Concept minutes meeting Faculty Council – Faculty Board
December 8, 2025

Present FC:	Véronique Roos (chair), Lars Jeuken (vice chair), Giulia Bandiziol, Angela Caredda, Tobias Dijkhuis, Arnav Goel, Henk Hoekstra, Martina Huber, Wouter Remmerswaal, Anna Michelle van der Spek, Mark Tadema, Jeannette de Wolf
Present FB:	Jasper Knoester (dean), Bart de Smit (vice dean), Suzanne van der Pluijm (Executive Director), Tim van Surksum (assessor), Floris van Kampen (Secretary of the Board)
Official secretary:	Liselore Brederode
Guest:	Elice Schöne, Manager HR Science faculty for 3.3, Eva van der Kruk
On behalf of Mare:	Marc Reid
Absent:	Maurien van der Linde, Laura Heitman

	Subject
1.	**Opening**
	Roos opens the meeting at 15:31 hrs.
1.1	Approval agenda The items 3.1 and 3.3 on the agenda will be swapped. With these changes the agenda is set.
2.	**Previous meeting**
2.1	Minutes meeting November 2, 2025 The minutes are adopted without changes.
2.2	Action points 20251103-5.1 Knoester Inform the Council about the outcome of the discussion on the FWN Wetenschapsberaad about the policy for printing costs and number of prints of the dissertation. *Completed.* *The topic was discussed on the FWN Wetenschapsberaad on December 4. Most institutes are positive about compensating PhD candidates €500,- for the printing costs of their dissertation booklets, with the condition that a minimum number of booklets is printed. A uniform agreement will further be discussed without guarantees that a faculty wide solution will be agreed upon.* 20251103-5.2 De Smit Inquire with SOZ whether and when an evaluation of the pilot "new regulation for participation of non-registered students in examinations" will take place. *Pending.* *The first enquiry did not make clear who is in charge of the evaluation of the pilot. Further inquiries will be done.* 20250526-4.4 & 4.5 Nijhof To prepare a summary of important topics from the RI&E's LACDR and CML, which the Council can use for determining its advice on and approval of the RI&E's. *Pending.*

	Due to the extra work from the implementation of the new AFAS-system, the submission of the summary is postponed and expected in February 2026. 20250526-5.2 Van Surksum Inform the Council about the feedback of the HSO and University Council on the problem analysis on the registration protocol. *Pending.* *The previous assessor was under the impression that feedback would be received. Van Surksum will request for it to the UR again.* 20250526-5.2 Van der Pluijm Send the Councils' question overview with questions and remarks to the UFB. *The action item will be cancelled, as the Council will contact the UFB directly with questions and comments.*
3.	**Subjects on behalf of the Faculty Board**
3.1	Vacancy profile vice dean FWN The Council is satisfied with the profile as presented. Roos will sent input on two sentences that seem somewhat odd. No further additions were made. The Council is pleased that ample time is being allocated for the recruitment process.
3.2	Manual Genetically Modified Organisms *Handboek Genetisch Gemodificeerde Organismen (GGO 2013)* Flutter has incorporated the points of attention provided by the Council into the current draft and thanks the Council for the positive advice provided. The Council gives unanimous approval of the policy. Thanks to Flutter for providing clarification.
3.3	Career policy Academic Staff *Loopbaanbeleid wetenschappelijk personeel (WP)* The Council notes a significant policy change. The Council expressed satisfaction with the process. Adequate time was taken for sessions and open discussions with the Council, and they are pleased with the policy as it stands. Almost all points from the advice, as well as those from the Rector, have been incorporated. One word of caution: implementation is a major step. Scientific staff and scientific directors may require guidance, support, and evaluation. There is still substantial work to be done. Knoester thanks the Council for the positive feedback. It is understood that implementation will take time, and it is important to proceed carefully. The programme team will determine the next steps for implementation, noting that the foundational framework is strong. Knoester notes that Professor 1 promotions have been removed due to the planned future university policy on this matter. The Council raised a question regarding training. When appointing new staff, they typically undergo bias training, which involves making participants aware of unconscious biases. This training usually consists of a few-hour session aimed at increasing awareness. This training seems appropriate to incorporate within the career policy. The Council gives unanimous approval of the policy Academic Staff.

	Approval of the policy will also be provided in writing *(completed on December 8).*
3.4	Received and sent documents The Council has no additional questions.
3.5	Decisions of the Faculty Board The Council has no additional questions.
4.	**Subjects on behalf of the Faculty Council**
4.1	Advice on Program logistics education *Advies op Programma onderwijslogistiek* The Council has provided its advice in writing on November 19. Van der Pluijm thanks the Council for their advice and input. She notes that during the last meeting there was insufficient time for proper discussion. The Board would like to take adequate time to review the advice thoroughly. The entire Council may be invited, depending on how the Council wishes to organize this *(actionpoint).* De Smit and Van der Pluijm will attend on behalf of the Faculty Board. The Council will await the invitation, after which they will prepare accordingly.
4.2	Higher costs of business and home-work travel *Shuttel cards do not allow coupling of personal travel discount products.* Some complaints have been raised by staff about the Shuttel account. The Council notes that many staff members have a discount card with NS, but it cannot be used for work-related travel, while full price is charged by Shuttel. Staff are unable to use their own card and claim reimbursement afterward. This is frustrating given the ongoing budget cuts in various areas within the university. For staff living farther away, a reduced fare was previously possible, but this is no longer available. Van der Pluijm explains that this issue has been raised at the university level. HRM has reviewed the matter. NS does not want to link their system with Shuttel. Shuttel however, is willing to comply but it is currently not possible because of the NS. The use of Shuttel is university policy. The Council notes that allowing alternatives could potentially save costs. The Council asks why Shuttel was chosen instead of the NS Business Card. Van der Pluijm explains that, after staff requests for higher travel allowances, the university sought a tool or partner. Shuttel was the best option in the procurement process, offering more features than the NS Business Card. Van der Pluijm will raise the questions at the central “Bedrijfsvoeringsberaad” on December 11 to see if deviations in costs are possible and will inform the Council *(action point completed on December 18).*
4.3	New: Regulation on Registration for Courses and Examinations *As of 1 September 2026 the registration protocol will no longer be part of the OER.* The Council understands that the issue is being addressed at the university level but hopes that the Board will take the signals into account. The Council notes that if the registration protocol is removed from the OER, the participation will no longer apply.

De Smit explains that the idea is that the registration regulations would not need to be updated annually as part of the OER, but rather become a more permanent arrangement. The university-level representative body would still retain participation rights.
The Council points out that this is happening while the pilot is still ongoing. De Smit is also surprised by this, as logically such a decision would usually be made after the pilot has been evaluated. He will raise this point with the central administration. De Smit will present the matter at the central "Onderwijsberaad" on December 11. De Smit will provide an update to the Council *(action point)*.

5.	**Conclusion**
5.1	Any other business

<u>AFAS</u>
The Executive Board will make a "go" or "no-go" decision regarding AFAS this week. The Council notes that staff have expressed significant concerns: a great deal of work has been done, with many lists to check or approve, often in considerable detail. Employees feel they lack an overview and are worried that the system may not be implemented successfully.
Project statuses are difficult to track, predictions within projects are challenging, and time tracking is a concern.
Staff still need training and are anxious about whether everything will function correctly and whether resources will be wasted. Despite the hard work of everyone involved, there remains a shared sense of concern among the staff.

Concerns have also been raised regarding work packages. Many tasks that were previously handled by others, such as the grading check by HR, now need to be done by staff themselves. This leads to an increasing workload and raises the risk that approvals may be given without sufficient knowledge and understanding of the implications. While some of these issues are expected to be resolved as staff learn to use the system, a steep learning curve is to be expected. At this stage, little more can be done until implementation begins.

Van der Pluijm responds to these concerns, noting that the Executive Board is expected to make a "go" decision tomorrow. Technically, the system is ready. The main uncertainty lies in whether administration entered via the completed lists will be correctly reflected in AFAS and in the appropriate locations. Some errors are anticipated; there is no illusion that everything will work perfectly, and it is expected that adjustments will take at least a few months. Regarding supervisors' responsibilities, some tasks can be performed by the "preparers," but supervisors will indeed have additional duties to perform themselves.

The Council expresses concern that supervisors are being assigned responsibilities they did not previously have. Previously, after preparation, supervisors or managers would give final approval. Certain tasks do not naturally fall under the supervisor's expertise, as they may not be fully familiar with contracts, appointments, or grading, nor with business or HR processes.
Van der Pluijm responds that many questions will be answered directly by the system, such as Collective Labour Agreement regulations. The system will generate contracts based on these rules. However, supervisors are expected to know salary, working hours, and other relevant details. If this knowledge is insufficient, training will be available.

Van der Pluijm concludes that while administrative adjustments will be necessary, the overall outlook is positive.

<u>AI-policy</u>
The Council has established an AI working group consisting of four Council members. The group will investigate how other universities have developed AI policies and assess the need for guidelines within the faculty. For students and staff it is currently unclear which AI tools may or may not be used.
Once the working group provides an update, the Faculty Board will be informed.

De Smit looks forward to receiving advice. At the central level, a working group is already addressing AI policy, as many questions have arisen. It has also been discussed in the central "Onderwijsberaad" that a faculty-level working group is needed, which should include student representation. The working group is advised to connect with Bri Dolce (Policy

	Advisor Education FWN) to see what has already been done to avoid duplication of work; potential collaboration may be possible. De Smit believes that there is no need to build a faculty-level policy from scratch. Some Boards of Examiners currently have their own policies; all of these could be collected. It is important to determine where a policy is necessary—whether faculty-wide or university-wide. The Council and the Board agree that this is an urgent topic.
5.2	Closure Roos closes the meeting at 16:21 hrs.

Number	Who	Action	Status	Deadline
20251208-4.1	Van der Pluijm/ De Smit	Prepare a session for the Council about the Programma Education Logistics.	New	jan-26
20251208-4.3	De Smit	Inform the Council about the outcome at the Education Council meeting following the submission of the topic regarding the registration protocol that will taken out of the OER.	New	
20251103-5.2	De Smit	Inquire with SOZ whether and when an evaluation of the pilot "new regulation for participation of non-registered students in examinations" will take place.	Pending	
20250526-4.4 & 4.5	Nijhof	To prepare a summary of important topics from the RI&E's LACDR and CML, which the Council can use for determining its advice on and approval of the RI&E's	Pending	feb-26
20250526-5.2	Van Surksum	Inform the Council about the feedback of the HSO and University Council on the problem analysis on the registration protocol.	Pending	

Planning meetings FC - FB 2025-2026		
26-jan-26	15:30 - 17:00	CE.0.18
23-feb-26	15:30 - 17:00	CE.0.18
13-apr-26	15:30 - 17:00	CE.0.18
1-jun-26	15:30 - 17:00	CE.0.18
13-jul-26	15:30 - 17:00	CE.0.18
27-aug-26	15:30 - 17:00	CE.018