<p style="text-align:center">**University Council**
Consultation Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam</p>

Date and Time: 26/09/2023, 14:00 – 16:30
Location: Van der Groot, M1-06
Present in the Meeting: Ed Brinksma (Chair EB), Annelien Bredenoord (RM), Ellen van Schoten (Vicechair EB), Ann O'Brien (Secretary EB), Lisa van Dalen (Support EB), Aleid Fokkema (UC Chair replacement), Ernst Hulst, Katarzyna Lasak, Sebastiaan Kamp, Esra Kahramanoglu, Joseph Ayinla, Timo Zandvliet, Cagla Altin, Yasin Demir, Nawin Ramcharan, Linquendo van der Klooster, Emre Ulusoy, Linda Dekker, Natascha Kraal, Emese von Bone, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen, Tom van Dijken, Achraf Taouil, Anthony van der Linden, Max Wagenaar, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).
Absent: Ivonne Cune-Noten (Chair), Pedro van Gessel, Albert Wagelmans, Maryam Mohamed

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda
The agenda point *Opening hours* was removed from the AOB section. With this adjustment, the agenda of the meeting was set.

01.02 Minutes previous meeting
The minutes of the previous meeting were set.

01.03 Action points
- **Outcomes discussion May 2023 on compensation participatory bodies**

The EB took part in a discussion on the topic during the bilateral meetings with representatives of the faculties. The faculties were informed to take action according to the requirements set by the Ministry. The dialogue was constructive. The EB will share more information with the UC in the next CM.

- **Meeting regarding UC questions on the Convergence**

The EB secretary is in the process of planning this meeting.

- **Dialogues on HeQa investments**

The dialogues are in planning, and a meeting will be scheduled in the final quarter of 2023.

- **Concept advice Starting and Incentive grants**

The topic is tabled on the current agenda.

- **Organize a meeting with DIT**

The meeting is being organized and is expected to take place soon.

- **Document on traffic incidents around the EUR campus**
The information was shared.
- **Strategy 2024-2028**
The topic is being discussed within the TF Strategy.

01.03 Announcements

- Protocol dealing with members of communities affected by natural disasters

Following the earthquake incidents in Syria and Turkey, the EB was confronted with the fact that there is no protocol in place for dealing with such incidents. After discussions with the students from the affected communities, the EB developed a protocol. This was recently applied following the Morocco earthquake. Based on the reactions received from the community, it appears that the protocol was a good decision.

The UC remarked that, when a natural disaster occurred in Libya several weeks ago, the protocol was not applied, and wished to know the reason behind that decision.

According to the EB, there were only two students affected by this incident, and they reached out to them individually.

02 Agenda items CM

02.01 Starters and Incentive grants EUR

It has been decided that this topic will be tabled again during the next cycle since the UC has not received a response to the advice and there are still documents missing. CPC and Academic Affairs are working on this matter.

It became apparent to the UC that the advice that was provided before the summer holidays was not included in the documents shared with the UC. Although the EB had informed the UC via e-mail that the advice had been discussed with the Deans, the outcome of the meeting and/or a reflection on the advice has not been shared since and was not included in the documents shared with the UC this cycle. This was disappointing to the members of the UC that worked hard, in a short time frame, and outside regular working hours to deliver the advice on the prior request of the EB.

The UC wants to signal that this was a problematic course of affairs for the UC for various reasons, such as missing the answers from the EB to the advice, an explanation regarding the process, the transparency of the 20% packages, an explanation for the buy-in procedure, a plan for evaluating this, and the clarity on the research strategies. The UC understands that not all the points will be incorporated into the final decision-making, but expects to see that the input was considered, and a proper response on the decision of including or not including the input. In light of these concerns, the EB was asked to give an explanation regarding the decision-making process.

> The EB emphasized that this outcome was not in their intention, and they feel it is unfortunate it proceeded this way. They received the UC's input over the summer and reacted to it amongst themselves, and they will ensure a written answer will be shared with the UC. The EB drew attention to the fact that a new UC was onboarded after the summer period.

The UC inquired whether the intended decision-making took place during the summer period. The EB confirmed that it took place. The UC replied that, in the previous CM, before the summer period, the UC was aware that the intended decision-making was scheduled during the summer period, and the UC provided input before that, to be taken into consideration during the decision-making. However, there is no mention of the input in the documents received from the intended decision-making. In this regard, the UC urged the EB that, in the future, if the UC joins a decision-making process at an early stage, the points will be taken into account as well. The UC also suggests including a brief overview of the decision-making process in the cover letter of the tabled documents.

> The EB understands the issue and promised to deliver on it in future situations. The EB shared that the summer period might have impacted this process as well, but they agreed that the process could have been more transparent. Also, the EB reminded the UC that we agreed not to communicate during the summer period and to continue the process in the first cycle of the academic year. The UC recognized the preference of not working during the summer period, which is the reason why the UC conducted the preparation before the summer and expected a response to that input in the first cycle.

On another note, the EB shared their and the Deans' discontent with the process of the Bestuursakkoord and the communication from the Ministry. The EUR, alongside UNL, had been lobbying for more investments into younger universities due to the low flat fee and the skewed student-to-staff ratio. Although the lobby was successful, the EB is disappointed with this process.

Finally, the UC is looking forward to a smooth decision-making process in the upcoming cycle.

Action point: In the next cycle, the response to the letter that was sent by the UC in July will be incorporated in the documents.

02.02 Action plan studying with a functional impairment.
The UC would like to address the topics of capacity, money, and effectiveness. The following questions were asked at the CM.

- *To which faculties does the action plan studying with a functional impairment apply? Are faculties such as MC, ISS, and EUC included?*

According to the EB, all EUR schools are included in the action plan.

- *What personnel capacity will be (made) available to work on this action plan, what capacity is needed outside the SMF Team, and will the budget be allocated specifically for those activities? Have any of the target dates been adjusted due to staffing problems at RE&F?*

According to the EB, the SMF team consists of two recently hired employees responsible for the coordination, program management, and action plan. The decision to focus the attention on this direction came as a result of meetings with several students with impairments wherein the EB recognized the need to make EUR more inclusive as well as to induce a cultural change, especially among teaching staff. For example, when teachers experience a high workload in their regular teaching hours, they might refuse to respond to a request from a student dealing with impairments if they request extra facilities to aid in their study. The EB disagrees with this viewpoint and wishes to encourage the effort to be made for these cases, such as by requiring trainings of teachers.

The UC extended this answer, wishing to know the view of the EB considering the increased workload on the support facilities. For example, IT support is overwhelmed with the increase in demands from these cases; two full-time staff members are no longer doing their regular role tasks due to the high workload required to support the cases of functional impairment.

The EB understood the concerns of the UC regarding the increased workload of staff members. If, in the future, more issues arise, for example within the IT department, the EB will investigate the budget. However, the EB believes that changing the culture around dealing with functional impairments is important, such as that sometimes employees must arrange their work differently than before to accommodate for these changes.

- *The UC is aware of situations where students suffer from invisible disabilities, such as neurodivergence, and are not able to present physically on campus. The UC asks whether online education can be provided specifically for these cases, especially as some faculties are reluctant to agree.*

The EB explained that the decision to offer exemptions from physical education falls on the Vice Deans, and it is made case-by-case; considering this, the EB encourages the faculties to make arrangements for these situations. The EB urged the UC that, if the UC has anindication that the Vice-Deans and Deans generally decline to offer these arrangements, they would like to be informed so that it can be discussed in meetings with the Vice-Deans of Education. However, the EB remarked that education is, in

principle, offline, and giving special arrangements to some students sometimes creates the wish in other students who do not qualify for the exemption.

- *The UC sees to it that, when making the issue of accessibility visible, such as by creating policy, we start grasping the large number of students who need access to the policy implementation and to the respective resources. The UC believes that more workload increases will come out of this policy being implemented and shared its concerns that additional structural budget and personnel is needed to keep up with the expected demands. Also, the IT example showcases this issue, as there are no systematic rules in place and the additional workload is being distributed among the current employees.*

Until now, the EB has not received signals that more budget is required. However, they are currently in the process of creating the budget plans for the upcoming year and mapping out the financial priorities at EUR. The EB believes it possible that more funds will become available to SMF following the investigation if it shows to be necessary. Nonetheless, the EB maintained that it is more important to act in the classroom.

- *Are the needs of the disabled also considered in general when tendering?*

The EB tries to take the needs of the disabled into account when tendering. Also, an expert is hired to organize awareness and the necessary procedures in the tender in this regard.

- *To what extent are the study advisors trained in dealing with individuals with functional impairments? And to whom does the study advisor in question refer to, whenever the situation with an individual with an impairment is beyond their scope as a study advisor?*

The EB raised the issue of the visible accessibility of the buildings. Also, the EB remarked that they make IT tools training available to the teaching staff, yet no one joins these sessions despite there being complaints from the same staff that they are not prepared to deal with the IT challenges. The EB requested the opinion of the UC on this issue.

- *The UC remarked that the teaching staff is experiencing a constantly high workload and participating in the trainings is not compensated with teaching hours, for example. One suggestion was offering compensation for participation in the trainings. Another suggestion was to include the IT training in the onboarding period of new staff, during which typically the workload is not as high as in regular working periods.*

The EB recognizes that the issue of workload is important but could not offer an immediate solution to this issue. For example, the suggestion of exchanging teaching hours might increase the workload for colleagues. However, the Smarter Academic Year could be a solution to this problem.

- *The UC would like to raise awareness of invisible disabilities, such as neurodivergence, and would like to see more resources available to teaching staff dealing with these students, such as mandatory training as part of the BKO.*

The EB appreciated the concerns of the UC and the BKO suggestion.

02.03 Draft Policy Development Cycle
The UC addressed the EB with several questions on the safety, transparency, and quality of the draft policy development cycle.
- *The UC believes it is very important that the faculties will be monitored for how they implement the new Development cycle. How does the CvB intend to carry out this monitoring? What actions will it take if faculties do not fully adhere to the spirit of the new Development cycle?*

According to the EB, part of the implementation cycle includes a mandatory half-day training for managers on using the cycle. Guidelines and a toolbox will continue to be available after the training.

- *What intentions can you describe for the policies that still have to be drafted: separation promotion/remuneration and contract extension from the development cycle? It is unclear now what rights employees have in requesting these talks, shouldn't they be scheduled regularly? Also, the content of current regulations needs improvement regarding transparency.*

According to the EB, there are separate procedures, for example for promotions and training. Also, when an employee wishes to receive a promotion, the document can be used as a guideline. The HR department will create guidelines in line with the CAO regarding promotions.

- *The draft advice sees an important connection with the Recognition and Rewards program. As far as the UC knows, there has been a pilot of R &R at ESSB. What is the status of this pilot in terms of success and failure? Did any of the other faculties adopt R &R at all? So far, it seems that employees with a Ph.D. on precarious contracts or permanent contracts as a lecturer (with little or no research time) are excluded from the R&R. All these considerations lead us to question of how R&R will be connected to the Development Cycle.*

According to the EB, employees from R&R of ESSB are part of the project group that is working on this cycle, and they intend to include the conclusions of R&R in the cycle. Although there has not been an R&R profile for professors yet, it is an ongoing process during the 2023-2024 academic year and it is expected that, by next summer, all schools will have the R&R portfolios ready.

Also, R&R is a program aimed at diversifying career paths for academics, and it is not obvious to use this program in other areas of development. For example, a Ph.D. student does not have enough experience in academics to start developing their academic profile. Based on these considerations, the EB decided to exclude these populations, as it is too early in their careers to choose specific academic paths.
Also, it is allowed to switch one's profile when wished for.

- We see potential concerns with at least three issues regarding safety and a high-quality Development cycle: the training of managers (should be a condition), training of employees for how to write an effective narrative, 360 feedback (selection, procedures, form), and safety & transparency in the case of precarious contracts, and PhDs who should be informed about their rights.

The EB recognizes the concerns of the UC. Besides the training requirements, there will be information regarding taking the narrative during the implementation phase and there will be information on how to use it, and a toolbox will be available. Also, the project teams will work in close collaboration with the HR safety and strategy. The EB will consider our concerns and is looking forward to clear suggestions.

- *How does the new set-up relate to the new leadership profile?*

The EB is working on it and will make a program available to all managers. The EB believes that the leadership profile emphasizes collaboration and development, and it is a means of getting more meaningful conversations about work. Therefore, this will be used in developing the cycle.

- *How does the cycle relate to team and organizational performance, seeing as it is mainly focused on individual performance?*

The EB agreed with the remark of the UC but shared that it would be difficult to integrate in a team setting.

- *The UC suggested that the manager assessment should be replaced by a committee.*

The EB disagreed, believing that managers have developed leadership skills that are necessary for making such assessments.

02.04 Policy framework for events (with external speakers)

The UC shared several questions with the EB about the policy framework for events.

- How was the situation before this policy? What guidelines were followed when inviting external speakers?

According to the EB, prior there was no policy specifically for this purpose, but there was a policy on general safety which was too general to be useful for this specific situation and, as a result, they were constantly improvising. Also, prior there was little awareness of risk assessment regarding certain events.

The EB is aware that, if the policy is ignored, the same problems will continue to arise. Also, the protocol will not fit all the situations, being more helpful in some and not in others. However, the EB believes that having a protocol in place is more helpful to make a proper assessment of such situations. Adding to that, the best way to ensure that the protocol functions are to be retrospectively answerable to decisions made through the protocol and to develop a basis on which decisions are taken.

- *To the question of why the document will not be fully published, the policymaker responded that the framework specifies safety and security measures that the EUR can take when conducting an event. This is part of the security protocol which is confidential. However, the UC has the right of information, also considering confidential information. Why is this information not shared with the UC?*

The EB wishes to mitigate the risks, and thus not all frameworks can be made public.

- *Who decides what's controversial?*

The EB believes this term is context and time-dependent, for example, 10 years ago, the Shell CEO would not have been considered as controversial as he is today. Some elements the EB considers are divisive, fuelling strong and opposing reactions in different communities, leading to risks such as reputational or regarding safety and security. Also, the EB is responsible for ensuring that these issues are dealt with.

Furthermore, the EB sees the University as a platform for debate, but only regarding matters of an academic nature. In this sense, the EB remarked on the difference between freedom of speech and academic freedom. They believe that the EUR should sustain discussions from the perspective of academic freedom, where matters are debated from all viewpoints, and not as a platform for freedom of speech, where potential non-academic based opinions are to be shared..

- *How does the EB plan to manage situations where protesters are involved, and how will the protesters be handled?*

The EB strives to create a balance and thinks it is difficult to give criteria for handling this in the absence of concrete situations. In this regard, if there is a concrete case, the way it will have been handled will be evaluated and used as a learning experience for the future.

- *Do other universities have such a protocol?*

The EB will investigate whether other universities also have such protocols. They shared already that other campuses struggle with polarization, and there are discussions on the misuse of the term "academic freedom". Nonetheless, EUR is a research university, and the EB sees the need to have a protocol for making conscious, deliberate decisions, which replaces ad-hoc decision making which they consider undesirable.

- *Can it be used as censorship?*

The EB wishes to strongly contest the protocol as a form of censorship, considering it to be used in the opposite sense of that, as a way of making informed and the right decisions, while considering as many variables as possible, such as money, security codes, etc.

- *The protocol describes refusing guest speakers on the reason of religious beliefs, how will that affect the religious student associations?*

According to the EB, EUR is a secular organization, neutral to all religions and as such, everyone has the freedom to exercise their own religion. Open discussions about religious values with different viewpoints and in an academic setting could be supported. However, the EB wishes to avoid using the university as a platform for teaching religious beliefs, as it would take away from this impartiality.

- *How do academic freedom and positive societal impact combine within this policy?*

The EB states that one can continue having an academic debate as it relates to societal issues, wherein multiple points of view come together to the right decision. In that sense, the rules of conducting an academic debate have to be followed, such as bringing logical viewpoints from different angles together and not having an ideological debate.

- *Does the EB see the possibility of misusing the policy as a censorship tool?*

The EB wishes to refine the policy regularly to maintain academic freedom and learn from new developments that may come up.

Finally, the EB has understood the UC's concerns and points of attention and they will be considered. The EB will consider extending the policy with an evaluation protocol that would make it possible for the UC and others to know of their decisions and form an opinion about them. The EB proposed the idea of forming a sounding board, where 1 or 2 UC members can join and discuss specific cases in a confidential, small-scale meeting. The EB encouraged the UC to share their concerns in a letter, and they will ensure it will be responded to. In that regard, the UC remarked that UC has the right to information on this topic and the informal letter of advice might take longer than the regular cycle.

Action point: The UC will draft a letter of informal advice summarising the concerns regarding the *Policy framework for events (with external speakers).*

02.05 Mindlab – HR Awareness campaign social safety 2023/2024
Several questions from the UC were raised.
- *How will the EB actively stimulate the Deans that the teams will visit Mindlab?*

According to the EB, Human Resources staff have informed all Faculty Councils of the Mindlab, and several ambassadors were trained to help share the information.
- *What is the capacity of the Mindlab?*

The EB expects ca. 2600 employees (70%) of the staff. The Mindlab will take place in the Pavilion and they expect to have as full of a theatre as possible.
- *Will the Mindlab take place at other EUR locations?*

The EB has been in contact with the Human Resource Business Partner at ISS to possibly arrange it there. However, according to the ISS UC member, the HRBP was not aware of this information. The EB will look into this issue.

Action points: The EB will contact the ISS HRBP to arrange the Mindlab at the ISS location.

04 Any Other Business
04.01 Ties with the fossil fuel industry
The UC will take part in the meeting on the 17th of October regarding the ties with the fossil fuel industry. Other than that, some questions were addressed.

- *What is the status of the Industrial Engagement Monitor?*

According to the EB, the results are ready, and the monitor will be launched this upcoming Friday. In more detail, there are almost 62,000 financial contracts with different industries, but only 33 of those are related to the fossil fuel industry, and another small number are related to the green industry. There are still investigations into the financial side of these engagements. The EB expects to use the results of the monitor during the upcoming dialogues.

- *How are the dialogues with DIT going?*

The EB has been in contact with the DIT employees and the first session is planned for the upcoming Tuesday. The UC is welcome to join the meeting.

- *How are the dialogues with other NL universities progressing?*

The EB will join the Unlimited festival organized by UNL, where they will co-organize a session with the directors from UvA and TUDelft touching on this subject. The EB believes that the aims of these universities are the same as EUR's, but the process looks different. The EB will share information about the approach at EUR, such as the dialogues being organized.

The UC shared that we will soon reach out to other university councils to discuss this topic.

- *Is the Holding included in the research that has been conducted?*

The monitoring concerned the public domain of EUR, and the Holding was taken into account in some situations, which will be highlighted in the document.

Action points: the Industry Engagement Monitor will be discussed in the upcoming dialogues.

04.02 HOVO

The UC would like to know what the current status of lifelong learning is at EUR, in particular, if there are any plans to offer courses aimed at elderly citizens.

The EB replied that EUR is developing a new life-long learning portfolio (LLO) with the aim of offering a more flexible approach to learning and development besides the traditional BA and MSc paths. Importantly, LLO is aimed at the entire adult population, and not only the elderly. The EB will check the timeline estimates and inform the UC.

Action points: The EB will share the timeline information for the life-long learning portfolio with the UC.

04.03 New employee card

It came to the attention of the UC that new employee cards that require a picture will be introduced. The UC presented several concerns. Firstly, the UC was not consulted, despite having the right of advice under the proper course of affairs regarding privacy. Secondly, the UC is concerned about the privacy issues of employees.

According to the EB, security investigations were conducted, and it became clear that the campus security should be improved. One of the measures to improve the security standards was the introduction of an employee card with an ID on it. The investigation is still in the pilot phase, but if the policy is rolled out, the UC will be informed. As soon as the pilot is finished, the full procedure will begin.

Regarding this, the UC notified the EB that new cards are already in use, as evidenced by a member of the council whose card is in use. The EB took the remark into account and will use the information provided in the meeting to investigate the issue.

Action point: The EB will investigate the issue regarding employee cards being printed with an identification picture.

04.04 Any Other Business

- Regulations for external speakers – the UC remarked that basing regulations on the Erasmian Values might not prove to be a concrete regulation plan, as values taken out of context can lead to different interpretations. The EB agreed that general values do not help make concrete moral decisions; for example, under the value of entrepreneurship, it could mean that all CEOs are welcome on campus despite their industries or viewpoints.
- Permanent contracts – the UC would like to know whether the temporary nature of the Ph.D. contracts will be changed soon. The EB does not plan on this soon.
- Party funding – the UC remarked that parties don't have structural funding yet and we are working on a proposal for the long term. However, we asked whether we could find an informal way to get funding allocated to the parties. The EB will check the matter with CPC and request them to contract the UC.

Action point: the EB will ask CPC to contact the UC regarding informal funding for parties.