

Plenary Meeting - University Council
Erasmus University
February 23th, 2021

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 Heesen, Jasper Klasen, Joep Schoenmakers, Luca Kriese, Philip van Moll, Wouter van Dam, Younes Assou, Hans van den Berg, Helen Gubby, Bianca Jadoenath, Marjan Gorgievski, Diederik Mosch, Machteld Harmsen.

Absent in the Meeting: Olaf Hornes, Dian van Toor.

Teams Meeting: 15:00

Index	Page #
01 Opening	1
01.01 Setting of the Agenda	1
01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting	1
01.03 Announcements	1
02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC	2
02.01 EUR-EMC-TUD convergence framework	2
02.02 Annual Report confidential counselors 2019	3
02.03 Communications Approach for Diversity and Inclusion at EUR	3
02.04 EUR Internationalization policy 2021-2024	3
02.05 Professorial policy	3
02.06 Integral security policy	3
02.07 EUR Regulations of the Advisory Committee	
Complaints and Objections 2021	4
02.08 Decision on BSA by EB (soft cut)	4
02.09 EUR carbon neutrality by 2024	4
02.10 Ongoing topics	4
02.11 Incoming letters	5
02.12 Outgoing letters	6
03 Any other business	6
03.01 Study spots at campus	6
04 Closing	6

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the Agenda

There is an extra item on the agenda: the study spots on campus.

01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes will be sent to the council soon. Any comments can be sent to the minute secretary within seven working days.

01.03 Announcements

Announcements Chair/ Clerk.

- Convergence Meeting

On the 16th of March from 13.00 – 14.00 there is a meeting with Jennifer Kockx from the Convergence office. This appointment has been planned following the presentation the UC has received. Here, the UC asked the question if there are more possibilities for brainstorming, storytelling, organizing events to get to know each other and getting involved creatively in the different projects. During the meeting it was indicated such an event was organized in December 2020, but that Jennifer would welcome any ideas for such an organization very much. Therefore, this meeting was planned and open to anybody who would like to share ideas on how to organize such events.

- Professorial Policy

The professorial policy is also being discussed within EUROPA.

- Clerk University Council

Anne has a new job and therefore she will be leaving us, Machteld has been building up her hours and will be taking over completely again per March.

- Sharing Building Space with Other Universities

The UC mailbox was CC'ed in a request by students from other universities to all EBs of the Dutch Universities to open up their buildings to all Dutch students. This would enable people to study together even though they study at different universities. The EB of the EUR has picked up on this and the issue is being discussed at the VSNU level.

- UC Chair Appointment

On Monday the 1st of March the Confidentiality committee will hold a meeting with the Chair of the UC for his evaluation. A report of this meeting will be discussed in the meeting of the 9th of March. It is important to note that the term (2 years) is ending this academic year. To this extent, Ana has explained a proposal to extend the current term of the Chair's appointment.

Ana is now processing the comments with all the feedback referring to the Chair's evaluation. There is an observation that the Chair's appointment occurs every two years. Hence, the Chair is appointed with a completely new council. In other words, the new term of a Chair starts with newly elected employees and students. It is important to guarantee continuity in the council. For that reason, there is a possibility to extend the current appointment of the Chair for a year to guarantee that a new Chair does not have to sit with a newly elected council.

Ana will send an email with more details about this proposal, including a possible route on how to vote to extend the Chair's term. The extension of the term does not constitute a change in the statutes, but rather a reappointment through a simple majority vote. On this note, there was a question about how other universities deal with the appointment and election of their UC Chairs. As other universities have different institutional structures for their councils, it is difficult to compare. At Leiden University, the appointment of a Chair used to be for one year and they changed it to two for continuity. Furthermore, at Twente University the Chair is appointed for two years and they can continue for an undetermined time as long as there is a confirmation of their reappointment.

Announcements Presidium.

- *Review UC Working Method*

Last week's meeting on the evaluation of the working method has been rescheduled to next week.

- *UC & Supervisory Board Meeting.*

On Monday there is a meeting between the UC and the Supervisory Board. This meeting was called for because of the high turnover in the executive board. If members have specific questions they want the SB to prepare on in relation to this topic, they should notify the Chair.

- *Task forces and Vice-Chairs*

For the information of the council, the following topics have been put in the portfolios of the following vice-chairs: Internationalization policy - John (Strategy), Student assessors - Bram (Participatory Development), Centralizing information streams participation - Bram (Participatory Development).

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 EUR-EMC-TUD convergence framework

Update from the Policy Officer

Isabel van der Heiden, a policy officer from the Convergence Framework, was present at the meeting to give an update on the Convergence plans. Every pillar of the Convergence has been working hard on drafting multi-annual plans. These plans have been handed in to the Convergence Executive Board two weeks ago, and they are being revised at the moment. A process of review and discussion between the Convergence Executive Board and the leads of the pillars will begin tomorrow, and they will be responding to questions and updating the Convergence Executive Board on their plans up until the 1st of April.

There are 5 million euros available for the pillars, but the plans exceed this amount of money. Therefore, there will be discussions on how to adapt the plans to the budget. Resilient Delta is looking for alternative ways of receiving finance, and they already submitted requests for government funding on its plans. The municipality of Rotterdam is an important partner for these plans.

Having a consultation meeting with the UC to discuss the content of the pillars could be important to have good communication with the council on the Convergence. There will be open consultation meetings that the council could join in the future.

One of the main questions from the council is how people from the EUR community can get involved in the Convergence plans. For instance, could there be co-creation in the different pillars to establish projects? The policy officer explained that the pillars are at different stages and have varying speeds. Co-creation could come in the future in each sub-theme. For

instance, the Health and Technology pillar could be involved in co-creation in the near future. However, Resilient Delta may need more time for a process of co-creation to come. The policy officer will provide written answers to further questions by next week Tuesday, and these will be shared with UC members.

Update from the UC Chair

The Chair has met with the chairs of the other participatory bodies with the aim of institutionalizing meetings and procedures of the bodies in relation to the Convergence plan. The Chair proposed to the other representatives to write a draft for a possible role in co-creation from participatory bodies, institutionalize meetings, and guarantee equal rights for all participatory bodies in the Convergence. However, it seemed that there was resistance from the other representatives in writing or institutionalizing these procedures. The other participatory bodies want to stick to the rights that they have been given. They do not want to formalize any other point in writing besides the fact that participatory bodies will have meetings to discuss the Convergence. One of the reasons to reject this idea is the workload increase that this would represent for the participatory bodies involved in the Convergence.

The Chair explained that from his experience with the LDE, it is very important to put the rights and role of participatory bodies in writing. Hence, the Chair recommended the Council to write a letter of advice on whether written norms are needed on the procedures of the Convergence in relation to participatory bodies. It is important for EUR to take the lead in this procedure.

02.02 Annual Report confidential counselors 2019

A letter is being drafted and will soon be included on Teams. The letter will be discussed with the rest of the council in the next plenary meeting.

02.03 Communications Approach for Diversity and Inclusion at EUR

The task force involved had a meeting and they are drafting a letter on Teams to react to the topic. The letter will be discussed with the rest of the council in the next plenary meeting.

02.04 EUR Internationalization policy 2021-2024

There are no updates on this topic.

02.05 Professorial policy

There are no updates from the task force working on this point yet. However, EUROPA is also working on reviewing this policy. It could be beneficial for the UC to receive the insights from EUROPA on this topic, as they have already sent some questions to the institution regarding the topic. The Clerk will ask EUROPA if their questions and answers could be shared with the UC.

Action Point: The Clerk will ask EUROPA if their questions and answers could be shared with the UC.

02.06 Integral security policy

A meeting with the policy maker took place to discuss this policy. Some further questions were sent to the policy maker, and the task force is awaiting responses. Depending on the responses that they receive, a draft letter of advice will be drafted.

02.07 EUR Regulations of the Advisory Committee Complaints and Objections 2021

There is a letter on Teams containing advice for this point. The advice is overall positive, yet two points of feedback are given in regards to this topic. Firstly, the language of the regulations is only in Dutch, and this should be changed. Secondly, they are re-writing a lot of regulations which need to be presented to the community. On this note, there's an emphasis on the importance of communication to the community.

02.08 Decision on BSA by EB (soft cut)

The Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) will take the decision at a national level on whether the soft-cut measures between BA3 and Master's level will continue next academic year. It is not up to the EUR to decide on this measure directly. The international Student Organization (ISO) is in talks with the VSNU at the moment to discuss this measure. However, ISO explained that participatory bodies could be involved in informing their EB on whether or not they support the soft cut measure for next academic year.

ISO wrote a letter for Councils to sign to support this measure. The letter is to be sent to the EB to endorse the soft cut proposal and show that other universities are also agreeing with this measure. This letter would not include an exact proposal on how to carry out the soft cuts, and faculties could decide whether students apply or not to the soft cut measures.

02.09 EUR carbon neutrality by 2024

The sustainability task force will draft a letter for the next meeting addressing the urgency that is needed for the university to act upon their compromise to reach Carbon Neutrality by 2024. Their letter will contain critical information on where the university stands in relation to their goal as of now, and concrete suggestions on how to move forward. Deadlines will be incorporated on the concrete suggestions to make the EB accountable for their actions in relation to Carbon Neutrality. The task force will discuss with the policy officer what are feasible deadlines to establish in the letter.

Some of the points to highlight in the letter include: the missing data from the last two years on the carbon emissions of EUR, the lack of communication from the EB on any progress related to the Rotterdam Climate Agreement, and the reduced number of personnel that is working on this goal. Furthermore, the task force wants to submit an article to Erasmus Magazine discussing the current issue of Carbon Neutrality.

Lastly, the UC has received a response on the Sustainability Awards. The response is overall positive, and the EB wants the UC to help in defining categories alongside the sustainability officer of the university.

02.10 Ongoing topics

- *Student assessors* (Right of initiative) - No discussion
- *Model-OER* (Right of initiative) - No discussion
- *Centralizing information streams participation* (Right of initiative) - No discussion
- *More housing on campus* (Right of initiative) - No discussion
- *LifeVersity* (Right of initiative)

The Chair sent an email yesterday with information about the status of LifeVersity in the University. However, some of the information contradicts what LifeVersity had shared with the

council members. The financial support towards LifeVersity from CLI lasts till the end of the academic year, instead of the end of the calendar year. Furthermore, LifeVersity is not in talks with ESE at the moment to integrate it into their HoKa funds. They were in talks to ESE in the past. At the moment, LifeVersity is being promoted in the network of HoKa, however, this does not mean that it will be institutionalized.

The current idea is to write a letter to the EB on how to incorporate LifeVersity on a central level and provide financial support to the project. Afrodita and Luca will work on writing a letter for the EB.

Action Point: Afrodita and Luca will work on writing a letter for the EB to institutionalize LifeVersity.

- *Caring Universities (Right of initiative)*

Two weeks ago, a draft letter about Caring Universities was sent to UC members. There are no objections within the UC to send this letter. Thus, the letter will be sent.

02.11 Incoming letters

- *Whistleblower regulations*

The task force is not entirely satisfied with the answers provided in regards to the regulation. However, they acknowledge that they can give positive advice as it is already good to have a new regulation. The task force is not entirely sure if they need to draft a response, but they will discuss this. Furthermore, the UC needs to monitor the developments on this policy.

- *Response to Student related advice from the Covid-19 Taskforce*

The task force will evaluate if a response is needed.

- *Response to BBR letter*

No response is needed for this letter.

- *Reaction to consent on Budget Plan EUR 2021-2024-01*

The task force is satisfied with the response. They will follow-up with Pieter Jellema on other finance-related topics in upcoming sessions. All members are welcomed in the follow-up sessions.

- *Deans Procedure*

This point will be discussed in the next meeting. In the response letter, the EB explained that they will make some changes, but there is no clear timeline on when they will send it to the UC. The Clerk will send a message to Ana to explain that the council would like to see the changes included in the Deans Procedure.

Action Point: The Clerk will send a message to Ana to explain that the council would like to see the changes included in the Deans Procedure.

- *Response to proposed letter student-staff relationships*

The EB will include the framework on student-staff relationships, as well as staff-staff relationships in their integrity code. For now, no further action is needed. The Wellbeing task force could be included in drafting this policy with the EB. However, there is no time indication about it. Members of the council have communicated with Sven Hogervorst to work on the Integrity Code. He can be contacted to discuss this topic. The Clerk will help Afrodita on following up on this topic to make a timeline on when the EB will take actions.

Action Point: The Clerk will help Afrodita to follow up on making a timeline with the EB on when to draft the student-staff and staff-staff relationship framework within the integrity code.

02.12 Outgoing letters

- *CLI budget*

There is a letter to inquire about the Study Advanced Funds and the retroactive consent from the UC on these funds. It was pointed out that the fact that this investment concerns the main elements of the budget may not be the strongest argument to advocate for retroactive consent from the council. The strongest argument would be the fact that the Study Advanced Funds do entail consent from the participatory bodies. Hence, Jasper will review the letter and see if they will edit this argument or leave it out to send a stronger message to the EB. Then, the letter will be sent.

Action Point: Jasper will edit the letter on the CLI Budget and the Study Advanced Funds and send it to Machteld so it can be sent to the EB.

03 Any other business

03.01 Study spots at campus

There is a lack of study spots EUR at the moment. This is worrying as $\frac{2}{3}$ students are near burnout, and many students are feeling lonely according to news articles. Other universities have more flexibility in opening study spots for students at their Campus. For instance, Utrecht University has spots on campus that do not require registration. At EUR, there is very limited availability in the University Library and spots fill within 5 minutes. Therefore, this point will be put to ask the EB during the Consultation Meeting whether it is possible to open more spots for students.

04 Closing