

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

Date and Time: 07/03/2023, 14:30 – 17:30h

Location: Polak 2-18

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, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, Emese von Bóné, Tom van Dijken, Erin van Gestel, Luuk van Tol, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Wincey Randoe, Veerle Bakker, Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Online: Georgiana Carp, Chaya Raghoenath.

Absent: Ernst Hulst, Friso Roos, Cagla Altin, Simo Azzarhouni.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The agenda was set with no remarks.

01.02 Minutes first plenary meeting

The minutes of the first Plenary meeting were set with no remarks.

There were two remarks on the action points of the first Plenary meeting:

- Earthquake in Turkey and Syria: The Chair had contact with the EB regarding this topic; the EB Chair informed us that a conversation with the Vice Deans of Education will take place to ensure that the faculties will reach out to the affected communities as well as ensure the social, psychological and educational safety of their students. Psychological help will be offered to students in need.
- Separate meeting C&C and Arts Institute: a meeting is scheduled for April 5th; the Clerk will ensure the councillors receive the right documentation in preparation for the meeting. Also, this will be discussed during the CM with the EB. Also, the Clerk will research whether UC members are expected to send their questions in advance of the meeting, in order to prevent any issues with the procedure.

01.03 Announcements

- UC-office and catering

UC-members can use the UC-office to host (external) guests for UC-related matters; drinks and lunch for these meetings can be arranged via the secretariat, with a day's notice.

- Presidium waiver

Councillor Georgiana is given a waiver to attend the Plenary meeting online.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Smarter Academic Year (closed meeting)

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

02.02 BSA (closed meeting)

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

02.03 CLI budget

With regards to the project ErasmusU_Online, CLI is using the underspent budget from previous years to enable the scaling of this project. However, in the future, this may mean that the CLI will request access to the extra HeQa funds that still need to be allocated in order to continue the project. Specifically, the project will require 800.000 a year of the HeQa budget. The UC had a discussion on the implications of consenting to the current plans for the future of HeQa budget allocation, as well as the benefits of the project EU_Online for current students; it was also discussed how to proceed with the topic in this cycle.

Firstly, the councillors discussed what they wish regarding the allocation of the funds. On one hand, if the councillors consent to the project momentarily, this may leave little room for not consenting to the continuation of the project in the future. On the other hand, if the project is consented to and discontinued in the future, it will result in a loss of resources, both financial and human. Also, since other HeQa projects have not planned in advance as CLI did with this project, it gives CLI an advantage over the allocation of money; the UC cannot foresee whether future HeQa-related projects would be more or less deserving of the extra HeQa funds. However, if the UC does not consent to the allocation of CLI reserves for EU_Online, it leads to a surplus of funds instead of a project that students can benefit from. Finally, it was decided that the council approves only of the upscaling of the project EU_Online from the CLI budget reserves, and not yet of the allocation of the extra HeQa budgets to the project. It was not clear what the rights supporting this decision would be; thus, the councillors wish to clarify it with the EB.

Secondly, the councillors discussed the impact of the project EU_Online. The UC believes that HeQa funds should be delivered to the bigger needs of students. A few councillors believed that current students benefit from the project, as some Master Courses are developed online and are helping students that cannot physically access the campus, in line with the UC accessibility concerns, as well as students that were impacted by Covid in recent years. However, other councillors believe that the needs of the students need to be better investigated. The Councillors were reminded that the HeQa projects are earmarked by governmental policy, and thus limited in what they can be geared towards. Thus, it is important to request in the Educational Vision that the budgets should benefit the current EUR students while still keeping to the governmental policy framework.

During the upcoming CM, the UC agreed to discuss about using the funds from previous years to enable the scaling of projects and what this means for the funding in the future (especially the funding of ErasmusU_Online) and the allocation of the HEQA budget that still needs to be allocated and in regards to HEQA funds in general to what extent students who are currently studying at EUR will benefit from the (in this case CLI) activities.

Also, the councillors would like to discuss with the CLI policymaker why the budget of the EU_Online project is increased despite it being downscaled by a third due to the elicitation of the social environment development.

Action points: Councillor Sandra will address the question with the CLI policymaker in preparation for the CM and share the response on Teams with the UC before the CM. The Clerk will table the discussion for the CM on the points raised by the councillors.

02.04 Starter Grants policy document (short-term)

The Chair and the Clerk are currently in the process of getting clarity on the formal role of the UC regarding the Starter Grants; however, the current policy document requires the consent of the UC.

During the meeting, it was shared that the documents contained a gap between the government policy and the EUR policy; also, the TF had received questions from different FCs which remarked on these gaps. Furthermore, the TF had a meeting with CPC and the policymakers in which they concluded that given the current policy, the UC will not consent to the document. Specifically, a few points in the policy must be adjusted for there to be UC consent:

- 1) Concern about the 20% indirect costs. It is not yet clear how the grants are to be divided to ensure a reduction in work pressure, specifically where it is highest. Thus, the parameters must be made clear. Specifically, for some departments, the 20% costs imply that the departments cannot use the grants for a PhD position. Also, there was confusion about the limitations of accepting a grant, specifically for the ESSB faculty. Consequently, the misunderstanding will be communicated in writing on behalf of the ESSB faculty to the TF, in order to specifically address it in the future.
- 2) Concern about implications for education. The governmental policy states that, if the grant is used for research purposes, then the University should create a policy that would account for educational purposes. The EUR policy did not specify the parameters of this situation.

The policy relating to these pointers will be mended within a week, after which the TF Finance will discuss whether consent will be given to the new policy. Also, the UC wishes to discuss with the EB the role of the Board regarding the process of the grants at the central and decentral level.

Action point: the TF Finance will continue the discussion on the policy with CPC. The Clerk will table a discussion on the *Starter Grants policy document* in the CM.

02.05 Educational vision

A meeting with the Vice Deans of Education was scheduled for Monday, the 20th of February; it was also attended by the TF. The updates were shared with the UC: there was agreement among the Vice Deans leading to the concept text being shared with the UC; however, the deadline for advice was on the day of the Plenary meeting. This deadline was not communicated timely with the UC. Although it was discussed that advice could be collected and shared on the day of the Plenary meeting, it was decided to keep the deadline for advice in line with the UC cycles; the Clerk will rectify this information with the policymaker. Also, the councillors were reminded that the consent deadline is April 25th.

Also, it was shared that the Deans of Education have unofficially agreed to the Educational Vision, without objection to the core aspects of it; currently it is discussed what options are possible and feasible. The councillors discussed the document as well. The parameters are

indicated properly and clearly, and the councillors believed the guidelines could be useful to Faculties when it comes to implementation. The role of the UC will be to review the input of the FCs on the implementation proposals, at the faculty level.

However, the UC wishes to discuss with the EB how they see the implementation of the Educational Vision, also regarding the balances within the faculties.

Also, during the EV meeting, the policymaker suggested that a collaborative TF between the EV and HeQa is created to ensure better implementation of the EV guidelines. This proposal was discussed in the council. It was discussed that there will be no financial compensation for the HeQa members for the extra work, however. Because there will be one meeting with this collaborative group during the current board year, the TF was created with the following council members: Nikita, Aleid, Georgiana, Sandra, Veerle, Wincey, Wesley, and Max.

Action points: councillor Sandra will inform the policymaker that the UC does not have advice on the plans momentarily. The Clerk will table the topic *Educational Vision* for the CM.

02.06 Year report 2021 network confidential advisers

The Council was sufficiently informed on this topic, and the questions and remarks discussed in the TF had been resolved. Therefore, the topic will not be tabled during the CM. However, the councillors requested tabling this document in a future Plenary meeting that the ombudsperson will attend.

Action point: the document *Year report 2021 network confidential advisers* will be tabled in a future Plenary meeting joined by the ombudsperson.

02.07 Preparation Consultation Meeting

The Clerk shared the concept agenda with the council via Teams. The councillors were reminded to inform the Clerk no later than the day after the plenary meeting if new topics should be tabled for the CM.

Also, the Clerk shared an update regarding the Culture&Campus, Arts Institute, and the Convergence received in writing from the EB:

- Arts Institute. A letter was received on Monday and a discussion on it is tabled for the third Plenary meeting. Also, it will be discussed with councillors Emese and Tom whether the TF should be bigger when it comes to processing the formal documents we will receive. Also, there was a discussion about the rights of the UC, however this is not known yet. More information about the procedure will become available in later cycles of the year. However, a few councillors were unhappy with not discussing this update with the EB in the upcoming CM, due to uncertainties about what implications there are for the regulations. After a discussion, it was decided to first address this issue with the policymaker, and table the topic for a future CM.
- Convergence: The process has started to come to a Work Agenda 2023-2026 Convergence in the autumn. Based on input from the current programs and a number of new advisory groups, this work agenda will form a framework for the further development of Convergence into a more visible and concrete form. To this end, the concept of 'Schools of Convergence' has been launched. The interpretation of this concept will hopefully be more concrete at the end of the above process. At the same time, work has recently continued on joint research and education projects within the five substantive programs of the Convergence. The support organization has also been further professionalized, with working groups that facilitate

Convergence cooperation from an operational perspective. An activity report will be published and shared with more information, including substantive progress and figures, prior to the next Convergence employee participation meeting.

Also, there was a lot of confusion in the council about what the Convergence is defined as by different participatory bodies and stakeholders. As this confusion was not cleared during the Plenary meeting, the topic will be addressed in the CM.

- Culture&Campus. Currently, we are working towards the New European Bauhaus fund that we were granted. The Council requested more updates from the Program Manager on the state of affairs of C&C. The procedure for requesting these was then discussed. It was suggested to table the discussion with the Program Manager in a separate meeting (i.e., upcoming 3rd or 1st Plenary meeting) where the role of the future EUR participation will be discussed, as well as implications for the budget. This procedure ensures that the Council is informed of the state of affairs in time. The topic will be tabled for a future CM.

02.08 ChatGPT

Following the discussion in the previous CM, the councillors discussed whether they wish to table the topic again. The councillors believe that it is too early in the development of this program to have it discussed. It was agreed to table it in a future cycle when more clarity on ChatGPT will be gained.

02.09 Smoking on campus

A proposal to the CM was shared in Teams; this was discussed during the meeting. Specifically, the proposal contained three points:

1. Personal fines (or at least threads of those) to solve non-compliance.
2. Email from EB to all staff and students (just a short reminder/announcement of personal fines) OR/AND poster on the entrances' window of Polak, Langeveld and UB, containing a reminder of the rule and the fine. On those, a link to free government aid can be provided too.
3. Conversation with security to check more often and more accurately.

As well as a question to the EB: "In the physical interest of both health of smokers and non-smokers as well as the financial interest of the university, does the EB agree with these three proposals?"

During the meeting, the councillors discussed several suggestions in preparation for the CM. Specifically, the proposal mentions fines as a suggestion to maintain compliance on campus. However, in previous cycles, the EB disagreed with the fines, as they do not have both the manpower and the legal force to reinforce them on campus. Following a vote, it was decided against mentioning the initial point. Nonetheless, the councillors agreed to the latter points outlined in the proposal to be brought up at the CM. Additionally, the councillors remarked that, since the campus smoking ban, the lack of concentration smoking zones has brought the consequence of people smoking in unstructured areas on campus, including at the building entrances. This remark will be mentioned in the CM as well.

Action point: The Clerk will table the discussion on *Smoking on Campus* for the CM.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 38552 - 275.749 RM Response to 38552 Project plan 'Towards an Erasmian positioning of the EUR Program Committees

The UC agreed not to send a reply letter. Also, councillor Max will join the TF for future projects.

03.02 293471 Studying with a Functional Impairment - Proposal PoA and Focus Group

The council was informed there is a need to appoint members for the Focus Group as well as a person responsible for the recruitment process. Councillors Patryk, Sandra, Luuk, and Aleid wished to join the Focus Group. Also, Patryk was appointed responsible for the recruitment process.

Action point: the Clerk will communicate that four council members are interested in joining the Focus Group.

04 Any other business

- **Compensation participatory bodies:** the process is ongoing; more updates will be shared with the UC when available;
- **CPC member leaving:** a CPC member is leaving, and several UC members were invited to the farewell party; the Clerk will arrange for a present together with those who will join.
- **UC events:** the council members wish to have more team-building events, such as bowling, or cooking workshops; the M&C officer will look further into this.

05 Closing