

**University Council
First Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam**

Date and Time: 11/04/2023, 15:00 – 17:00

Location: ISS, Kortenaerkade 12, Den Haag -The Hague

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, Albert Wagelmans, Tom van Dijken, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Wincey Randoe, Veerle Bakker, Friso Roos, Cagla Altin, Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Absent: Irena Boskovic, Erin van Gestel, Chaya Raghoenath, Emese von Bóné, Max Wagenaar, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Luuk van Tol.

Waiver: Georgiana Carp.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The agenda was set without any adjustments.

01.02 Minutes third plenary meeting

The following adjustment was made to the minutes of the third plenary meeting: under the agenda point *02.08 Opening Hours Buildings*, the minutes will be changed to include that the council agreed on sending the letter with the points 1) and 2) included, and the points 3) and 4) will be excluded and discussed in the last UC cycle.

01.03 Announcements

- Meeting Ombudsperson June 20th

A dedicated meeting with the Ombudsperson has been scheduled for June 20th. The Chair wishes to ensure a significant representation from the UC. Currently, only four councillors have confirmed their attendance via the Teams invite. The Chair informed the UC that the meeting will be postponed for the next academic year if fewer than 10 members are present.

- Follow-up Meeting SAY

A dedicated, follow-up meeting with the SAY policymaker has been scheduled for June 27th. The Chair wishes to ensure a sufficient representation from the UC. Until now, only 7 councillors indicated their attendance via the Teams invite. The Chair informed the UC that the meeting will be cancelled and postponed for the next academic year if fewer than 10 members are present.

Action points: If the meetings with the Ombudsperson and SAY policymaker are postponed, the new Clerk will table them for the next year.

- UC monitor

The presentation on the results of the UC monitor survey is postponed for the second Plenary meeting due to the excused absence of the councillor who organised it.

- Eureka week stand info market Woudestein

We need volunteers for the Eureka week stand on Tuesday, August 22nd. The current and new Clerks will be present, but we would like to have two employees and two students who can join our stand during the day. The exact time is still to be communicated. Please check your availability and we will

come back to this next week during the second plenary meeting. We will also invite the new UC members to take part in the stand.

Also, the UC discussed whether student parties can take part in the UC stand to increase their visibility. The council debated this suggestion but decided against it. The Clerk will inquire with the Eurekaweek board if additional space can be created for the parties, i.e., separated from the UC.

- *M&C officer*

Unfortunately, the M&C officer will not join the UC next year. Therefore, we will put out a vacancy for 0,2-0,4 FTE. Depending on the applications, we are considering splitting the roles of the M&C officer and event planner in the vacancy, so that it can also be filled with two different student assistants. We are considering this as we observed that the two tasks are quite different and sometimes require two different areas of expertise.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Acquaintance new clerk

The new clerk was introduced to the council and explained her previous engagements with the EB as well as expectations for her upcoming role. She had experienced working in the secretariat of the EB for the past year, where she learned the perspective and ways of working of the EB; she hopes to use this knowledge in her new role to better help the UC when communicating requests with the EB. Also, she will be joining the UC as a spectator for the final UC council, except for the CM.

02.02 Erasmus Perspectives

During the third plenary meeting of the previous cycle, the UC decided upon tabling the discussion on the final version of the *Erasmus Perspectives* letter of consent for the current meeting. The councillors made several textual remarks in the final version of the concept letter. Furthermore, the TF clarified a remark related to the funds' allocation. The TF explained that the changes in the allocation model are not methodological, but rather small and positive adjustments that aimed to balance the support for smaller faculties by increasing the funds they receive comparatively to the larger faculties.

The UC decided upon sending the letter after the remarks have been adjusted.

Action point: The UC Clerk will format the letter of consent on *Erasmus Perspectives* and send it to the EB.

02.03 Tender process Arbo Dienstverlening

The UC is requested to give consent on the *Arbo Dienstverlening*; some information was shared in the cover note, but since the tender process is confidential, additional information will be provided once the UC decided on a process plan for this agenda point. Also, the policymaker requested that one UC member join a committee (i.e., *kernteam*) for the tender.

Firstly, the UC was unsure what our rights extend to regarding the *Arbodiesntverlening* contract. The Chair explained that the UC has consent on the tender documents which will then be considered in the process of creating a final contract.

Secondly, the council discussed that this is the first time we are given rights on these documents and decided to inform ourselves thoroughly on the legal requirements for the involved parties. For example, the councillors who will decide to review the documents might be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement.

Thirdly, the ELC will be involved in the process, and the UC suggested co-creating with them, seeing as they already have a formal process in place for this situation.

Finally, the UC was unsure what the process will look like. The Clerk will ensure the UC will get more information on this.

Action points: A temporary TF consisting of councillors Aleid, Albert, and Sebastiaan was created. The Clerk will table the topic *Arbodiesntverlening* as confidential for this cycle and will request more information on the process and the sensitive documents to be shared with the TF.

02.04 Impact Definition

During the third plenary meeting of the previous cycle, the UC decided upon tabling the discussion on the final version of the *Impact definition* letter of consent for the current meeting. The letter was shared with the UC in Teams. The UC agreed on sending this version of the letter.

However, a councillor made a critical comment regarding the content of the letter: in the document, the UC failed to respond to two questions. Although this remark will not impact the final version of our letter, the UC took note of the feedback for future notice.

Action point: The UC Clerk will format the letter of advice on *Impact Definition* and send it to the EB.

02.05 Extra Projects HeQa EUR-central

The documents shared with the UC represent a proposal for spending the remaining HeQa budget over the next 2 years; this proposal was developed through a collaborative process involving the EV and HeQa TFs, Vice Deans, and other members of the education staff. The HeQa TF has reviewed the documents and shared several remarks with the UC.

Firstly, it is not clear how the specific proposal was formulated, despite the preparatory meetings. It is also unclear how the budget was divided and conceptualised, as it has not been discussed in these meetings. Also, it is unclear which parties have been involved in this final proposal.

Secondly, the HeQa councillors remarked that the projects proposals contain differences in the level of detail that describe the KPIs, outcomes, and requirements, expenditure plans. For example, the CLI documentation is quite brief, despite requesting the highest amount of funding.

The UC also raised several remarks. Firstly, the council is uncertain about the extent of student involvement in this process, which they consider important. According to the TF members, student UC members were involved in co-creating the different themes of the proposal. Secondly, a councillor expressed confusion about the sustainability proposal, as the project plan appeared unclear. It was later clarified that the goal of the sustainability proposal is to educate the EUR students on different sustainability themes by embedding them into courses. This is a goal described in the EV and serves as a pillar of the UC.

Moreover, there was a discussion regarding the involvement of UC members in the activities of different TFs. Several UC members expressed their heightened dissatisfaction with the low turnover in the TF meetings, which was also reflected in the preparatory meetings for this agenda item. Furthermore, the TF members believe that some of the remarks shared in the current meeting could have been addressed earlier if the participation of all members had been ensured in the preparatory meetings; the workload of the active members of a TF increases if the non-active members raise many remarks in the plenary discussions instead of participating in the early co-creative stages of the process. However, the Chair suggested that the first plenary meeting is a good point in time to collect these additional remarks of the UC in preparation for the cycle.

To better understand the process and requirements of the UC, the HeQa TF will meet with the policymakers before the second plenary meeting.

Action point: The HeQa TF will discuss the remarks of the UC with the policymakers in preparation for the second plenary meeting. The Clerk will table the discussion on *Extra Projects HeQa EUR-central* for the second plenary meeting.

02.06 Rules of procedure UC

The Presidium elaborated a proposal for adjustments in the *Rules of procedure UC*; this was submitted for approval by the council. The documents were shared in Dutch, but the adjustments are explained in English in the Cover Letter.

The UC reviewed the proposal and shared their remarks considering the adjustments in *Article 3*.

Several councillors regarded the phrasing of Article 3 as not representative of the workload of different TFs. For example, members of the HeQa or Finance TFs experienced a high workload, compared to members of other permanent TFs that are not as active throughout the academic year; they argued this would not be represented appropriately under this article. However, the Presidium wishes to ensure equal participation of all UC members, and the current adjustment to the regulation gives room for a judgement about the differences in workload between members.

The UC discussed that it is difficult to quantify the members involvement in the council. One suggestion was made to quantify the number of active cycles in TF engagement; for example, a permanent TF that is active 8 cycles per year would be equivalent to 8 temporary TF active one cycle each. However, this might pose a problem as councillors would abstain from volunteering to ad hoc TFs if they have completed the 8-cycle requirement or if they are already involved in a permanent TF. However, the UC members wish to reflect the requirement that all councillors need to show stable participation in the council, such as by working on one agenda point on average per cycle.

The UC also discussed whether it is appropriate for us to change the regulations for the new members of the council since we are stepping down. We concluded that it is a useful process, as we are better informed now than new members will be when they are only starting their duties. Also, the council membership changes annually or bi-annually, therefore the regulations will always be changed before a new council.

The Chair proposed the following changes for Article 3: *participation in at least 1 active TF per cycle/ participation in a comparable number of TF with an average of 1 TF per cycle*. The UC opposed this wording as it discourages the participation of members that are in permanent TFs. Also, the wording would allow councillors to work twice as hard for one-half of the year and then cease their council participation for the remainder of the year.

Finally, the Chair proposed the following wording for Article 3: *participation in a comparable number of TFs per cycle, with at least one active TF per cycle*. This version was accepted by the UC. The UC consented to the Rules of procedure UC with the adjustment of article 3 as mentioned above.

Action points: The Chair will adjust the regulation in Article 3 of the *Rules of procedure UC* accordingly.

02.07 Concept advice Starting and Incentive grants EUR

The UC has received the concept documents on the “*Starting and Incentive grants EUR*” and is asked to advise on the issue of dividing the budgets among faculties. The final versions of the documents will be tabled for consent in the next academic year.

The UC was reminded that we requested the EB to give us a higher level of involvement in the division of funds of the *Bestuursakkoord*, which is reflected in the current process. The UC should feel free to provide input on these documents despite having been involved in earlier discussions.

The Financial TF will pick up the topic for this cycle. Nonetheless, the documents concern many staff members, and the suggestion was made that all staff members share and discuss this document with their colleagues.

Action point: The TF Finance will review the documents for the *Starting and Incentive grants EUR*. The Clerk will table the agenda point *Starting and Incentive grants EUR* for the second plenary meeting

02.08 Numerus fixus bachelor programmes and selection master programmes 24-25

The Numerus fixus is an annual topic that is shared with the UC for advice. The UC commended having received more information from the EB on the process for the BA in Medicine, which is not an EB decision and is decided nationally depending on the distribution of the total number of medicine students. However, a UC member criticised the phrasing used to describe the measures against internationalisation – “flooding of non-EEA students” – which was regarded as discriminatory.

A temporary TF consisting of councillors Simo (TF Lead), Ernst, Cagla, and Sandra was formed. Councillor Irena will be asked if she wishes to participate given her previous involvement in the topic. The TF took note of the remarks shared in the meeting.

02.09 Good conversation

Due to time constraints, the UC decided to postpone this agenda point.

Action point: The Clerk will table the updates from *Good conversation* for the second plenary meeting.

02.10 Proposal professionalising list system

A councillor's proposal on *Professionalising the list system* was shared with the UC. We decided on forming a TF which will discuss the points outlined in the proposal. The TF may reach out informally to the elected UC members to hear their opinion but it was made clear that their input cannot be formally included in the official advice.

A TF consisting of councillors Nawin (TF lead), Tom, Cagla, Wesley, Simo, and Albert was formed.

02.11 Sustainability Educational Proposal

The name of the agenda topic will be changed to Sustainability Proposal.

A councillor's proposal on *Sustainability* was shared with the UC. The proposal was drafted in collaboration with the Sustainability Hub and includes all previous proposals and documentation that were communicated with the EB and not followed up on.

It was asked to remove 'Educational' in the name of the topic, since it does not only include education. Another councillor suggested creating a table overview of the previous action points and references to the mentioned documents, to better illustrate the issue to the EB. She will discuss this suggestion separately with the TF.

Also, seeing as this proposal was made in collaboration with the Sustainability Hub, the councillors are encouraged to assess whether we agree with all the views stated in it. The letter will be posted in Teams to facilitate the UC's review.

Action points: The UC members will read and review the proposal on *Sustainability* shared in Teams. The Clerk will adjust the name of this topic to 'Sustainability proposal'.

02.12 Opening hours buildings

The name of this agenda topic will be changed to Access to Personal Offices.

As discussed during the third plenary meeting of the previous cycle, a letter was sent to the EB without comments 3) and 4) regarding access to personal offices. This topic will be discussed during this cycle. The TF will research the legal underpinnings of such a request in order to make an informed request to the EB. The discussion will take place in the second plenary meeting.

Action point: The Clerk will table the discussion on *Access to Personal Offices* for the second plenary meeting. The TF will gather the necessary information to prepare for this topic.

02.12 Handover UC

The handover process is undergoing with the aim of having a final version of the Handover document by the end of this cycle; this overview will be shared with all new UC-members of the next academic year. All TFs were requested to add any information they consider important to be passed on to the next members. This concerns both the permanent TFs and the temporary TFs that dealt with recurring or important events.

Action points: The UC members will share their input in the *Handover UC* document before the third plenary meeting.

03 Incoming documents

- 38561 Plan of Action Smarter Academic Year

The UC members were requested to read the document in preparation for the SAY meeting with the policymaker.

04 Any other business

04.01 HOVO

The HOVO program offers education for elderly people, and it is done in almost all other Dutch universities and is almost always organised by a University. Last year, the UC had a discussion with the EB about HOVO classes being revitalised through cooperation with Utrecht. However, recently a councillor discovered that HOVO classes are taking place again but without the involvement of EUR; instead, Utrecht University is collaborating with Hogeschool Rotterdam. The interested councillors could read the documents of the previous year to review if the EB indeed promised to revitalise the HOVO classes.

Action point: The Clerk will table the discussion on HOVO for the second plenary meeting.

04.02 Past Policy

A councillor was experiencing difficulty with finding policy's set in the past, as it is difficult to find. It was proposed to table this topic in a future meeting and will be prepared by councillors Sebastiaan and Jaap.

Action point: Sebastiaan and Jaap will prepare a proposal for making policies better available for the community.

04.03 Traffic Safety

A councillor remarked that there is an increase in traffic issues around the Woudestein campus. It was agreed that he will put forward a letter addressing the EB and describing the issues; the letter will be discussed in the second plenary meeting.

Action point: Ernst will draft a letter addressing the traffic issues around Woudestein.