The information will be shared with PM.
- An interview is scheduled by Erasmus Magazine with QdG to speak about the School Council's activities.

1.5 Action point list

- Implementation numerus-fixus IBEB in TER: the proposal was submitted to the Executive Board. If it is decided to implement the numerus-fixus, it needs to be mentioned in the TER of 2025-26, otherwise it can be left out. VK suggested to provide the SC with an overview of articles that were changed. LH wondered how it would be determined whether there will be a numerus-fixus or not. MvdW: the government has a pack of demands on internationalization, and it depends on the new law. ESE set up this tool to use if needed. Action point can be taken from the list.
- Problems educational support systems: a working group is asked to meet for a discussion on partial grades. The action point will be taken up in the monitoring list.

Monitoring list

- HOKA/HEQA project: a last update was shared, which will be discussed next meeting together with the final report on HEQA.
- PhD monitoring: on agenda.
- Future housing plans: no update. A Future housing committee will be installed.
- Evaluation internal procedures SC: on agenda, keep on monitoring list.
- Opening hours campus EUR: the SC did not receive the outcome of the evaluation yet. The opening hours of the E-building were temporarily changed as during construction on Tinbergen

a part of the building could not be used and therefore was made available in the evenings. As of next week, the opening hours will be as before.

3.1 PhD monitoring

The documentation was discussed during the internal meeting of the SC, the questions were shared with PGG:

- From the document it looks like ESE places their own PhD's within ESE, which is not according to policy. Furthermore, own placements are marked green, which seems as if ESE boasts itself for placing its own PhD's. PGG: it is not a conclusion yet, the numbers still have to be looked at, as there are still a lot of other things going on. It is indeed policy not to hire own PhD's, it might have happened to cover a gap, or when it takes a long time for candidates to finish. If someone came back at ESE, the process would be via tenure track procedure.
- It is suggested to add wellbeing as KPI. PGG agrees wellbeing is very important; PhD wellbeing is also followed in the Enablement & Engagement Scan, in an Erim survey and departments also have their own surveys. Then there are meetings with PhD students which generate qualitative input. PGG is not sure where to put the target, but it can be discussed when the annual plan is discussed.

The SC can reach out to PGG if they have any further suggestions or questions.

4.1 Evaluation New ways of working SC: committees

The new way of working is an ongoing process. It is agreed that the SC will work with in committees more often as the experience is that it is effective. At this moment the financial and educational committee are active, and the idea is to set up a committee on future housing issues. The way of working with committees will be taken up in the regulations. The School Council still has full approval. The MT is asked for suggestions to improve the way of working as well. As of next year, the committees that will focus on certain topics will formally be installed.

4.2 Support MT on Tinbergen

Bauke Visser send a letter regarding the available m2 at Tinbergen to the Executive Board. The letter was signed by a lot of colleagues, but VK noticed that none of the MT members co-signed the letter, although some of them are also part of the academic staff. He would have liked to have seen the academic members co-sign as a signal of support and wondered why they decided not to.

PG: the academic staff had several reasons not to sign this letter. Whether or not agreeing with the content, it is an important aspect that the university and the schools are under great financial pressure. The Executive Board decided on 'people before bricks' which was backed by the deans. Consequently, this means a reduction of m2. A few years ago, the SC were asked for advice on the new ways of working. Setting up the procedure for getting new floor plans were then discussed and rolled out. In general, everyone in an MT position has to represent and also consider the greater good and balance the demands. If it would have been possible to have more space for everyone that would have been great. But if a decision needs to be made, the task of the MT is to implement them as good as possible. And asking for more m2 might not land well with people that are on the verge of losing their job.

LH: from the perspective of students, there is no need for more study spaces; the stories of study space for students in the plans for Tinbergen are not strictly necessary for improving study. It would

possibly be better to provide staff with the space they need to make sure education is properly organized. AKu sees a long-term risk if staff would leave; quality of education is of main importance.

MGB: there is still a growing dissatisfaction from academic staff; he would like to have more information to be able to transmit the response from the MT. PG: there are other people that decided not to sign the letter as they are against what is said in the letter. These others come from different departments. The letter was also sent to staff of other schools, but it is doubtful if they supported it; ESHCC and ESL already work according to the new norms. Given the situation, everyone is asked to make the best out of it, although nobody will be in favor of a reduction of space. The amount of m2 is a given and both the staff as well as the SC were involved.

4.3 Diversity travel

Staff encounter a lot of problems with the new travel agency. VK knows of a lot of negative experiences and prefers to go back to how it was. All faculties have the same issue. The SC wishes to raise the concerns and make the issues known. PG: the situation has attention everywhere, up to the Executive Board and the OM's are working on it; Tala Alrufaie is representative for ESE. The subject was also discussed in the UC. The SC will reach out to Albert Wagelmans to make the issues known at the UC. Apparently only the interface was piloted at RSM. For now, it is possible to arrange for travel as was done before, with no extra cost.

6. Any other business

The chair of the faculty council of ESL drafted up a letter on the budget cuts – to not let cuts go to primary processes - to be co-signed by all EUR faculty councils. The UC were asked as participatory body on central level to look into the letter and see if all the information in the letter is correct. QG wonders if ESE should sign the letter. VK suggested looking at issues at central level and have more contact with central representative bodies. LH: the SC should be careful about deciding whether to sign or not, as other faculties already commented on how ESE seems not as much effected by the budget cuts as other faculties. By not signing the letter they might see their thoughts confirmed. QG: in the UC chairs meeting, central services were not happy with the letter and the message in it, as they already had large budget cuts; the UC also represents the service councils. QG feels the final letter is not something that can be supported by the SC. If the SC decides not to sign the letter it is suggested to give a proper argumentation why this decision was made.

The chair closed the meeting at 14.30.