

University Council
Third Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 02/11/2021, 14:00 – 16:00h

Location: JB-44 (Bayle building)

Present in the Meeting: Hans van den Berg (Chair), Aleid Fokkema, Zohra Hayat, Ernst Hulst, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Cagla Altin, Friso Roos, Daemon Kregting, Bianca Jadoenath, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, Timo Zandvliet, John van Wel, Georgiana Carp, Lobke van Steenberg (clerk), Oriana Morales Hernández (minutes).

Absent in the Meeting: Nikita Schoenmaker, Pi Cheng Hu, Simo Azzarhouni, Emese von Bóné, Jasper Klasen, Robbert Rog, Max Wagenaar, Bram Heesen, Natascha Kraal.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The agenda has been set

01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes have been set

01.03 Announcements

- Procedure new Chair

The Confidentiality Committee will work on drafting a procedure to set a new Chair. However, the first step needed to start this process is to decide on the pool of applicants to be considered by the UC. There are three options for this, which need to be voted in order. Firstly, the Council could decide to choose a Chair within the current Council. In case that this option is not accepted by the Council, there will be a decision on whether to look for a Chair within the broad EUR Community. If this decision is also rejected, the third option would be chosen. Within this option, the Council could look even at external people to be the Chair of the UC. It is important to mention that even if the third option is chosen, it would not limit UC members or other people within the EUR community to run for Chair. All the options have pros and cons, and UC members should start thinking about it before next week. A decision on which option to take (one, two, or three) will be taken in the first plenary meeting of the next cycle.

The voting will take place as usual in the UC. To avoid confusions, if members are not present, they can commend a vote through another member, and it is requested to notify the Secretariat in advance. This has been the institutional procedure within UC in the last years, but it is not explicitly written in the Rules of Procedure. In the long-term, the Rules of Procedure could be adjusted to avoid institutional confusion on how to commend a vote when a member is absent.

After a decision is taken by the whole council, the Confidentiality Committee will start on the arrangements of finding a new Chair. The new chairing term would start on September 1st, 2022, and it would last for two academic years with a possibility of extension to another two terms of two academic years (hence, an individual would be able to chair the UC for a maximum of six years).

- Increasing Corona figures

Tonight, there will be a press conference from the government that could introduce new measures against COVID-19. The UC will continue with in-person meetings, unless the EUR or the national government decides to prohibit in-person meetings.

- Living room

A member of the Council explained that there was communication today with the project lead of the Student Wellbeing HeQa Project. They formally introduced a request to change offices with the UC last Friday, after a vote had already taken place against changing offices with them. The Chair explained that this happened because the team had previously discussed their initiative of switching offices through the Presidium, and therefore, it was the Presidium that brought the vote to the plenary meeting. The team is allowed to make this formal request and put it in the documentation of the UC. However, the UC can decide on how to react on this point. The Council could maintain their previous position of not changing offices and avoid having another discussion about the matter. This decision will be taken in the upcoming plenary meeting.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Code of Integrity

Last week, the Council discussed with the EB the Code of Integrity. Aleid drafted a letter of response on the topic based on the conversation with the EB, as well as the conversations with the policymakers. The letter poses some questions to the EB, while keeping an evaluation from the board as part of the future timeline on how to assess the code. There are some links about the code that have not been made, mainly because it has not been implemented. Therefore, more questions will come when the project is running.

It was mentioned how important it is to check how the code will affect students. The code was drafted mainly by the HR team of the university, and therefore, more student input may be needed. The legal team asked for two UC students to join the working group. The task force would like to make a timeline of the decisions taken regarding this code, as well as other decisions that the UC takes, for more clarity and transparency, when it comes to the EB's promises.

A vote took place to consent to the Code of Integrity. The council gave consent unanimously. A letter with consent and advice on this point, and points 02.02 and 02.03 will be sent.

02.02 Personal relations

The changes made on the policy of personal relations by the policymakers were in accordance with the recommendations given by the UC in the second plenary meeting. Advice on the policy will be given through the letter of consent on the Code of Integrity.

The only concern about the personal relations policy has to do with the translation. The document had Dutch-to-English issues, and it is mainly because it was translated by the policymaker. The university lacks the support from a translations' company that is good at translating legal documents, and this has been a problem for some time. The current tender for translations has issues with legal documents. EUR needs to find an alternative for this.

Action Point: the Chair will discuss with the Chair of the EB the issue of finding a team of legal translators for the university.

02.03 Relation on gifts

There is a positive reaction to this policy, included within the Code of Integrity (see 02.01)

02.04 Annual social report

The task force drafted a letter in reply to this initiative. Overall, they are content with the idea. There are some questions for more information, but there are no major concerns about the creation of this report. Some questions involve: what would be the role of the team of experts working with the report? what counts as a serious complaint on the report? Additionally, the Council would like the inclusion of a flowchart that makes complaint procedures easier for students.

This point is closely related to a concern that the Ombudsperson raised last year. She mentioned that it would be beneficial for the university to connect the different services where complaints are made. This is something that could be taken up as a task for the UC in the future, as strengthening the network of confidential counsellors could bring benefits to the community. However, this idea will not be addressed in the letter of reply to the annual social report.

02.05 Allocation of Private Equity

In the time being, this point will not be put forward in the agenda. The UC is waiting for further information from the EB on this topic. In the upcoming consultation meeting, the Council will check if there is any progress. For now, the Council knows that the EB would like to also discuss this topic with the sustainability task force.

02.06 Outgoing letters

- *Eu-HEM fees*

The Council would like to be informed about the policy (or lack of thereof) to set institutional fees at the university, considering the case of the Eu-HEM fees. This is especially relevant for programs that become constituted in the future. A letter has been drafted, but the Secretariat proposed to re-arrange the letter to make the references to legal texts in the appendices.

A vote was taken, and there were no objections to the adjustments of the Secretariat,

Action point: The Secretariat will adjust and send the letter on the Eu-HEM fees.

- *Annual Social Report*

Action point: This letter will be sent

- *Code of Integrity*

Action point: This letter will be sent

03 Incoming letters

There were no incoming letters

04 Any other business

- *Introduction Meeting with the CLI*

The members of the UC are reminded of the CLI introduction meeting on November 16th. The meeting will take place from 12:00 to 13:30 and will include lunch for the attendees. This is an initiative of the CLI so that the Council members become familiar with their projects. The CLI is a very relevant stakeholder for any project related to hybrid education, innovation, and

changes in education at EUR. If members want to attend, they have to mark it on the calendar as soon as possible.

- *Election rules for the UC.*

The Secretariat found a minor textual error in the election rules for the UC. The textual error makes it complicated for readers to understand that the elections from students and staff are fully separated, and that the dynamics for the election of students is not faculty-based. Therefore, the Secretariat will adjust it to make the distinction clearer. After the UC consents to this change, the EB will have to review it to approve it as well.

There were no objections to adjusting to the textual error. Therefore, the UC gives consent to this change.

- *Attendance Policy at EUR*

A member of the Council inquired about the attendance policy at EUR. They are not clear whether there are guidelines or binding regulations for students' attendance in the university. According to fellow members, the policies are faculty-bound, and it is probably preferable that attendance is decentralized at EUR. The Clerk will contact Academic Affairs to make sure that the Council has the correct information about this.

The discussion on attendance policy can also be linked with the theme of hybrid education. For instance, in COVID times, it is relevant to know how programs are checking for attendance in tutorial/practical groups. In the upcoming weeks, some students will discuss with the rector the issues of limited access to hybrid education.

Action point: The Clerk will contact Academic Affairs to make sure that the Council has the correct information about the attendance policy for students at EUR.

- *Contact with Participatory Bodies*

A council member explained that the students are trying to make stronger ties with the representatives from other participatory bodies at EUR. Therefore, they have approached all student (vice) Chairs of the Faculty Councils in the university and are now in a contact with them via chat. Ideally, this chat can be used for disseminating information, inviting the representatives to the Chairs' meeting, etc.

05 Closing