

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

Date and Time: 24/01/2023, 14:30 – 17:30

Location: Polak 1-21

Present in the Meeting: **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Max Wagenaar, Jaap Cornelese, Aleid Fokkema, Ernst Hulst, Simo Azzarhouni, Albert Wagelmans, Emese von Bóné, Tom van Dijken, Luuk van Tol, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Wincey Randoe, Veerle Bakker, Georgiana Carp, Friso Roos, Cagla Altin, Feliks Majchrzyk (Intern), Lobke van Steenberghe (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Guests: Vanessa Abel (EramusX), Milan Vidakovic (ErasmusX), Jeroen Jansz (CLI), Aida Tunovic (Academic affairs).

Online: Irena Boskovic, Bienneke Verheijke (HeQa), Chaya Raghoenath.

Absent: Nikita Schoenmaker, Natascha Kraal, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Erin van Gestel.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

Agenda points *02.05 Smarter Academic Year* and *02.06 BSA* have been moved forward on the agenda to account for the presence of a guest participant. Also, due to confidentiality reasons, no external parties are allowed to participate during those two points. With that, the agenda was set.

01.02 Minutes first plenary meeting

The minutes were updated with the action point: a member of the CC was selected to join the interview round of the project coordinator EUR Program Committees. With that, the minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

- Chairs meeting

The previous week the Chairs meeting took place. The topics of visibility, diplomas, and starter grants were discussed. ECHSS informed the UC they are investigating possibilities for students whose gender identities do not match their names to have a ceremonial diploma with the chosen name on it while maintaining no change in the legal name on the official diploma. Most faculties were positive about this and will be discussed internally as well. The TF M&C will give more information on the visibility during *02.07 Representation of the UC*.

- Assignment Intern (draft)

The Intern will be researching the list system for the elections, with a focus on developing and strengthening it; he will reach out to other Dutch Universities, research their election methods, and make a report on implementing the ideas at EUR.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Budgets HeQa funded programmes (education)

The TF HeQa prepared several questions and remarks; these were shared with the policymakers during the meeting.

Erasmus X:

- *Can you reflect on the fact that many of the projects (mainly in EdTech) overlap with other projects, such as Erasmus U_online, and how is the knowledge between these different projects shared?*

The representatives of Erasmus X and CLI remarked on the differences between the projects; Erasmus X set out to explore innovative ways of engaging students and providing a sense of belonging by using online platforms, while CLI was assigned to collaborate closely with schools to have innovation in education within the existing curriculum. Additionally, in the past year, Erasmus X and CLI collaborated on a close basis to share their progress and to ensure a difference in their perspectives. Further, policymaker Vanessa will share a graph with the UC that better describes the differences between the two projects. The TF HeQa will reflect on this internally.

- *How can the implementation of initiated projects and gained knowledge be guaranteed? Who should be held responsible for this, and why?*

The representative of Erasmus X emphasised that their mission never was the implementation of the project, however, they would like to be part of a conversation addressing ways of improving the overseeing of implementation.

- *What is Erasmus X doing at the moment to ensure that the projects are sold to faculties?*

Erasmus X is networking with teachers and faculties, providing online guides, and doing research as the projects are being implemented. Also, Erasmus X has reviewed the reports from 2019-2021, which were evaluated and discussed in the midterm evaluation with external stakeholders.

- *How is the situation at ErasmusX right now, especially in light of the fact that many people left?*

Erasmus X is made up of 4 senior staff members, which ensures that knowledge is being handed over; also, the positions within Erasmus X were revised and new openings were created which are expected to be filled by Q1 and Q2.

- *The original Erasmus X budget plan timeline ran until 2023 and was thus consented on until 2023. However, it is now running until 2024. What is the rationale behind this extension, where is the money coming from, and how do we oversee the allocation of it?*

Policymaker Bienenke explained that the plans submitted to the ministry listed the four projects having the same implementation period, from 2019-2024. In the documentation of EUR, Erasmus X was listed until 2023. However, the project had been allocated funds for the full period consented to by the ministry.

- *Where are the funds for the extended period coming from?*

After the midterm period of 2021, the remaining funds were budgeted and allocated to the 4 projects. This can be viewed in the evaluation published in 2022.

CLI:

- *It was unclear how Risbo and the CLI are related (p. 8 speaks of collaboration, while p.15 mentions Risbo as a contractor). Can this relationship be clarified?*

Risbo is a private-public enterprise that EUR has had a relationship with for a long time. Since one of the CLI pillars is to encourage the professionalisation of the teaching staff, CLI started collaborating with Risbo as well in the long term. This stable relationship ensures that the expertise of Risbo is kept and put into practice with the support staff. Also, CLI is evaluating the agreement on a yearly basis and there have been positive reviews.

- *Page 8 mentions the costs of UTQs and “all basic training is borne by the schools”, thus implying that UTQs are basic training; contrastingly, page 8 also mentions “building upon the basic training courses, the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) and the Leadership in Education Course (LEC) are offered”, thus implying that the UTQ and LEC costs are borne by the CLI. Can this be clarified?*

The CLI representative explained the confusion on the basis of a typing mistake. It was explained further that UTQs are financed by the programmes themselves, based on a long-term agreement within Dutch Universities. However, the Senior Teaching Qualifications and the Leadership in Education Course were additionally requested by EUR, and financed by CLI. This is based on an agreement with the EB from a previous year, whereby CLI observed a large difference between schools in terms of Senior qualifications which they wished to diminish with this initiative. This model is now being evaluated, as it is not clear whether the project is working in the intended manner and the differences between schools remain present.

Also, the CLI representative shared his surprise that the UC was in the possession of the document, which he believed was not meant to be shared yet. However, policymaker Bienenke reassured the council that the procedure was followed when sharing the documents with the UC, as agreed by the EB.

- *On the cover note under CLI budget, the 2019-2020 reserves are estimated at “M1.298”, but the repartition of this sum to the three projects does not amount to this amount.*

Policymaker Bienenke ensured that the final sum is correct and in line with the annual reporting of 2021; however there are mistakes in the following explanations, which will be adjusted. The corrections will be uploaded in a new document.

- *What is the effect of the Senior qualifications? Why is the difference between faculties?*

The CLI representative believes it depends on the extent innovative education is being prioritized in each faculty. It was also discussed that a disincentive on a personal basis is that they require a high amount of effort from the professors to complete them.

The TF HeQa members will review the discussion with the policymakers internally.

Action point: the councillors are requested to share their remarks on the HeQa budgets with the TF HeQa before Monday, 30th of January. The TF will review these in the TF meeting on Tuesday, 31st of January. The Clerk will request the original HeQa documents.

02.02 KRUR

The UC was requested to review the proposed adjustments to the articles. The UC consented to the changes.

02.03 Plan of action accessibility

The TF D&I was requested to review the plan. The TF was not able to discuss the topic in detail in preparation for the Second Plenary meeting. As a result, the councillors are requested to share their input with the TF Lead; these will be discussed in a meeting of the TF.

Action point: the councillors will share their input with the TF Lead. The TF D&I will review the input during a meeting. The Clerk will not table the discussion on this point for the CM.

02.04 Safe@EUR

The TF Wellbeing/Social Safety was not able to discuss the topic in detail in preparation for the Second Plenary meeting. As a result, a discussion will take place on Teams in preparation for the CM.

Action point: the councillors are requested to share and discuss their remarks on Teams. The TF Lead will prepare a discussion with the CM based on the input received. The Clerk will table the discussion for the CM.

02.05 Smarter Academic Year

Due to confidentiality issues, the minutes have not been made public.

02.06 BSA

Due to confidentiality issues, the minutes have not been made public.

02.07 Representation of the UC

The TF M&C shared the state of affairs regarding improving the representation of the UC at EUR.

The TF discussed some ideas for moving forward in future elections: stronger social media presence, creating posters and banners, organising events during the election period outside of the UC office, and organising candidate debates, such as by collaborating with the Erasmus Debating Society.

Other points of improvement were shared during the meeting by the UC: strengthening the contact between the UC and the FCs, improving the onboardings of the FCs, uploading the meeting agendas on social media, inviting people actively to the plenary meetings, and streaming the meetings. Also, the UC recurrent meetings could be held in the same room; this request was made in the past, but due to the constrictions on campus, the EB was unable to grant it. However, the UC wishes to start the discussion again to secure a more central location for the UC office/ meeting room.

The funds of the UC regarding elections were discussed. The Clerk reassured the council that the UC has sufficient funds to implement ideas but remarked on the waiting period to secure those funds. Also, the EB could be asked for more funds.

Furthermore, the councillors remarked that the UC is a participatory body and therefore is not required to make policy; instead, the UC should request it from the responsible parties.

Action point: the TF M&C will evaluate the suggestions shared in the meeting. The TF will prepare to have a discussion with the EB during the CM.

02.08 International students

A document was shared that was discussed during the meeting. The councilors agreed to table the discussion for the CM as well as share the document with the EB during the meeting.

The UC discussed how to table the discussion on the recent decision of the cabinet whereby Universities are not allowed to actively recruit international students. A few councilors argued that the discussion might relate to the current agenda point, while other councilors wish to wait until more information arrives from the decision. It was agreed that the discussion will be tabled as AOB. The focus will be on how EUR is dealing with the ministry decision and what is expected to happen after February.

Action point: TF International students will prepare to address the main agenda point at the CM using the overview shared on Teams. The Clerk will table the discussion on the decision of the cabinet as AOB.

02.09 Preparation CM

The UC discussed what topics will be tabled for the CM.

- **HeQa** – a TF meeting is scheduled next Tuesday; based on the meeting, it will be decided if the topic will be on the CM. The Clerk will be informed of the decision after the meeting.
- **Safe@EUR** – the councilors are requested to share their input with the TF Lead Erin via Teams; the TF Lead will decide whether to prepare the point for the CM and will inform the Clerk about the decision.
- **Smarter Academic Year** – the councilors are requested to share their questions and remarks via Team by Friday; based on the input, the Clerk will table the point for the CM and invite the policymaker.

- **Representation UC** – the Clerk will table the point for the CM; the TF will prepare to discuss with the EB 1) collaborating with the M&C Office for the elections, 2) improving the participating culture and organizing debates, 3) the participation hub and future location of the UC office on campus.
- **International Students** – the Clerk will table the point for the CM.
- **Chat GPT** – the councilors wish to ask the input of the EB on this; the Clerk will table the point as AOB for the CM.
- **Scholarship guidelines** – the EB was expected to share the results in the fall; the Clerk will research what was discussed and expected, and will request a state of affairs and table it as an announcement or AOB for the CM.
- **Bauhaus project** – the state of affairs will be requested as an announcement or AOB for the CM.
- **Cultural Campus and HOVO** – the state of affairs will be requested as an announcement or AOB for the CM.
- **Selection criteria** – the UC requests the vision of the EB on how certain selection criteria can discriminate against different people based on their backgrounds.

03 Incoming documents

- 38548 - 275.745 Response to 38548 Institutional plan Corona EUR

The TF formed in the previous cycle (TF Lead Luuk) was requested to read the letter and decide if a response is needed. It was decided that there will not be a follow-up.

04 AOB

04.01 Waiver policy

Due to a miscommunication, the Presidium points were not shared timely with the UC; as a result, the topic will be tabled for the third Plenary meeting. The councilors are requested to read the points in preparation for the meeting.

04.02 Occupy EUR

The EB is conducting a thorough evaluation of the events of OccupyEUR; there will be a report based on the outcomes of the evaluation. The reports will be shared with the UC as soon as they become available, in a future cycle.

04.03 Bins

The councilors were informed that the garbage disposal bins are located outside the UC office in Tinbergen building.

04.04 TF Strategy

The TF Strategy staff members expressed concern over the low turnout of the student members of the workgroup in their meetings. Councilors Tom and Veerle will contact the TF to discuss potentially getting involved.