

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

Date and Time: 13/09/2022, 14:30 – 17:30h

Location: T3-35 Mandeville

Present in the Meeting: **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Max Wagenaar, Nikita Schoenmaker, Jaap Cornelese, Natascha Kraal, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Aleid Fokkema, Ernst Hulst, Simo Azzarhouni, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, Emese von Bóné, Tom van Dijken, Erin van Gestel, Luuk van Tol, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Wincey Randoe, Veerle Bakker, Friso Roos, Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Digital: Cagla Altin

Absent: Georgiana Carp.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

No adjustment was made to the existing agenda. The agenda was set.

01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

- *Waiver Cagla*

The presidium decided to grant Cagla a waiver. However, it also decided to discuss the regulations at a latter point in time. The reason for this is to maintain a clear and objective process regarding getting waivers.

- *Evaluation form onboarding*

A short evaluation took place during the first plenary meeting. Today, the UC-members could fill in a physical evaluation form. A digital form can be requested from the M&C Officer.

- *Format topic proposal UC*

Every UC member has the right to contribute to the agenda. The process of formatting agenda points was explained. The members of UC can table an agenda topic via the format topic proposal University Council. This can be found in Teams under 'Files' -> '0. General Information-Admin'. UC members are required to fill in the form and send it to the Clerk. The Clerk will add it to the agenda of the Presidium to discuss when to discuss this proposal with the UC.

- *Election presidium and confidentiality committee members third plenary meeting*

The elections for the formal positions of the Presidium and Confidentiality committee members will be held during the third plenary meeting. The voting procedure will resemble the HeQa during the first plenary meeting. The UC members that wish to candidate to either committee are required to inform the Clerk by next Tuesday, a week before the third plenary meeting. The candidates are asked to prepare a short pitch (1 min.). If needed, a voting procedure will take place, where all UC members are allowed to vote. A voting committee will count the votes and announce the chose members for both positions.

- *Presidium vs portfolio's*

Ivonne as chair: HeQa

Aleid: IT, Development & participation, Wellbeing & Social safety

Nikita: Educational & student affairs, HR

Simo: Diversity & Inclusion, Legal affairs, Real Estate & Facilities

Nawin: Finance, strategy, Sustainability

This list can be found in an overview on Teams.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Erasmus Perspectives 2023-2026 (Roadmap durability)

Based on inconsistencies in the report that was shared with the UC, the UC decided to take on this topic with the entire UC. There is a meeting planned September 22 in which the UC will address these inconsistencies with the policy makers.

The following questions were gathered from the UC:

- What is the effect from selling buildings on the finance in general and the roadmap specifically and how do we calculate this in? Is this decision made already? If so, which decision was made and what measures are taken? (see mentioning EUC on page 2 of the cover note for 2.01)
- Cover note mentions a M€20 investment, graph on pg. 5 (Figure 1) shows a M€27,5 investment; on page 11 a total investment of M€27 is mentioned, and the table on the same page shows M€30 or even M€41 as a grand total in the text. Can you explain these differences?
- As we're all aware, inflation has risen to >10%, increase in energy prices is even higher, and increase in funding for EUR seems limited at +3% for now; even though updating the perspectives and roadmap may not be feasible, it basically invalidates these documents entirely. Can you reflect on this challenge, and explain how EUR / CvB intends to deal with this?
- The documents mention 'Van Beek Ingenieurs'. The council would like to know if they are only the executives of the plan or if they also created the plan? If they did not create the plan, who did? And if they drafted the plan why is there only one option been worked out and not several options presented to the university?

These points will be raised in a presentation with the policymaker.

Action point: The Clerk will submit the questions to the policymaker.

02.02 Erasmus Professors

The concept letter was uploaded on Teams on September 6th. The UC adjusted the letter to fit comments from members. It states that overall, the UC is positive about the profile reports that were sent to the UC. But three points of concern were raised: 1) the evaluation criteria are described too vaguely; 2) although the main report mainly focuses on social impact, it appears odd to completely ignore its link with education, despite the strong tendencies to put teaching roles equal to research productivity; 3) question if there is a specific reason why the domain is narrowed down in document 2b in comparison to 1b.

The UC voted in favour of sending the letter.

Action point: The letter will be shared with the Executive Board.

02.03 Educational vision

The process plan and the cover note on the educational vision have been shared with the UC. During the meeting, the UC discussed their level of involvement within this project. It was concluded that the members of the council cannot conclude on the level of co-creation based on the documents that were shared. The UC was promised to receive three options from the policy maker so the UC members could choose between them.

The UC also discussed the composition of the TF and if the current composition is sufficing for the co-creation process. One UC member suggested broadening the TF in accordance with the demands of this project.

During the meeting, the UC also discussed several other issues with the current process plan. One issue is the decentralisation of the University bodies regarding the digitalisation plan. Additionally, the council wishes to see sustainability in the vision, improving the IT issues on campus, and broadening the historical aspects.

Action point: The Clerk will request the three options from the policy maker. The discussion on this decision is tabled for a future plenary meeting. Also, the point regarding the composition and size of the task force is tabled for next meeting.

02.04 Annual Report EUR 2021

Last week the EUR annual report (2021) was published. The UC members could read and send questions to the Clerk regarding the report.

No questions were sent to the clerk. Thus, it is concluded that the UC is informed on the subject.

02.05 CLI Microlabs

Last week CLI Microlabs sent documents to inform the UC following an assessment by Risbo. The UC members could send questions regarding this to the Clerk. No questions regarding the document were asked.

One UC member addressed that CLI Microlabs asked for a representative member. In this position, a UC member will bridge the contact between the two and will maintain a consistent presence in their meetings.

The UC did not implement this, but the members took note to secure a sufficient attendance in the coming CLI meeting next Tuesday.

02.06 CMT Student member

Last year, the Executive Board agreed to invite a student UC member within the Crisis Management Team (CMT). There was a discussion regarding the requirements necessary for that student role.

The UC agrees it is important to have a student UC member in this position to represent both the council and the student voice. Further, the UC wants to know the requirements the EB expects of the new member in order to make an informed selection. Two students will be nominated, a main member and a substitute.

Action point: the UC Chair will contact the chair of the EB to inquire about the qualifications of this role. A discussion on the nomination will be tabled for a future plenary meeting.

03 Incoming documents

There were no incoming documents.

04 Any other business

04.01 Steering committee Edubadges

The UC needs to decide on a student UC member to join the Edubadges steering committee. The Clerk informed the UC on this initiative: the steering committee is in favour of using edubadges to recognize and reward extra-curricular activities of students and education staff. This project is supported by CLI. The steering committee met on Tuesday 13th September from 15:00-16:00 with recurring meetings once every 6 to 8 weeks.

The UC student members that were interested requested more information about the requirements and tasks of this position before volunteering as part of the role.

Action point: The Clerk will ask Marieke Veenstra next Tuesday for more information. Thus, the interested UC student members have more time to decide to volunteer.

04.02 Conference on scientific integrity

The UC needs to decide on a student UC member to join the conference on scientific integrity on the 5th of October (entire day). The UC representative will give a short speech (10 minutes including 5 for Q&A) about academic integrity from the student perspective. More information was sent via email.

Some UC student members were interested (Sandra, Nawin). The UC members agreed on needing more context and information regarding the conference as well as the content of a speech from the student perspective. One member proposed recruiting an external student with experience in scientific work (such as Lambers Student Excellence Winner).

Action point: The Clerk will get in contact with Nick den Hollander to get more information about the content and process of the conference before the upcoming plenary meeting.

04.03 AOB Consultation meeting

The UC discussed any other business in preparation for the Consultation Meeting on September 22nd. The following points will be added to the agenda:

- The opening of the academic year: some comments on the ceremonial part of the opening of the academic year will be discussed.
- Information on convergence / Culture&Campus / Arts institute.
 - o **Action point: The clerk will share the most recent information via Teams**
- Sector plans on Corona measures
- Update on increasing energy costs in relation to perspective budgets

04.04 UC office

The UC office is located opposite from the library building. It is lacking in hygiene standards (e.g., it has mould patches on the ceiling), and it is not currently used by the UC as an office. Some UC members do not have access to the office due to malfunctioning or not existing keys. Members of the UC discussed that the office could benefit the members in providing them a working space, and the students by giving them a physical point of reference of the UC.

One member proposed that the UC members should frequent this space. Further, it was suggested to create office hours with a voluntary schedule. This would encourage more contact between students and the UC.

Action point: The Clerk will request working keys for all UC members from the secretariat and will arrange that the hygiene standard be improved. The M&C TF will work on the office hours initiative.

04.05 ISO

The UC members are invited to attend the introduction week and regular meetings from ISO.

Action point: The interested UC members can contact ISO to request access to the documents.

04.06 Attitudes UC members

During the meeting, there was a discussion about attitudes regarding the new Chair. The UC agreed to maintain a respectful attitude towards the new Chair.

04.07 Housing Crisis Impact on International Students

During the meeting, the UC members analysed the impact of the housing crisis on international students. The UC criticized the lack of transparency on this matter from the University and also criticised the diffusion of responsibility that occurs among the relevant parties (municipality, government, universities). Different ways of coping with this problem were mentioned. Among them were addressing the EB during the CM and addressing ISO.

Action point: This topic of International students was added to the AOB for the upcoming Consultation Meeting.

04.08 Erasmus Sport Advertisement

The UC was informed that Erasmus Sport cannot place physical advertisements in the windows of the new Sports building because these will consequently break.

05 Closing