Plenary Meeting
University Council
Erasmus University
March 9th, 2021

Present in the Meeting: Ana Uribe Sandoval, Ben Bode, Ferry Blom, John Piarelal, John van Wel, Natascha Kraal, Sebastiaan Kamp, Albert Wagelmans, Yogi Hendlin, Afrodita Dobreva, Armand Gozé, Bram Hessen, Jasper Klasen, Joep Schoenmakers, Luca Kriese, Philip van Moll, Wouter van Dam, Younes Assou, Hans van den Berg, Helen Gubby, Bianca Jadoenath, Marjan Gorgievski, Machteld Harmsen.
Absent: Olaf Hornes, Dian van Toor, Diederik Mosch.
Teams Meeting: 14:00

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda
The agenda has been set

01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting
There are no comments to the minutes at the moment. Members can contact the minutes secretary within seven days if any comments arise.

01.03 Announcements

Chair Announcements
- *Voting Procedures*

To create a more transparent and clear voting on substantive matters (so consent, adjustment of regulations or on a letter), the Chair will proceed through voting per head (art. 30 of the rules of procedure). This means that the Chair will call members by their name and then, they vocally state whether they are in favour, against, or vote blank. The Clerk will then count the votes. On procedural matters it will commence via hands or google forms/docs. In a vote concerning a person (for instance (re)appointment of the chair) this will always be an anonymous vote.

- *Consequences of Brexit at EUR*

The Chair discussed the fallout of Brexit with the Chair of the EB. The EB indicated the following expected negative effects:
- EU students (therefore also Dutch) will probably do less exchanges or studying in the UK.
- The university expects an increase in international students from outside the EU. Often these are looking for a high-ranking university in combination with the possibility to travel in Europe.
- In relation to research, the UK will stay involved in Horizon. However, financially the university will have to find out how to work this out.
- British students will of course be able to finish their studies at our University.
- EUR will have to find ways to keep the relationship with UK Universities strong.
- A final issue that needs to be solved (at a national and EU level) is the fact that the UK is not anymore part of the EU Security Framework.

- *Consequences because of the involvement in participatory bodies.*

The Chair discussed the issues of potential consequences UC members have experienced due to their work in the UC. The Chair of the EB has stressed that this is unacceptable and will investigate the particular individual matters. Besides this, the UC will reach out to the UvA, Leiden, and UU to discuss their policies and see how the UC can adjust these to apply at EUR. This includes making UC work part of R&O (in

a positive way), discussing recognition and reward, letting it count as work and governance experience, among others.

Presidium Announcements
- *LOVUM Meeting*

LOVUM had a large agenda with different topics, here are a few of the core points:
- Attention to the topic of Recognition and Rewards at each University. LOVUM wrote a letter on this. Some important pointers from LOVUM: At some universities UC members (staff and student) are part of a working group on this topic. It is worth discussing how to encapsulate participatory work into recognition and reward. The letter from LOVUM has extra insights on the matter.
- Future of Participation at Universities: The parliament will be discussing reforming participation at Universities. Therefore, the LOVUM will send a letter to state it would like to be involved. Furthermore, they critically review the influence of participatory bodies on a national level, for example at VSNU level. Currently the only bodies doing so are ISO and Unions, the question is whether a participatory body for the VSNU would be "healthy".
- Involving participatory bodies in accreditation: Documentation is available with a letter from the Parliament on this point.
- Work pressure was discussed, it is clear this is a complicated issue at all universities. The call was made to exchange more actively what is happening and what seems to work.

- *ICT Rules and Regulations*

The Ombudsperson has indicated that she will work with the legal department on article 7.2 of the ICT regulations. The UC is asked to withhold consent until this article is reframed. The taskforce will need to review this article and will be given extra input on advice on this topic (Wouter can be consulted on this).

- *Taskforce Leaders*

At the end of the first plenary meeting of a new cycle, the Chair will go over the new taskforces that have been formed to ask for a lead or appoint one (keeping in mind how much a particular member has already done).

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC
02.01 Outcome annual chair evaluation*

*As this point concerns the evaluation of the Chair, Ana took the place of chairing to have an objective discussion about it.

The outcome of the evaluation of the Chair is available. Most of the members of the council participated in the evaluation. Furthermore, the Confidentiality Committee had four meetings with UC members who wanted to give more insight into the work of the

Chair. The evaluation is fairly good. Some points of attention are highlighted in the report. The perception of the council on the Chair is good overall. The council highlights that the Chair has a very good relationship with the EB and other bodies. Some members asked if this relationship is perhaps too close to other bodies. Both the Supervisory Board and the Executive Board acknowledge this closeness, but they also reflect that the Chair represents the interests of the council in these meetings. Ana, as head of the evaluation process, considers this to be normal.

The main points of improvement for the Chair are related to voting procedures. There have been some confusions on what members are voting on and the tools to vote. The Chair is aware of this, and he is working on how to clearly establish what is to be voted on. Additionally, the Chair's work outside of the meetings could be discussed. Lastly, there are some points of attention in relation to time management in meetings. There are extra points that could be asked in the questionnaire next year, such as paying attention at the work of the Chair outside of UC meetings.

Now, the Chair can be reappointed for a new term. However, the Confidentiality Committee identified an issue with the terms of appointing a Chair. The current term for the Chair's appointment is for two years, which means that a new Chair is appointed at the same time as newly elected staff and student members of the Council. To guarantee continuity, it would be possible to re-appoint the Chair for one year and afterwards, continue with the two-year cycles.

The Chair is interested in this possibility. Therefore, a vote for his reappointment took place during the meeting. Twenty-one votes were casted: 17 votes in favor of reappointing the current Chair, 2 blank votes, and 2 votes against. Therefore, the Chair has been reappointed for one more year.

On this note, there was a question on revising the Chair's status in the rules and regulations of the UC. Whenever the rules and regulations are revised in the future, there could be a point on re-examining the legal role of the Chair.

02.02 EUR-EMC-TUD Convergence Framework
There is a draft letter on the Convergence Framework. The letter touches upon three main topics. Firstly, a suggestion is made to make it explicit that the most intrusive right of one participatory body should be the same for all participatory bodies involved. Secondly, although not all decisions require advice from participatory bodies, the board should sure that participatory bodies are kept informed. Thirdly, there is a point on formalizing meetings with the stakeholders involved at least once a year. Additionally, there is a general framework for proposing a model of co-creation similar to HoKa to develop projects in the Convergence.

There is a legal question related to Art. 1.3 of the Convergence Framework. This Article explains that parties can collaborate with each other and they can enter an agreement with other parties. However, if there is an agreement that affects the collaboration of the Convergence, the other parties need to be informed. A lot of bureaucratic work could arise because of this article. In the future, this point can be raised to the Legal Team at EUR.

Action Point: After Natascha reviews the letter on the convergence, the draft letter can consequently be sent to the EB.

02.03 Annual Report confidential counselors 2019
There is a letter of unsolicited advice on this topic. The letter asks for the latest report of confidential counsellors. Furthermore, there was an evaluation for the counsellors that needed to take place and the UC is requesting for this to happen. Although these efforts for confidential counsellors are good, more support on the topic is needed. There is a coordinator for the confidential counsellors but they do not have enough time to support with training.

02.04 Communications Approach for Diversity and Inclusion at EUR
The letter written for this point recognizes the document received by the UC. The document was very complex; it was partly a study and partly a summary. Therefore, the letter asks for more concrete actions and for a more systematic approach towards D&I. More personnel to support in this D&I approach are needed for this type of action to have an effect.

The person that presented the document only works part-time for the D&I office. The end of the document proposes a lot of ideas on how to potentially proceed, yet all these actions fall to only one policy maker. Another policy maker needs to support and convert these intentions into policies. A last sentence can be more explicit about this: concrete actions instead of strategies are needed to improve the D&I approach at EUR.

02.05 EUR Internationalization policy 2021-2024
The taskforce is looking at the documents, but no feedback is available yet. The policy maker will meet with the taskforce soon. This point will be moved to the next agenda. This point is for the right of information; no deadline is ahead for the topic.

02.06 Professorial policy
A meeting will take place this week to discuss the professorial policy. Consequently, a letter of advice will be written. The deadline for dealing with this topic was short. EUROPA also discussed this point, and the information from EUROPA will be sent to the taskforce.

02.07 Integral security policy
The taskforce had a meeting with the policy officer. There are two main points in this letter: firstly, there are a lot of regulations to be drafted within this policy, and the UC wants to be included in their development. Secondly, they give different maturity levels for each of the programs, but the goals of these maturity levels are not entirely clear.

The EB explained that it is a high-over policy. It is set to be a broad policy from which more specific points can grow. It covers different topics and programs that take place at EUR. A member of the council explained that in the CMT (Crisis Management Team) at other universities, they include students in these discussions, and this can

be considered in future policies. The question on whether to include students or not in the CMT will be asked during the consultation meeting.

02.08 EUR Regulations of the Advisory Committee Complaints and Objections 2021

This letter has been discussed and sent. The Legal Affairs department called the Chair and mentioned that in relation to the letter, they have been working for two years on software to which students and employees can ask questions about complaints in an intuitive way (a bot), and that directs them to the procedure applicable in their case. It has been difficult to find the right developers for this project. The UC can give some extra encouragement for this system to be developed. The UC has expressed the urge to have better legal communication with the community on separate occasions, so this can be a part of it.

02.09 Decision on BSA by EB (soft cut)

There is a draft letter available for this topic. The letter encourages the EB to consider extending the soft cuts. The letter has been written on a national level, and has already been co-signed by representatives from different university participatory bodies in the Netherlands. The letter will be sent.

On the topic of the BSA, it is expected that in the following months it could be possible to review the BSA policy. Therefore, there is a request for information on six different topics in relation to the BSA. The taskforce would like input on this letter before the end of the next cycle. Consequently, the information received can be evaluated and help form a standpoint if necessary.

02.10 EUR carbon neutrality by 2024

A letter for this point was proposed. The letter will be sent. Furthermore, this topic will be touched upon during the consultation meeting. Yesterday, the sustainability task force met with Mariecke van der Glas and Jan-Cees Jol to receive some insight into how the reports are developed.

Action Point: The letter on EUR carbon neutrality 2024 should be sent.

02.11 LifeVersity

There is a letter on Teams and it was sent to the FCs for support. Afrodita met with the team of LifeVerstiy and the HoKa Coordinator. The idea is that the FCs and UCs give support to the value of LifeVersity to the community. Afterwards, the HoKa Coordinator will make a proposal to the EB on how to embed LifeVersity in HoKa. They are trying to embed it in personal and professional development. This is not a long-term solution because HoKa has an expiration point. For the future, it would be ideal for LifeVersity to become part of the EUR organisation. Both in the consultation meeting and in the letter, the point of long-term integration will be addressed.

The budget of LifeVersity is quite high. There was a question on whether students could financially contribute to the courses they participate in for long-term sustainability. The response from other members was that this would increase the

threshold to enroll in the courses. Furthermore, the larger costs related to the programs of LifeVersity are related to the development of the courses. The operational costs of the training are low. Another idea on how to structurally embed LifeVersity in the university was to integrate it under the umbrella of Student Affairs.

It was pointed out that these types of soft skills should be embedded in the curriculum. Jasper will send Afrodita a draft email on how to recommend the university to have better soft-skills training at a program-level.

Action Point: The LifeVersity letter should be sent after the support from FCs is clear.

02.12 Caring Universities

This letter has been sent. The UC is waiting for answers from the EB on the topic. The Wellbeing HoKa team at EUR is exploring how to include Caring Universities within their framework, but it is uncertain if this will occur.

02.13 Study spots at campus

More study spots will be opened on campus. However, Jasper and Bram wrote a proposal in relation to the way in which the opening of more spots could take place. These are tips and tricks on how to carry out this task. The letter also contains a recommendation on how to unify the reservation software at the university. There could be a partnership with FAECTOR, the study association of Econometrics, to improve this reservation system.

02.14 Ongoing topics

- *Student assessors (Right of initiative)*
  There was no discussion on this topic.

- *Model-OER (Right of initiative)*
  The university is already working on a model OER. They have decided to delay this implementation for the next academic year. However, starting with its development. A working group for this academic year will start. The proposal is to join the working group in the future.

- *Centralizing information streams participation (Right of initiative)*
  A meeting is planned for next week on this topic.

- *More housing on campus (Right of initiative)*
  There is a draft letter available. It will be discussed next week.

03 Incoming letters

- *Reply to UC initiative on sustainability awards.*

A meeting took place this morning with Mariecke van der Glas about the awards. Real awards and recognition are needed. Follow-ups on this topic will come soon.

- *Reply to UC question on compensation tuition fees non-EEA students.*

Some follow up questions may be needed to clarify how the decisions of the government impact the fees at EUR. Jasper will review this response and see if this concerns the questions he had drafted about tuition fees at ISS.

Action Point: Jasper will review this response and see if this concerns the questions he had drafted about tuition fees at ISS.

- *Reaction to the UC advice on the appointment procedure of deans*

The UC asked how it can be sure policymakers actually changed points mentioned by the UC in the appointment procedure policy. Normally, the UC does not automatically get the latest version with the improvements on the policy. However, the Clerk will request to the EB that they provide the latest policy on this point.

For the dean's appointment at the EMC, there is a different procedure. The EB explained that the gap for the MC procedure will be implemented in a different document.

Action Points: the Clerk will request to the EB that they provide the latest policy on the Appointment of Deans Procedure when the changes have been made. Additionally, the Appointment of Deans procedure will be included on the agenda of the Chair meeting.

04 Any other business
- *Free Menstrual Products:* a study association made a cabinet with free menstrual products available at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. The UC wants to pick up on this initiative and also make a cabinet available for it on Woudestein campus. Dian is taking initiative on this point. Luca will also help Dian in accomplishing this goal.

- *Involvement of participatory bodies for the quick testing for corona:* The UC would like to explore how participatory bodies are involved in the planning of the rapid testing.

- *Group picture UC:* It is important to have a group picture of the UC. The M&C officer is working on this.