

University Council
Second Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 21/06/2022, 14:30 – 16:00h

Location: Polak 2-16

Present in the Meeting: Pi Cheng Hu, John van Wel, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Cagla Altin, Friso Roos, Max Wagenaar, Simo Azzarhouni, Nikita Schoenmaker, Albert Wagelmans, Emese von Bóné, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Irena Boskovic, Bianca Jadoenath (Acting Chair), Ernst Hulst, Robbert Rog, Aleid Fokkema, Lobke van Steenbergen (Clerk)

Absent: Zohra Hayat, Hans van den Berg (Chair), Jasper Klasen, Yusuf Balci, Timo Zandvliet.

Online: Natascha Kraal, Georgiana Carp, Daemon Kregting, Oriana Morales Hernández (Minutes).

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous two meetings

The minutes have been set.

- There were no changes to 3rd plenary
- There was one change in the first plenary, Emese received a waiver and was present.
- *The UC Clerk will check on the letter that was mentioned in the additional information send by the Erasmus MC*

This information was shared with the Council on Teams.

- *HeQa/UC Clerk The HeQa Clerk will send the final version of the CLI budget letter to the UC Clerk, so it can be sent to the EB.*

This has been done.

- *The minute taker will ask Aleid and Jasper if they want to join this task force institutional fees 2023-2024*

Aleid is part of the task force. This action has been completed.

- *If UC members have questions about the Legal Protection Annual Report, they send them to the Clerk by the upcoming plenary meeting.*

This action has been completed.

- *HeQa Clerk the HeQa Clerk will write a letter providing the input of the Council for the educational vision of the EUR in relation to HoKa considering the input of the June 14th*

This action has been completed.

- *If UC members have questions about the Reorganisation EDIS, they send them to the Clerk by the upcoming plenary meeting.*

This action has been completed.

01.03 Announcements

- *Follow up accessibility of Campus*

It is important for the Council to follow up on the process of making the campus more inclusive for all students, including those with special needs due to physical limitations. This point has been raised several times, but there is no update from the EB on the process. Thus, the Council has decided to ask the EB for an update during the consultation meeting and continue asking for updates every three months.

Action point: The Clerk will request a follow up from the EB on the accessibility on campus so it can be shared in the consultation meeting. This point will be in the agenda of the consultation meeting once every three months.

- *Student Assessor Task Force*

The taskforce has decided to extend their work to next academic year. Therefore, no formal letters or requests will be sent through the Council regarding this topic by the end of this academic year.

- *Newly elected members of the UC*

Before this meeting, UC students had a meeting with newly elected members of the UC. They have been invited to this plenary meeting, and some of them are present as guests.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Institutional Tuition fee 2023-2024

Guests: Ansgar Richter (Chair of the Institutional Fees' Committee), Carolien Hennekam (E&S)

Introduction

Ansgar Richter introduced the topic of the tuition fees 2023-2024. He clarified that he is the Dean of RSM, but he is not present in this meeting to represent the faculty, but rather, the institutional fee committee. Institutional fees are not the same as statutory fees. Institutional fees comprise the tuition non-EEA countries, and those doing a second Bachelor or Master degree after finishing their first Bachelor or Master programme. Last year, the institutional fees' committee was set with collaborators from different faculties to review the rules related to this process across the different programs in the university.

The committee summarized their three main findings to the UC:

- There is a large discrepancy in the institutional fees set across different faculties. Sometimes, these discrepancies seem hard to justify.
- Our institutional fees have only increased in the same percentage as the inflation rates in the Netherlands, with some minor exceptions.
- The institutional fees at EUR appear to be lower than in other Dutch universities, as well as in other European cities.

Considering these observations as well as other considerations, the committee came up with three main points of advice to the university:

- Institutional fees should be partly homogenized in clusters. Considering that each program provides different activities and resources, four different clusters of institutional fees could be formed so that depending on the program, the fees are set

in relation to other similar ones. Furthermore, there should be a clustered waiver of institutional fees.

- The committee is giving advice on how to cluster the institutional fees per program.
- If institutional fees increase, the students that are currently enrolled in the program should not be affected.

It was explained that in most cases, faculties seem to be willing to follow this advice, except for ESHCC. The UC has a right of advice on the fees as a whole.

Q&A

- *What is the relationship between the cluster of fees and the quality of education?*

The approach of the committee was to set fees that reflect the quality of education that EUR students receive. The idea is to get more institutional fees to charge similarly to other institutions and set the prices similarly to the market price. The faculties themselves have access to the institutional fees. The faculties that currently charge the largest tuition fees also provide the largest number of waivers on tuition fees.

- *Wouldn't the increase of institutional tuition fees make the university exclusive for students that have rich families?*

A (small) increase in institutional fees should not make the difference on whether a student joins the university or not, considering all costs that are related to living in the Netherlands for a long period of time.

- *What is the relationship between the tuition fees and the perceived quality of the university?*

Having lower tuition fees than other university can create an artificial perception that the quality of education at EUR is lower than in other institutions, although this is not the case. The quality of education at EUR is very high.

- *Is it correct to say that those students that pay those fees have enough funding, so they do not use the waiver?*

That may be partly correct, although we do not have statistics on these numbers.

- *Is the possibility of have a waiver part of the reasons why a student applies to the university?*

There are around 6-8 criteria that the university believes that students take into consideration to enrol in a program. A possibility of a waiver is one of them, but it is certainly not a heavy-weighting one.

- *It appears that the increase of institutional fees is happening due to a branding practice, but there is not any information talking about a focus-group that backs this-up. Why is this?*

The university has done research on this, and it appears to work.

- *Why isn't the socio-economic background of students taken into consideration when setting fees?*

This is not the case for EEA students regardless of the country they come from, so it could be unfair to do this for non-EEA students.

- *The documents say that students and parents expect to pay around ten thousand euros for their institutional fees. However, have you considered that some students join EUR because of lower tuition fees?*

It is difficult to know for certainty whether more or less students join as a result of the increase of tuition fees. However, for now, there is an increase in non-EEA students.

- *How many students will be affected by this?*

At the moment, 6.8% of students at EUR are non-EEA students. This percentage of students will be affected by this. However, it will not affect the currently enrolled students.

02.02 Lower tuition fee 2022-2023 for Ukrainian students

Guest: Carolien Hennekam (E&S)

Introduction

The UNL has decided to lower the fee of Ukrainian students to statutory fees instead of institutional fees. The EUR is still waiting for the compensation that the university will receive for this arrangement. If this cannot be arranged with the government, it may be the EB compensating. Students do not have to be refugees, but rather to have a Ukrainian passport. There is also a fund at the university for Ukrainian students that may assist them with other financial issues. The fund will have 85 thousand euros in next academic year.

Q&A

- *If the EB compensates for the money, where would the money come from?*

It was explained that this is not highly likely to happen, but that the CPC would help in deciding how to do it in the worst-case scenario.

- *Why is this also not applied to students that are also struck by war in other countries?*

This was a national decision. It would be very difficult to determine which students are affected by situations of war in other countries at a university level. The emergency funds have helped students from other countries, including Belarus and Russia.

- *Was there a discussion on providing a subsidy to the students instead of a lowering on the tuition fees?*

No, this was not discussed. The university only got a press release from the ministry regarding this issue.

- *Would this be a start of a policy for helping students from other countries?*

This is only for Ukrainian students. However, the university does provide different fees for students with a refugee status in the Netherlands.

- *A Ukrainian student received a message saying that they would get a refund for half of their tuition fees for the current academic year. Moments later, they received a message saying that this was a mistake. Is this a common mistake?*

The guest was not aware of this situation happening to any students. Patryk will make sure that this email is forwarded to Carolien so she can follow-up on the problem.

- *Will the students that already paid tuition fees be compensated for the difference between institutional and statutory fees?*

Yes. They will receive a message for being compensated.

The UC would like to point out that students from other countries are also struck by war, and other difficulties. The Clerk will post this question on the Teams environment so that other UC members can review it.

Action points: Patryk will forward an email that a Ukrainian student received explaining that their fees were being halved in this academic year. However, this was a mistake. Ideally, Carolien can follow-up on this situation. Furthermore, the Clerk will post a draft question on Teams to the EB regarding the funding of students struggling with other wars or international disasters.

02.03 HEQA: Budget plan 2022 Student Wellbeing

There has been no progress on this process. The HoKa task force will work on a draft letter of reply by the third plenary meeting.

Action point: The HoKa task force will work on a draft letter of reply by the third plenary meeting regarding the budget plan 2022 of Student Wellbeing.

02.04 HEQA: Budget plan 2022 Impact at the Core

There has been no progress on this process. The HoKa task force will work on a draft letter of reply by the third plenary meeting.

Action point: The HoKa task force will work on a draft letter of reply by the third plenary meeting regarding the budget plan 2022 of Impact at the Core.

02.05 Student charter 2022-2023

The task force had a meeting and concluded that there are no comments on the student charter 2022-2023. There are some grammar mistakes on the English translation. The UC has proofread a few documents for grammar mistakes, and this is something that should be avoided. The UC needs to give consent to the student charter through a letter.

Action point: Sebastiaan will draft a short letter of consent on the student charter 2022-2023

2.06 Erasmus Perspective 2023-2026

This week, the task force met with one of the policy makers to clarify some questions of the UC. A follow-up meeting will take place next Monday, and the task force will draft a letter of response, as more information from Pieter Jellema is needed.

2.07 Highlights Report December 2021

The highlights are updated for information. The task force will check whether all the points that have been promised for the highlights are addressed in the document.

2.08 Legal Protection annual report 2021

This point does not need a follow-up.

2.09 Midterm Report and follow up actions: Future Education

A meeting took place on the 14th of June on this topic. This is something that should be followed-up with the next Council. The HoKa Clerk will draft a follow-up of the process of the involvement of the UC in the educational vision. This point will not be a part of the agenda for the consultation meeting.

Action point: The HoKa Clerk will draft a follow-up of the process of the involvement of the UC in the educational vision.

2.10 Evaluation of allocation model

A letter was shared on Teams on June 16th to respond to the evaluation of the allocation model. The Council agreed with sending the letter of advice on the evaluation of the allocation model.

3 Incoming documents

There were no incoming documents

4 Any other business

4.01 Feedback on the letter 38522 Proposal for centrally regulating compensation of Participatory Bodies

The EB shared their reflection on the proposal for centrally regulating compensation of participation bodies. The EB asks the UC to make sure that all participatory bodies are on board with this change. A member of the Council expressed that they disagree with this response, as looking for a consensus amongst all faculties is very difficult. The EB should not put the UC in this position, as they should take the lead to set the new rules.

The Clerk will ask the Chair of the UC for input on how to proceed on this process. Some faculties really want this change. It should not be a decentralized decision, as this puts the faculties in disadvantage to ask for their compensation on participatory actions.

Action point: The Clerk will ask the Chair of the UC for input on how to proceed on this process.

4.02 Profile reports for the Erasmus Professors

Taskforce: Albert, Ernst, Irena

There is a concern of where the money for the compensation of the Erasmus Professors would come from. This will be asked to the EB in the consultation meeting. The Council has to give advice for this matter. The TF members indicate that they can start working on this topic after the current cycle and it depends on how quick the translations are available and if possible questions are answered quickly if an advice can be drafted before September 6.

Action point: The Clerk will ask for information in English about the profile and inform the policy maker that the UC will try to draft an advice September 6.

4.03 Code of integrity

The task force met with the policymaker of the code of integrity to ask about the further steps related to the implementation of the code. A fruitful conversation took place in this meeting, and the UC would like to monitor the implementation.

There are some thoughts about how to handle issues of sexual misconduct, as they can be too linked to the way if they are handled with criminal law (innocent until proven guilty).

There are conversations on the possibility of receiving advice on how to deal with these situations through alternative solutions.

The policymakers will develop an APP about dilemmas related to integrity to keep the conversation open.

04.04 Advertising policy on campus

The Council will continue following-up on the policies and rules related to advertising on Campus. Thus, the UC will ask for updates on the information.

6 Closing