

University Council
2nd Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 18/10/2022, 14:30 – 17:30

Location: Polak 2-18

Present in the Meeting: **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Nikita Schoenmaker, Jaap Cornelese, Natascha Kraal, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Aleid Fokkema, Ernst Hulst, Simo Azzarhouni, Emese von Bóné, Tom van Dijken, Erin van Gestel, Luuk van Tol, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Wincey Randoe, Veerle Bakker, Georgiana Carp, Friso Roos, Chaya Raghoenath, Albert Wagelmans, Max Wagenaar, Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes), Erasmus Magazine.

Absent: Irena Boskovic.

Digital: Sebastiaan Kamp, Cagla Altin.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

No adjustment was made to the existing agenda. The agenda was set.

01.02 Setting of the previous minutes

The minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

– *Letter Compensation participatory bodies*

The Letter was sent before the meeting and shared with the council in Teams.

– *Functioning TF's*

During the meeting, there will be a discussion on the topic of the functioning of the TF's since a few members reached out to the Chair regarding issues with organisation. This topic is tabled under the section Any Other Business of the current meeting.

– *Advertising in Erasmus Food Court*

There was a meeting with RE&F and the M&C officers regarding the advertisement on campus. Specifically, it was discussed that there are politically motivated advertisements in the Food Court that do not meet the campus regulations. This matter will be investigated further, and the UC will be informed in future meetings.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Institutional plan corona EUR

During the First Plenary meeting, a TF was formed to manage the concerns of the UC with regards to the Corona sector plans. The TF prepared many specific questions that were shared with the policy maker through the Clerk a day prior to the Second Plenary meeting. The questions could not be answered within one day and affected a diversity of services and faculties. For that reason, it was decided not to invite the policy maker for the current meeting.

During the discussion, it was decided that the TF will distinguish the remarks that are attainable during the current cycle. These will be addressed during a meeting with the TF and the policy makers. The remaining questions will be tabled for the next cycle.

Furthermore, the UC was reminded on the procedure of addressing questions. These should be delivered to the Clerk no later than the Friday before each meeting to ensure enough time for processing.

Action point: the TF will share the relevant questions with the policy makers either in writing or in a separate meeting.

02.02 Erasmus Perspectives 2023-2026 (Roadmap durability)

A TF was formed in the First Plenary to address the concerns of the UC with regards to consenting to the Erasmus Perspectives plans. Currently, there will be a meeting with the TF and the policy makers RE&F on Monday the 21st of October, where the concerns will be addressed.

The UC will consent to the plan if three criteria are met: 1) clarity on the targets, 2) a risk paragraph (e.g., inflation, workforce, etc), and 3) clarity on the level of the UC involvement with the plan.

The TF will draft a letter based on the outcome of this meeting. Specifically, if the three requirements are met by the EB, the UC is in favour of the plan. If some or none are met, the UC will dissent.

Action point: The Erasmus Perspectives TF will meet with the policy makers and draft a letter based on the outcome of the meeting. A discussion of this letter is tabled for the Third Plenary meeting.

02.03 G&I Report “Evaluation Pilot Ombudsman and Pilot Confidential counsellor”

The TF’s D&I and Wellbeing & Social Safety are currently drafting a letter in reply to the report on the “Evaluation Pilot Ombudsman and Pilot Confidential counsellor”.

Action point: The draft letter will be shared with the UC on Teams. A discussion is tabled for the Third Plenary meeting.

02.04 International Students

The UC is dissatisfied with the way EUR is accounting for international students in practice compared to its marketing campaigns. The UC is preparing to share these opinions with the EB. During the Presidium meeting a procedure was proposed that follows a step-by-step process: 1) problem analysis (document was shared on Teams), 2) response of EB, 3) discussion on response, 4) reaction to EB’s response, 5) advice from TF to UC.

In the 1st step, the UC shall address the following points to the EB: 1. What is EUR’s marketed profile towards international students and to what extent do we meet that profile? 2. Which facilities are offered to international students at EUR and how effective are those facilities? In other words, are there facilities that are currently missing and/or can be improved? During the meeting, there was a discussion regarding this step.

The UC will address the proposal in a two-step process, firstly by requesting more information about the policy on international students and secondly by addressing our

concerns. Also, the first question will be rephrased to focus specifically on recruitment goals instead of marketing goals. It was noted that the UC will focus mainly on the points that can be answered by the EB, and the less relevant remarks will be tabled for future cycles.

Additionally, the UC wishes to avoid a discussion on growth as it happened in the CM. It was debated whether to rephrase the issues to achieve this, but that may attenuate our opinions. Consequently, the UC will refuse to accept a growth response and will insist on a different answer.

In conclusion, the UC will begin addressing the issue in a two-step process, firstly by requesting information on recruitment policies and goals and then by engaging in an in-depth conversation with the EB on the concerns outlined in the document. The discussion may continue with future cycles.

Action point: The Clerk will send the questions for the first step to the EB. A discussion on the response during the CM is tabled for the third plenary meeting.

02.05 Preparation Consultation Meeting

The UC discussed the agenda points to be addressed with the EB in the upcoming CM. The UC will send the Clerk the relevant documents and they could be shared with the EB. This will ensure the TF's are prepared to have a discussion with the EB.

- Institutional plan Corona: there will be a policy maker meeting where the concerns will be filtered; the relevant issues will be sent to the Clerk who will send them to the EB.
- Roadmap durability: there will be a policy maker meeting where the concerns will be addressed; the relevant issues will be drafted in a letter, sent to the Clerk, then sent to the EB.
- G&I Report (pilots): a document will be drafted and shared with the UC on Teams; if the UC considers there should be a discussion going along the document, this will be tabled for the CM.
- Erasmus Perspectives: there were several issues with the response letter of the EB. The TF Finance will draft a letter in response that will be announced to the board.
- Sector plans: the EB did not send the information to the UC as requested in the last CM; the Clerk will table this as an announcement during the upcoming CM. Natascha will give more information on the procedure and a discussion is tabled for the Third meeting.
- Professional services: the UC would like to know more information, especially on how the professional services relate to the faculty level. This is tabled as AOB during the CM.
- Rising energy costs: the rising energy and heating costs led to buildings closing earlier; the UC would like to discuss its impact on the study spaces for students during the CM
- Accessibility on campus: the rainbow crossing is slippery and is causing problems for students with disabilities; further, the new buildings suffer from the same accessibility issues as Polak.

Action point: a discussion on the rainbow path is tabled for the CM; the UC will make an official request of information on the roadmap for the upcoming cycle.

02.06 UC-members x TF

There were no changes mentioned in the meeting. The UC are requested to let the Clerk know if there is information wrong or missing.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 Email Erasmus Professors

Members of the UC noted that the process that was followed was different than the process the UC was informed of. The policy makers replied, but members of the UC have additional remarks.

Firstly, the recruitment process was not a transparent procedure. The UC would like to know the requirements of the candidates. Additionally, the UC was informed it was an internal procedure and instead a closed procedure was followed. Moreover, the UC was not informed of a change in procedures. This does not agree with the code of integrity, with the Erasmian values, nor with the information communicated with the UC in the first place.

Secondly, the decision was taken before the UC was informed. This was done through an advisory committee; however, the UC was not made aware of who appointed the committee and who forms it.

In conclusion, the UC was not informed correctly or not updated on the changes in procedure of the EP recruitment. The UC would like to address their concerns to the EB.

Action point: The discussion on the EP is tabled as an AOB on the CM. Based on the discussion, the UC can table it as an initiative during the next cycle.

04 Any other business

04.01 Commitment UC-members to TF's

Some UC members reached out to the Chair with issues regarding the TF's. This concerns two related aspects: the size of TF's and difficulty with planning the TF meetings.

A few concerns were remarked. Despite Tuesdays being preordained as UC days, some staff members and most students have commitments that cannot be moved (e.g., classes, department meetings, etc). Furthermore, sometimes there are time conflicts with other TF's which creates a problem for UC members of multiple TF's. Some other issues are: invitations to meetings with short notice and members not replying to meeting invites.

To attenuate these issues, it was suggested that members contribute to TF's as much as possible and compensate for not being present in the meetings. Members of multiple TF's with conflicting times can alternate their attendance to the overlapping meetings. Furthermore, there should be understanding for members who cannot make it to mandatory Tuesday meetings, and meetings can be rescheduled at other times of the week only if necessary, and not necessarily with full attendance. TF Leads are suggested to use the RSVP function on the Outlook calendar to facilitate the visibility of the schedules. TF's shall decide in advance how many meetings are required per cycle and there shall be timeslots for the TF meetings.

04.02 AOB

- Emese will check with the Clerk regarding the schedule of the Arts institute meetings
- the Christmas activity will be planned on the mandatory UC day in December
- the keys to the office aren't working; the Clerk will investigate the issue
- a discussion on the procedure of division of TF topics will be tabled for the Presidium
- M&C TF will look into organizing a lunch meeting with the UC before the CM
- next year marks EUR's official 50 years' anniversary; the events and experience team planning a celebration, but the UC level of involvement is not yet known
- last year there was a discussion on adding a student to the EB, Max and Simo will collaborate on proposing this agenda point
- during the Presidium, it will be discussed that the UC gets an update on the outcome of the Good Conversation meetings.

05 Closing