

University Council
First Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 18-11-2025, 14:00-16:00

Location: Langeveld 3.02

Present in the meeting: Luca Hellings (Chair), Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Dogukan Demirbuken, Albert Wagelmans, John Hays, Anne Vromant (Student-assistant), Rik Alleleijn, Linda Dekker, Clara Eggers, Bilal El Allouchi, Federica Violi, Max Wagenaar, Sebastiaan Kamp, Mohamed Khalil, Caressa Bol, Lourdes Wansink Mangiano, Bodi Winkler, Simon Maas, Deniz Alican, Hans van Oosterhout, Joseph Ayinla, Jaap Cornelese, Manuela Bartolovic, Max Wagenaar, Borja, Ranzinger, Rosita Boedhai, Albert Wagelmans, Wesley Hennep, Clara Egger, Iwona Gusc, Deniz Alican, Borja Ranzinger

01 Opening plenary meeting UC

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The Chair announced that two initiatives were not placed on the agenda this cycle because it was too full. There were no further remarks.

01.02 Setting of the minutes of the previous meeting

There were no remarks on the previous minutes, therefore the minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

Absence Clerk

The Clerk is absent today.

Absence Student-Assistant

Floortje is still absent due to injury; therefore, the meeting will be recorded.

Oberon survey

All UC members received an email from Oberon. Oberon is a research company that conducts the bi-annual monitor of participatory bodies. UC members will receive a questionnaire, and the Chair encouraged everyone to complete it.

NVAO Panel

It has been decided which UC members will participate in the NVAO panel.

Poffertjeskraam

A UC member remarked that they really enjoyed the poffertjeskraam yesterday and asked whether it would be possible to organize something similar during the election period. The Chair complimented the organization of the poffertjeskraam and remarked that organizing something similar would likely be possible.

02 Agenda items

02.01 Rules of Procedure UC

The Chair gave some context regarding this point and noted that the rules were revised due to HoKa being taken out and that Legal had reviewed them. These rules of procedure are up for consent. A UC member remarked that they had some technical questions regarding the document and would like to take a look at it. Another UC member asked whether this point is up for consent by the EB. The Chair clarified that this is not the case, as these are the rules of procedure for the UC themselves. A taskforce will be formed to look into this topic.

- Taskforce Rules of Procedure UC
Mohamed, Hans, Clara, Dogukan, Federica (lead), Simon, Manuela

02.02 Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) – Closed meeting

This topic was discussed in a Closed meeting.

The Chair explained that this topic is closed due to camera placement being sensitive. The UC has the right of consent on the placement of cameras. The policy makers are working on a more elaborate policy framework surrounding this topic, but for now the placement of cameras is solely up for consent. A member from the cybersecurity taskforce remarked that they were in contact with the policy makers and that the UC will be receiving the policy in the next few weeks. The UC member will let everyone know when the policy is sent to the taskforce. A member asked why the camera placement is being changed now and wondered whether it is necessary. Another member remarked that the policy makers will not share the exact locations of the cameras, but they did share the blind spots in the document. The exact locations will not be shared due to safety reasons. The security taskforce will look into this topic. The following members will join the taskforce for this topic: Lourdes, Wesley, Mohamed.

02.03 EUR Meerjarenpian 2026–2030

The Chair remarked that the UC has the right of consent on the main points of the budget. A UC member from the finance taskforce noted that the taskforce has held meetings with the policymakers in preparation for this. The taskforce received an updated version of the document that has not yet been shared with the rest of the UC, and the taskforce members will review this updated version. A meeting with the policymakers will also take place next week. The UC member asked other members to send in their questions before Thursday.

The Chair added that the EB will decide on the final version of the document today, after which it will be shared with the UC. A member asked what type of questions would be appropriate. The taskforce member responded that members are free to ask any questions. The finance taskforce will continue to look into the document.

Another member asked how non-English-speaking members can comment on the document, as it is currently in Dutch. The Chair responded that an English version will be available tomorrow. A member then commented that this leaves only one day to read a 60-page document. The Chair acknowledged this as a good point and said it will be taken into account for next year. The English version will be made available as soon as possible.

02.04 EUR Institutional Policy on Quality Assurance in Education 2025–2029

There were no remarks, and this topic will be assigned to the ITK taskforce.

02.05 Assessment Vision / Assessment Framework

There were no remarks. A taskforce was formed to look into this topic.

- Taskforce Assessment Vision / Assessment Framework
Iwona, Bilal, Joseph, Mohamed, Rik (lead)

02.06 Multi-year Budget Proposal Administrative Agreement Funds (Bestuursakkoordmiddelen/BAO)

A UC member from the taskforce remarked that they have been in regular contact with the policy makers and are providing comments on the budgets and the multiyear plan. The

member encouraged others who have comments to send them to the taskforce so these can be forwarded to the policy makers. This topic will be assigned to the BAO taskforce.

02.07 Draft 10-pager ITK

The Chair remarked that this document is confidential because it will later be shared with the NVAO and the NVAO panel. There were no remarks, and this topic will be assigned to the ITK taskforce.

02.08 PhD Seat University Council

The Chair remarked that last year, when the UC decided on the election regulations, the UC gave advice that they would like a PhD seat in the UC council. The EB has now shared feedback on this proposal. The UC can form its opinion on this feedback and decide whether to move forward with the PhD seat proposal. A UC member remarked that they do not remember there being consent last year on this proposal. The Chair clarified that in the consent letter on the KRUR, it was included that the UC would like to see a PhD seat. Consent was therefore given to the KRUR, but not to the PhD seat itself, which was only a suggestion.

A member explained that the proposal was made because PhD students are a vulnerable group that is not included in the formal participatory body. Another member asked what prevents PhD students from standing for election to the UC. It was answered that they are allowed to do so, but it is difficult due to their smaller networks and limited time to participate. Another member remarked that the issue should be addressed by making it easier for PhD students to join, rather than creating a separate seat for them, as there are many underrepresented groups and an extra seat cannot be created for everyone. A taskforce was formed to look further into this topic.

- Taskforce PhD Seat University Council

Joseph, Wesley, Bodi, Federica, Mohamed, Linda, Borja, Clara, Sebastiaan, Max (lead)

02.09 Financial semi annual report

The Chair remarked that this point is for information. A UC member suggested that it would be good to discuss this within the Tomorrow's Campus taskforce. The topic will be assigned to Tomorrow's Campus, and Joseph will join this taskforce.

02.10 Mechanisms/Options for students and staff from Gaza to work/study at EUR

A member from the taskforce remarked that they have received answers to the first few questions but are still waiting for the rest. The member asked when the remaining answers are expected. The Chair responded that they will receive them within this cycle.

02.11 Policies on undesirable behavior, breaches of academic integrity and code of conduct

A member from the taskforce remarked that they had a meeting with the policy maker last week. Some uncertainties remain, such as whether this code of conduct will be included in employment contracts. The taskforce also discussed the gathering of feedback, which varied significantly across different faculties and was not streamlined. Some questions have not yet been answered because the responsible policy maker is on holiday. Another member added that the policy makers aim to raise awareness among managers about this code of conduct, and they are currently considering how best to do so.

03 Incoming documents

04 Any other business

04.01 Overview of attendance and taskforces

A member remarked that their name was not included in the Tomorrow's Campus document. The Chair noted that they can adjust this themselves in the document. Another member remarked that they were marked as absent on November 4th, even though they were present. This will be corrected.

Action point:

- The Clerk will rectify the overview of attendance and taskforces

04.02 Any other AOB

Timeframe for answers to personal questions

A member asked how long it takes for the EB to respond to personal questions. The Chair replied that this typically takes 4 to 6 weeks.

Article NRC Handelsblad

A UC member remarked that an article appeared in NRC about an Israeli speaker who was disinvited from Erasmus University. The speaker had been critical of Israel, and the UC member wondered why they were disinvited. A member clarified that the university did not disinvite the speaker. As it was done by an individual, so there was no institutional involvement. Another member noted that it is important to clarify whether someone can act as an individual, as they could be perceived as representing EUR. The member also suggested that Erasmus University should issue a response to prevent misunderstandings.

The Chair remarked that this could be discussed during the next plenary meeting. Another member commented that they cannot participate in this discussion due to a conflict of interest. A UC member expressed interest in confidentially discussing the topic with the researchers themselves. The Chair responded that this is a sensitive issue and should be addressed by the EB. Finally, a UC member added that individual topics should not be discussed by the UC, and the focus should only be on potential reputation damage to EUR. The Chair noted that UC members can discuss how to formulate this topic for the EB.

05 Closing