

University Council
Third Plenary Meeting (Part I)
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 27/09/2022, 14:00 –16:00h

Location: G2-41

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

Digital: Cagla Altin

Absent: Patryk Jarmakowicz, Albert Wagelmans, Max Wagenaar.

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

- *Welcome Chaya Raghoenath (ISS)*

As of this week, Chaya will join the council as a representative of ISS (International Institute of Social Studies).

- *Absent procedure*

The Presidium is working on a proposition regarding the absent procedure. This will be discussed with the UC during one of the coming cycles.

- *Meeting allocation model*

There was an update from the Finance TF regarding a meeting with the CPC about the allocation model. The model represents the University system of allocating money to services and faculties. The current model (as of 2017) was evaluated in the previous academic year (2021-2022) by a steering committee under the lead of Ellen van Schoten (VP in EB) and including the TF Finance and faculty deans. Currently, a new model is being calculated with the help of an external party.

In the CPC meeting, it was decided between 3 scenarios as calculated by the external company. The result of the agreement was that the model shall be based on ECTS. This provides flexibility in the future, stimulates interdisciplinary collaborations, and supports interinstitutional communication.

The TF members forecast that only parts of the model will be added to the next Erasmus Perspectives, i.e., pertaining to research and services (e.g., IT, Central office). The UC will have the right to consent on the adjusted allocation model.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Voting Presidium and CC members - Closed meeting

The voting for Presidium and Confidentiality Committee student members took place during the meeting. The outcomes are as follows:

Presidium

- Staff: Nikita, Aleid
- Students: Erin, Simo

Confidentiality Committee

Because of the confidentiality, the names will not be shared in the minutes.

02.02 Reflection Consultation meeting

During the meeting, the UC members reflected on the outcome and offered feedback to the content, performance, and procedure during meeting.

Firstly, it was discussed that there was a time management problem. To be precise, one important agenda point was not discussed in full, and the UC did not have enough time to be critical towards statements of the board. It was suggested that the agenda points should be organized in a rank-order based on importance. Also, the section “Setting the minutes” can be shortened to discussing only the unclear action points.

Secondly, the UC believed they were not critical enough to the EB during the meeting, as compared to Plenaries and in-writing communication. The UC members should voice their opinion more in relation to the EB members. It was suggested that the Chair limit the responses of the EB when they become vague or repetitive, to allow more time for critical questions to the UC. Also, the seating should be arranged before the meeting with the respective name tags, so that all UC members can directly face the EB members to have a better communication. The UC agreed not to arrange a representative-based communication with the board, as it can be hindering the discussion and appear scripted.

Thirdly, the EB sent a late and insufficient written reply to the concerns of the UC. This ties in with the second point, as the UC could not present their criticism directly to the EB during the CM and will have to communicate it otherwise. This point will be discussed in the meeting under **04 Incoming documents** and was tabled for the Extension of the 3rd Plenary meeting.

In conclusion, several suggestions were made to improve the CM meetings.

Action point: The agenda point leads and ranks will be decided in the preparation for the next CM during the Second Plenary meeting. The reflection on the EB letter is tabled for the Extension of the 3rd Plenary meeting.

02.03 Erasmus Perspectives 2023-2026 (Roadmap Durability)

In the previous meetings, Natascha was asked to draft a letter after the meeting based on the formal outcome discussed during the meeting. During the meeting, there was a discussion about the content and the outcome of the letter (i.e., consent).

The UC discussed the issues with the Roadmap Durability. Some examples include EB being vague about their plan and meeting the mentioned goals, the lack of a risk paragraph, no mention of sustainability. However, it was appreciated that the EB was transparent with their shortcomings.

Consequently, the majority of the UC withdrew their consent to the Roadmap Durability. There was a debate on how to handle this towards the EB. Some members wished to consent in order to maintain diplomacy, while others wished to dissent in order to make a broader statement. Also, it was pointed out that the UC does not have an alternative to put forward to the EB plans. Furthermore, the UC was not critical enough to the EB in the CM, thus the dissent would come as a surprise.

The UC would require that the EB respects certain boundaries before consenting to their plan. Some include a risk paragraph, more short-term goals, transparency when changes in the plans and budget are made.

In conclusion, the decision is postponed for the next cycle. The UC is required to inform themselves in order to partake in a discussion tabled for the First Plenary meeting. Sebastian will make a summary of the issues mentioned during the meeting which will be used as a benchmark for the UC but will not be presented to the EB. The goals of the next cycle are to create a substantial and concrete plan regarding the Roadmap Durability, and to communicate this plan transparently and critically to the EB.

Action point: Sebastian will summarize the issues as a benchmark for the First Plenary. The decision is tabled for the next cycle.

*The agenda point **02.04 Role UC Educational Vision, and 03 Incoming Documents** are tabled for the Extension Meeting of the Third Plenary Meeting.*

University Council
Third Plenary Meeting (Part II)
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 04/10/2022, 14:15 –15:00h

Location: Polak 3-18

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

Digital: Georgiana Carp, Cagla Altin.

Absent: Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Patryk Jarmakowicz, Max Wagenaar.

02.04 Role UC Educational vision

The policymaker provided a document with three options describing how the UC can participate in the procedure towards a new educational vision. The Hybrid Education TF Lead organized a poll, and the UC members are asked to choose one option. Several considerations were made during the meeting.

Firstly, the UC discussed how different levels of involvement may impact the members' ability to maintain a critical outlook on the educational vision. To be exact, more involvement (i.e., co-creation) may run the risk of less critical feedback due to the members' active involvement in the process. To minimise this effect, it was suggested that the more involved participants (i.e., of the Hybrid Education TF) should provide constant updates of their progress to the lesser involved party (i.e., the full council). In response to this high level of transparency, the UC should maintain an active critical role to the efforts of the TF.

Secondly, it was remarked that the level of involvement is in direct proportion to the amount of workload required of the participants. Therefore, a decision needs to be made regarding how the TF members can realistically meet the workload requirements of their involvement in this process.

Five members of the TF are available: Wincey, Tom, Georgina, Albert, and Sandra.

In conclusion, the UC would like to obtain the highest degree of involvement as allowed by their availability. This would be at maximum co-creation, and at minimum co-writing. The interested members of the TF will meet with the policymaker to obtain information on the process and content of this project. A decision on the level of involvement will be based on the feedback.

Action point: The Clerk will update the Teams environment with the current members of the Hybrid Education TF.

Action point: The TF Lead will meet with the policymaker on to discuss the level of participation.

03 Incoming Documents

03.01 Response to 38539 Institutional Tuition Fee 2023-2024

No comments.

03.01 Response to 38542 Erasmus Perspectives

The members of the previous years' Financial TF were requested to check if the letter needed a follow-up. Sebastian has a list that will be added to the response document.

The EB responded with a letter to the UC letter on Erasmus Perspectives. The UC members agreed to offer a response. In particular, the UC would like to address that the response letter from the EB arrived after a decision was made. This is against the procedure, whereby the UC should give advice before a decision is made.

Action point: Sebastian will add a list to the document.

Action point: The Finance TF will prepare a response. A decision on how to deliver the response to the EB is tabled for the Second Plenary Meeting.

04. Any other business

This section is tabled for the end of the First Plenary Meeting taking place on the same day.

05. Closing