

**University Council
Third Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam**

Date and Time: 07/11/2022, 10:00 – 12:00

Location: Van der Groot M1-08

Present in the Meeting: **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Sebastiaan Kamp, Max Wagenaar, Nikita Schoenmaker, Jaap Cornelese, Natascha Kraal, Aleid Fokkema, Ernst Hulst, Simo Azzarhouni, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, Emese von Bóné, Erin van Gestel, Luuk van Tol, Nawin Ramcharan, Wincey Randoe, Veerle Bakker, Georgiana Carp, Friso Roos, Lobke van Steenberg (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Absent: Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Tom van Dijken, Wesley Hennepe, Chaya Raghoenath.

Digital: Cagla Altin.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The topic *02.06 International Students* was removed from the current agenda and was tabled on the agenda of the first Plenary meeting. With that, the agenda was set.

01.02 Setting of the previous minutes

The discussion regarding Erasmus Professors is tabled under *03 Incoming Documents*. With that, the minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

- *Questions professional services and rising energy costs*

These topics were not discussed during the CM. The UC was asked how to proceed with this. It was decided the topics will not be tabled for the next CM.

- *Follow-up goal setting*

A training session was organized last week as discussed during the Onboarding. There was a lot of feedback on the training that was discussed in the Presidium meeting. Based on that, goals were created. During the plenary meeting, a Task Force was created to deal with these goals.

TF members: Irene, Georgiana, Tom.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Voting CMT-student member

The voting of the CMT student took place during the meeting. Veerle was the selected candidate.

During the voting, Nawin withdrew from the election following untrue allegations being shared about him among some council members. Due to time constraints, an agenda point was tabled for the first Plenary meeting of the next cycle when the topic will be discussed in depth.

Due to the allegations, some UC members were concerned for the safety and integrity of the council. There was a discussion on the voting procedure. Some UC members believed the voting should have been postponed by the Presidium until after the explanation by Nawin in the first Plenary meeting. The Chair informed the council that the Presidium was not made aware of Nawin's decision to withdraw due to the allegations.

Action point: a discussion on the allegations is tabled for the first Plenary meeting.

02.02 Erasmus Perspectives 2023-2026 (Roadmap durability)

During the meeting, the UC discussed the final changes to the response letter on Erasmus Perspectives and agreed to send the finalized version to the EB. Some changes were made during the meeting, such as making it clear the UC is consenting to the roadmap until 2026.

Additionally, the UC members were asked to maintain the interactions on Teams in English as much as possible.

Action point: the Clerk will format the letter and sent it to the EB.

02.03 Educational vision

The TF Educational Vision has discussed the procedure of co-creation with the policy maker (Bieneke) and shared a document with the council for the current meeting. The TF requests that the UC consents to the boundaries of co-creation as stated in the document. Furthermore, the TF Lead would like to know who from the TF will participate in the co-creation process.

During the meeting, there was a discussion in which members of the UC asked the decisions to be made internally within the TF and not during the full council meeting. The members who wish to and can participate in the process based upon the information in the letter are asked to contact the TF Lead (Sandra). Also, the members who needed more information (e.g., timeline, time constraints) should contact the TF Lead.

Action point: the members of the TF who need more information or wish to participate will contact Sandra. A decision on the process will then be taken internally within the TF.

02.04 Institutional plan corona EUR

The letter to be sent to the EB was shared in Teams and the council members were asked to review and consent to it.

During the meeting, the suggestions of the council members were discussed. A statement relating to the introduction of QR codes was taken out of the letter on the basis that it did not represent the content of the original report. Furthermore, politically inclined messages were rephrased to a more neutral tone. One member noted that a statement that connected eating healthy and being active to prevent COVID-19 infections was misleading and factually untrue, thus it was rephrased and moved to a paragraph on mental wellbeing. The statement concerning raising a threshold for mental health issues was kept as a request from the UC and it was discussed that it will be further elaborated by policy makers.

One UC member added additional comments during the meeting, mostly regarding the phrasing.

The TF members will take the additions of the council into account and the adjusted letter will sent.

Action point: The TF will adjust the letter according to the additions by the UC. The Clerk will format and send the letter to the EB.

02.05 G&I Report ‘Evaluation Pilot Ombudsman and Pilot Confidential counsellor’

The UC agreed on sending the letter that was shared and edited in the Teams environment.

Additionally, the UC was asked to send letters no later than the Friday before the Plenary meetings, if possible, in order to avoid lengthy discussions concerning editing of the letter during the meetings.

Action point: the Clerk will format and send the letter to the EB.

02.06 International students

This agenda item was taken off the agenda and tabled for the next Plenary meeting.

02.07 Evaluation Consultation Meeting

The UC evaluated the previous CM. Overall, the council members are satisfied with their performance compared to the first CM. The members presented a more unified front, showed more confidence in their questions, and were on the same level with the EB. However, some points of improvement were mentioned.

Firstly, during the discussion on the Erasmus Perspectives, some questions were asked outside of the structure on the agenda, which confused the EB; the EB was more likely to be vague about their answers to those questions. It was suggested that the UC members follow the structure more closely. Secondly, during the discussion on international students, a few UC members interrupted the TF Lead as she was addressing the EB. This resulted in the conversation drifting away from the main topic. The Chair did not intervene because the goal of the agenda point had already been achieved by that interruption, since the topic will be tabled for one more cycle. It was suggested that the council members show patience when topics are being addressed to the EB.

Additionally, there was a low turnout at the drinks following the CM, which are useful for managing the tension build-up during the meetings. The secretariat will look into this.

Action point: the UC will take note of the improvement points for the next CM. Also, the secretariat will send the drink invitations sooner to increase turnout.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 38543 - RM 275.744 Response to 38543 Erasmus Professors Profile Reports

Following the CM discussion on the procedure of Erasmus Professors, the UC decided to pick up the topic during the next cycle.

Action point: the response of the UC to the Erasmus Professors is tabled for the first Plenary meeting of the upcoming cycle.

04 Any other business

04.01 Good conversation October 11

During the *Good conversation* on October 11th, four topics were discussed. These were shared with the council members during this meeting. The UC made several additions to these topics.

1. The EB wishes to make decisions during the CM. The UC feels they need to establish more trust with the EB before we follow that procedure. For example, the EB could use the divisions between the council members in their favour. Also, the UC has lengthy decisions before reaching a decision, thus the time in the CM would not be enough at the moment. Furthermore, at the moment the council is not receiving documents and information from the board timely, and the UC considers this should be a requisite before changing the procedure.
2. There was a discussion on how to incorporate the participatory bodies in case of a cross-faculty and cross-university education. The UC agreed to think about this.
3. Request EB to make use of the position within the council to discuss pressing issues before involving external parties. Some of the EUR students appeared in a newspaper, with a discussion that would better have been in the council instead
4. There were concerns over the low voter turnout during previous elections, and the UC decided to look into this from a broader perspective. Another issue is that some faculties are not represented in the student body. The council members are requested to think of suggestions on improving the turnover for the upcoming first Plenary meeting. Thus, this topic is tabled for the next cycle.

Additionally, there will be a discussion on the student assessor. The UC decided to form a TF concerning the following members: Friso, Simo, and Max.

Also, the UC requested that the minutes reflect the discussion closer. The Chair will ensure that will be the case.

Action point: the topics will be tabled for the next cycle. The TF will be formed for the student assessor discussion.

04.02 Smarter Academic Year

The exploration of the Smarter Academic Year (SAJ) is aimed at mapping out opportunities and possibilities with regards to harmonizing and shortening the EUR Academic Year. The biggest gains are expected to be reducing the workload of lecturers, increasing student well-being, and creating opportunities for interdisciplinary education and collaboration. Student and staff members will be interviewed by Bureau Turner (which carries out the exploration) to enhance the exploration.

During the meeting, three student members (Veerle, Simo, Erin), and 3 staff members (Albert, Nikita, Max) volunteered for the interviews.

Furthermore, there was a discussion on ways in which the UC can contribute further on the exploration. It was decided to table the topic for the upcoming cycle

Action point: 6 UC members will be interviewed by Bureau Turner. The topic *Smarter Academic Year* will be tabled for the upcoming cycle.

04.03 Revision Performance and rewards policy

The Learning & Career Centre (HR) will start the revision of the Performance and Rewards (P&R) policy of the EUR. The UC is asked to join a board meeting with the aim of going more in depth into the content and collect input.

There will be one session of two hours supervised by Ivonne Tossings and Sabine Goes from Leeuwendaal. During the meeting, there will be a discussion on the disadvantages of the current system as well as tips for improvement. No preparation is necessary but active contribution/attitude during the session is required. There is a maximum of 10-12 people allowed, with an emphasis on staff members (however, students are also welcome). The exact date will be planned with the joining UC-members.

The following UC members volunteered to participate: Albert, Jaap, Aleid, Irene, Max.

04.04 Breaks

Some UC members asked to have a break planned during the Plenary meetings, but this may not always be possible due to time constraints.

04.05 TF planning

During the meeting, Tom, Aleid, Irene, Georgiana and Friso decided to join a TF.

05 Closing