

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

**Date and Time:** 13/12/2022, 14:00 – 16:00h

**Location:** Polak 2.22

**Present in the Meeting:** **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Sandra Constantinou Juhasz, Sebastiaan Kamp, Max Wagenaar, Nikita Schoenmaker, Jaap Cornelese, Patryk Jarmakowicz, Aleid Fokkema, Ernst Hulst, Albert Wagelmans, Irena Boskovic, 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, Lobke van Steenberghe (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

**Absent:** Natascha Kraal.

**Digital:** Simo Azzarhouni, Cagla Altin.

## **01 Opening**

### **01.01 Setting of the agenda**

The agenda was set.

### **01.02 Minutes third and first plenary meeting**

The minutes were set.

### **01.03 Announcements**

#### *- Supervisory board*

Twice a year there is a meeting with the Presidium and the Supervisory Board. Yesterday, the first meeting took place. There was a fruitful discussion that touched on important issues relevant to the UC: sustainability and the role of the UC regarding *OccupyEUR*, the *Bestuursakkoord*, the upcoming elections, the reimbursement of the program committees, and the bureaucracy with EUR.

Regarding sustainability, the SB reviewed the role of the UC and reinforced maintaining transparency when opposing views are being discussed among the councillors. Regarding the *Bestuursakkoord*, the SB reinforced our need for involvement, and recognized the need for involvement from the FCs; the UC should stay connected with the FCs.

The low turnout rate of the elections and ways of increasing it were also discussed; the list system could not be assessed due to the exceptional circumstance during which it was organised (i.e., Corona); however, EUR could take an example from other Universities, where there is a very high amount of promotional material. A discussion followed where the role of the UC with the Marketing and Communication department was addressed; in previous years, there was no support from them, but requesting it again by substantiating the reasons for their help could improve the collaboration. Other suggestions were shared, such as contacting study associations, having a marketing budget, and using the Instagram account for advertisements.

The SB recognized that a high level of interdisciplinarity creates difficulty within the PCs. Also, the SB warned the UC to pay attention to the amount of new rules and regulations put in place, as bureaucracy could be hindering progress. The SB recognizes the amount of decentralisation at EUR but kept the goals of centralisation and harmonisation for future perspectives.

**Action point:** The TF M&C will research better marketing options for the upcoming elections. They will be shared as updates with the UC.

- *Student assessors*

The SB reviewed the student assessor function; it was found useful at the faculty level, but the UC was cautioned about implementing it at a more central level.

Relating to this, three councillors (Max, Simo, and Friso) had an informal conversation with the Chair of the EB. The outcome of the discussion was positive, as the Chair agreed to the idea of implementing the function at the Executive Board level, as well as making it a part of the strategy for the new educational vision. Also, student assessors working at a central board of other universities were interviewed, and the outcome of their experiences was reported to be positive.

The councillors shared the procedure of this project. Firstly, the councillors will research the functioning of the student assessors at the faculty level and model based on that how the position would translate at a central level. This model will be presented to the student bodies of the FCs. Furthermore, the responses of the FCs will be evaluated and discussed with the Chair of the EB to further implement the idea, such as by creating a pilot.

This topic will be discussed further in the cycle of March-April based on the developments of the process mentioned.

- *Invitation round table discussion December 15*

A faculty-initiated Round Table will take place on Thursday, December 15, from 12:00 to 14:00. During this event, academic freedom and EUR's ties to the fossil fuel industry will be discussed. The Round Table is open to everyone interested, and all councillors are invited as well. However, due to limited places, interested members are requested to register via the link shared in the invitation as soon as possible. Two councillors will be part of the discussion panel (Tom and Max).

- *Focus group Revision Performance & Development*

A few councillors (Irena, Albert, Max, and Aleid) took part in a discussion where viewpoints about the performance of the councillors were assessed. More information will be shared with the UC in a future cycle.

## **02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC**

### **02.01 BBR EUR**

The concept letter of consent was shared in Teams and the councillors were asked to review and consent to it. The letter provides consent to the plans. The councillors agreed on sending the letter with its current content.

**Action point:** The Clerk will format and share the finalised letter of consent to the *BBR EUR* with the EB.

### **02.02 Concept Budget Plan EUR 2023-2026**

The concept letter of consent and advice was shared in Teams and the councillors were asked to review and consent to it. A few suggestions were made during the meeting

Firstly, the budget and its implications were explained by a TF member. The budget is based on money that is expected to be received in the upcoming year, and the plans are not yet completed due to the *Bestuursakkoord* (i.e., sector plans, starter and incentive grants). The UC's involvement was not asked at an earlier stage, which caused confusion within the TF and was addressed at the previous CM. One issue that was pointed out was that the plans are developed at a national level, and the rules are under continuous change. However, because of the changing parameters, it was discussed whether the level of involvement should cascade

down to the faculty level, while the UC maintains its participation by overseeing these activities. In doing so, one councillor could participate at a central level. The EB Chair had disproved the central participation idea; however, the UC believes they should aim for that. Based on this change in the UC role, it was discussed whether the content of the first point of the letter should be changed as well. It was decided that the phrasing will be adjusted to include the involvement of the FCs specifically for the sector plans and the role of the UC as an overseer of that activity.

Secondly, there was a discussion on the level of involvement of the UC, specifically regarding co-creation. The UC wishes to be highly involved from an early stage, whereby we provide feedback earlier in the process while also leaving space for withholding consent for the final product. The UC wishes to be clear that being involved early does not hinder our moral rights to consent. It was suggested to rename co-creation into a term that suggests a clearer image of our desired level of involvement.

Thirdly, there was a discussion on choosing a potential candidate as the position would require time commitments. The UC would like to get information on the schedule as well as the number of positions. It was suggested to involve the CPC in the process as well; this will be communicated further at a meeting scheduled for January 10<sup>th</sup>.

In conclusion, the letter will be adjusted with the clarifications in content that were discussed in the meeting and the phrasing will be made clearer. The UC agreed on sending the finalised version of the letter of consent.

**Action point:** The TF members will adjust the content and phrasing of the letter as discussed in the meeting. The Clerk will format the finalised letter of consent and advice to the *Concept Budget Plan EUR 2023-2026* and send it to the EB.

### **02.03 Project Plan “Towards an Erasmian positioning of the EUR Program Committees”**

The concept letter of consent was shared in Teams and the councillors were asked to review and consent to it. The letter provides consent to the current project plan, as well as several advising remarks.

The UC was informed that one councillor will be invited to participate in the interview rounds for appointing the project coordinator. The UC accepted the invitation; the decision on whom to appoint will be discussed within the Confidentiality Committee; the decision will be communicated to the EB via email, separate from the consent letter, at a later time.

Several suggestions relating to formatting and phrasing were added to the document. No other changes were made to the content of the letter.

**Action point:** The TF will adjust the phrasing of the letter according to the additions made by the councillors online; the decision to accept the invitation to the interview rounds will also be added to the document. The Clerk will format the finalised letter of consent to the *Project Plan “Towards an Erasmian positioning of the EUR Program Committees”* and send it to the EB.

### **02.04 Midterm review Strategy 2024**

The letter of advice was shared in Teams and the councillors were asked to review and consent to it. A councillor shared a few points regarding the content of the letter. Due to time considerations, it was decided that any suggestions will be shared separately from the letter, as part of the collaboration between the TF and the Strategy Office. The councillors agreed on sending the letter with its current content.

**Action point:** The Clerk will format the letter of advice for the *Midterm review Strategy 2024* and send it to the EB.

### 02.05 Application for macro-efficiency IMARC (ESL)

The concept letter of advice to be sent to the EB was shared in Teams and the councillors were asked to review and consent to it. The UC members agreed on sending the letter with its current content.

**Action point:** The Clerk will format the letter of advice to *Application for macro-efficiency IMARC (ESL)* and send it to the EB.

### 02.06 International Students

There was a discussion on the reason for not addressing this agenda point at the previous CM; the Chair recognized the time constraints due to the discussion of *OccupyEUR*, and, due to the previous meeting on this topic with the Rector, the point was addressed sufficiently during the current cycle. It was agreed to table this agenda point for the next cycle.

The two councillors responsible for this initiative shared the content of the meeting with the Rector. The Rector was open to hearing the remarks and solutions, and the discussion focused broadly on both current issues and preventative measures, mostly referring to preventative recruitment and expectation management. The discussion touched upon communication issues as well, as there were several points of concern that already had solutions in place, which had not been communicated clearly with the students, e.g., affordable Dutch-language courses for international students.

Sandra will create a list consisting of the information discussed during the meeting with the Rector and will share it online with the UC. This list would consist of facilities and information that is already provided to students as well as that which is lacking and recommendations from the UC.

The councillors wish to discuss this issue with all the members of the EB as well. The Presidium will decide how to table this point in the upcoming cycle, either as a letter of advice to the EB or a discussion during the CM.

**Action point:** The Presidium will discuss how to proceed with the topic *International students* for the upcoming cycle.

### 02.07 TF Goal Setting

The TF prepared a presentation on the data collected during the second Plenary meeting. The slides have been shared online with the councillors. There was a discussion on the outcome of the presentation.

Overall, the councillors agreed to continue the surveys on a regular basis as it promotes self-awareness and self-reflection. The councillors discussed that the beginning of the board year was met with friction, and gradually developed into a more positive way of working together. Further, the councillors agreed that it is each individual's responsibility to contribute and promote a positive and safe working environment. Also, close connections between UC members should be used sporadically as opportunities for shared self-reflection between these members. Also, it was proposed increasing the number of informal activities as a group to stimulate cohesion within the group.

### 02.08 Evaluation Consultation Meeting

The councillors evaluated the previous CM. Overall, the councillors were satisfied with their performance and the points raised during the discussion. However, some points of improvement were discussed.

The councillors requested the Chair to interrupt the members of the EB when their responses become repetitive and lengthy. This could promote more efficient discussions. The Chair took note of the suggestion; during the discussion under the *OccupyEUR* action point, the Chair gave the board more space as it was a sensitive discussion topic. Also, the UC would like to interact more with the Rector by directing more questions toward her.

The councillors discussed how to deliver the announcements. Currently, the announcements are tabled at the beginning of the meeting and are found lengthy and difficult to follow by most councillors. There is also an issue that they cannot ask questions. Instead, it was suggested having them delivered in writing from the EB, however this runs the risk of receiving the announcements late. The Chair and the Clerk will discuss this possibility.

### **03 Any other business**

### **04 Closing**