



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

Date and Time: 17/05/2022, 14:30 – 17:30h

Location: T3-29

Present in the Meeting: Hans van den Berg (Chair), Pi Cheng Hu, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Yusuf Balci, Cagla Altin, Friso Roos, John van Wel, Aleid Fokkema, Timo Zandvliet, Max Wagenaar, Natascha Kraal, Simo Azzarhouni, Georgiana Carp, Nikita Schoenmaker, Albert Wagelmans, Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Oriana Morales Hernández (Minutes).

Absent: Emese von Bóné, Jasper Klasen, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Bianca Jadoenath, Ernst Hulst, Robbert Rog, Zohra Hayat.

Online: Daemon Kregting, Irena Boskovic.

01 Opening

01.01 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 Action points from the previous meeting

- *The UC-members will inform the Clerk the reasoning if you can't join the meeting physically and want to listen in digitally.*

This point is ongoing.

- *The Chair will send out a survey to all UC-members.*

This point is ongoing. The English translation of both reports will be added to Teams this week.

- *Student members will have a meeting with the external legal advisor to discuss the compensation of the student members. Also, will bring in the position of international students.*

This meeting is not being planned yet. But will be planned in the upcoming few weeks.

- *UC members should send any questions regarding Student Wellbeing for the EB by Thursday 17:00h*

The Clerk did not receive any questions. However, two points were raised during the meeting. Firstly, the Council would like to address the status of sexual misconduct on campus based on the latest Erasmus Magazine article. And secondly, the UC would like to address the status of internships for students in the EMC, and its relationship to inclusivity.

- *The Chair will forward the response that he received on the interdisciplinary of the allocation model to the entire council.*

The Chair will forward this message as soon as possible.

- *Project for the mental health of students*

A member of the Council received information regarding a course on students' mental health. They want to see if this course could be promoted by the UC. Therefore, they will contact the Clerk to introduce this point to the agenda.

Action point: Cagla will email the Clerk with information about the student wellbeing program to include it in the agenda for the next cycle.

01.03 Announcements

- *HoKa - UC Meeting*

A meeting for the UC will be planned on June 14th to follow-up on the HoKa budgets and their relation to the educational vision of the university. An invitation will be sent to all Council members later this week.

- *Participation day 24 May*

The UC Secretariat has planned the participation day for May 24th. There is an agenda program on MyEUR to see the different activities of the day. There is an open invitation to all UC members to join throughout the day.

- *New UC member*

John's successor in the UC has been announced by the Central Election Office. Jaap Cornelese (PRO) will take his place next year. Jaap works at Erasmus Digitalisation & Information Services (EDIS). That is the name after the merger of IT and CIO. For your information there will be information shared about EDIS next cycle.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Evaluation of the revision of the internal allocation model

Guests: Elisabeth Zwaan and Pieter Jellema

The evaluation of the Internal Allocation Model recently took place. It was carried out by an agency external to the EUR considering the delicacy of the subject. The evaluation also had the involvement of internal stakeholders at the university in the form of a steering group, including UC members, deans, and policymakers. The report of the allocation model is quite lengthy and heavy. Therefore, the guests provided a summary of the topic and results of the evaluation.

Summary of the evaluation

The main question of the evaluation of the internal allocation model was the following: *did the revision of the internal allocation model from 2018 fulfil the objectives that were set back then?* To answer this question, a broad evaluation took place. There was a focus on six different themes.

- First, it was asked whether the model is transparent. The results show that the model is complex and is not perceived as transparent by the interviewees. The university is on its way to make it more transparent, but more efforts are needed.
- Second, the model's simplicity and reliability were studied. The model is not simple, and there are limitations on how to explain the allocation in some boxes.

- Third, the robustness and sustainability of the model were analysed. It appears that there is friction among faculties, and some processes are under pressure. At the same time, the model is close to the national model, which gives it robustness but makes innovations difficult to accomplish.
- Fourth, the evaluation considered whether the model contributes to the strategic goals of the university. The results show that this contribution has been successful, but that there is rivalry among faculties to obtain budgeting.
- Fifth, the model incorporates internal income as one of its pillars, which is seen as a positive development. However, there is a critique on whether there are enough stimuli for obtaining external funding.
- Lastly, it was analysed whether the model can absorb external developments. The model does absorb these developments, although there is some financial pressure to accomplish this.

Conclusion

The internal allocation model is a very complex matter. The external agency explained that there are various critiques on the process level of the model, but that there are fewer critiques on the parameters of the model itself. Quick actions could be taken to improve the communication and information about the internal allocation model, and the EUR could use inspiration from other universities on how to proceed with its model. There will be a benchmarking on how other four Dutch universities are managing this matter. Advice from the steering committee will follow in June, stating whether a revision on the model is needed.

Natascha will take a look at the proposals from the policymakers on the quick actions to improve the feedback on the evaluation of the allocation model and will send information to the UC about it.

Action point: Natascha will take a look at the proposals from the policymakers on the quick actions to improve the feedback on the evaluation of the allocation model and will send information to the UC about it.

02.02 Numerus Fixus 2023-2024

Guests: Carolien Hennekam (E&S), Leen Blok (Erasmus MC), Maarten Frens (Erasmus MC)

The guests are present in the meeting as the UC received the advice from all FCs regarding the numerus fixus for the academic year 2023-2024. Appendix 9 of this documentation contains the input from the FC of the Erasmus Medical Center. This FC provided a negative advice on the numerus fixus, and thus, faculty representatives from the Erasmus MC would like to discuss this advice.

The representatives from Erasmus MC explained that they regret and disagree with the advice given by the FC of the EMC. They explain that the advice does not take into consideration the laws in place for numerus fixus, nor the positioning of the Erasmus MC in the Netherlands. In the entire country, there are around 3000 places available for becoming a doctor every year. Of these places, 410 have been assigned to the Erasmus MC by the Ministry. An advising organ has given a positive outlook on this number of students. Doctors are needed in the country, and thus, the Erasmus MC has a responsibility of training new personnel.

The FC does not have the right of advice on the number of places available for medical students, but rather, they have advice in the way these students are chosen. Yet, the Faculty Board asked the FC for their input. The FC proposed to lower the intake of students. The Board

considers their input irresponsible and believe that if they are to follow their advice, this would cause damage to both the Erasmus MC and to health at a national level.

Erasmus University has a responsibility of educating doctors. Usually, 410 students enrol in the program, and around 360 graduates. If the Erasmus MC takes fewer students, this will put a higher level of pressure on other medical institutions in the country that are already at their full capacity. Additionally, fewer students mean less funding for the Erasmus MC, which would have an impact on the quality of education for the few students that enrol in the program. The Erasmus MC representatives explained that the argumentation from the FC to decrease the number of students is this flawed. In the future, the Dutch Cabinet may adjust the law on Numerus Fixus, so they can be established for a maximum of three years. However, this law has not been implemented as of now. Natascha will follow-up on this information with one of the policymakers.

Q&A

- *It appears that there is a large conflict between the Faculty Board and the FC on the numerus fixus. How can the UC help in this situation?*

The UC can help by giving positive advice to the numerus fixus. Their board believes that there are problems to be solved, but that lowering the number of students in the Erasmus MC is not the solution.

- *Why are there so many students in the Netherlands waiting for their specialization?*

Currently, there are around six to seven thousand students waiting for their medical specialization in the country. The reason is that some specializations, such as surgery and oncology, are more popular than other tracks such as general practice and psychiatry. Students in the Erasmus MC have a waiting time lower than the national average of unemployment. The Erasmus MC wants to create a new curriculum that could lead more students into the less popular tracks of medicine.

- *What is the waiting time for medical students to start their master's degree in Rotterdam?*

Students wait for their master's degree for less than one year. The waiting list time in Rotterdam is not worrying when compared with other Dutch medical centres. Furthermore, it is expected that the waiting times will decrease through the creation of more spots and the removal of bottlenecks to enrol in the master's. It would be impossible to eliminate the waiting times in its entirety, and this is a standard custom for medical programs. The waiting time also serves to make sure that students start their internships in different months, and that all specialties are covered.

- *What is your response to the letter of negative advice from the Erasmus MC FC?*

The faculty board provided detailed answers on why they believe that their advice is incorrect.

- *Does the Erasmus MC have a say in the number of spots available for each medical specialty?*

No, the Erasmus MC does not decide this.

Conclusion

The advice from the UC is independent of that of the FC. The UC needs to give advice on the numerus fixus on a global level and focus on all programs. If there are further questions for the Faculty Board of the Erasmus MC, they can be sent to the Clerk for further clarification.

02.03 CLI Budget

The clerk has to send in the questions the UC want to discuss during the meeting next week (24 May) to the CLI. The following is a list of questions that will be addressed:

- Page 14: Mentions finance participant cost for lecturers to get SUTQ, - The UC would like to know why this is part of the CLI/HeQa budget and not paid by the EUR out of a general budget?
- Page 15: The UC would like to know what is meant by 'unbundling'?
- Page 15/16/17 ErasmusU_Online – The UC would like to know why HeQa money is spend for target groups like internationals and students with a disability. The UC is in favour of developing programmes for those target groups but would like to know why this is done with HeQa money which should benefit Dutch students. Shouldn't EUR spend general allocated money to these developments?
- The UC has the same question when it comes to lifelong learners – can't they pay more? And do we need to use HeQa money?
- In relation to 'The CLI network organisation' The UC would like to know more about the collaboration with ErasmusX and latC also in relation to the budget.
- Regarding Fellows. The UC would like to know what the effect is of working with fellows? How does the gathered knowledge and experience find its way/benefit the larger community?

02.04 HeQa Midterm Report

The midterm report has been submitted to the UC as a point of information. Last Friday, members of the HoKa taskforce joined a follow-up meeting for brainstorming about new projects that could rise considering the results of the report. It would be important to make a bridge between the finance taskforce and the HoKa workgroup, as funding is needed in different areas of the university and the HoKa money could be used as support.

02.05 Highlight report "Campus in ontwikkeling / Campus under development III"

Last meeting, the Secretariat asked if there were further questions in this point of information. For now, it appears that the only question raised on the topic is whether it would be possible for the UC to receive an update of the report based on the current economic situation in the country (inflation, shortages, etc.)

Action point: The Clerk will send an email asking for an update on the highlight report that considers the current economic situation of the country.

02.06 University Council Student Assessor

The taskforce working on student assessors has written some focus points for their goals. They have decided to only look at incorporating a student assessor at the central level of decision-making. The task force will arrange a meeting with representatives from other universities that include student assessors for some input. Afterwards, they will write a proposal letter and share it with the rest of the Council.

02.07 Rights on ICT and Privacy

Taskforce: Cagla, Simo, Aleid.

The Rights on ICT and Privacy will be followed-up by the new task force. They will focus on the cameras on Campus.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 Response to 38519 Sustainable Catering in the new Sportsbuilding

This letter was not discussed during the meeting.

04 Any other business

- Sustainability

The sustainability taskforce met today, but only one student member attended the meeting. It is important for students to be involved, as the sustainability officer still needs support from the UC. At the moment she is working on integrating sustainability in the curriculum, and thus, student involvement is essential.

- Updates on Accessibility on Campus

In the previous months, the Council has been in contact with the EB to see whether they are following-up on accessibility issues on campus. The Clerk will email the EB to ask for updates on the matter.

Action point: The Clerk will email the EB to ask for updates on the topic of accessibility on Campus.

- Moderator on Sustainability Event

A team working on sustainability in the university has emailed Friso to see if he could contribute to a sustainability event as a moderator. Friso is thus asking the Council whether it would be appropriate to join this event considering his position in the UC. It was agreed that there is no issue with his contribution to the event as a moderator.

- Debate Idea

A member of the Council asked whether the UC could organize a debate for the candidates of the elections. It was explained that this could be a good initiative, and that this member of the Council could organize it themselves if they wish to do so. A good window for this debate would be the 24th of May in the participation day.

- Chinese Scholarship Council Inquiry

The Chinese Scholarship Council is an organization that funds PhD positions abroad. It appears that people from oppressed minorities are excluded from getting these funds, and it is not certain whether this program follows Erasmian Values. Therefore, Albert will ask the EB in the Consultation Meeting whether they have any input on this topic.

- Taskforce formation

A member of the Council mentioned that the UC should be critical in the task force formation processes. Members that are involved with the documentation received by the Council should not be allowed to join taskforces, as they would bring a biased opinion.

05 Closing