

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

**Date and Time:** 24/05/2023, 14:30 – 17:30

**Location:** Langeveld 2.16

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

**Waiver:** Erin van Gestel, Patryk Jarmakowicz.

**Absent:** Wesley Hennep.

## **01 Opening**

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

The agenda was set without adjustments.

### **01.02 Minutes first plenary meeting**

The minutes of the first plenary meeting and the action points were set without adjustments.

### **01.03 Announcements**

#### *- Candidate UC Clerk position*

A candidate for the Clerk position was put forward and an interview with Presidium will follow. The current UC Clerk created a profile relevant to the position based on her experience; the profile will be used as a template while meeting with the candidate.

#### *- Labour Inspectorate*

The Labour Inspectorate will conduct research at EUR on inappropriate behaviour and discrimination among staff. They requested the participation of 2 UC members to help in their research. Councillors Jaap and Chaya volunteered.

#### *- Updates TF Wellbeing and Social Safety*

Several updates related to the activity of the TF Wellbeing and Social Safety were shared with the UC. Firstly, the TF experienced scarce participation in meetings attended by the policymakers involved in all matters related to well-being. The only UC member that attended a recent recurring meeting within the TF signaled their dissatisfaction with the attendance of the other councillors and wishes to regulate this issue. The matter will be addressed within the TF as well. Secondly, all EUR employees were asked to participate in a scan on employee engagement and enablement; a report will be drawn based on the results of the survey and will subsequently be shared with the UC. Thirdly, the leadership development program is organising a new training program concerned with the issue that decentralisation at EUR hinders decision-making and the note that employees in lower-rank leadership positions do not attend these meetings.

#### *- Safe@EUR*

Safe@EUR is expected to launch in mid-June, and a campaign to increase its visibility will be launched after the summer.

#### *- Meeting for Accessibility on Campus*

The councillors that attended the meeting regarded it as interesting, however, it was signalled that there is a lack of central leadership on accessibility which is seen as a problem. The councillors wish to discuss this issue with the EB.

- *Allegations against UC election candidates*

The UC representatives of the Liberi Erasmus student party announced that they experienced alleged disrespectful allegations, such as being referred to as a “fascist party” or being the proponents of “fascist ideologies”. These have allegedly been shared in student group chats; the UC representatives consider these messages as attacks on their party’s electoral success and, consequently, do not feel comfortable working in the UC.

Also, the party experienced confusion with the financing during the elections due to the funding from external sources which was cancelled. They believe this may have affected all other candidates.

The UC Chair took note of the announcement and made the comment that it is important to draw the line between UC related matters and those that concern the Electoral Office instead.

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

### **02.01 Educational Vision**

The TF EV and HeQa attended a series of meetings with the policy maker with the purpose of co-creation of the new Educational Vision. The letter of consent and advice was shared with the policymaker after having been approved by the TF members. The letter can be found on Teams. It was mentioned that the decision at the current point concerns the EV as well as some co-creation tasks that the TF was involved in. The decision does not yet affect the funding that is related to the EV as that will be a separate agenda point tabled in the upcoming UC cycle.

The UC was sufficiently informed and decided not to table this agenda point for the CM.

### **02.02 Code of Conduct Elections**

The UC Chair prepared a plan of action regarding the Code of Conduct Elections. It was not clear if the council has a say in the regulations, so the Chair wishes to ask the Legal Office for guidance. The Chair will ensure that the matter will be treated with urgency.

Plan of action:

*1. Ask legal if we have the right to decide about this topic in the University Council.*

*If yes:*

*2. Discussion in the council if external funding is expedient.*

*3. Ask legal to create a proposal in line with the discussion we had in step 2.*

*4. Decision-making by the council*

The UC agreed to the above-mentioned plan of action.

Furthermore, the council discussed other situations that proved problematic in the current election period and that should be improved in advance of the next year’s election period. For example, the room booking system was temporarily adjusted this year, but the process is not part of the official regulations, which does not guarantee that it will be maintained in the future. The council discussed whether there should be an evaluation of the elections to establish more points of improvement for the regulations. On the one hand, the process would be better streamlined if an evaluation were to take place and all improvements were shared at the same time with the Legal Affairs Office. On the other hand, that process might take a long time and will consequently extend to the next UC board. The UC decided to proceed with the former plan of action and conduct an evaluation of the elections first. The UC agreed to tackle the issue by the second cycle of the next year latest.

**Action points:** the Chair will request the help of the Legal Affairs Office regarding changes in the Code of Conduct Elections with a matter of urgency. The evaluation of the elections period is tabled for the upcoming cycle. The UC will tackle the outcomes of the election evaluation, latest by the second cycle of the next year.

### **02.03 Erasmus Perspectives**

The TF is currently in the process of researching the documents. The rights of the UC are of advice on the entire document and extend to consent on the main elements of the document referring to changes in the allocation model. The TF is researching the changes in the allocation model thoroughly with the help of CPC and already noticed several points of concern in the policy. For one, the large investments (such as for real estate, sustainability, energy costs, etc.) are described vaguely. Also, there are a few uncertainties in the document relating to the drop in income from lower BSA requirements and the reduced influx of international students. All concerns of the TF will be shared with CPC in a meeting scheduled before the CM, and the outcome of the meeting will be shared with the EB.

**Action point:** The TF Finance will share their remarks on the Erasmus Perspectives document in an upcoming meeting with CPC. The agenda point Erasmus Perspectives will be tabled for the CM.

### **02.04 Student Charter 2023-2024**

The temporary TF reviewed the document and the UC agreed on consenting to the Student Charter 2023-2024 without any remarks.

**Action point:** the temporary TF will draft the letter of consent to the *Student Charter 2023-2024*.

### **02.05 2023 EUR Whistle-blower Regulations**

The questions and remarks of the TF were shared with the policymaker. The response was forwarded to the UC a day before the meeting. The councillors believe the document to be overall good and legally sound, but several remarks might need further attention and will be tackled by the councillors responsible for this agenda point. During the meeting, Article 4.12 was discussed, as some councillors believed that the clarifying answer given by the policymaker appeared to differ from the perceived meaning of the Article. Consequently, the council found the article confusing and will include this mention in the advice.

The UC decided not to table this for the CM.

**Action point:** The discussion on the 2023 Whistle-blower Regulations will be tabled for the third Plenary meeting.

### **02.06 Institutional Tuition Fee 2024-2025**

The TF identified several issues which were addressed to the policymakers and the response was forwarded to the council. The TF was not able to properly assess the answers at the time of the meeting. During the meeting, the councillors decided to restructure the agenda points *02.06 Institutional tuition fee 2024-2025* and *02.07 Institutional tuition fee Ukrainian students*. Mainly, it appears there are two issues, the first referring to the increase in institutional tuition fees in general, which should be in accordance with the official inflation rate, and the second referring to waivers and scholarship criteria. The UC would like to discuss the topic of individual waivers and scholarships with the EB. The UC believes the criteria are strong and clear-cut, but questions whether these are in line with what EUR demands of their excellent students. Similarly, during the discussion on tuition waivers for Ukrainian students, it surfaced that other groups of students that are disadvantaged did not receive tuition waivers; based on that realisation, the council questioned the waiver system. Furthermore, the UC would like to know the stats of individual waivers per faculty and how it is decided when personal circumstances are to be considered for waiver receivers.

The council requested a discussion with the EB during the CM on the outlined points. In preparation for this discussion, the TFs working on the two agenda points that were merged will also join efforts and prepare for the discussion.

**Action point:** The TFs responsible for the points *02.06 Institutional tuition fee 2024-2025* and *02.07 Institutional tuition fee Ukrainian students* will jointly prepare for the discussion with the EB. The Clerk will table the agenda point *Institutional tuition fee* for the upcoming CM.

### **02.08 Impact Definition**

The UC discussed the Impact Definition document and the process of providing advice on the content. Several councillors involved in the TF argued they have already performed their advisory duties, albeit informally; therefore, it would not be necessary to provide written advice. On the one hand, the councillors argued that since the formal process of the UC was not respected, the document should arrive formally in our agenda for advice, therefore we should provide a letter of advice that summarises all prior feedback and the opinions of the UC. Also, a councillor remarked that the document touches on ethics and advised the TF to include a mention of whether that will be a matter of concern in discussions with faculties.

In conclusion, the TF agreed to provide a written letter of advice in which the main discussion points and remarks of the UC will be included. The topic will not be further discussed in the CM.

**Action point:** The TF Strategy will draft the formal letter of advice for *Impact Definition*. The agenda point *Impact Definition* will be tabled for the third Plenary meeting.

### **02.09 Ties with the Fossil Fuel Industry**

Following the discussion of the first Plenary meeting during which the councillors shared opposing views regarding the ties of our university with the fossil fuel industries, a separate meeting was held where these different opinions of the council were taken into consideration and incorporated into a proposal. Namely, the TF acknowledges that we need to collaborate with the fossil fuel companies, at least during a transitory period, and proposed to pause for up to a year setting up new ties with these industries in order to investigate the conditions involved in collaborating with them. This proposed transitory period would allow us to research the impact these ties have on our research, internship opportunities, funding, recruiting, etc. The TF also proposed writing an open letter addressed to other UCs to incite collaborations and to request the EB to sign an emergency letter addressed to the government considering the fossil fuel subsidy. Also, the UC can invite the DIT platform staff members to a meeting, as they are experts on this topic and may help us stimulate a broader movement. This plan of action implies that ultimately ties will be cut if these companies are not able to attain the requirements imposed by the Paris Agreement.

The UC members shared several remarks in light of this proposal. A councillor shared that cutting the ties will be difficult, as companies like Shell have an alleged influence on the curriculum in RSM. However, the RSM representative disagreed, stating that based on a recent investigation, this information is not correct. Furthermore, the TF acknowledged that the process will be difficult but vouched for the necessity of working towards the goal of limiting our ties with these companies despite the difficulties along the way.

The TF was reminded that in Erasmus Perspectives it is outlined that EUR is investing in an Industry Engagement Monitor; by requesting more information from the EB on the details of this investment, we can obtain insight into the research EUR is preparing on our ties with the fossil fuel industries.

Also, it was remarked that, while the climate is a major consideration, it is important to evaluate all the ties our university has, in general. The council agreed that, once we discuss the high urgency and concrete topic of fossil fuels, we can extend our efforts to this general consideration and evaluate whether EUR needs to have ethical guidelines on approaching different industries. Also, we can use the current process as a model as we move forward.

Moreover, it was remarked that the EB was expected to provide us with a Partner Policy by October of the previous year and the updates we received so far have been vague; the UC wishes to ask for a concrete update on the partner policy.

The council discussed how to move forward with this topic. On the one hand, the TF wished for a vote on the proposed project plan during the meeting. However, several councillors disagreed, requesting a written and detailed project plan that they can research in order to arrive at an informed conclusion. The councillors wish to know how the activities on campus will be different once the interaction with the fossil fuel companies is paused for a year.

In conclusion, the TF agreed to discuss and prepare the proposal considering the remarks of the council and share the proposal in the third Plenary meeting. The topic will not be tabled for the upcoming CM.

**Action point:** The discussion on the proposal for cutting ties with the fossil fuel industries is tabled for the third Plenary meeting.

## **02.10 UC Monitor**

The councillors have reviewed the input given by the UC in the previous meeting and are preparing a survey which will be taking place in the upcoming third Plenary meeting. The results of the survey will be processed and shared in the next cycle.

**Action point:** the survey *UC monitor* is tabled for the third Plenary meeting.

## **02.11 CiO Report**

The CiO report was reviewed by the TF and there are no remarks to be addressed to the EB. A councillor shared a remark regarding the Erasmus Sports Building, whereby several issues arose due to an allegedly hasty finishing of the building's construction. The remark will be tackled within the TF.

## **03 Incoming documents**

### **- 38551 - Budget plan EUR 2023-2026**

The TF Finance will discuss the points that need to be followed up within their TF. A formal reply to the letter will not be necessary.

### **- Kamerbrief BSA samenvatting**

The UC would like to know how the changes in the BSA requirements will impact the SAY plans; this will be addressed both to the policymaker responsible for SAY and to the EB.

**Action point:** the topic of BSA impact on SAY will be tabled in the upcoming CM.

## **04 Any other business**

### **04.01 Concept Agenda Good Conversation**

The UC discussed the agenda of the upcoming Good Conversation meeting. The UC requested the removal of the point on the *student assessor*.

Additionally, several UC members requested that more councillors be invited to partake in the meetings in the upcoming year; however, the invitations extend mainly to Presidium members and councillors whose points or projects are to be tackled in the meeting. The council agreed to extend the invitations to councillors who show high motivation to join the meetings, with the additional reminder that the meetings function best when the number of attendees is small.

**Action point:** the agenda point *student assessor* will be taken off the agenda of the Good Conversation meeting.

#### **04.02 Concept Agenda SB-UC Meeting**

No remarks regarding the agenda of the SB-UC meeting were made in the meeting.

#### **04.04 Transport to ISS June 13**

The June 13<sup>th</sup> Plenary meeting will take place at ISS to increase the visibility of the UC there. The UC secretariat is willing to organize transportation to ISS for the UC members who need it. The Clerk will share the list on Teams.

#### **04.04 Professional Service Day June 27**

A message with more information was shared with the councilors on Teams. The UC was asked to give a workshop for the event of Professional Service Day taking place on June 27<sup>th</sup>. An ELC member will prepare a workshop on participation. No UC members volunteered during the meeting.

#### **04.05 Impact Document for Education**

Several councilors remarked that discussions on sustainability, as outlined in the Impact document, rarely take place in education as there seems to be resistance to incorporate the material in the curricula of courses. In the discussion, it surfaced that the matter is different per faculties, for example, the topic is not well integrated within ESE, but it is better included within EUC. The council discussed addressing this matter as part of the SAY discussion.

**Action point:** the remark on better including sustainability in educational curricula will be mentioned in the SAY discussion.

#### **04.06 STG Game**

The STG game will take place on the upcoming mandatory Tuesday May 30<sup>th</sup>. The council was reminded to participate, with the addition that securing this activity was difficult.

#### **04.07 Regulations for Protests at EUR**

According to a recent Erasmus magazine article, a vigil was held on campus for a Palestinian journalist that was killed a year ago. The situation escalated as the security intervened and displayed alleged physically and verbally abusive behavior towards the students and staff present at the vigil. Similar responses were recorded in the context of the occupations. In this context, one councilor remarked there are no clear rules and regulations defining the responses of security staff and believes it is the role of the UC to define these situations. However, several other councilors disagreed, believing there are indeed rules in place defining which activities are not allowed on campus and for maintaining order. For example, the UC relied on those rules when we requested the removal of politically harmful messages displayed in the food plaza a year ago. Also, it was remarked that as a council, we are not supposed to get involved in individual situations. Nonetheless, the council



suggested that we check the regulations and whether they were adequately followed in these incidents. Further, the councilor who brought this point wishes to ask the EB to ensure the security staff follow the appropriate rules when addressing protests.

It was remarked that there is an increase in on campus demonstrations which is a development we have to take seriously as many things can go wrong. It was suggested to discuss ways in which the UC can ensure demonstrations can happen in a safe way.

#### **04.08 Report Occupation**

A councilor made the reminder that the evaluation of the Occupation has not yet been shared with the UC and requested an update on the process. The UC Chair had not received any information.

**Action point:** The UC will ask for an update from the EB on the OccupyEUR report in the upcoming CM, under AOB.

#### **04.09 Continuation Announcement *Allegations Against UC Election Candidates***

The UC representatives of the party having received the alleged allegations during the electoral period wished to discuss them with the UC. This is because the concerned councillors believed the alleged slander violated the rules made by the UC and contributed to a feeling of unsafety in the council environment. The concerned members of the council request an apology and consequences for these happenings. To that extent, the Chair suggested including this in the election evaluation.

The council discussed this matter. It was remarked that the alleged slander did not originate from current UC members, therefore it cannot be addressed here. Also, it was discussed that the alleged slander comes as a reflection of people's understanding of the councillors' party membership, making it an issue of the party being misrepresented outside of the council. Also, this behaviour reflects an issue reflected in politics in general, whereby candidates and their supporters fight for seats in an establishment also in unfair ways. Thereby, it was suggested to report the unwanted behaviour to the Elections Office, thus not discuss it within the UC.

Furthermore, the councillors took note of the feeling of unsafety shared by the councillors and wished to monitor it in the future.

#### **04.10 Key UC Office**

The councillors were reminded that the UC office key is personal and should only be used by the people who were given one; it should never be given to other people, including members of parties that some UC members are part of. This way, we ensure that general access to the UC office is regulated.

#### **04.11 Role CMT Member**

A councillor expressed concern over the lack of a clear understanding of the role of the UC and that of the UC CMT member within the CMT team. The UC CMT member explained her role, that of representing students and not the UC. Also, the CMT meetings are confidential thus the CMT member is not allowed to report anything back to the UC. However, the councillor was not convinced that a single person is sufficient to oversee such a task without supervision or collaboration of some kind.

It was further explained that the CMT was established 2 years ago to represent students when it comes to education, wellbeing, and other relevant matters. We decided to select a representative from within the UC for the first few mandates to evaluate the process with the possibility of, in the future, selecting someone from the whole EUR. Several councillors believe that seeing as there are many polarising topics such as OccupyEUR and ties to the fossil industry, we should be mindful of how this impacts the work of the CMT member. However, the UC members should be mindful of the discussions that arise out of this, as we might risk losing the CMT position altogether.

Erasmus