

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

Date and Time: 07/02/ 2023, 14:00 – 16:00

Location: Langeveld 2-12

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

Online: Simo Azzarhouni, Patryk Jarmakowicz.

Absent: Sebastiaan Kamp, Friso Roos, Tom van Dijken.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The agenda points *Smarter Academic Year* and *BSA* were moved to the next plenary meeting and are tabled for the next cycle. Also, the topic *02.08 Bestuursakkoord* is added to the current agenda. With that, the agenda was set.

01.02 Minutes second plenary meeting

The minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

- *Bestuursakkoord*

The Bestuursakkoord involve three grants: starter grants, incentive grants, and sector grants. The sector grants are faculty based, meaning that the role of the UC is to oversee the activity of the FCs regarding this; a plan has been made within the TF Finance for this. The starter and incentive grants are overseen by a commission that will decide on a policy for the division of the funds. In relation to this, the TF Finance had three options of involvement: 1) join the commission, 2) co-create within the commission, and 3) receive the minutes of the commission meetings. The TF decided upon councillor Jaap joining the commission for co-creation, as well as sharing the minutes with the UC. Thus, the TF Finance will be involved in the policymaking of dividing the funds at the central level, while the FCs will be involved in the process concerning the decentral levels. Importantly, it is the duty of the TF Finance to ensure that the goals outlined in the Bestuursakkoord are respected in the policies developed by the commission.

- *Drinks Pavilion*

At the beginning of the Academic Year, the Pavilion and the UC secretariat arranged that the UC could order wine, beer, and soda from the bar after the CM. Last week, this led to some disagreement between the UC-members and the Pavilion regarding the kinds of drinks that could be requested. Thus, the Presidium agreed to change the arrangement with the Pavilion from a limit on specific drinks to a limit of a budget for the drinks. This will be communicated with the Pavilion next week.

- *Training/coaching UC*

The Presidium discussed the possibility of offering training and coaching to UC-members. Some possibilities for coaching within the EUR were communicated with the councillors.

- Coaching on career opportunities: <https://my.eur.nl/nl/eur-employee/hr/learning-career-centre/leren-ontwikkelen/career-progress/verdiepen-en-verbreden/career-coaching>
 - Work-Life balance coaches: <https://my.eur.nl/nl/eur-employee/hr/gezond-veilig-werken/mentaal-en-sociaal/werkdruk/wat-kan-ik-doen-tegen-werkdruk/work-life-balance-coaches>
 - Coaching for participatory members or bodies: <https://mzoo.nl/coaching-voor-de-medezeggenschap/>
 - Individual coaching: this option of personalised coaching trajectories can be arranged if the interested councillors contact the Clerk; it will be arranged through the HR/ team Health Safety & Wellbeing.
 - TOP: this training trajectory is already available to EUR employees; the Clerk is discussing with the HR the possibility of extending the option to students. Also, the Clerk is checking with TOP if the trainings can be used during the onboardings as well.
- *OccupyEUR*

There is an occupation taking place in the A-building at the time of the third Plenary meeting; the Chair shared that the atmosphere of the occupiers is friendly and that members of the EB are also present.

02 Agenda items plenary meetings

02.01 Waiver policy

The Presidium shared with the UC the concept policy for granting waivers.

A member can request the presidium to grant a waiver for a meeting or a cycle, by sending an e-mail to the clerk with such a request the latest on the Monday morning (before 9:00) prior to the (first) meeting that the waiver is needed for. With a waiver, a council member who is digitally present has a right to vote and can share reactions during the meeting.

A waiver can be given by the presidium for maximum of one full cycle.

The waiver will be given in case of temporary Physical inability:

- *Quarantine due to corona*
- *Travel abroad due to Academic or personal obligations*

The UC shared some input regarding this policy. Mainly, there was a discussion on the statements elaborating on the special circumstances that could grant a waiver. These were found confusing by some councillors. For example, other situations that are not clear from the wording in the policy could be reasons for receiving a waiver, such as other illnesses (e.g., broken bones) and personal situations (e.g., divorce, burnout). The Presidium also had difficulty outlining the special circumstances for granting a waiver. Also, the Presidium chose not to specify mental health reasons or illness other than Corona in the policy in order to protect the councillors from feeling obliged to join online instead of taking a full break. Several suggestions for improvement were made, such as developing a more specific waiver policy. However, it was agreed that outlining the reasons for a waiver can be confusing and create limitations as well; the UC decided not to mention any circumstances. Instead, the waiver policy will focus on a time constraint for receiving a waiver. The UC believes that this kind of policy allows the UC members to personally decide if their situation deserves a waiver, while allowing the Presidium to exert control over the practicalities, such as knowing in advance and time limits. Also, it was discussed that in case of absences longer than one cycle, the regulations allow for a temporary replacement of the absent councillor.

Action point: The Presidium will adjust the waiver policy as discussed in the meeting.

02.02 Budgets HeQa funded programmes

The concept letter of consent to the *Budgets HeQa funded programmes* was shared in Teams and the councillors were asked to review and consent to it. Also, the UC received the draft of the CLI budgets and not the original budgets approved by the EB; the numbers in the draft did not add up, and this was discussed with policymakers Jeroen and Bienenke in the second Plenary meeting. As a result, the CLI budget letter will be tabled for the upcoming cycle with a remark about it arriving late being made.

The council discussed there being tension between the policymakers at the previous meeting and discussed what steps could be taken in relation to this, however, it was decided that it should not be addressed yet.

Also, policymaker Bienenke will organise a meeting with the HeQa TF and the Rector to clarify the concerns regarding this topic.

Action point: the HeQa TF will adjust the letter according to the discussion. The Clerk will format the finalised letter of consent to the *Budgets HeQa funded programmes* and send it to the EB.

02.03 Termination clinical research

During the current cycle, Erasmus MC requested the Presidium to add the termination of the Master Clinical Research; the request for termination needs to be applied before February 28.

Firstly, the council remarked that the topic was sent late to the UC for consent. Also, the UC discussed the option of creating a temporary TF to work on this. However, it was remarked that the FC and the PC accepted this proposal, and there is sufficient official advice given to it that supports the decision to terminate the Master. Also, one of the concerns expressed in the meeting that the current students may not have time to finish their studies was resolved, as plans had been outlined for those cases in the proposal of termination. Thus, the council voted in favour of giving consent to the termination plans.

Action point: The UC Clerk will draft a letter of consent to the *Termination clinical research* and share it with Erasmus MC.

02.04 Plan of action accessibility

The concept letter of advice was drafted by councillor Patryk and shared in Teams with the UC. Due to time constraints, the councillors were requested to read the letter during the break in order to decide on consent.

There was a discussion on whether to keep in the letter a reference to OccupyEUR. Some agreed, as the reference signals that the issues raised by the group were not sufficiently recognized by the institution, without siding with the occupiers themselves. Other councillors disagreed, as OccupyEUR is not an official report but an opinionated group. Following a voting procedure, it was decided to keep the reference in the letter. Thus, the UC consented to sending the letter in its current format.

Action point: The UC Clerk will format the letter of advice on the *Plan of action accessibility* and send it to the EB.

02.05 Safe@EUR

The concept letter of informal advice was shared with the UC in Teams. The councillors were required to read it and consent to it. A few suggestions were made during the meeting.

Firstly, the Central Point was discussed and there was some confusion regarding the roles and hierarchies of the contact points. The councillors agreed that the Central Point should not be the go-to in case of undesirable and worrying behaviour and advise that the de-central options become just as accessible. That is substantiated by the fact that, in practice, students tend to prefer contacting the student advisors when they have difficulties of any kind. The UC would like to see that substantiated more clearly in the letter. Also, the confusion reflects that the

document is not clear enough; thus, the councillors asked for a clearer outline of the services in the form of a visual flowchart. This suggestion would be specifically useful for students searching for the right place to receive help.

Secondly, there was a discussion about the availability of social safety resources, specifically whether the lack of availability of confidential councillors outside of normal office hours could be improved. It was discussed that in certain cases, such as workplace bullying or harassment, people cannot reach out during office hours. Some alternatives were discussed, such as requiring councillors to be available in the evenings, on a rotating basis throughout the week, or being available only for special circumstances that can be requested during the day. However, it was remarked that the issue of the availability of services might not fall under the reach of this agenda topic, thus councillor Aleid agreed to check the feasibility of this advice before including it in the letter. Nonetheless, a mention of this difficulty will be included in the letter in order to raise awareness to situations when issues related to social safety cannot be discussed during office hours.

Thirdly, it was suggested to better inform the students of the way social services function in the Netherlands, as well as on campus. Also, it was suggested to improve the communication between the security services and the social safety counsellors. However, the council decided against including these remarks in the current letter of advice.

In conclusion, the UC consented to sending the finalised version of the letter, according to the suggestions discussed.

Action point: TF Wellbeing/ Social Safety will adjust the content of the letter as discussed in the meeting. The UC Clerk will format the finalised letter of advice to *Safe@EUR* and send it to the EB.

02.06 Representation of the UC

Following the discussion that took place during the CM, the TF M&C was asked how the topic will be handled moving forward.

The TF was pleased with the level of support the EB has for the visibility of the UC.

However, the TF wishes to discuss the point of funding, which was shared during the CM but, due to the unprepared phrasing, was not responded to by the EB. The councillors wish to make it clear that the funding request to the EB would not suggest they side with certain parties. As a result, the TF will formulate a plan involving the entire UC and not specific groups. Additionally, a year-long budget was suggested, so that it can be used for events without requesting the permission of the EB, thus avoiding the previous complication. The councillors suggested that the TF would structure the matter of visibility as an event-planning funding, such as by creating a list of events that are meant to increase the visibility of elections in general, and without mentioning the participators.

Currently, the TF M&C is working on specifying the timeline of events that will be used to ask for permission of a budget regarding the plan. The councillors are invited to share their input in order to help achieve this goal.

Action point: The TF M&C will work on a timeline of events in order to request funding to increase the representation of the UC in future elections.

02.07 International students

During the CM, the EB suggested that councillors Sandra and Erin discuss their requests with the International Student Officer.

Following the discussion with the EB, it was understood that the attitude of the EB is that they recognize the issues brought up but are lacking in terms of concrete policy implementation. Similarly, a few councillors feel that the discussions on this topic, in general, are only informative and that the UC is not making enough requests. However, the documents

shared with the EB contain specific requests. This confusion reflects the difficulty the councillors face regarding sharing the topic with the EB. Moving forward, it was suggested that councillors Sandra and Erin meet with the International Student Officer to discuss the concrete progress mentioned by the EB; based on the meeting the UC can decide what to request further.

Also, the councillors want to give the EB recognition for the progress that is already made regarding the international student situation.

Action point: councillors Erin and Sandra will discuss the improvements in a meeting with the International Student Officer. A discussion on the outcomes of this meeting will be tabled for a future meeting.

02.08 Bestuursakkoord

The topic was discussed as an announcement (Agenda point 01.03).

02.09 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.

Firstly, the UC remarked on the EB Chair leaving the meeting sooner, multiple times, and believed it disrespectful towards us. Also, there were time constraints regarding discussing the Convergence and the Culture&Campus agenda points. The councillors remarked that the EB did not share them in writing, as requested previously, nor did the EB allocate sufficient time for the points during the meeting. The UC believes that we are missing important updates about these topics and wish to improve the situation. It was decided to request the announcements on these topics in writing in preparation for the meetings; also, the UC request a separate meeting focused on the EB presenting these updates and request the documentation in preparation for the meeting.

Secondly, after facing the issue of insufficient time management multiple times, the councillors discussed ways to improve that. It was suggested to pre-set a fixed time constraint or an approximate time guideline for each topic. A few councillors disagreed, stating that the fixed format might hinder the discussion with the EB as in multiple cases the extra time spent on certain topics was proved to be fruitful. Also, this could cause disruption in the meetings as the councillors might disagree on how much time is needed for different topics if the council needs more time to discuss certain points. Finally, this will be further discussed in the first Plenary meeting.

Action point: the discussion on improving the time management of the CM will be tabled for the first Plenary meeting.

03 Incoming documents

- 38549 - VZ 275.748 Response to 38549 G&I Report 'Evaluation Pilot Ombudsman and Pilot Confidential Counsellors

The UC agreed not to send a reply letter to this incoming document.

04 Any other business

04.01 BSA research

During the second Plenary meeting, the councillor remarked that the documents shared on this topic were in Dutch and requested the English version. The policymaker shared once more documents in

Dutch, while some councillors believed the English documents were not extensive enough. It was decided not to request a translation from the policymaker; the Dutch councillors will provide the English councillor with translations where needed instead.