

**University Council
First Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam**

Date and Time: 21/11/2023, 14:00 – 16:00

Location: T3-29

Present in the Meeting: **Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair)**, Ernst Hulst, Sebastiaan Kamp, Pedro van Gessel, Joseph Ayinla, Albert Wagelmans, Timo Zandvliet, Cagla Altin, Yasin Demir, Nawin Ramcharan, Rami Elorabi, Aki Negate, Linqendo van der Klooster, Rami Elorabi, Aki Negate, Emre Ulusoy, Linda Dekker, Emese von Bone, Aleid Fokkema, Tom van Dijken, Achraf Taouil, Anthony van der Linden, Wesley Hennep, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Ellie Cercel (Minutes).

Absent: Katarzyna Lasak, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen, Natascha Kraal, Max Wagenaar.

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

- Proposal Creating an environment where student associations flourish.

A topic proposal was shared for this new cycle. However, the presidium agreed that the proposal would be tabled during the next cycle since this cycle already contains a lot of topics.

01.02 Minutes third plenary meeting

The minutes and action points of the previous meeting were set.

1.03 Announcements

- *Vacation Clerk*

From November 23 until December 8, the Clerk will be enjoying her vacation. The previous Clerk (Lobke van Steenberg) will join the Second Plenary meeting on December 5. The handling of technical questions to the policymakers will be done by Ellie. Please also let Ellie know in case you would like to invite a policymaker to the Second Plenary meeting.

- *Chairs Meeting*

On November 14th, the Chairs meeting took place. The chairs and secretaries from the faculty councils, program committees, and ELC were invited. The main discussed points were the following:

- At a central level, faculty level, and decentral level, the same issues are experienced regarding the loss of knowledge. It's not always easy to find policies or regulations we need. It would therefore be good if the UC could work more closely with the faculties. More outcomes will be discussed within the policy TF.
- ELC emphasized that they can help with labour conflicts and labour agreements and asked the faculty council and UC to reach out to them in case there are any questions or issues regarding this.
- The service councils mentioned that they deal with a lot of topics concerning employees. However, the handling of these concerns has to go through the UC. The process is not very efficient. It is therefore good to also reach out to service councils when discussing these kinds of topics within the UC.
- The group discussed the financial situation within EUR. The idea was raised to include the faculty councils in the discussion of the list with "possible cutbacks" that was shared by the EB.
- Under AOB, the limited room availability during exams and the new employee card (with a picture) were discussed. It was mentioned that these topics will be picked up further by the UC.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Financial semi-annual report Investment program – Confidential

The members of the UC experienced technical issues when accessing the documents in the mymeeting environment. Thus, the UC Clerk will share them on Teams. The UC members will review the documentation and discuss their remarks in the Teams environment.

Action points: the UC Clerk will share the documentation on *the Financial semi-annual report Investment program* in Teams. The members of the UC will share their remarks in Teams. If there are remarks the topic will be discussed during the second plenary.

02.02 Budgets HeQa Programs

There are four teams within the HeQa investments: Erasmus X, Impact at the Core, Student Wellbeing, and CLI. The HeQa TF members have been in close contact with the HeQa policymakers and project managers in discussing the budget plans for the upcoming year. As the HeQa funding is ending in 2024, this is the final point to consent. The HeQa TF members shared several remarks with the policymakers, and some are yet to be answered; also, there is some discussion with the TF whether or not, or to what extent we can move towards approval of the budget, as some areas still have to be clarified before we can agree to the budget request. These remarks were also shared with the UC.

- *Erasmus X*. The TF members inquired about the budget reservation of 59.000 euros for the upcoming year on the online virtual campus (divided into 5 subprojects) as it appeared to us that the projects have already been finished. Furthermore, it is unclear what the funding reserved for research and D&I is aimed at, and whether it is justified in the context of quality agreements.
- *CLI*. The previous UC did not approve the CLI budget request for the online education project; as a result, the CLI project managers have been in close contact with the TF members, and a comprehensive overview of the project and its impact on current students was offered. Furthermore, the current TF was critical of the fellowship project, with some concerns being the predicted financial deficit and the lack of rigorous outcome measurements. Also, it is unclear whether the impact of this project is justified in the context of quality agreements for students.
- *Impact at the Core*. The TF reviewed the budget and was satisfied with one remark; the salary reservation for the project manager appears differently in two tables in the document.
- *Wellbeing*. The TF reviewed the budget and was satisfied with it.

The members of the UC were asked to share their questions regarding the HeQa budgets in Teams before Monday 27th November. The members of the TF will share their questions with the policymakers and inform the Clerk if the policymakers should be invited to the second plenary meeting.

Action point: the members of the UC will share their remarks on the HeQa budget requests in Teams before Monday 27th of November. The members of the TF will inform the Clerk to invite the HeQa policymakers.

02.03 EUR Meerjarenplan 2024-2027

The EUR Meerjarenplan 2024-2027 was shared with the UC; the TF Finance members discussed the contents of the request before the first plenary meeting. A meeting with the CPC policymakers is

scheduled for next week, during which the remarks of the UC will be addressed. Thus, the Finance TF members kindly request the members of the UC to review the documentation and share their input via teams before Monday, 27th of November, in preparation for the meeting with the policymakers.

Some remarks were made in the meeting. For instance, the Meerjarenplan includes the proposal for the vegan campus, however, some members of the UC are critical of this proposal and suggested including this remark as part of the final advice to the agenda point. Also, the members of the UC discussed whether the agenda point should be treated only as a financial document or should also be interpreted from a strategic perspective. Specifically, some councillors shared that the strategy onto which the finances are laid is not entirely in agreement with their current views. However, the majority of the councillors agreed that the strategy has already been approved by previous UCs and do not believe that differences in the current opinion should be addressed within the context of this document as it serves a financial, not strategic, function. Thus, the strategic components can be tackled either within the Strategy TF with separate proposals or they can be included in the consent letter as points of advice.

In conclusion, the TF Finance members will resume their efforts on this agenda point, and the UC members will share their remarks, on strategy or otherwise, in Teams, by Monday, 27th November. Depending on this, a discussion can be tabled at the Second Plenary meeting, in preparation for the CM.

Action points: TF Finance will tackle the agenda point *EUR Meerjarenplan 2024-2027*. The UC members will share their remarks with the TF Finance in Teams before Monday, 27th November.

02.04 Order Regulations for EUR Buildings, Grounds and Facilities 2024

Based on the experiences of the past three years, the EUR Buildings, Grounds, and Facilities Order Regulations have been amended to better align with practice and case law in the hope of achieving even more effective and applicable regulations for the organization. Some of the topics that could be tackled under this proposal are the regulation on employee passes and manifestations on campus. Furthermore, a protocol specific to manifestations was developed by TU Eindhoven and was shared with the UC as it can serve as inspiration.

A TF consisting of councillors Nawin (Lead), Wesley, Sebastiaan, Aki, and Aleid was formed to tackle this agenda point.

02.05 NVAO-application for accreditation ('Toets Nieuwe Opleiding') E-Master

The discussion on the topic is tabled at the second plenary meeting.

Action point: the Clerk will table the agenda topic *NVAO-application for accreditation ('Toets Nieuwe Opleiding') E-Master* at the second plenary meeting.

02.06 Compensation student members participation

Recently, there have been discussions between OCW, UNL, and student organizations (ISO and LSVb) to create a standardized compensation framework for student members of participatory bodies. A TF was formed comprising councillors Yasin (TF Lead), Cagla, Linqendo, Aleid, and Rami. Some remarks were made in the meeting.

Firstly, there was dissatisfaction that staff compensation was not yet considered in this proposal, as the arguments in favour of student compensation hold for staff compensation as well. Secondly, several councillors disagreed with the decentralized faculty compensation policy which allows faculties to determine the additional compensation they offer to students and strived for a more equal approach between faculties to ensure compensation fairness. Furthermore, an EMC council member remarked that the compensation amount for EMC participatory students that is indicated in the document is inaccurate and requested the TF to investigate this further. Thirdly, the UC advised the TF members to take CAO regulations and the inflation rate into account when advising on the policy.

Action point: the TF *Compensation student members participation* will review the policy documents and tackle the remarks of the UC. The UC Clerk will table the topic at the Second Plenary Meeting.

02.07 Erasmus MC Bachelor of Medicine Selection Regulations 2024-2025

In June 2023, the previous UC provided positive advice on the method of selection for medical education. In the current cycle, advice is requested for the regulation policy specific to the medicine study to clarify the previous decision. Several remarks were shared in the meeting.

Firstly, councillors remarked that article 11.1 requires more clarity on when the yet unknown selection date will be determined. Secondly, several councillors shared dissatisfaction with the lack of input from the FC as per common procedure, as it allows for a better-rounded understanding of the needs of the students. This is due to the agenda item being tabled simultaneously for both participatory bodies. The UC discussed options for receiving input from the FC, such as requesting advice informally or postponing the agenda point until the next cycle. One UC member argued for prioritizing swiftness, to give upcoming students better clarity in the application process; however, several UC members argued for prioritizing the quality of information when offering advice, which is currently lacking. Also, the upcoming students should be sufficiently informed outside this policy document. Ultimately the UC requested the Chair to postpone the discussion until the next cycle; this request will be further discussed in the Presidium meetings.

A Task Force consisting of councillors Yasin (TF Lead), Linqendo, Achraf, and Albert was formed to tackle this agenda point, however, it will be discussed in the Presidium when the agenda point will be tabled, depending on whether time pressure exists to discuss the topic this cycle.

Action point: The Presidium will decide when the agenda point *Erasmus MC Bachelor of Medicine Selection Regulations 2024-2025* will be tabled. The policymakers will be informed of the decision of the Presidium.

02.08 Code of conduct for elections Erasmus

Due to previous UC election issues involving violations of the Code of Conduct, the Central Elections Office shared a revised version of the Code of Conduct with the members of the UC. Several remarks were shared in the meeting.

Firstly, several UC members shared that the changes do not sufficiently cover the issues that arose in the past. For instance, article 7.3 does not appropriately mention the consequences of trespassing the rules. Several councillors requested that sanctions be more clearly stated. However, there was disagreement in the UC on this request, as there can be unwanted consequences from an increase in sanctions and disagreed with weaponizing this specific

document. Also, it was argued that it is not possible to correctly assess what influenced the elections last year because of the anonymized nature of the voting data. A councillor disagreed with this statement, suggesting that overlapping the time stamps of the specific events with the voting data could provide some indication of the influences the event had. Thirdly, regarding article 2.7, it was criticized that the layout of the voting system was confusing to some voters, and a request was made to improve its ease of access for future elections.

Finally, a TF consisting of councillors Joseph (TF Lead), Nawin, Timo, Sebastiaan, Emre, Cagla, Tom, and Achraf was formed. The TF will tackle the agenda point and the remarks shared by the UC in collaboration with the Elections Office.

Action point: the TF *Code of Conduct for Elections* will tackle the agenda point.

02.09 EUR campaign budget rules for the student elections of the University Council 2024

The policy will determine a new way of subsidizing student campaigns. The UC discussed whether the topic should be handled within the TF Professionalization of the Party Systems or separate from it. It was remarked that the topics do not fully align and therefore should be kept separate. A TF was formed consisting of councillors Timo (TF Lead), Rami, Nawin, Joseph, Emre, Cagla, Wesley, Achraf, and Aki. Also, a disagreement occurred during the meeting regarding the way the campaign subsidy process occurred in the past. It was agreed that the TF will look at this document and other action points related to this agenda point.

In addition to the discussion on the previous agenda point, the Chair of the UC made several critical observations regarding the conduct of councillors during plenary discussions, in general. Several council members showed undesirable behaviour during the discussion of this agenda item. Therefore, the chair called for an immediate stop to such behaviour to uphold the professionalism and psychological safety standards within council meetings.

2.10 Highlights reports – August 2023

Due to time limitations, the discussion on this topic is postponed to the second plenary meeting. Some brief remarks shared in the meeting were regarding the financial deficits within Erasmus School of Law and Rotterdam School of Management, as well as whether the influx of students can be regulated to avoid further costs caused by insufficient staff capacities.

Action point: the topic *Highlight reports – August 2023* is tabled for the second plenary meeting.

03 Incoming documents

There were no incoming documents.

04 Any other business

04.01 Overview of attendance and taskforces

The UC members are asked to review the attendance and task force overviews to decide if any changes are required.

On the 10th of October (media training), councillors Anthony and Tom were marked as absent, despite having been present at the activity. The councillors kindly asked the UC Clerk to modify the log.

Also, in the task force overview, two different columns (“TF Policy” and “EUR Policies”) refer to the same task force; the Clerk was asked to remove the overlap.

04.02 Any Other Business

- Selection process UC agenda topics. A councillor inquired about the process of handling e-mails that the UC receives on the general e-mail. It was explained that all topics that are forwarded to the UC are required to have some involvement with our participatory rights. If the UC has no say in the matter the e-mail is answered, and the person is forwarded to the right place. In instances when it is not clear how to handle an e-mail, this is discussed with the Presidium. This is because in the past councillors received an overwhelming number of e-mails from the secretariat.
- Food on campus. A TF was formed in the previous cycle to tackle this topic. However, it was not tabled yet due to the high workload expected this cycle.