

**Plenary Meeting - University Council**  
**Erasmus University**  
**March 30th, 2021**

**Present in the Meeting:** Ana Uribe Sandoval, Ben Bode, John van Wel, Natascha Kraal, Sebastiaan Kamp, Albert Wagelmans, Yogi Hendlin, Afrodita Dobрева, Luca Kriese, Philip van Moll, Wouter van Dam, Younes Assou, Hans van den Berg, Helen Gubby, Dian van Toor, Bianca Jadoenath, Marjan Gorgievski, Diederik Mosch, Machteld Harmsen, Olaf Hornes, Joep Schoenmakers, Armand Gozé.

**Absent in the Meeting:** John Piarelal, Bram Heesen, Jasper Klasen, Ferry Blom.

**Teams Meeting:** 15:00

| <b>Index</b>   | <b>Page #</b> |
|--|---------------|
| 01 Opening   | 1             |
| 01.01 Setting of the agenda  | 1             |
| 01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting                       | 1             |
| 01.03 Announcements  | 1             |
| 02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC   | 2             |
| 02.01 HeQa: Impact at the Core budget                                      | 2             |
| 02.02 February Report on 2020 spending HeQa                                | 3             |
| 02.03 First report employee well-being monitor                             | 5             |
| 02.04 EUR Internationalization policy 2021-2024                            | 5             |
| 02.05 Discontinuation post-initial Master of Public Information Management | 5             |
| 02.06 Recognition & Reward: update   | 6             |
| 02.07 Second Camera - UC Student delegation (closed session)               | 6             |
| 02.08 Initiatives under right of initiative                                | 6             |
| 02.09 Incoming letters   | 7             |
| 02.10 Outgoing letters   | 7             |
| 03 Any other business  | 7             |
| 04 Closing   | 7             |

## **01 Opening**

### **01.01 Setting of the agenda**

Added Agenda Item: Second Camera (closed session)

### **01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes from the last two plenary meetings have been set.

### **01.03 Announcements**

#### *Chair Announcements*

#### *- Working Method of the UC*

The following is a break-down of the working methods that will be applied in the current and next cycles:

- a) In the current cycle plenary meetings take place during the first, third and fifth week of the cycle. The consultation meeting will take place in the fifth week of the cycle. Task forces can reserve a time slot for the Tuesday in the fourth week of the cycle to have an in-depth session for their topic with the UC. Task forces need to indicate to the Clerk before 31st of March 12.00 if they wish to use a timeslot. The Clerk will then plan one and invite the whole UC. It is up to individual UC members whether they attend.
- b) In the next cycle, plenary meetings take place during the first, fourth and fifth week of the cycle. The consultation meeting will take place in the fifth week of the cycle. Task forces will be able to reserve a time slot for an in-depth session for their topic with the UC anywhere after the first plenary meeting and before the 2nd plenary meeting in the fourth week. Task forces can indicate a time and date to the Clerk for the in-depth session, who will then plan it and invite all UC members (the initiative is thus with the task forces to plan such a session). It is up to individual UC members whether or not they attend.
- c) In the final cycle of this year plenary meetings will again take place during the first, third and fifth week of the cycle. The consultation meeting will take place in the fifth week of the cycle. In-depth sessions will be planned in the fourth week for all topics before the UC that have consent or advice right. Machteld will plan and invite all UC members. It is up to individual UC members whether or not they attend.

As mentioned under 1a, any task force during this cycle that wants to plan an in-depth session on their topic with the whole UC needs to indicate this to the Clerk before 31st of March 12.00. She will pick this up further.

#### *- Action Points in the Planner*

The action points from Plenary and Consultation Meetings will now be included in the Planner. The action points will be added by the minute secretary within three days after each meeting. Members can see the action points from the last two meetings we have had. Members can easily mark them as complete whenever they have finished them. If further questions arise from this point, UC members can contact the minute secretary.

#### *- Confidential Documents Second Camera*

The documents shared by the Clerk, which were originally sent by the Executive Secretary of the EB, about the second camera are confidential.

- *Profile of the Rector*

This weekend, the profile for the recruitment of the new Rector was published on external platforms. The Chair had not been informed, but he will communicate with the SB about it. Anything significant about the process of recruitment will be sent to the UC. The Chair is not sure if the university is looking for an external person considering that the profile has now been published. All EUR professors received an email saying that they were looking outside, as there was not a lot of interest from the inside. However, it is possible that a lot of the information about recruitment and selection is confidential.

*Presidium Announcements*

- *Taskforce Overview*

Members can find a document with a task force overview (which task forces each member has contributed to) on the UC Teams. However, it is important to note that being part of a certain amount of task forces does not equal to high or low participation in the UC. For instance, members of the Confidentiality Committee are involved in different matters, but this is not reflected in the document on the task forces and some task forces also take up a lot more time than others (for instance HoKa).

- *Updates from Vice-Chairs*

The presidium will, from now on, go over the UC agenda point items, and the Vice Chairs will provide a short update on each topic when available. The presidium minutes are published on teams, this way UC members can check for any updates on the different task forces. Do note that Vice Chairs are mainly involved in process and not perse on content. Therefore, the notes will focus mainly on process updates.

- *Using the UC office*

Members of the UC have indicated they would like to start using the office again. The presidium is in favor, however current campus regulations prevent this. Currently to get access to a workspace special security clearance is necessary 24 hours before the actual use. As students do not have an employment contract with the University getting an employee card is not possible. This card is necessary to get the security clearance. Once this rule is lifted, the UC will have to construct a reservation system to prevent more than 4 people from being in the office at one time. The Presidium will keep you updated on progress on this point.

## **02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC**

### **02.01 HeQa: Impact at the Core budget**

The HoKa Workgroup has worked with the team of Impact at the Core (IAC) to review their budget. The budget that is now being presented to the council was agreed upon in December. In the meantime, more progress has been made at IAC. Currently, more projects are being started. IAC has contacted all schools to develop plans. Additionally, they are working on completing the team with some post-doctoral researchers.

IAC has a large emphasis on the educational plan. The team has two Learning Innovators, and they are looking for a third one. The HoKa Coordinator is supporting the team at the moment. During the process of co-creation, some changes were made, and it was decided to hire post-doctoral researchers instead of PhDs. One post-doctoral researcher will be shared with Erasmus X.

*Questions and Answers with the Project Lead, Daniel van Vliet.*

- *When looking at the final budget, it is not clear what is meant with the resources for “boosting new initiatives.” Could you clarify what these funds are spent on?*

The boosting new initiatives budget is there for supporting any open calls for teachers or students that come up with a new project. Faculties can also use this budget for new initiatives. This is a mix between a bottom-up and top-down approach. For instance, EMC wants to create a new course related to Art for transdisciplinary education. IAC looks at these types of projects, see if they fit, and then revamp the project to make it feasible.

- *What is the difference between boosting new initiatives and prototyping and testing?*

At the moment, IAC is prototyping and testing to see what works and what does not work. This phase of the projects is ending in 2022 because projects are scaling up. IAC aims to have projects and initiatives impacting all programmes of EUR soon.

- *Can you give the UC some insight into the day-to-day work of the Learning Innovators?*

The Learning Innovators work with a variety of activities. They focus on education, but they also work with a quality framework, communication with stakeholders, taking part in the community of practices, among others. They want to share the knowledge developed in certain projects. There is a lot of designing, reading, and communication involved in this position; it is a very iterative process.

- *What best practices could come from the outside instead of running a costly experimental budget?*

IAC looks for sustainable ways of implementing best practices for education at the University. They want to prevent projects becoming unsustainable or just inefficient in the future. IAC works on long-term projects which are evidence-based and have the capacity of being embedded in the educational structures of EUR. IAC asks faculties for a financial commitment so that projects can become independent of IAC in the future. There is only one project as of now that is not embedded in an independent financial structure. This is software that will be included on Canvas so that external stakeholders can access information from certain courses and work with teachers and students. Some faculties are already interested in financing this project, and it is relatively affordable software.

*Input from the HoKa Workgroup*

The Workgroup believes that this budget makes sense according to the HoKa plans. There are no serious issues with this budget. The Workgroup has been involved in changing some details of this budget during the process of co-creation. The Workgroup believes that IAC is doing their best to share knowledge in the EUR community and embed their projects into the university.

## **02.02 February Report on 2020 spending HeQa**

The HoKa Coordinator (Bieneke Verheijke) was present in the meeting to provide answers to some questions that the UC had sent in advance regarding the February Report 2020. She will also provide the answers in a letter by the end of this week. If the UC has any remarks on how to improve the February Report and make it more accessible to a broad range of stakeholders, they can contact the HoKa Coordinator to give some constructive feedback on it.

### *Questions and Answers with the HoKa Coordinator*

- *We can see this rise of student numbers. How does this affect educational quality at EUR and the HoKa funds?*

The element of student influx is not a part of the HoKa plans. The HoKa Coordinator believes that this is a particularly important aspect to study in the university, but it does not fall under the umbrella of HoKa. The only exception where the influx of students is considered under HoKa is if the growth of the students directly affects the plans of HoKa. The coordinator suggests addressing this at a university level.

- *How do HoKa plans deal with under- and over-spending in their projects?*

There is a governance code from 2019 that explains how to deal with under- and over-spending on HoKa. If there are substantial deviations, they are addressed in bilateral conferences between faculty boards and the EB. The coordinator will provide a specific example of how this has been managed in the university in written form. Additionally, she explains that there has not been underspending with HoKa funds coming from the Ministry. Instead, there has been underspending of funds used in HoKa projects coming from the reserves of the university. This is a complex theme but will become clearer in the written answers.

- *Can the UC get more insight on the output of the CLI Fellowships? It was recently reported that one person finished their fellowship, but it is the understanding of the council that dozens of fellowships are active. How are these other fellowships developing?*

The Coordinator has contacted CLI to address this question. As soon as she has answers from CLI, she will communicate with the UC about it.

- *How many professors and teaching staff have been supported by CLI during COVID-19?*

The Coordinator has contacted CLI to address this question. As soon as she has answers from CLI, she will communicate with the UC about it.

- *In the report, it is explained that some projects have a certain number of “students impacted.” How is this operationalized? What does “impact” entail according to this report?*

The “students impacted” number is there to provide context on how many students are enrolled in a programme that includes HoKa projects. A more detailed answer will follow in a written form. In short, this number is cumulative and should be treated as contextual information. Considering that this is a generic number and does not explain how students receive this impact, the coordinator suggested to change the phrasing from “students impacted” to “students involved.”

- *Is there a review of student opinions about HoKa?*

The faculties were supposed to include evaluations of HoKa from students in 2020. However, due to the pandemic, this became difficult. In 2021, a review from students needs to be included. Furthermore, the national student survey can be used as a tool to get input from students. However, this survey also has limitations due to COVID-19.

- *Why is the role of participatory bodies limited in the report?*

In the 6.1 implementation plan of HoKa, it was agreed that the HoKa Coordinator will provide the UC with a report twice a year on the developments of HoKa. If further information is needed on this report, such as the role of participatory bodies, then the formalistic rules of the reporting need to be changed. It is important to notice that the HoKa Workgroup has been asked to include a letter of reflection that accompanies this report. Nevertheless, the workgroup can discuss with the coordinator the possibility of integrating the role of participatory bodies in this report.

### **02.03 First report employee well-being monitor**

There is another meeting that the task force is planning on this topic. Two meetings with Roos Schelvis took place last week. The task force wants to communicate to the EB through a letter the three fundamental issues with this wellbeing monitor. This letter will be available for the council next week.

1) The wellbeing monitor emphasizes the individual employee as the main person accountable for staying healthy. People who filled in the monitor noticed that the monitor is asking what employees themselves have done or are doing to make their work better manageable during COVID-19 and improve their work conditions. These questions evoked negative reactions.

2) The monitor does not clearly convey that the university is aware of the underlying issues for work stress and other wellbeing-related issues.

3) The task force members missed questions on how employees experience university support (broader than supervisor support and individual autonomy, and more related to policy making, strategies, culture, and psychological safety). There is an empty space in the figure facing the "individual strategies", where "company strategies" seem to be missing.

Roos Schelvis has a lot of suggestions based on the wellbeing monitor. The task force would like to touch on this topic in the consultation meeting. They would like to hear what the concrete actions are that the EB will take regarding the results of this monitor. To summarize, the UC would like to know what the assignment is coming from this point. They will ask this question, as well as what is the influence of the EB in the content of the employee wellbeing monitor, in the next consultation meeting.

A member of the council asked if there is any link between the employee wellbeing monitor and the student wellbeing monitor. It seems that they do not relate to each other, and that the current employee wellbeing monitor has changed in contrast to previous years.

**Action point: Marjan will publish the letter on the first report of the Employee Wellbeing Monitor on Teams next week.**

### **02.04 EUR Internationalization policy 2021-2024**

There will be a letter from the taskforce on the internationalization policy next week. It will be shared on Teams.

**Action Point: The taskforce working on the internationalization policy 2021-2024 will share a letter on Teams about the policy.**

### **02.05 Discontinuation post-initial Master of Public Information Management**

There is no further information about this topic. It will not be tabled again for this cycle.

## **02.06 Recognition & Reward: update**

This is a UC initiative. A meeting about Recognition and Reward will take place on the 20th of April.

## **02.07 Second Camera - UC Student delegation (closed session)**

### **02.08 Initiatives under right of initiative:**

- *Compensation UC.*

No updates on this point

- *Abandoned Bikes on campus.*

A letter was posted last night about this topic. The decision on whether to send this letter will be taken in the next plenary. Members should notify if there are any objections on the letter before the next meeting to prepare any adjustments.

- *Extending number of OpenUp sessions.*

This point will be put as a question to the EB when discussing the wellbeing monitor.

- *Student assessors.*

It seems that another university in the Netherlands has a student assessor in the EB. It may be interesting to further explore this point to incorporate more student assessors in the university.

- *Centralizing information streams participatory bodies.*

Last week, there was a meeting for drafting a *shopping list* of what is wanted from the centralization of information streams. This point was briefly discussed in the Chair meeting this morning, and the councils of the university will provide some input on what they would like to see on this platform. The idea is to have a data-base and searchable website where individuals can find all the information related to participatory bodies. For instance, the platform could host agendas, documents being discussed, communication between FCs, etc. At the moment, there is not an exact timeline on this point. It will probably be a long-term topic. All councils will be contacted to inquire about what would be needed in this platform. In the short-term, the Clerk will create a Teams environment for communication between EUR Councils.

It is not clear if this platform would be open to the broader public or if it would be closed to the EUR community. Ideally, it could have a function to serve both. Some documents could be confidential while other documents can be public. This point needs to be approached carefully, and the task force will investigate it.

- *Free sanitary products on campus*

The first meeting between the task force and the PhD working on this topic took place. Additionally, Dian is attempting to contact the organization at VU that created their own cabinet for sanitary products.

There is a discussion on what would be the best approach to offer free sanitary products on campus. Originally, the UC wanted to arrange the sanitary product cabinet by themselves. Another possibility would be to ask the EB to act on this. There is some complexity on the topic, as it might be part of a contract that was awarded through a European tender and there might be other rules governing offering free sanitary products at EUR. Therefore,

the taskforce will investigate the context and situation to propose a plan of approach. Communication with VU would be a great step to achieve this goal.

**Action Point: The Clerk will send the taskforce the contact of the policy maker in charge of sanitary products at EUR.**

## 02.09 Incoming letters

- *EB response to letter on student organisations / point of contact.*

This letter is very positive. The EB is looking into giving resources for a person of contact within E&S. There is not a timeframe included in the response from the EB. Therefore, it is important that this topic is followed-up in the future.

- *EB response to letter on Whistleblower's Committee*

If a response is needed the task force will draft a proposal letter and it will be discussed in a future meeting.

- *EB response to letter on BSA policy*

The EB explained that this is a difficult year to evaluate the BSA policy. This is a satisfactory reply. If a response is needed the task force will draft a proposal letter and it will be discussed in a future meeting.

- *EB response to letter on use of second camera during online proctoring*

There was no further discussion on this point.

## 02.10 Outgoing letters

- Increasing budget for University Library (right of initiative)

This letter is not yet finalized. The letter is being adjusted according to the given feedback.

- Information on evaluating and contracting educational software (right of information).

This letter has been withdrawn. A different type of letter needs to be written because of conflicts with the European tender.

## 03 Any other business

- *LifeVersity Letter*

There is a complete list of signatories from the FCs. The letter is going to be prepared today or tomorrow for sending EB, but will be shared with the HoKa coordinator beforehand. There will be a proposal on how to incorporate LifeVersity on HoKa processes. The UC will be reached for consent in the case that LifeVersity becomes embedded in HoKa. Additionally, this letter includes a paragraph on the future sustainability of HoKa projects.

- *Letter on EB Expenses*

The deadline has lapsed for a response on this point. The Clerk of the UC will speak with the Executive Secretary of the EB to inquire about the response from the EB on their expenses, as the letter asking for information was sent more than six weeks ago. This point can be added to the consultation meeting for asking questions.

**Action Point: The Clerk of the UC will speak with the Executive Secretary of the EB to inquire about the response from the EB on their expenses, as the letter asking for information was sent more than six weeks ago.**

## 04 Closing