

**University Council  
Second Plenary Meeting  
Erasmus University Rotterdam**

**Date and Time:** 15/01/2022, 14:30-17:00

**Location:** Teams (online meeting)

**Present in the Meeting:** Hans van den Berg (Chair), Simo Azzarhouni, Zohra Hayat, Pi Cheng Hu, Ernst Hulst, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Bram Heesen, Friso Roos, Nikita Schoenmaker, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, John van Wel, Max Wagenaar, Daemon Kregting, Natascha Kraal, Emese von Bóné, Aleid Fokkema, Jasper Klasen, Bianca Jadoenath, Georgiana Carp, Hamza Erdogan, Onka Sarwari, Lobke van Steenberghe (clerk), Oriana Morales Hernández (minutes).

**Absent in the Meeting:** Robbert Rog, Cagla Altin, Timo Zandvliet, Patryk Jarmakowicz.

## **01 Opening**

### **01.02 Setting of the agenda**

The agenda has been set.

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

The minutes have been set.

### **01.03 Announcements**

#### *- Party Leader Debate*

The Chair and the Clerk were contacted by the Rotterdamse Kamer van Verenigingen (RKvV) to organize a Party Leader Debate for the students of Rotterdam. They met with their organizational team and discussed various scenarios on arranging a debate. The UC could contribute 700-900 euros to the debate and get involved in its organization. For instance, the Council could give input in different statements, as well as promote the visibility of the UC. The RKvV is also looking for various ways of financing the debate through other parties.

#### *- BSA*

The BSA rules will again be more flexible this year due to the pandemic. The UNL (former VSNU) made a press release about the continuation of this measure. It is important to notice that this does not mean permanent changes in the BSA rule. Instead, it is a measure applied to the 2021-2022 academic year.

#### *- New Member of the Supervisory Board*

There is a new proposed candidate for the Supervisory Board. The Confidentiality Committee had the chance to meet this person and got a good impression. The process for appointing a new member for the SB has slightly changed since the previous appointment. Thus, if extra steps are required for the appointment of this person, the Chair will communicate this information to the Council.

#### *- UC Physical/Online Meetings*

It is likely that the government will decrease some of the COVID-19 related regulations this evening in its press conference. The Council, and more explicitly the Presidium, will follow-up on what this means for the UC meetings. There is a debate on whether the activities of the

Council should be considered as educational. This has an impact on whether physical meetings can take place. This theme will be discussed in the coming weeks.

- *Menstrual Products on Campus*

The pilot on the menstrual products on Campus is going well. The tender that supplies sanitary products for the university expires in 2032, and thus, waiting for a new tender to include menstrual products would not be ideal. Thus, the EB explained that they will talk to the company that has the tender to see if they can expand their services to the provision of menstrual products. The task force will provide a reasoning for why this project is needed. Real Estate & Facilities will check its costs and propose two scenarios: one in which all toilets are supplied with menstrual products, and another in which only some toilets are supplied with them.

- *Chair Qualifications for Teaching*

The Chair is going through the process of obtaining his formal qualifications for teaching. This intervenes with his attendance at the two upcoming Consultation Meetings. Thus, Zohra and John will be co-chairing the upcoming Consultation Meeting for the first hour, and the agenda will be slightly adjusted so the Chair can take over the meeting after the first hour has passed. The clerk is discussing with the EB whether the meeting of the 10<sup>th</sup> of March can be rescheduled one hour later to avoid this scenario.

## **02 Agenda items**

### **02.01 CLI budget**

*Guests: Marieke Veenstra (CLI), Jeroen Jansz (CLI), Mirjam van de Woerd.*

The following is a summary of the most relevant questions and answers from the discussion between the CLI representatives and the UC. The budget discusses some points for 2021, and other components for 2022. Yet, the progress report for 2022 will give more information about the spendings of the current calendar year in March. The CLI promised that they will provide written answers to all the questions from the UC for further clarification. Thus, members of the Council can refer to their written answers to look for more detailed information about the topic.

#### **Document 1 – Budget of the CLI**

- *There has been severe underspending in the CLI in 2021. What guarantees that there will not be the same underspending in 2022?*

In 2021, the teachers of the university were undergoing a lot of work pressure due to the pandemic. Less people stated new projects. Additionally, there has been some misunderstandings on the role of the CLI across campus, as some employees believe that they can only request funding for matters of innovation, whilst the CLI can provide support for a variety of projects. Thus, it is expected that these circumstances are not repeated in 2022.

- *Is it contested that the surplus from the 2021 underspending remains with the CLI?*  
It is not contested. The surplus money is going to remain within the CLI.

- *What will be the procedure for employees to use some of the surplus money?*  
The CLI has a low threshold approach for innovation projects. Increasingly, more of the budget goes to logistics. The low threshold approach will continue for the funding of new projects.

- *Should the UC push for reconsidering a redistribution of the surplus money?*

The CLI believes that this is not necessary. Additionally, their budget has been reviewed by the financial institutions of the university without a reconsideration for the funding.

*- There is a lack of specifics on the fellows programs. At the moment, there is 300K for CLI fellows. However, in the Erasmus Online document there is another 150 K for CLI fellows. Is the same true for the other overall headings such as Educational Innovation Projects?*

There is a large group of fellows working on the program. They are given a budget of one day a week for a period of two weeks. The CLI is very keen on making it fit with the HoKa criteria, and this is difficult for the establishment of some projects.

### **Document 3 - Erasmus Online**

The CLI started with this project in the early days of the pandemic. The project aims to tackle master and pre-master students. The idea behind Erasmus Online is to provide engaging online education, which is different to the way that education has taken place during the pandemic. The UC believes that the plans for Erasmus Online are overall vague and speculative. For instance, the lack of social interaction in online education is acknowledged, but not convincingly solved in the documents.

- *Where is the CLI now in this process?*

There are four already existing programs that are being tackled for the Erasmus Online. There are two masters from ESSB, one master from ESHCC, and one pre-master from ESHPM. The project was striving to go live in 2022, however, this will only be possible for the Master in psychology of Digital Media for ESSB. The remaining programs will be in discussions to go live in 2023. For all the programs, an action plan is being developed. The plans include the involvement of participatory bodies, and management teams.

- *To what extent participatory bodies have been involved in the development of the Master and Pre-master tracks?*

In all programs, there has been a close contact with the vice-deans of education and the management team. The participatory bodies are being approached according to their pertinent rights, which in this case is the right of advice.

- *There is a large sum on money going to the project development of Erasmus Online. How do you see this budget distribution?*

Each of the projects are in different stages of development, and they need a liaison with the program. Thus, in order to establish a good liaison, budget needs to be allocated for FTEs in each project.

- *How does this process relate to the creation of new programs and the rights of participatory bodies?*

The CLI is following the normal procedures for the establishment of Erasmus Online. Each program is being adapted to an online variant. However, they are not new programs. Thus, advice from the Program Committees is required, and in some cases, the CLI can have discussions with the Faculty Councils of the programs involved.

- *Couldn't the Erasmus Online project be seen as a new university?*

No, the entire program runs under the label of Erasmus University.

- *Have you analyzed the relationship between student wellbeing and online education?*

Yes. Erasmus Online tackles the design of online education, as well as online social community platforms for students.

- *How will examinations take place at Erasmus Online?*

The number and format of assessment will be reviewed by the pertaining programs. It is not up to the CLI to decide on the nature of the examinations.

- *On the long-term budget, there is a trend for overspending in the future. Why is this the case? Where will the money come from (40k in overspending)?*

That money can be financed with the surplus. The CLI believes that in the future, the university will have more underspending in some schools.

To conclude, the team of the CLI stated that they would provide written answers to all the UC's questions. Additionally, they will provide an updated progress report. Thus, the UC will not take a decision on whether to consent or not to the budget in this cycle, but in the months of March/April after they have received the updated 2022 progress report.

## **02.02 EUR Sustainable Mobility in business travel policy**

This morning, the task force discussed the business travel policy. It is unclear what the exact timeline and implementation of the policy is. Furthermore, there are questions about who is the exact target audience of the policy; for instance, does it apply to study associations or just to employees?

Another point emerged in the discussion, that had not been considered by the task force: are employees with a lower income taken into consideration when paying higher prices for travel-tickets, even though they need to be reimbursed afterwards for the ticket prices? This point was brought up in the Chairs meeting, and the answer may differ per faculty.

The discussion of this point is not urgent. Thus, it will not be included in the agenda of the upcoming consultation meeting. The task force will communicate with the policy maker to follow-up on some questions.

## **02.03 Master Societal Transitions**

The task force read the documents, and there are no further questions for the point of information. This agenda point will not be included in the upcoming Consultation Meeting. A member of the Council highlighted that setting interdisciplinary programs in the university is particularly challenging. There are bureaucratic issues in setting this type of interdisciplinary education. The faculty-based system complicates the acknowledgement of different examination procedures within one program. In the future, Max will bring more inquiries about this topic.

## **02.04 Reorganisation and organisational change;**

### **02.05 Transition HR ESL to HR PRO**

These two points are on the agenda due to the changes in the collective labour agreement of last year. The agreement came into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January of this year. It stipulates that when there are changes to the organisation, but there are no people losing their jobs, then the changes will not be treated as a reorganization.

This will be the case in some changes in the organisational structure of HR from ESL to Central. No jobs will be lost in this transition; thus, it will not be treated as a reorganisation. EUROPA is also involved in supervising this process.

In conclusion, points 02.04 and 02.05 will not be discussed with the EB in the upcoming Consultation Meeting.

### **02.06 Compensation Participatory Bodies**

Currently, the task force is doing research and gathering information to proceed. They aim to have a letter on the topic ready by the end of the cycle. The Chair has asked the EB about more information on centralizing the compensation schemes at the university, but they have not responded. This agenda point may be included at the Consultation Meeting.

### **02.07 Ecosia as standard browser**

Ideally, a discussion about Ecosia would take place with Robbert, in order to follow-up with the discussion from the last plenary meeting. However, he was not present during this part of the meeting. The task force therefore asks members of the Council to continue sharing through Teams information that they may have about Ecosia. The sustainability task force already shared some points about it. This discussion will not be tabled for the Consultation Meeting.

### **02.08 Students with a disability**

The Chair discussed with the Ombudsperson the situation of students with disabilities being uncomfortable with the Campus facilities. Various students have stated that the Campus is not suitable for people with physical impairments. It appears that there is a department at the university that should be tackling a policy on the facilities for students with special needs. The UC can ask the EB to follow-up on this policy, and see if it can be discussed with the Council. At this point, there is no information on the nature of the policy, or any legal obligations to improve the accessibility of the campus. As soon as more information is available, it will be shared with the UC.

On another point, it is important for members of the Council to have another conversation with the Ombudsperson, as last year's conversations were very fruitful. The 2021 report from the Ombudsperson will be available soon, and the Chair will make sure to reserve enough time for the UC to talk about it with her.

### **02.09 Wearing masks and keeping distances during lectures**

Albert proposed a letter to discuss what will happen if the current government advice changes in relation to the use of face masks in lectures. It is in the interest of the Council to ask whether the EB will facilitate masks for students and lecturers, and see what the guidelines will be for both employees and students on this topic. For instance, will lecturers be able to ask their students to wear face masks during class? Currently, there is an overall feeling that the members of the community are not complying with the COVID-19 related regulations. Therefore, the questions will be sent to the EB in writing, and will also be touched upon during the Consultation Meeting. Some of the questions may need to be adjusted in accordance with the information given by the Dutch government during tonight's press conference.

**Action Point: Albert will adjust the letter with questions to the EB on face masks on Campus so it can be sent before the Consultation Meeting.**

### **02.10 Profile and process new chair Update from the Confidentiality Committee**

The Confidentiality Committee has shared an outline of the procedure for hiring a new Chair for the UC. The outline is very similar to the last appointments of a new Chair with some minor adjustments. The profile is now on Teams, and the CC will wait for feedback on the profile in order to approve it in the upcoming plenary meeting.

There were a few discussions on the requirements for the profile. For instance, some members were supportive of having proficiency in both Dutch and English as requirements in the profile, while others were against. The outcome of this discussion was that if there is an excellent candidate that does not speak Dutch, they could still be appointed. It is important to remember that profiles are just for reference, and that there is no candidate that can fit perfectly with all the requirements. The same applies to other requirements, such as being familiar with the rights of participatory bodies at the university. Furthermore, there was a discussion on whether the profile should include the fact that the position is a “technical” Chair. Yet, this topic will be managed through feedback on Teams.

Ideally, the profile will be ready by the 9<sup>th</sup> of February, and the vacancy will be open for three weeks to a month. More information will be discussed in the upcoming plenary meeting.

### **03 Incoming documents**

*-Response to Eu-HEM fee*

**Action Point: Aleid and Jasper will look at this letter.**

*-BBR-EUR 2022*

**Action Point: John will follow up on this topic.**

*- BSA*

There was no discussion about this point

### **04 Any other business**

There were no discussions under any other business.

### **05 Closing**