

Present: Hans Hellendoorn (VRM-VPE a.i.), Danko Roozmond (staff ESA), Merel van Gruijthuijsen (secretary SR), Step Kruisinga (chairman SR), Nathan de Jong (TV), Daan van Ginkel, Guus Doldersum, Sara Nagtegaal, Wiek de Bever, Koos Meesters, Nanette van de Luitgaarden (ASSR, staff BB, report)

5 Absent with notice of absence: Lisa Kurstjens, Rosalie Fritz, Bart Meenderman

### **1. Opening and adoption of agenda**

Hans Hellendoorn opens the meeting and welcomes everyone. The meeting will be held in Dutch, some items will be in English.

### **2. Adopt minutes Jan. 15, 2025**

10 P.2, r.38 - 'study spaces' is added to 'teaching halls, and teaching spaces '. With this addition, the report is adopted

### **3. Communications**

- Lisa Kurstjens, Rosalie Fritz, Bart Meenderman are going to Brussels today. They are visiting the European Parliament with the ISO.
- Koos Meesters presents the SR Annual Report 23-24. The report will also be sent digitally.
- 15 • SR party ORAS is going on a research trip to Britain next week. Daan van Ginkel explains that ORAS will investigate how the university can play a role and be more visible in the city (civic engagement), how is that shaped in education etc. Hans Hellendoorn points out that the role of the city council and municipality may be different in Great Britain. He wishes them well.
- 20 • Merel van Gruijthuijsen is pleased that a project at the investment fund ' Climate Fresk' is starting to take off. The SR finds this important and therefore this is highlighted, to increase understanding about sustainability and achieving the 2030 sustainability goals. The Sustainable Education @ TU Delft project is also briefly touched upon. A knowledge platform for teachers is being built and events are being organized for teachers focusing on sustainability. The SR is pleased that money has been made available for this. However, the council is concerned about sustainability in light of the upcoming budget cuts. Hans
- 25 • Hans Hellendoorn reports that he recently attended a workshop on sustainability. He urges the SR to take into account that the workshop Climate Fresk has a great impact, follow-up care is needed.
- Wiek de Bever learned that the D&I office at the University of Groningen is being cut. The SR would not want that to happen at TU Delft. Hans Hellendoorn takes good note of this.

### **30 3. Student World Update**

Step Kruisinga gave a presentation, reviewing circular PV panels, the blue Monday run, the annual student ski vacation, D&I student teams, the Spring IP for master and exchange students, and the new campaign in Delft on student welfare "FFinchecken.

### **4. Social Security**

35 Merel van Gruijthuijsen reports that the SR supports the design of the hotline for social safety and would like it to start soon. With this hotline, students, and staff can contact in an accessible way and at a central point if they have experienced something socially unsafe. The request for consent will be discussed in the GV-Combi meeting (Student Council, Works Council and CvB) on Feb. 20.

40 Social safety and TAs: sometimes a TA exhibits unsafe behavior on one faculty, and then that TA can then work on another faculty. The SR has talked to several people about this. Merel van Gruijthuijsen advocates the establishment of a TA portal, in which the courses given are assessed. Such a portal already exists within EWI and Applied Sciences. Hans Hellendoorn wants to look into this at EWI first; he does not know if this is allowed. Merel van Gruijthuijsen will give him the contacts at EWI. Hans Hellendoorn is curious how big the problem is? He says not many TAs go to other faculties, but Mathematics is a good example of a cross-faculty subject. Hans Hellendoorn will

45 discuss this with the lawyers; the use of TAs must also be socially safe for others. Hans Hellendoorn believes that sometimes there are TAs who do not function adequately in their work, such a platform can also help with that.

### **5. Generic Education Building South**

*Adopted March 13, 2025*

5 Koos Meesters states that no decision has yet been made to build Generic Education Building South, and the SR has given an unsolicited opinion on this. The SR wants to be involved in this decision. Hans Hellendoorn is asked about the feedback from the advisory board space question education. Danko Roozmond states that the point has been discussed before, the advisory board is aware that there are objections. Koos Meesters reiterates that the SR would like to bring in the student perspective. Hans Hellendoorn points out that Rosalie Fritz has already been updated by the advisory board, he will see what else he can do. Koos Meesters mentions the conversations that have taken place at the executive level. Hans Hellendoorn emphasizes that it is in mutual interest to involve the SR as much as possible. He will look at what the Campus Board will do now, the Advisory Board is now waiting for an elaboration of facilities on Middle. Danko Roozmond explains the way forward. Koos Meesters points out that that he sees little student input in it, and that is what the SR would like to see.

## **6. Contemplation Rooms**

15 Wiek de Bever states that civil engineering students inquired about the realization of a reflection room in their faculty. Despite the faculty's enthusiasm for implementing the facility, the faculty ultimately decided not to proceed because 'there is a clear university policy on where reflection rooms can be implemented'. Faculty autonomy is being discussed and, in the eyes of the CSC, a faculty should be able to make such a decision. Wiek de Bever asks whether the Executive Board wants to allow the faculty to recreate such places. Hans Hellendoorn answers in Dutch and reports that the Executive Board will not force faculties to do such a thing, he certainly won't. Faculties can decide for themselves to do something, the dean is the manager of the building. Danko Roozmond explains that supervision is needed at such places because their use sometimes gets out of hand. Supervision costs money, which in turn is paid for by the CREFM management. He asks the SR to take this into account

## **7. Open Government Act**

25 Koos Meesters points out the importance of disclosure of WOO requests; this is a legal requirement. In November 2025 there was a conversation about disclosure of WOO requests submitted. This has not happened yet, why is it taking so long? Hans Hellendoorn is working to find out. If it is a legal requirement, it will be done by TU Delft. Koos Meesters points out that the position of archivist actually no longer exists, is action being taken on that? Hans Hellendoorn says that is an obligation, action needs to be taken on that. Danko Roozmond says it takes an untold amount of work to prepare a WOO request. Responding correctly is a focus to get the right things to surface. It has to be extracted from a multitude of systems, but at the same time poses problems of feasibility, Danko Roozmond said. At this, some discussion takes place.

## **8. Conversions**

30 The SR received the announcement for the so-called "Rebates" on January 31, 2025. Daan van Ginkel explains that the SR is not completely reassured that the students are included in this process. The SR will be included too late, the real decisions have already been made by then. How will the Executive Board ensure that the student perspective is included? Hans Hellendoorn explains the process:

35 There are 8 faculties and 13 departments that have been presented with the retrenchment question. The first teaching workshops on effective teaching have started: what role do faculty and ESA play in this? Hans Hellendoorn wants students to be more involved, precisely in this process. However, he can imagine that some issues will sometimes be discussed with, and sometimes without students. When the efficiency process is finished, then the other processes will be looked at. Daan van Ginkel explains how he has interpreted the retrenchment letter. How will it be ensured that there is a red line? Hans Hellendoorn explains that that will be discussed in the workshops, how we are going to realize the deflection together. A list of the strategic themes is being worked on. Daan van Ginkel says that 10% cuts are to be made everywhere, the SR finds that remarkable. Hans Hellendoorn agrees with him. He says that a calculation was made of the expenses and the expected income, and that was about 10. He emphasizes that that was not a choice in advance and explains that that is also the national picture using an example.

45 There was a very urgent request from the faculties to give them the freedom to be able to implement the retrenchment policy-wise. The cut will not be imposed from above. The choice has been made to do the cutback evenly. It is easy for a department to cut faculty services, but then a faculty may run into problems again and have to hire (externally or additionally) for that. That's what the consultation is for, because that's what we want to avoid.

*Adopted March 13, 2025*

Daan van Ginkel reports that the SR misses the strategy; how did this come about? Hans Hellendoorn says that right now it is not clear what can be fleshed out. It has been decided to have an iterative process for the next 6 months. Merel van Gruijthuijsen asks for invitation to participate. Possibly the SR will be invited to workshop 3, Hans Hellendoorn would be in favor of that. He would like to discuss/evaluate that next Monday at the first meeting. Daan van Ginkel asks the Executive Board to include the input of the FSRs. Hans Hellendoorn estimates that that will be difficult, but can be done at the decentralized discussion.

Daan van Ginkel questioned the stated t.v. Strategy Development Board. The board has been asked to develop a Terms of Reference (ToR). Why can this board only form their strategic vision after 80%? The SR finds this remarkable. Hans Hellendoorn explains that this is not strange, because it is an iterative process in which it is first determined what we as TU Delft find important. Merel van Gruijthuijsen asks when the SR can join the workshops. That will be decided after next Monday.

## 9. **StOF**

Sara Nagtegaal the timeline from February 2024 and communications regarding the revised Profiling Fund Arrangement (now Student Support Fund (StOF)). The revision was necessary to better align the scheme with the current needs of student boards and other recipients.

Early on, the SR urged that the review process be started in a timely manner so that there would be sufficient room for careful decision-making and communication with the associations and student organizations involved. Unfortunately, the process started later than hoped and took longer than expected, partly because of the complexity and the large number of stakeholders involved. This delay created time pressure, so communication towards associations and other StOF recipients started late. This led to much uncertainty, because associations did not know in time how many board months they would receive and therefore could not prepare for this. There has also been no clear communication about the transitional arrangement for associations receiving substantially fewer board months under the new arrangement. The SR would like to see this improved.

In addition, the SR has not yet received the final StOF regulation, nor has it been published online. In the mails that clubs have received from ESA it says that they did their best to distribute the regulation as early as January. Would like to receive the adopted regulation as soon as possible. When will the regulation be put online?

Hans Hellendoorn points out that only one person attended the communication meeting. There can be no formal publication until there is a final decision. The LS board needs to put that regulation on the website, this is on the schedule.

Sara Nagtegaal reports that there are associations whose number of board months is changing substantially. They have not yet received official communication about this and do not know anything about the transition arrangement. This creates uncertainty among associations about their succession and financial situation. This is especially true for sports and cultural associations in Box 4, where significant shifts are taking place. Formally, an award decision comes only after recognition, and only then is the number of months known, says Danko Roozmond. Sara Nagtegaal says that creates a lot of stress. Danko Roozmond would also have preferred the scheme to be approved by the SR in September 2024, precisely because the process takes so long. ESA is doing its best to get things done ASAP.

Sara Nagtegaal has questions about the transitional arrangement. The memorandum states "In the first year of award, where the arrangement results in a substantial decrease (ie >5 board months) in the number of board months awarded to an association, it may be decided to resource in the first year of award (ergo for 2025/26) the number of board months from the 2024/25 award and the new award StOF."

Can an explanation be given on this? Danko Roozmond explains that the BoE can decide to resource with the old arrangement, this is done case by case. It may also still be the case that some associations are not recognized. He assumes that the CCFO includes that in the decision and makes a proposal to the CvB.

Sara Nagtegaal requests full transparency about this transition arrangement as soon as possible so that associations can prepare for it. She is curious how the 15% increase will be implemented? The contingency has not been increased. The StOF for the boards-the contingency part-has been increased by 15% to 1.15 million euros. That is the starting point. From that follows a monthly amount. It will apply from next year; for this year the allocations have already been made.

*Adopted March 13, 2025*

Koos Meesters points out that every year the increase of the STOF budget for the upcoming year is negotiated. This seems redundant to the SR as the budget could also be indexed with the living costs of students. Think of the average wage increase from the collective bargaining agreement for universities. The SR would like to see the budget indexed in order to get student support at an acceptable amount. Danko Roozemonde says it is incorrect, the *amount* is set annually. He explains that the amount of the budget is normally looked at every 3 years. This also makes it easier for ESA's budget. The amount of money the university makes available is the policy freedom of the CvB. Hans Hellendoorn does not want to speak for subsequent Boards. It should be possible to look at it anew every time. It is also a social discussion, he points to the discussion with the other rectors on this subject. Agreements are not fixed for decades, not even once for 3 years, according to Hans Hellendoorn.

5  
10  
15  
Sara Nagtegaal would like to conclude by identifying some learning points for the 2027 review. The time pressure on this process has led to poor communication with StOF recipients. The SR advocates starting the next revision earlier and possibly putting in additional staff capacity to allow sufficient time for careful decision-making and communication. In the future, associations should also be better informed from the ESA management, to avoid information disparity. The SR would like to see a full reflection on this process from ESA to ensure that the next review is better. Hans Hellendoorn agrees that it should be possible to learn from things done. Danko Roozemonde would like to see it mentioned in the reflection process that there were staff members who fell out due to illness and therefore there was force majeure.

### **10. Accessibility Lecture Halls**

20  
Wiek de Bever repeats in English the question from the previous meeting in which there was discussion about the (in)accessibility of certain teaching rooms for students with disabilities. Hans Hellendoorn has since spoken with the Dean EWI and with Director CREFM. They would like to remedy the situation, but do not currently know which halls are involved. It is agreed that the SR will provide a list of problematic halls.

### **11. Mandatory scanning exams**

25  
30  
Guus Doldersum reports that sometimes students cannot view exams because the instructor in question is not available and illustrates this with an example. It is a cumbersome process to view an exam and it is difficult to schedule. The SR points out what he sees as the enormous advantage of scanning examinations in order to see them. Can't the scanning of exams be included in the OER? Hans Hellendoorn raised the issue of review deadlines and scanning of exams last ODO. He indicates that this will take time. Hans Hellendoorn himself is convinced of the advantages of scanning exams, and explains the history of ANS. This is discussed at length. Danko Roozemonde points out that the issue of copyright of exam questions also comes into play. A teacher does not like to see the exam questions on [studeersnel.nl](http://studeersnel.nl) and related websites. This is discussed again. Guus Doldersum is curious about the progress. Hans Hellendoorn points out that the subject will soon be discussed again with the education directors bachelor. He does not want to push the scanning of exams, but wants to support the process.

### **12. Master theses**

35  
40  
In March 2024, the SR argued for a central policy on clear communication of collaborations around MSc theses. At the moment, the different faculties are only asked if they can announce collaborations with the information about the specific thesis and at the beginning of the thesis. This is done as a result of the vision for education 2024-20230. The SR believes that it is important to see how this measure can be realized and implemented in the long term in the realization of the vision on education. Therefore, the SR would like to be involved in the elaboration of this point in the implementation documents.

45  
Hans Hellendoorn points out that there will be four workshops on efficiency in education. The graduation process will be high on the agenda because it has everything to do with efficiency. We will have to wait and see what comes out of the workshops. The list of organizations and companies is much shorter at the operational level. It would not be so difficult to implement, but for now we are relying on good will. Hans Hellendoorn points out that there are 40 departments, each with its own way of working. Sometimes contacts are made through a student association, sometimes through a coordinator. Hans Hellendoorn thinks it's good that they are so different. Danko Roozemonde adds that if there is a feeling that information is being deliberately withheld, it should first be raised through the FSCs. And even then it will only be brought here if they cannot resolve it themselves.

*Adopted March 13, 2025*

Wiek the Beaver still has problems with good will. It is rather nebulous. Hans Hellendoorn would like the MSc associations to play a bigger role. They could also ask for placement fees to finance the study trip. This is being discussed. Hans Hellendoorn discusses the master's examination ('master's thesis'). We should see graduation more as a subject, just as BEP is seen as a subject.

5 **13. Differences in courses double 's**

Merel van Gruijthuisen calls attention to students doing two bachelors who experience difficulties with using the courses of one bachelor as a minor with the other bachelors. Each program has its own way of doing things. This causes confusion for students and stress. Can't this be deployed more uniformly? Hans Hellendoorn recognizes the problem, but it just doesn't work; the programs are leading in this. There was a master regulation, but that has been stopped. This is being discussed. Hans Hellendoorn does not think it will work to regulate this centrally. The programs have the legal space to make their own choices. The SR should discuss this with the directors of education. As for a mutual minor, it is really up to the programs whether they allow it. This concludes the agenda item for now.

10 **14. Print**

Guus Doldersum will give a presentation. Hans Hellendoorn believes this is a question for the FSR IO and Bk. If that does not work, then the topic can be brought up again here. The Haagse Hogeschool has a €30 print credit available for their students. Hans Hellendoorn again refers the SR to the FSR, it is up to the faculty. It is not up to the CvB to impose this, Hans Hellendoorn knows that something similar is also arranged for projects (e.g. WtB). Guus Doldersum points out the perceived performance pressure among students, people feel pressure to spend money on implementation. There is further discussion about a possible solution to deliver the work in digital form. Work culture and environmentally friendly design are also topics of discussion. Hans Hellendoorn agrees to discuss this with the deans as well.

20 **15. Internationalization**

Wiek de Bever states that the Minister of Education Eppo Bruins released a follow-up letter on the legislation on internationalization in higher education. The CSC recognizes that there is no formal law yet on internationalisation, but believes it is important to already be prepared to act in case this law passes eventually, as this law may have an enormous impact on the international students and staff. The CSC stresses that the prospect of the WIB (Law Balanced Internationalization) is already affecting life at the TU and other universities. Nationwide, the inflow of international students has decreased, and some universities are afraid some studies cannot take place anymore in their current form. A message to students and prospective students informing about the things that the TU is doing in preparation would be an easy way to inform staff and students about the current situation, and its political volatility.

The CSC's suggestion would be a statement, placed on the website, similar to this:

35 *At the moment, the Dutch government is developing a law on internationalization in higher education. At the moment, much is unknown about how this possible law will be affecting the TU Delft and other universities. The TU Delft monitors this situation constantly, and has conversations with other universities as well about possible (but still unknown) effects of this law. For current students studying at TU Delft, we do not expect any changes during their study time. For prospective (international) students, possible changes in legislation and inflow policy will be communicated in due time. For the beginning of coming academic year however, the law will most probably not come in effect, hence we expect no changes for that.*

40 Hans Hellendoorn asks Wiek de Bever to send him the text of the statement, and he will discuss it with the Communication department. There is a brief discussion about how the BoG and UNL experienced the minister's amendment. People are upset and disappointed.

**16. Language**

45 Wiek de Bever says that there are plenty of Dutch courses for staff, but not for students. He would like to hear from the CvB how the discussion on this is going. Hans Hellendoorn says that the government believes that Dutch should be taught to Dutch students. He understands that it is important for lawyers, psychologists and doctors. It is about

*Adopted March 13, 2025*

language skills for the profession you are studying. It is about quality, what a student needs to know in their profession. So it is definitely not about teaching Dutch to foreign students. Hans has discussed this with Willem van Valkenburg from the Extension School. It is not a problem at all to expand the existing MOOC.

5           **17. Hospice survey presentation**

Step Kruisinga presents the results of a survey on housing conducted among TUD students in November 2024. This was done in response to an NOS article showing that student housing organization of Utrecht is going to stop housing in their new buildings. Drawing lots is fairer, Dutch and international students agree. However, they do not want to abolish hospiteren. Step Kruisinga asks Hans Hellendoorn to include the results of the survey in the discussions with DUWO and the municipality of Delft.

10

**18. Campus South**

Merel van Gruijthuijsen broaches the subject of student housing in relation to Campus South. Campus South is now quite empty and there is a shortage of student housing. The SR sees opportunities for realizing student housing on Campus South. There are also sounds that TU Delft and the municipality of Delft are having talks about this. What is the progress of those talks? Hans Hellendoorn does not know. There is talk about infrastructure and what that will cost. Such a decision lies partly with the municipality of Delft because the zoning plans etc. have to be adjusted (Kruithuisweg location), and that takes a long time. This could possibly be done around 2030. Ideas for Campus South must first be discussed with the province of South Holland, and then the municipality of Delft, which takes even longer. Hans Hellendoorn emphasizes that the municipality of Delft is sympathetic to TU Delft, they see the problem.

15

20

**19. Round-up**

Koos Meesters asks about the alcohol policy evaluation. Hans Hellendoorn has no update on that yet.

**20. Closure**

Hans Hellendoorn closed the meeting at **11:02**.

25