

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

Date and Time: 21-01-2025, 14:00-17:00

Location: Polak 3-18

Present in the meeting: Luca Hellings (chair), Hugo Speelman, Sebastiaan Kamp, Linda Dekker, Emese von Bone, Achraf Touil, Jaap Cornelese, Albert Wagelmans, Ernst Hulst, Nawin Ramcharan, Aleid Fokkema, Katarzyna Lasak, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Floortje Dekker (Minutes). Esra Kahramanoglu, Timo Zandvliet, Deniz Alican, Reinier van Woerd, Daan de Boer, Sara Ouljour, Bachar Farousi, Federica Violi

Absent: Luna Becirspahic, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

The Chair remarked that there was a misconception around agenda point 2.02 which is up for consent. However, the order of the agenda will remain the same for now. There were no further remarks.

Setting of the previous minutes and Third Plenary Meeting minutes

There were no remarks regarding the minutes of the third plenary session. However, a correction is needed for the minutes of the second plenary session. It currently notes that a UC member has left the council while also stating that the member is absent. This should be corrected.

Action point:

- The Clerk will correct the minutes of the third plenary

01.02 Announcements

UC member last meeting

Emese announced that this would be her final UC plenary meeting and introduced her replacement, Federica.

Update planetary health diet

A UC member gave a report on a meeting regarding planetary health diet. Concerns were raised by stakeholders during the meeting had not previously been discussed in the UC. They expressed a desire to address these concerns in the upcoming consultation meeting.

Attendance media channel

A UC member remarked that it was planned for a media channel to be present at today's meeting. However, it was ultimately decided that their presence would not be permitted. They would like to discuss this in AOB.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Central crisis plan EUR – Closed meeting

The Central crisis plan EUR was discussed.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the question regarding '*Central crisis plan EUR*' to the EB

02.02 Reorganisation regulations EUR – Closed meeting

The Reorganisation regulations EUR were discussed.

02.03 Decision on closing of buildings Campus Woudestein (Building FGQ, V and N)

There is a meeting planned next Tuesday as there were no other opportunities to meet before. There are no questions for the EB. An update will be given in the third plenary meeting.

02.04 Results E&E scan 2024

The taskforce met last week to discuss this topic. They decided to send a set of technical questions, to which they received elaborate responses. These responses led to follow-up questions from the taskforce. One of the questions was about an area that was not measured—the experience of bureaucracy. The taskforce believes it is important to measure the experience of bureaucracy and how it affects employee stress. Therefore, they would like to ask the EB about this. Secondly, they would like to ask about the response rate of 49% and how the EB intends to increase it. A UC member remarked that employees often do not have enough time to complete questionnaires and are not compensated for doing so. They would like to ask the EB how they plan to encourage a higher response rate under these circumstances. A third question concerns why the EB asks questions about managers, as the responses are almost always neutral. Finally, another UC member would like to ask why topics such as worldview and religiousness were not included in the E&E scan. The Chair asked if there were any additional questions the taskforce wanted to raise. As there were none, it was decided that these four questions will be sent to the EB and discussed during the consultation meeting.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the questions regarding '*Results E&E scan 2024*' to the EB

02.05 Promote and support for student parties

The TF lead gave an update, explaining that an issue with teams prevented the newer questions from being sent. As a result, the technical questions were not submitted in time for the policymakers to provide answers. The Chair asked whether it would be realistic to complete the initiative during this cycle. A UC member from the taskforce believed it was possible to receive answers this cycle and finish the initiative but noted they had no questions for the EB at this time. However, another UC member from the taskforce expressed a desire to ask some of the technical questions to the EB. Another UC member disagreed, arguing that the questions were already included in the technical questions that were sent too late. On the other hand, another UC member stated that some of the questions are politically charged, making it unlikely that the policymakers would answer them. They suggested these questions should instead be addressed to the EB. A UC member commented that there was no need to finish the initiative in this cycle. They suggested the taskforce take more time and ask the EB questions in the next cycle after receiving answers from the policymakers. Another UC member questioned the taskforce's overall goal, arguing that the taskforce should focus on creating a concrete proposal rather than asking for the

EB's stance. In response, a UC member emphasized that considering the changes within the university, it is important to ask for the EB's stance now and take it into account when developing a proposal. Ultimately, the UC members agreed on asking the following questions to the EB:

- What is the university's vision regarding the professionalisation of student parties, if there is any?
- To what extent does the university believe it is responsible for the professionalisation of student parties?
- What role does the university believe it can play in the professionalisation of student parties?
- What types of resources could the university potentially consider providing to support the professionalisation of student parties, such as financial assistance, policy support, or visibility on EUR communication channels?
- What is the university's stance on using the leftover funds from the campaign subsidy allocated for the last University Council elections to support student parties throughout the year?

A UC member questioned why the taskforce does not simply develop an initiative and present it directly to the EB. In response, another UC member explained that a similar discussion had occurred last year, and no agreement was reached. They emphasized the importance of consulting the EB first before forming proposals. Another UC member suggested avoiding lengthy discussions about the EB's answers during the consultation meeting. A UC member agreed except for question 5, since this is a concrete proposal. The UC member agreed with this approach.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the questions regarding '*Promote and support for student parties*' to the EB

02.06 Ius promovendi

The UC member leading the taskforce commented that some technical questions had been sent to the policymakers, but they had not yet been answered. Therefore, there is nothing to discuss with the EB at this time

02.07 Initiative for a flag protocol: promoting unity and shared values within the university community

The taskforce had a meeting last week. A UC member in the taskforce commented that members expressed differing views on the initiative during this meeting. One taskforce member commented that the group could not reach an agreement on the technical questions to send to the policy makers. However, some questions were still sent. The Chair remarked that they would request the policymakers not to respond to the technical questions that were sent, as there was no consensus on them. Another taskforce member proposed asking the EB a question, but this sparked further discussion. A UC member suggested that the taskforce should first meet again to reach an agreement before proceeding. However, another UC member expressed a preference to avoid delays, arguing that there was no harm in asking the questions to the EB now. Another UC member reminded all the UC members of the established procedure, which requires questions to be addressed to the policymakers first before asking questions to the EB. They reiterated that this initiative should be extended to allow the taskforce more time to follow the proper procedure. In the end, the UC agreed to ask the EB the following question: *How does the EB make choices about which flags are being raised?*

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the question regarding '*Initiative for a flag protocol: promoting unity and shared values within the university community*' to the EB

02.08 20 week minors at EUR

A UC member in the taskforce commented that within the taskforce it was discussed whether they have any technical questions. It was concluded that there were no technical questions and the taskforce is already in direct contact with the policymakers. Additionally, there are no questions for the EB. However, another taskforce member suggested asking the EB a brief question to inform them that the taskforce is working on this and to ask the EB about how to strategically align the faculty councils.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the question regarding '20 week minors at EUR' to the EB

02.09 Preparation Consultation meeting (28 January)

Request for Update on Academic Freedom Survey

The EB said they might include academic freedom in a survey. A UC member remarked they would like an update on this.

Planetary health diet

A UC member commented that several concerns were raised in a recent meeting regarding this topic. Particularly financial concerns. For example, Spar has indicated it may consider leaving if the plan is implemented, as it would become too costly. During the discussion, a UC member asked whether Spar would even be affected, and it was clarified that this would happen upon the renewal of the contract. Some members suggested the topic could be addressed in the next cycle, while others believed it would be beneficial to ask preliminary questions now. The Chair concluded that it would be better to discuss this topic in the next cycle, so no questions will be asked at this time.

Collaboration Bangladeshi universities

A UC member sent personal questions to the EB about the collaboration with Bangladeshi universities but has not received a response. Another UC member noted that since these were personal questions, follow-ups should also be pursued individually. Other UC members emphasized the importance of adhering to proper procedures and conducting thorough research before asking questions to the EB. Some members mentioned that an advisory committee for sensitive collaborations should be approached first and noted that certain questions have already been answered, making asking them again unnecessary. Consequently, no questions will be asked to the EB on this topic at this time.

Program committees

A UC member heard that some program committees are reducing their members, due to the higher compensation rate. The UC would like to ask the EB questions about this development.

Possibility to have full access to UB after retirement

A UC member mentioned if someone wants to continue research after retirement this is very difficult as they do not have access anymore to the university library. Another UC member responded that there are costs for everyone who has access to the library therefore there are only some gastvrijheidovereenkomsten which still give access. The UC member would like to ask if there are alternatives to a GVO (gastvrijheidovereenkomst). The UC member would like to ask the following question to the EB: *Is it possible to establish a GVO contract with a retired employee that reimburses the university?*

Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities

A UC member feels like there have not been many updates on this topic and would like to ask the following question to the EB: *What are the measures for people with impairments to have full access to the university?*

Extra costs resulting from Campus protests

A UC member brought up that as a consequence of demonstrations some events organized on campus have been dealing with extra costs. They would like to ask the EB about their stance on the protests and their vision longterm considering the financial costs for organizing parties. Other UC member commented that these discussions have been taken place so this would be a repeat. Other members concurred. A discussion ensued which resulted in an agreement to ask the following questions to the EB:

- How will the EB make sure that the security knows the regulations and rules around demonstration?
- How does the EB deal with extra costs organisations make as the result of protests?

Reflection EB on results student survey

The results of the survey showed that Erasmus was last place in the student survey. They would like to ask the EB their stance on this. Another UC member proposed that the EB could also be asked to reflect on the result of the survey in the announcements. The Chair agreed with this. So, the EB will be asked to reflect on the results of the survey in the announcements

Action points:

- The Clerk will add '*Request for Update on Academic Freedom Survey*' to the agenda of the consultation meeting
- The Clerk will add '*Possibility to have full access to UB after retirement*' to the agenda of the consultation meeting
- The Clerk will add '*Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities*' to the agenda of the consultation meeting
- The Clerk will add '*Extra costs resulting from Campus protests*' to the agenda of the consultation meeting
- The Clerk will add '*Reflection EB on results student survey*' to the announcements of the consultation meeting

03 Incoming documents

03.01 EB Response to 38785 BBR-EUR 2025

A UC member remarked that the taskforce looking at the BBR should look into this and form a response. UC member Jaap will join the taskforce as well.

Action point:

- The Clerk will add Jaap to the BBR taskforce

04 Any other business

Cyber attacks

The university recently experienced cyber-attacks that have impacted some exams. A UC member brought this up to see how the other UC member looked at this and whether anyone would like to ask any questions to the EB regarding the cyber-attacks. A UC member brought up the idea of asking for a short reflection from the EB. A UC member mentioned that any answers from the EB regarding this topic would be quite complex. Therefore, they propose to send written questions instead as there is not enough time in the meeting. Another UC member proposed making an initiative on this topic instead. Another UC member proposed to ask for a small reflection from the EB. The Chair proposed to send written questions as a short reflection might not be very informative. The UC decided to send the following questions to the EB

- What is the scope of the problem?
- How do the attacks effect our way of working?
- Is there a plan for students so that the exam time will not be limited?

Policy media access

A media channel requested to attend the meeting, but it was ultimately decided that they would not be allowed. One UC member expressed concern about the inconsistency in media access, specifically mentioning that certain outlets, such as Erasmus Magazine, are regularly permitted to attend while others are not. Another UC member clarified that media is allowed as it is an open meeting, but they are not allowed to film unless they have explicit permission. In response, a further comment was made by a UC member, stating that media are allowed to film only if they have been granted permission. The Chair proposed that they will look into the issue further, as the discussion was quite complex.

UC member departure

The Chair expressed gratitude to Emese, who is stepping down as a UC member.

Action points:

- The Clerk will send the questions regarding '*Cyber attacks*' to the EB
- The Clerk and the Chair will look further into the topic of '*Policy media access*' and provide an update if needed

05 Closing