

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

Date and Time: 20/06/2023, 14:30 – 17:30

Location: Langeveld 1.12

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

Absent: Tom van Dijken.

Waiver: Georgiana Carp.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The agenda point *Proposal professionalising list system* will be moved to the second agenda item due to the early absence of the TF Lead from the plenary meeting. The topic *Report Occupy* will be added to the agenda. With these adjustments, the agenda of the second plenary meeting was set.

01.02 Minutes first plenary meeting

The action points were set without adjustments.

01.03 Announcements

- *Follow-up meeting SAY*

Momentarily, 7 members of the UC accepted the invite on Teams for the SAY meeting taking place on June 27th. The councillors were reminded to respond to the invite if they want to join. If the minimum of 10 participants is not met, this meeting, like the one with the Ombudsperson, will be postponed for the upcoming academic year.

- *Eurekaweek stand info market Woudestein*

The secretariat was able to arrange a second stand for members of the student parties which will be placed next to the UC stand during the Eurekaweek on August 22nd. The Clerk will contact all parties this week to ask about their availability and if they will be present to represent their list at the stand.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Tender process Arbo Dienstverlening – Confidential

The agenda item is confidential because of the tender process. The minutes have altered accordingly.

Councillor Ernst was added to the TF. Policymakers Minke Versluijs-de Kogel and Femke Damen have been invited to the plenary discussion to answer the questions of the UC. A separate meeting was set with the TF and the policymakers on the 3rd of July.

In the previous plenary discussion, it was unclear to the members of the council what is required from us to advise on; if our rights concern the process, the councillors found it general and did not have enough insight into it; if our rights concern the requirements for the new Arbo service, we would like to have better insight into the considerations. The UC asked the policymakers for more information on the process leading up to this decision and how they envision the role of the UC.

According to the policymakers, the current Arbo contract is set to end soon, and a new tender is needed to renew it; the role of the UC is to get informed on the process and consent to the difference in the way of working. The UC will not be involved in the selection due to confidentiality concerns. The policymakers will draft a document clarifying the expectations of the council.

The Chair advised the TF to reschedule the meeting with the policymakers earlier than the 3rd of July, considering that the deadline for consent is the 4th of July; this would avoid the issue of delaying consent until September. The topic will not be discussed with the EB at the CM.

Action point: The Clerk will add councillor Ernst to the TF. The TF will reschedule the meeting with the policymaker in time for the consent deadline on the 4th of July.

Action point: The Clerk will make sure a clarifying document is shared by the policymakers regarding the formulation of the consent for the Arbo Dienstverlening.

02.07 Proposal professionalising list system

A TF meeting took place a day before the plenary meeting. The TF discussed their expectations of this agenda item and concluded that the workload is too high to tackle for the remainder of this final UC cycle; they requested tabling this agenda item for the next academic year, either in the second or third cycle. The rescheduling will enable the councillors to request the help of the Central Election Office on legal matters as well as review how the old list system functioned ca. 25 years ago.

The councillors discussed their expectations regarding this agenda item for the CM. The TF Lead requested tabling the topic in order to get the opinion of the EB which would be helpful in preparing the topic for the next academic year. However, the Chair advised against this option, as there had already been a discussion with the EB on this item in a previous CM which resulted in the current initiative. Instead, she suggested writing an email to the EB for their opinion. Also, the topic could be briefly tackled as AOB in the CM, if time allows it.

Action point: The Clerk will withdraw the topic *Proposal professionalising list system* from the agenda list of the current cycle. The item is rescheduled for the second or third cycle of the next academic year.

Action point: The TF professionalising list system can ask their questions to the EB via the Clerk.

02.02 Good conversation & SB/UC meeting

The UC Chair shared with the members of the UC the state of affairs of the agenda points discussed in the meetings with the SB and the *Good conversation*.

- *Visibility UC*

The visibility of the UC in general and the outcome of the recent elections were discussed, and many useful suggestions were listed. The Chair and the Clerk will use the suggestions in the evaluation of the election with the M&C Officer and discuss if the UC can receive central assistance with visibility during the year. The Clerk will draft a plan with the help of the UC Chair and the future student assistant.

Action point: The Clerk will draft a plan of action for visibility with the help of the UC Chair and the future student assistant.

- *Compensation Participatory Bodies*

The EB is discussing the proposal of the UC on *Compensation of the Participatory Bodies* in the bilateral meetings with all faculty deans. They will inform the UC of the outcome of these conversations, however so far, no big objections have been encountered.

Action point: The announcement regarding feedback of the EB on Compensation Participatory Bodies will be added to the handover by the Clerk.

- *Convergence*

The EB Chair informed the Presidium that the SB members of all institutions have a delegation in a joint SB meeting for the Convergence; since there is an informal organisation, all structures of the separate institutions have their formal role, but this process is a way of relaying input from the UC and share updates with the UC. However, given that the participatory bodies differ in each organisation, the Chair is looking for a way to approach all the participatory bodies and will inform the UC of the outcome.

A councillor remembered that the EB had promised to give the UC regular updates on the Convergence and hoped to continue this development despite the informal participation in the Convergence. The Chair informed her that they requested written updates from the EB in preparation for the CM.

- *Role UC within the community*

The Presidium discussed the role of the UC as a spokesperson for the EUR community, in light of the Occupy EUR developments. It was communicated to us that discussing important matters with the UC might be better than protesting and it might help the UC increase our visibility. The Presidium agreed to this observation and shared that we are already doing this, such as proposing the *Fossil Fuel Ties* initiative as a result of the discussions mentioned in the recent occupations.

- *Accessibility*

The SB shared their views and an update on Accessibility at EUR. The Presidium put it to their attention that besides physical accessibility, the UC is aiming for more awareness and action regarding invisible impairments and dealing with individual cases at a smaller scale within faculties. The SB was receptive to the points of the UC.

02.03 Extra Projects HeQa EUR-central

The HeQa TF reviewed the documentation and was overall satisfied, with the exception of the CLI proposal. As a consequence, the HeQa TF took part in two meetings with the HeQa policymaker and several CLI project members where it was discussed the procedure for the documentation of this agenda item and the content of the CLI proposal. The members of the TF shared the outcomes of these meetings.

Firstly, the councillors were surprised at the fact that the CLI receives almost half of the remaining budget; this amount was decided upfront, meaning that the remaining amount of the total budget was divided among the other projects. According to the policymaker, the other project teams were happy with the amount they received, and in most projects, it is going to be used to finance a learning innovator who will develop the project.

Secondly, the CLI explained that the requested funds will be used to finance the plans they already had in the budget at the beginning of this year, which is the reason their proposal does not indicate a new project.

Thirdly, the proposal from CLI was misleading, as it was labelled “online education,” but the explanation we received in the meeting with the project leaders was different from that.

Further, the UC discussed how to proceed with this agenda point. On one hand, if we consent now to the proposal, the projects can commence, and we will be asked for consent later on the official budget plans. However, this process makes it difficult to not consent later. Therefore, the UC decided to table this agenda point at the CM and discuss with the EB:

1. our views of the budgeting process and ask for an explanation of why the CLI budget ran a different course from the other projects.
2. how they are looking at the CLI proposal.

Action points: The Clerk will table the agenda item *Extra Projects HeQa EUR central* for the CM; The Clerk will share the two discussion points on the HeQa budget with the EB.

02.04 Concept advice Starting and Incentive grants EUR

The TF took part in a meeting with the policymakers to discuss the process of the grants in the long term. The TF shared their concern that the advice they provided on the short-term consent several cycles ago was not represented in the long-term plan. There are still negotiations taking place and the TF needs to discuss what they expect of this.

A staff member of the UC shared that, in her faculty, there are 3 starter grants allocated to 9 academic staff members, which leaves the responsibility on the staff to create a collaborative process that would benefit them. Therefore, it is not going to be an individual grant, but a shared grant. There is still vagueness communicated to the staff which indicates that the process is unclear. The TF members found this process confusing, as the central policy indicates that there should be enough grants for all qualifying candidates. Also, this goes against the goals of the Bestuursakkoord, which aim to stimulate autonomous research.

The TF is pushing towards clear reporting on how the money is spent; if the money is spent not conform to the policy, then it should be transparently communicated.

The advice we previously gave on the short-term plans was that faculties should decide how to divide the grants. However, the example shared in the meeting demonstrates that the advice may not be applicable in the long-term situations, where the UC believes there should be better control at the central level to at least ensure the grants are spent in the way they were intended. However, the TF is unsure what their stance is on this yet, and they need to discuss their differing viewpoints some more. Furthermore, the UC would like to discuss their viewpoints with the EB in the CM.

Action points: The TF will continue discussing their viewpoints on the agenda point *Starter and Incentive grants EUR* in preparation for the CM; the TF will let the Clerk know if they want to table more points of discussion. The Clerk will table the discussion on *Starter and Incentive grants EUR* at the CM.

02.05 Numerus fixus bachelor programmes and selection master programmes 24-25

Councillor Irena joined the TF.

A member of the UC that was part of the TF in the previous year remarked that even though we had given advice last year, the current document does not appear to mention any changes. The TF would like to share this remark at the CM and get more insight on whether our previous advice was followed up on.

Action point: The Clerk will table the agenda item *Numerus fixus* at the CM.

02.06 Ties with the fossil fuel industry

The UC discussed how to proceed with this topic at the CM. We decided to share with the EB the document created by the TF that was previously discussed in the third plenary of the previous cycle. During the CM, we agreed to table a discussion on this letter with the EB.

Action point: The Clerk will share with the EB the proposal on the *Ties with the fossil fuel industry* initiative. The Clerk will table the agenda item for the CM.

02.08 Sustainability Proposal

The Sustainability proposal was created by a UC member in collaboration with the Sustainability Office and was shared in Teams so that all councillors could share their input on the document. In the proposal, we are reminding the EB of proposals the UC has made in recent years that they have not followed up yet. We hope that, with the current momentum, it is of use to them to do something about it. The TF decided they will not ask any questions in the CM as it is a reminder, but proposed to send the document as a letter, which means the councillors have time to add their comments to the letter. The letter will be finalised in the third plenary meeting.

A member of the council believed it to be inefficient to send the letter instead of tabling the topic at the CM. However, the majority of the UC agree that sending a letter and receiving a written reply within 6 weeks may lead to a more substantial conclusion than receiving an oral answer in the meeting.

Action point: the UC members will contribute their remarks to the letter *Sustainability proposal* shared in Teams. The Clerk will table the agenda point for the third plenary meeting.

02.09 Access to offices

Councillor Jaap is the leader of the TF.

The TF Lead will arrange a meeting with the members of the TF and the members of RE&F to discuss the agenda point.

Action point: The TF Access to offices will organise a meeting with RE&F on the topic *Access to offices*.

02.10 Evaluation Occupy

In the previous CM, the EB informed the UC that the report on the OccupyEUR event will be shared with us on June 14th. However, this promise was not fulfilled as there are privacy issues with the UC receiving the full report; however, at the insistence of the Chair, the UC received a redacted version of

the Occupy report before the plenary meeting. The English version will be added if the UC wishes to table the discussion at the CM.

The UC discussed whether we wish to discuss the outcomes of the report with the EB at the CM. As there was not sufficient time to review the report, we decided that the Clerk will open a topic on Teams where the UC can share their remarks before Thursday, June 22nd at 17:00.

Action point: the UC will share their remarks on the Occupy report via Teams before June 22nd at 17:00. The Clerk will table the topic if the UC requests it.

02.11 UC Monitor

The results of the survey *UC Monitor* was shared with the UC during the meeting; the file is also available to the councillors via Teams. Following the presentation, the members reflected on the functioning of the UC.

When comparing the two surveys done this academic year, the councillors believe it is effective to have the survey filled out during the plenary meetings as it appears to lead to a higher response rate. Also, the UC reflected on the low attendance in the TF meetings as well as sometimes in plenary meetings and agreed there needs to be a change about this.

02.12 Handover UC

The members of the council were requested to add to the draft document shared in Teams. We will review the document during the third plenary meeting.

Action points: The UC members will fill out the *Handover UC* document before the third plenary meeting. The Clerk will table the discussion on the topic for the third plenary meeting.

02.13 Preparation CM

- Traffic around Woudestein

The letter with the concerns of the UC was shared in Teams. The UC believes there is urgency on this issue, and it should be tackled before the next academic year.

Action point: The Clerk will share with the EB the document drafted on traffic around Woudestein.

- HOVO

In the first plenary meeting of this cycle, it was remarked that the EB had informed us a year ago that the HOVO classes were set to be revitalised with help from Utrecht University; however, these classes are now taking place without EUR, and instead with the help from Hogeschool Rotterdam. While reviewing the minutes of this agenda item in the past, it appeared that the EB had informed us that it is not legally possible for EUR to get involved as a university. This statement is confusing, as several other Universities, such as Utrecht or VUA are involved in HOVO. Also, we are interested in asking the EB if they are interested in joining the initiative. Finally, we would like to know what the status of lifelong learning is and if they are focused on providing education to this age group.

The UC would like to send the letter on HOVO to the EB in preparation for the CM. Councillors Ernst will take the lead on this topic during the CM.

Action point: The Clerk will share with the EB the document drafted on traffic around Woudestein.

- **Update on Strategy 2024**

The UC would like to discuss our involvement with Strategy 2024.

The following topics will also be tabled for the CM:

- **Extra Projects HeQa EUR-central**
- **Starting and Incentive grants EUR**
- **Numerus fixus bachelor programmes and selection master programmes 24-25**
- **Ties with the fossil fuel industry**
- **Evaluation Occupy**
- **AOB: Development Dutch language standard Universities**
-

02.14 Updates Chairs meeting – TU Delft building

In a recent news article, it was reported that TU Delft decided to open a new building in Rotterdam; this decision is due to the shortage of housing in Delft. During the Chairs meeting, the UC Chair was asked whether this decision is related to the Convergence. The UC Chair shared this update with the UC.

03 Incoming documents

04 Any other business

04.01 Eureka week information stand August 22

We arranged that 2 employee and 2 student members of the UC would join the Eureka week information stand on August 22nd. Councillors Jaap, Natascha, Wesley, and Nawin volunteered for this event.

04.02 Representation ISS students in the UC

During the UC visit to ISS, we spoke with student representatives of the supervisory body. During these discussions, we came to understand that ISS students are not allowed to vote in the UC elections and are not allowed to join the UC as student members. This is concerning to some members of the council, as we try to represent all students as well as staff members, and ISS is considered a faculty of EUR. The Clerk will check how ISS participation in the UC is regulated.

Action points: The Clerk will check the UC participation regulations for students of ISS.

04.03 Biodegradable menstrual products

A member of the UC was approached by a company that creates sustainable biodegradable menstrual products. He will contact the Sustainability Programme Manager at EUR to further discuss the idea of adding these products on the EUR campus.

04.04 Internationalisation Discussion Parliament

The UC will table the topic of Development Dutch language standard Universities as AOB at the CM.