

**Plenary Meeting - University Council**  
**Erasmus University**  
**November, 10th 2020**

**Present in the Meeting:** Ana Uribe Sandoval, Ben Bode, Ferry Blom, John Piarelal, John van Wel, Natascha Kraal, Sebastiaan Kamp, Albert Wagelmans, Yogi Hendlin, Afrodita Dobрева, Armand Gozé, Bram Hessen, Diederik Mosch, Jasper Klasen, Joep Schoenmakers, Luca Kriese, Philip van Moll, Wouter van Dam, Younes Assou, Hans van den Berg, Anne Zijleman, Helen Gubby, Dian van Toor, Bianca Jadoenath, Olaf Hornes, Marjan Gorgievski.

**Teams Meeting - 15:00**

<b>Index</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Opening	1
1.01 Setting of the Agenda	1
1.02 Setting of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting	1
1.03 Chair Announcements	1
1.04 Presidium Announcements	1
1.05 UC Announcements	2
2 Agenda items plenary meeting UC	2
2.01 Revised regulations use of internet and ICT-facilities (staff and students)	2
2.02 Action Plan Psychological Workpressure	2
2.03 Headlines budget EUR	3
2.04 Highlights report August 2020 + COVID report	3
2.05 Whistleblower policy	3
2.06 Update/information/advice on budget for 2021 of ErasmusX	3
2.07 Evaluation Electoral	3
2.08 HoKa Student Wellbeing	4
2.09 Incidents in app groups	4
2.10 Compensation UC work	4
2.11 Administration and Management Regulations	5
2.12 Incoming documents and letters	5
3.0 Any other business	5

## **1. Opening**

### **1.01 Setting of the Agenda**

There is one change in the agenda: the Administration and Management Regulations will be included as point 2.11. Hence, point 2.12 will be incoming documents and letters.

### **1.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting**

Considering that the minutes were sent yesterday, send any adjustments to the minute taker.

### **1.03 Chair announcements**

#### *- Email Announcements*

From next meeting onwards, the announcements will be sent by email before the plenary meetings.

#### *- Appreciation for Hard Work*

The Chair complemented everyone for their hard work. There is a tough cycle coming up, and more hard work will come. The Chair urged all the members to only take the workload they can handle. If they feel that they are working too much, they can reach the Presidium, the Chair, or in very personal cases, the Confidentiality Committee to discuss their situation.

#### *- Personal Discussions*

The Chair sent a message to the employees to have a personal discussion with them. This was also done last year. The personal talk is not mandatory.

#### *- Evaluation of the Chair*

In January, the Clerk will arrange the evaluation of the Chair which is made every year.

#### *- Minutes*

As decided in the last plenary meeting, the Minutes will be kept anonymized. Using an opt-in system of personalization has become problematic for the workload of the Secretariat, as quotes and ideas must be very specific for it. Hence, Armand proposed to find a middle ground where the Secretariat's workload is not heavily increased. This proposal entails mentioning the names of the members that come up with proposals in the plenaries, without including quotes. This proposal will be partially accepted, and the Secretariat will do its best to include these names. However, if it seems that this inclusion is increasing the workload, minutes will go back to full anonymization.

### **1.04 Presidium announcements**

#### *- Management of Any Other Business, Questions, and Agenda Points*

There are a lot of ideas that come up in "Any Other Business". Although this is a good thing, it would be nice to implement a system so that the Chair can handle the points in a more effective way. Therefore, the Presidium came up with the proposal of submitting "Any Other Business" at least 24 hours before the plenary meetings. These points will be therefore added to the agenda. If further points come up during the Plenary discussion, they can be integrated at the end of the "Any Other Business" list if time allows it. To submit "Any Other Business", contact the Chair. Furthermore, if the "Any Other Business" is addressed to the EB, the Chair will look for the best strategy to channel the question/remarks to the EB.

If there are questions about procedures on the rights of a certain topic, please submit these questions to the Clerk at least seven days in advance of a Plenary meeting. For these

questions to be answered, the Clerk may need to contact external stakeholders, which takes time. Finally, if a member wants to bring up an agenda point for a cycle, they should communicate their point by Friday of the 4th Week of the previous cycle.

- *Feedback on Ideas and Proposals*

The Presidium understands that it is positive to give feedback on the ideas and proposals that members bring to discussion at the UC. Therefore, they recommend using the Teams chat for discussions on proposals or reaching out to members of both the staff and student body for feedback.

- *Office Use*

The Presidium will draft some instructions for using the Office. These instructions are meant for whenever it is possible to use the office without Covid-19 regulations.

### **1.05 UC announcements**

- *Teams Documents*

The Clerk set up the documents on Teams. They should be available to all members.

- *Letters: Blended Working and Appointment of Deans Procedure.*

Ana sent a letter for Blended Working, and a letter for the Appointment of Deans Procedure. There were two comments regarding the Appointment of Deans Procedure's letter. First, a member asked if it was beneficial to ask for letters of motivation or CVs to be in English. The taskforce representative replied that this point is especially relevant for the schools that are managed mainly in English. In the document, this is clarified in parenthesis. Secondly, a member asked why EUC was not a part of the structure of the letter. The remarks for EUC were at the end of the letter with the headline "Special cases". It was then clarified that it was in this structure as all other points of the letter are law related. However, to raise awareness on the point, the headline will be changed to "Special Procedure EUC".

**Action point: Ana will change the headline from "Special Cases" to "Special Procedures EUC" on the Appointment of Deans Procedure letter.**

## **2 Agenda items plenary meeting UC**

### **2.01 Revised regulations use of internet and ICT-facilities (staff and students)**

*Taskforce: Wouter (vice-chair and member), Ana, Olaf, and Helen.*

This is a new point in the agenda with a right of advice. It was previously set-up for right of information, but after some discussions it was decided that it would be brought up as a right of advice for a good course of affairs. Sebastiaan expressed that he has been involved in the creation of this regulation, and therefore will not partake in votes or discussions on the topic. Another member of the council asked if there was a supervisory body on emails, as there are some blank provisions on the arbitration bodies to deal with this. This was recognized as an interesting point to ask the policy-makers on the matter.

### **2.02 Action Plan Psychological Workpressure**

This point has a right of consent. Updates are expected in the next plenary. The taskforce has an appointment to discuss this point with the policy-makers this week Thursday.

### **2.03 Headlines budget EUR**

This topic is up for consent. Ben highlighted the timeline in the last plenary meeting to deal with the topic. There's already an invitation for the taskforce to meet with the representatives in charge in two different sessions.

### **2.04 Highlights report August 2020 + COVID report**

This point is for the right of information. Yesterday, there was a meeting to discuss the report with Pieter Jellema. The taskforce will make a brief summary of one page to summarize the contents of the meeting and the document.

### **2.05 Whistleblower policy**

The documents regarding this policy were discussed today by the EB. They will look at them soon. Most of the input provided by the UC has been included in the policy (around 95% of it). The document should be available this week, unless the EB has substantial issues with it. Angelo Rijdsdijk, the policy-maker in charge, will be invited to the plenary of November 24th to discuss the new policy. The idea is that the UC can draft a final advice on the 24th. There's no actual deadline to submit this document, but the legal department wants to implement the policy as soon as possible so that it is valid in January. A member asked if the EUR Holding Regulations were taken into consideration when creating the new policy, but this is not clear. Again, most of the UC input has been included in the document, and Angelo will be present in next meeting for questions.

All members are invited to send the Chair any questions about the policy by November 18th. In the future, these questions could be discussed through Teams. Furthermore, the Chair will ask the legal team to provide a cover note for the document, explaining what they included in the new policy and what was not included from the UC input.

**Action Points: All members are invited to send the Chair any questions about the policy by November 18th. Furthermore, the Chair will ask the legal team to provide a cover note for the document**

### **2.06 Update/information/advice on budget for 2021 of ErasmusX**

This point will be discussed at the HoKa Workgroup, and they will bring some advice on the matter. Furthermore, this topic is currently being discussed by the EB. Updates will come in the next plenary.

### **2.07 Evaluation Electoral Pilot**

This morning the proposal for the electoral system became available. Because of personal circumstances of one of the members of the team, there was a small delay in the drafting of the proposal. The proposal is based on the input that the UC gave for a new system considering what is feasible for the organization. On the 24th of November, Jochem Streefkerk from the legal team will come to the Plenary meeting to clarify any points of attention. He will take the floor for 20 minutes for any clarifications. Afterwards, there will be an internal 20 minutes discussion on the proposal.

There will be a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority vote on the proposal after the discussions on November 24th. If the  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority is not reached, then the electoral system goes back to the old system (not the pilot). Nevertheless, if this is the case, there could be a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority vote to continue with the current pilot if necessary. If none of the two proposals pass, the electoral system goes back to the old system by default.

It is important to notice that if the proposal for a new electoral system is passed, the legal team will still need some time to draft the statutes of the system. Hence, this vote is extremely important for the legal team to draft the statutes according to the plan. The plan with the statutes would therefore be expected to be formally consented later on.

If members have any questions in advance, they are invited to contact Luca and Albert before the meeting. Nevertheless, it is important to notice that Luca is not a legal expert and some further questions could come from his side to understand the proposal better.

**Action point: Members can contact Luca or Albert for questions on the Evaluation of the Electoral Pilot before the 24th of November**

## **2.08 HoKa Student Wellbeing**

Last week, the HoKa Workgroup members met with the Rector, the HoKa Coordinator, and the Legal Department to discuss the plan. They had some questions on both content and process-related information. After some clarifications, it was decided that the whole Action Plan on Student Wellbeing is up for consent to the council. For this reason, the UC members will get documentation by the end of this week, as well as an hour of discussion with Luca and Jasper (HoKa Workgroup Members) next week Tuesday. The idea is that all members can carefully review the plan and ask all the necessary questions in time.

On the 24th of November, this plan will be discussed for 40 minutes. The project lead will be invited for clarifying any points for 20 minutes, and then the council will internally discuss the plan for another 20 minutes. Hopefully, there will be enough information for a vote on the 24th of November, but the vote can also take place on the 8th of December.

Luca sent a letter to the project team with the concerns of the workgroup on the plan. He will send their concerns, alongside the reply from the project team to the rest of the council so that they are kept informed about it.

**Action point: Luca will share the exchange between the project team on the workgroup's concerns about the plan to the rest of the council.**

## **2.09 Incidents in app groups**

There are some concerns about the way in which the university dealt with the incidents in group apps last academic year. There is no clarity in the different ways of treating the information, the exact procedures for the cases, or what is the role of the university on it. There is a task force already created for this case. The idea is that the taskforce formulates a response to the EB on their email exchange. Furthermore, they can inquire about how the procedures for these complaints are checked, and other points such as defining when something is wrong in APP groups. The Chair suggested dealing with this topic in January.

## **2.10 Compensation UC work**

*Taskforce: Luca, Ana, Albert, John (W), Sebastiaan, Natascha, Dian.*

The UC council members have a compensation of 0.2 FTEs for their council duties. Several members expressed that this is not enough. Some members perceive their work for the council to be up to 20 hours per week (0.5 FTEs). Last year, there was small research on the topic, and the Chair brought this point of attention to the EB. The EB believes that perhaps there are "peaks and dips" in the UC work, and that on a yearly basis, 0.2 FTEs would be a fair estimate. Additionally, they explained that this compensation scheme is new and that they are still reviewing it. However, even if this was true, a member explained that it is not only about the money, but also about overworking some weeks.

Several arguments were raised during the meeting to increase the compensation of UC members and to engage in this discussion. Firstly, members believe that there are no real “peaks and dips”, and that the work is constant and demands a lot of time. Secondly, when Covid-19 stroke last year, members seriously overworked and there was no extra compensation. Thirdly, this discussion has been present in the council for several years, and there’s still dissatisfaction with the compensation. Fourthly, 0.2 FTEs would mean that the council only works on Tuesdays, which is easy to disprove as extra meetings and preparation take place during other days of the week. Finally, there’s an interesting point of asking for retribution on previous work of the UC members. The question here is: if it is proven that the UC members work more than 0.2 FTEs, would they get retributed for more FTEs since the beginning of the academic year? This point will be put forward to the taskforce working on this.

The initial idea was to have six council members counting their UC-related work hours from now until May. Although this idea will still occur to generate some data on the topic, a taskforce will work on communicating the concerns of UC members on the time-compensation to the EB. They will develop some written arguments to start pushing for this topic in the upcoming cycle.

A final point of attention is that the HoKa workgroup members need to contact Yvonne for getting their extra compensation.

### **2.11 Administration and Management regulations**

The Taskforce got new information from the people in charge of this point. The answers that they got contradict the previous input they had received on the topic. More updates will be discussed in the next plenary.

**Action Points: The Chair will therefore ask for a delay on the advice for this point. Additionally, the taskforce will schedule a meeting with the policy makers to clarify their communication.**

### **2.12 Incoming documents and letters**

#### *- Global Address Lists*

Last year, there was a discussion on the fact that students were able to see the agenda of their teachers. This had some negative repercussions on the teachers as students could book question hours in the teacher’s agendas. Furthermore, teachers could be busy even if their agendas seemed empty. At the moment, there are some “Cortana” messages being delivered to staff and students without prior permission. A member expressed that this feels like surveillance on the university software.

**Action point: Ana, alongside Yogi and Olaf, will work on drafting a response to this letter.**

### **3.0 Any other business**

#### *- Diplomas and Proctoring Exams*

There was an article on Erasmus Magazine about this topic. The EB or Examination Board granted some exams even though the proctoring was not working. This decision was perceived as a result due to external pressure. However, this is not evidence of why the decision was taken. The question is: is there a policy from the EB on how to handle these cases? Students are stressed about this topic, as they do not know the consequences of proctoring exams.

**Action point: Olaf will formulate a question to the EB on this point.**

- *Medezeggenschapsmonitor*

The “medezeggenschapsmonitor” takes place every two years. It is a survey for participatory bodies in the Netherlands to see how the University stands in contrast to other participatory bodies in the country. It contains some evaluations, reflections about how the members of the body feel, among other points. The survey also contains information about compensation and time investments. Considering the previous discussion on time compensation from the EB, the document of the survey will be included in the Teams documents

**Action point: Anne will upload this document on Teams**

- *Complaints UC Members*

A member of the council expressed that they are aware of a complaint taking place at the UC against another member. They want to express their discontent about this, and they believe it is better to confront work and personal issues with members directly. They invited the rest of the council to approach this type of issue in a more direct way.