

University Council
Second Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 09/04/2024, 14:00 – 17:00

Location: Polak 2.22

Present in the Meeting: Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair), Ernst Hulst, Sebastiaan Kamp, Pedro van Gessel, Joseph Ayinla, Albert Wagelmans, Timo Zandvliet, Cagla Altin, Nawin Ramcharan, Aki Negate, Linqundo van der Klooster, Emre Ulusoy, Linda Dekker, Emese von Bone, Aleid Fokkema, Tom van Dijken, Achraf Taouil, Anthony van der Linden, Wesley Hennep, Katarzyna Lasak, Max Wagenaar Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Absent: Rosita Boedhai-Jansen, Natascha Kraal.

Waiver: Yasin Demir.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The agenda is set.

01.02 Minutes and action points of the first plenary meeting

The minutes of the first plenary meeting were set.

Several updates were made regarding the action points:

- Timeline Election Office. The Election Office offered the following response to our request for a timeline: "Unfortunately, it is difficult to provide a clear timeline regarding the possible adaptations of the KRUR. The reason for this is that various bodies have yet to discuss the possible changes and the consequences of such changes. We hope to bring the final new version of the KRUR to the University Council for approval during the summer, but this also depends on several different factors. Because preparations for the upcoming elections are already in full swing, it is unfortunately not possible to make changes to the KRUR before the elections."
- Response Letter to 38701 EUR Order Regulations Buildings and Grounds. The letter was not shared in time for the second plenary meeting. It will be tabled at the third plenary meeting.
- Tenure boundaries for student participation. The regulations for the University Council state that the student tenure is one year; a 2/3 majority in favor of changing the regulation would be required if needed. This update was for informational purposes.
- Addressing concerns of the UC to the Chief Redactor of the Erasmus Magazine. Instead of an email, the Chair approached the matter in person, explaining that the UC would have preferred for an article to more clearly show there was a discussion instead of a unanimous decision, with the disclaimer that we understand it is the right of EM to write freely as a journalistic entity. As the discussion at the first plenary did not substantiate that clear content differences exist between the article and the UC discussion and/or letter, the Chair did not address it either. If there is still a need to address inconsistencies, the Chair advised those interested in writing a side-by-side comparison to substantiate the claim.

1.03 Announcements

- Chair of Professionalising Party System.

The UC Chair will join the discussions of the task force to expedite the process.

- Seat renouncement councillor Pedro.

Councillor Pedro announced his departure from the University Council as of Tuesday 21st May, due to accepting a new position and thus leaving EUR. He expressed his deep appreciation to his colleagues in the University Council and the Presidium for the time spent working together. In light of this, the Election Office is going to begin the procedure of securing a replacement. In addition, there will be a Presidium seat opening, the procedure for this will be discussed in the Presidium.

- NPO reports.

The NPO reports will be shared with the UC in the upcoming days.

- HeQa task force.

The HeQa task force has attended the second co-creation session with Erasmus X based on the money that was available after the termination of the Inclusion project. The discussions converged towards the creation of an app concerned with improving the student journey. The project managers are planning on researching the design of the app through the help of internal and external stakeholders, such as establishing which student needs should be tackled. The app prototype will be developed between September and December 2024. While the exact future of Erasmus X is uncertain due to the funding termination after December 2024, the project will be transferred to the stakeholders within RSM, thus it will continue to operate in 2025.

- The strategic role of UC regarding HeQa.

A councillor attended a Strategy briefing regarding the trajectory of the ending of the current period and the design of the new period. It was also communicated what the role of the UC in the process would be, with emphasis that it would be separate from the HeQa process. It was thus unclear how the HeQa process would be tackled. The Chair clarified that the HeQa funding is ending in December 2024, however, central funds will be available for projects aimed at improving the quality of education. This means that although the HeQa projects will end in 2024, some aspects will be transferred in the new period. Momentarily, the HeQa TF is tasked with overseeing the ending of the projects, and the budget decisions will take place between September and December, thus involving next year's council. The task force was informed of this in today's task force meeting; thus, we are in the process of figuring the process out.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Compensation participatory bodies (faculty staff) & 02.02 Compensation participatory bodies (program committees)

The answers to the technical questions were shared in Teams. The TF convened once, tackling both agenda items; in their discussions, there remain several points that will be addressed at the upcoming Consultation Meeting.

Firstly, we would like to understand why the service councils were not included in the policy, despite the advice given by the UC. Secondly, the document is not clear on whether the policy is going to be implemented in all faculties, or whether it serves as a guideline; we would like to ask the EB for clarity while standing by our initial advice of implementing the policy in all faculties. Thirdly, we would like to ask the EB how they intend to communicate this policy to ensure that all participatory bodies are aware of the policy change, in light of the difficulty in accessing or tracing policy documents at EUR.

Action point: the Clerk will table the agenda item *Compensation participatory bodies* at the CM.

02.03 Sleeping pods on campus Woudestein

A draft proposal on the *Sleeping pods* was shared with the UC via Teams. We are still awaiting RE&F's answer regarding location possibilities. The UC agreed to inform the Executive Board of the proposal as AOB at the upcoming Consultation meeting.

Because of the larger waiting time for RE&F's response, a councilor suggested approaching the University Library, which functions as its own entity, and might lead to the implementation of the proposal on their premises in a timelier manner. Also, a suggestion was made to elaborate on the measurements of the pilot in the proposal, to record its impact and use it as grounds for expanding the project; an idea would be installing buttons that record user satisfaction with the pod.

Action point: the Clerk will table the agenda item *Sleeping pods on campus Woudestein* as AOB at the consultation meeting.

02.04 Concept Reflection HeQa Annual Report 2023

The HeQa task force is asked yearly to reflect on their role within the HeQa projects and investments. The Reflection for 2023 was tabled in preparation for this meeting.

A few suggestions for improvement were made. Firstly, the phrasing “right of co-creation” will be changed into “access to co-creation” since it is unclear whether the right of co-creation exists at the central level of participation. Secondly, the consistency will be improved, as some paragraphs read significantly differently than others. Finally, a sentence stating that the HeQa task force reflected deeply on their role was added in the introduction of the document.

The HeQa task force will make the agreed adjustments in the document.

Action point: the HeQa TF will make the adjustments in the *Reflection HeQa Annual Report 2023*. The Clerk will share the *Reflection HeQa Annual Report 2023* with the policymaker.

02.05 Preparation Consultation Meeting (16/04)

- Campus Renovation. Due to the overlap between the renovation of the Tinbergen building and the demolition of the G building, a concern was raised that the availability of classrooms, offices, and study spaces on campus will be impaired. However, the EB already shared the following response: The demolition of the G building will take place after the Tinbergen Building renovation is finished. So, there will be no shortage of space. This response sufficiently answers our prior concerns, so the topic will not be tabled at the consultation meeting.
- Student Union Campaign. A recent student union campaign taking place on campus that was aimed at increasing students' awareness of the lowering of the student grant as well as mobilizing students to join the union was ended by EUR security. A councilor suggested asking the Executive Board why the decision was made, especially seeing that manifestations are allowed on campus. A discussion ensued, as some members of the councils disagreed with discussing this topic with the EB, while others were in favor. The voices against claimed that prior individual cases were not tabled for discussion as the council decided it would not be its responsibility, thus requesting a similar approach for this topic. Those in favor explained that this case differs from previous ones, as it appears to be a deviation from policy, and we would gain better clarity regarding the boundaries of this policy. As it was unclear why the security decided to stop the activity, the UC decided to first inquire about this decision before deciding to escalate it to the Executive Board.

Action point: the Clerk will contact Security to ask the reason for stopping the recent Student Union Campaign.

- Law Case RSM BV. Recently, a court ruled that RSM BV is required to pay back approximately 5M euros for overcharging tuition fees. A councilor suggested asking the EB how this development will impact the financial situation at EUR. However, as the case concerns RSM BV, it falls outside the role of the UC. The topic will not be tabled at the CM.

- Increase in customers at the cafeteria. Since the closing of the Tinbergen building for renovations, and thus the Tinbergen cafeteria, the number of students frequenting the only remaining cafeteria in the Mandeville building has increased exponentially. Seeing as there are few affordable food options for students and staff members on campus, we would like to ask the Executive Board whether they envision a short-term solution for the increase in people frequenting the Mandeville cafeteria. Also, as the contract with the Vitam supplier is rather strict, no other food suppliers are allowed to distribute on campus, increasing the difficulty in accessing affordable food options. The UC would express the wish to research the Vitam contracts.

Action point: the Clerk will table the question about the increase in consumer traffic in the Mandeville cafeteria at the consultation meeting. The Clerk will check if it is possible to obtain the contracts with Vitam.

- First aid on campus. Recently, a student required first aid help on campus, however this is not currently an option at EUR. This incident opened up a longer discussion within the UC regarding medical care on campus. Although we learned from previous discussions with the EB that the option of installing a medical practitioner office on campus is not viable, we could inquire about alternative solutions in case of medical emergencies, such as first aid.

Action point: the Clerk will table the question about medical/ first aid options on campus at the CM.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 275.787 Response to 38706 Request evaluation of institutional ties

The University Council members wished to follow up on the letter at the Consultation Meeting, on several grounds.

Firstly, we would like to understand how the Executive Board sees soft diplomacy developing in this conflict and what are they planning to do regarding that. Secondly, we would like clarification on why the EB referenced "Hamas" in their response, despite it being absent from our letter. Thirdly, we would like more information on the establishment of the committee, including a timeline of when they will make the evaluations. Fourthly, we would like to understand how the EB sees the distinction between legal basis/legal obligation when evaluating the ties with other institutions. Fifthly, we would like to know what organs the EB has the legal obligation to follow, as well as if they would take the ICJ ruling into account as one of the developments that can trigger a re-evaluation of their decision regarding institutional ties. Also, we would like to know what the EB will decide regarding the ICJ ruling even in the case that the Dutch state does not follow it. Finally, the UC would like to ask if the EB is exploring opportunities for helping those affected by the conflict, seeing as a similar procedure had been set up in the case of the Earthquakes in Turkey, as well as seeing that other Dutch universities have found ways of assisting.

Also, seeing as the topic can be sensitive, the Chair advised the UC to formulate their questions to the EB in a neutral way.

Action point: the Clerk will table the agenda item *Request evaluation institutional ties* at the Consultation Meeting.

04 Any other business

04.01 Quality assurance

The quality assurance educational team has drawn up a program plan for the EUR-wide strengthening of quality assurance. This includes, among other things, the development of a quality management system, but also a training course for faculty quality assurance staff, the development of a website, and the preparation of the institutional quality test in 2026. In addition to all the official bodies, they would like to invite a group to a sounding board session about the vision and principles chosen in their program

plan. They would therefore like to ask 2 UC members (1 staff, 1 student) to participate on June 13 from 2-4 p.m. Councillors Achraf, Nawin, and Ernst will join the sounding board session.

Action point: the Clerk will inform the Quality Assurance of the councilors joining the sounding board session.

04.02 HeQa

Several questions regarding quality assurance will be shared with the policymakers:

- What is the EUR policy in terms of quality assurance of assessment/testing at EUR? The BKE or BEQ is not mandatory and has minimal intake.
- To what extent are all lecturers/professors required to fulfill a language (English/Dutch) proficiency? Is there any indication that this affects the quality of education?
- How do we at the EUR ensure a similar quality of teaching staff, given that faculty should fund SKO/SUTQ? How is this handled for faculties with minimal budget? And how can we assure quality overall?
- Is there some sort of educational quality control for lecturers/tutors?
- The UC received signals that students feel less free to express their opinions during lectures. Is there data available on 'the freedom of speech' during lectures?
- Is there a central policy on the selection of students for master programmes?

Action point: the Clerk will share the questions regarding quality assurance with the policymakers.

04.03 AOB

- ISO email. An ISO meeting is organized for next week; this would be an opportunity for the UC to express what issues we are facing and what can be tackled at a national level. In addition, the National Day of Participation is set to take place on May 27th.