

**University Council
Second Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam**

Date and Time: 29/11/2022, 14:30 – 17:30

Location: Langeveld 0.08

Present in the Meeting: **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Max Wagenaar, Nikita Schoenmaker, Natascha Kraal, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Aleid Fokkema, Ernst Hulst, Simo Azzarhouni, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, Emese von Bóné, Tom van Dijken, Erin van Gestel, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Wincey Randoe, Georgiana Carp, Friso Roos, Lobke van Steenberghe (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Absent: Luuk van Tol, Jaap Cornelese, Chaya Raghoenath.

Digital: Cagla Altin, Veerle Bakker.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The point *02.01 OccupyEUR* was added to the agenda. With that, the agenda was set.

01.02 Minutes third and first plenary meeting

The minutes of the third plenary meeting were set.

Several suggestions were made to the minutes of the first plenary meeting. These will be adjusted.

01.03 Announcements

– Outlook Invites

The UC members were asked to respond to the Outlook invites concerning events of the UC, particularly for the 6th of December. Also, the participation of the council members in the Holiday activity was checked during the meeting by a raise of hands.

– International students

A meeting with the Rector is planned for the upcoming Thursday. The council is requested to discuss the procedure and content of the topic in preparation for the CM.

– OccupyEUR

OccupyEUR occupied the Sanders building on Campus Woudestein the Monday prior to the Plenary meeting. The Chair of the UC shared with the council the contents of a meeting with the Chair of the EB. Specifically, the EB was conveyed an alleged threat from external parties and, upon advice from the police forces, concluded that the safety of staff and students cannot be further guaranteed. Based on this, a decision was made to evacuate the Campus at 18:15, including the action group. The police intervened leading to a forcible evacuation of several activists. As a result of the evacuation, the discussion with the EB as requested by the action group did not take place, and the EB is willing to organise a separate meeting at a later point.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 OccupyEUR

A discussion followed from the *Announcement* on the evacuation, as well as the role of the UC in relation to the occupation.

Firstly, relating to the evacuation, several council members requested to know the nature of the alleged threat received by the EB. It was argued that forcible evacuations may create unsafe environments for students, thus we need evidence that it was necessary. Additionally, the CMT

did not come together, and several councillors believe this was a crisis situation that required a CMT meeting. It was brought to the attention of the UC that several students were unhappy with the evacuation because it hindered their studying.

Secondly, the role of the UC was discussed. One council member remarked that the occupation event was not an internal EUR activity but was organized by external parties and institutions and that may be a reason why the council should not get involved. Several UC members disagreed as they remarked that students and staff of EUR participated actively in the occupation. Additionally, certain points the activists raised have also been discussed within the council and are relevant to our activity.

The council agreed that the discussion should take place with the EB. Nawin will share a list of questions and remarks on the Teams environment in English. The council members are requested to respond and make additions where necessary before next Friday. A discussion based on this document is tabled for the CM.

Action point: Nawin will share a document on Teams and the council members are asked to respond to it. The Clerk will table a discussion on this point with the CM.

02.02 BBR EUR

The TF Lead will share a document online with the UC containing questions and remarks on the proposed BBR. The TF members are requested to make additions before Friday in preparation for the CM.

Action point: the TF Lead will share the document on Teams. The UC members can reply before Friday 12.00h.

02.02 Concept Budget Plan EUR 2023-2026

Several meetings have been planned between the TF Finance and CPC in which the questions of the TF are being addressed. The documents were made available on Teams. The questions concerning the initial meeting were reviewed during the plenary meeting.

The main point of concern was the consent procedure for the *Bestuursakkoord* (sector plans, starters-incentive grants). The TF Finance considered that the method of allocation of the Financial Means, mainly on the incentive grants, is not clear enough; specifically, there is a lack of policy on the allocation of the funds (50M). The CPC requested the UC to consent to the budget excluding the graph distribution in waiting for the policy. The TF was not in favour of this procedure and addressed the UC on how best to proceed.

There was a discussion on the rights of the UC regarding the consent procedure. It remained unclear whether consent can be given only partly to the proposed plans; the EB will be consulted on this. The Chair reminded the UC that a lack of response within the allocated time from receiving the information, unless being given an extension from the Board, implies consent.

Additionally, the UC discussed the lack of policy surrounding the allocation procedure of the funds and finds it important to request the policy from the EB. This can be done during the CM. The Clerk advised the council members to clearly specify to the EB that they are thinking of withholding consent. However, as one council member advised, that could create pressure on the policymaking process and could lead to a less appropriate policy.

Furthermore, staff contracts and sustainability were discussed. Regarding staff contracts, it was addressed that while the EB is encouraging faculties to hire as many staff as possible on permanent contracts, some faculties continue to draft temporary contracts. The implications of this were discussed. Secondly, regarding sustainable energy usage, the UC is requested by the TF Lead to look more into this topic. The UC discussed addressing this point in accordance with the *OccupyEUR* protest. Additionally, there will be a meeting on the state of affairs by the Sustainability Office on the upcoming Tuesday. The TF Sustainability is preparing to join the

meeting and requests the UC to send remarks to the TF Lead in time so they can be forwarded to the Sustainability Office Manager.

Action point: The topic of UC rights is tabled for the CM; the TF will prepare questions for the EB and will share them timely with the Clerk. The UC members will address remarks on sustainability to the TF before Tuesday.

02.03 Project plan “Towards and Erasmian positioning of the EUR Program Committees”

The TF reviewed the plan and several aspects of it were discussed with the full council.

Firstly, it is mentioned that the UC was consulted and endorsed the prioritisation of extra funds for the Program Committees. The Chair recalled that the advice on the plan was a result of a discussion between several council members and the previous UC chair. Yet several council members did not recall a discussion taking place; thus, the decision was reviewed. The UC agreed to support the decision to allocate the funds to the PCs with priority because they have the least access to extra compensation from all the participatory bodies of the university. Also, it was suggested to make use of the funds to reinforce the relations between PCs and FCs, such as by investing in a joint training.

Secondly, the process was discussed. The TF members will discuss internally whether they agree with a biphasic plan, whereby initially, a coordinator will be appointed to draft the detailed budget plans for the PCs in the second phase occurring by the Q2 of 2023. It was not clear to the UC what the extent of our rights is in the two steps; thus, it will be reviewed whether consent is given for both phases, or only the first followed by co-creation in the second phase. The councillors agreed to ensure the consent rights for both stages.

Thirdly, the employment offer was discussed. Currently, the contract will be drafted for part-time hours with a decreased incentive over time. The TF is concerned whether the offer is attractive enough to ensure high quality of work. The policymakers will be advised to ensure that. Furthermore, the UC would like more information on the profile and tasks of the candidate, as well as on the hiring team.

Action points: The UC members are required to send the TF Lead any additional questions or recommendations on the plans.

02.04 Midterm review Strategy 2024

Several meetings have been planned with the TF and between the TF and the staff of the Strategy Office. The TF Lead will share the notes of the meetings with the UC by Friday and requests the council members to review them. The TF will discuss how to address the topic during the CM. The outcome will be communicated to the Clerk.

The TF believes that the proposal was not specific enough and remarked that the Strategy Office is struggling with cascading the plan from higher levels. Furthermore, the TF requested more clear expectations of the process because of several miscommunication issues.

Action point: The councillors are requested to review the notes by Friday. The TF Lead will inform the Clerk how the topic will be handled in the CM by Friday.

02.05 Application for macro-efficiency IMARC (ESL)

The TF discussed the consent that was given by the faculty council and reviewed the application. They reached the same conclusion as the FC. It was concluded that no further elaboration with the EB is necessary on this point.

02.06 International students

A meeting with TF members and the Rector is scheduled for Thursday during which the document will be discussed. The TF requested to table this point for the CM as well in order to have a constructive official discussion with the EB.

Action point: The TF Lead will share the document with the UC on Teams and will inform the Clerk how the topic will be handled in the CM by Friday.

02.07 Preparation Consultation meeting

The UC members are requested to send the Clerk any specific questions to the EB no later than Friday at 12:00h. Several points were already tabled for the CM as *Any Other Business*.

- TF Finance – updates will be given on Tuesday after the meeting with CPC
- TF Sustainability – will ask the EB if they want to partake in an open dialogue based on the occupation
- Culture Campus & Arts Institute – the Clerk will request the EB for a new timeline of the *Fusieplan*.
- Accessibility - One council member remarked that the new building Langeveld is not accessible and is violating the building regulations as stated by the Parliament. Other accessibility issues were discussed as well, such as waivers, the Rainbow crossing, and the lack of recorded lectures for students with disabilities. The UC is of the opinion that accessibility issues are worsening despite the standards being promised by the EB. It was discussed to raise the issue of accessibility in relation to invisible and visible disabilities during the CM. The discussion with the EB will be evaluated and the UC will decide how to proceed with this topic in the next cycle.

02.08 Presentation TF Goal setting

The TF prepared a short survey and requested the council members, Clerk, and Chair to complete the survey during the meeting. The absent UC members were requested to respond by the end of the day. The TF will collect and analyse the data in the upcoming days. A presentation on the basis of the anonymous results is tabled for the third Plenary meeting.

Furthermore, the council members were asked to contact the TF if any questions or remarks about the survey arise.

Action point: The TF will analyse the data and a presentation is tabled for the third Plenary meeting.

02.09 Discussion Waiver

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the UC introduced the waiver for members who were ill with the virus, were in quarantine, or belonged to a vulnerable group, but could still attend the meetings. Following the pandemic, the UC requested to discuss if the waiver could be extended for cases other than those relating to COVID-19. The Presidium discussed the specifications of the waiver this year and decided to only grant a waiver relating to COVID-19, and thus withdrew Cagla's waiver. Last plenary meeting, the council members disagreed with the decision of the Presidium, and a discussion on how to proceed further took place during this meeting.

Firstly, the council members discussed whether the contributions of the online members are different than of those joining in person. It was agreed that participation in the council happens outside of plenaries as well, e.g., members who join digitally are active in the TF that take place mostly online.

Secondly, the grounds for giving waivers were discussed. It was remarked that currently there are no clear specifications on waivers, and the Presidium is making case-by-case decisions. The UC would like to point out that waivers are not COVID-19 exclusive, and members have many valid reasons to participate online in the meeting, e.g., disabilities, illness, flexible working options, etc. The members of the Presidium are concerned that waivers might make the meetings hybrid, thus it was agreed that waivers are exceptions to the rule that everyone attends in person.



The UC discussed what the procedure should be around waivers. Firstly, the Presidium should not change the rules midterm, even though Cagla's waiver was granted with the remark that it may be withdrawn. The councillors would like to decide on rules and plans on how waivers will go from the next year onwards.

Action points: The Presidium will draft regulations concerning limits of waivers and will present them to the UC. Cagla's waiver remains for the time being and a discussion will be tabled for an upcoming meeting.

03 Any other business

04 Closing