

University Council
Consultation meeting UC/EB
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 10-12-2024, 14:00-16:30

Location: Polak 1-23

Present in the meeting: Annelien Bredenoord (EB, president), Jantine Schuit (EB, rector magnificus), Ellen van Schoten (EB, Vice-Chair, until 15:00h), Ann O'Brien (Secretary to the Board), Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair), Rosan Pittens (EB, secretary), Hugo Speelman, Sara Ouljour, Sebastiaan Kamp, Linda Dekker, Emese von Bone, Achraf Touil, Bachar Farousi, Jaap Cornelese, Albert Wagelmans, Luna Becirspahic, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen, Ernst Hulst, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Aleid Fokkema, Daan de Boer, Katarzyna Lasak, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Floortje Dekker (Minutes). Esra Kahramanoglu, Timo Zandvliet, Deniz Alican, Reinier van Woerden

Absent: Jaron Buitelaar

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

No remarks, therefore the agenda was set

01.02 Setting of the minutes/action points

No remarks, therefore the minutes were set

01.03 Announcements

Announcement from the EB

Ellen van Schoten has to leave the meeting early.

Update LDE strategy

The EB is working on a new strategy for LDE together with the various stakeholders. The strategy will mainly have an educational focus. A UC member inquired whether PHD students would be taken into account. To which the EB responded that it is mostly focused on bachelor's and master's students as this PHD students are fall more under research rather than education. However, the EB might put the PHD students on the agenda in the future. A UC member wondered if this new strategy will also come with a new budget plan. As they heard some money has been taken away from LDE programs. Specifically, that the minor budgets are getting smaller and travel expenses are rising. The EB responded that the EUR has many minors and these are expensive. Which is why they are being revisited.

02.01 Confidential agenda item

The EB and UC discussed the confidential agenda item.

02.02 EUR Meerjarenplan 2025-2029

A UC

member had some questions and comments regarding the strategy. The UC member remarked that they felt the UC had been sidelined in regards to strategy. For example, in the continuation or discontinuation of projects. The UC expressed sympathy for the difficult decisions that have to be made because of the budget cuts. However, they remarked that these strategic projects were created for a reason and these budget cuts could jeopardize the continuation of the strategic ambitions. The UC member stressed that it is important that the UC gets more involved. The EB responded that they understand that the UC felt sidelined and apologized for the way of working. The EB remarked that it was a very turbulent period for the university. Therefore, the EB took decisions without involving the UC. The EB mentioned there will be a revision of the meerjarenplan. There will be a reserve of 10 million and each quarter there it will be look at where this money is needed. The EB promised that they will involve the UC in this. The UC member responded that they appreciated the apology and would indeed like to be involved. The EB also remarked that some programs will not be paid anymore by strategy as they become more established within the schools. So not all programs that do not get budget are discontinued but they are just established in the schools and not funded by strategy anymore. A UC member responded that in practice these programs do not really get established within the schools. The EB responded that this could be indeed a risk although there are 'bestuurlijke afspraken' with the schools. The EB remarked they might consider monitoring the schools with schools although it is up to the deans in the end. The EB announced there is an update from the medical faculty which they will add to the meerjarenplan. This will not lead to an overturn of the meerjarenplan as this not from the profit and loss account of the EUR but from the account of the medical faculty.

Action point:

- The EB will involve the UC in the revision of the meerjarenplan

02.03 Election rules (KRUR) 2025

A

UC member responded that some individuals might not report a change in their status to retain their seat. They argued that it might not be the responsibility of UC members to notify the EB, as this requirement is not explicitly mentioned in the regulations. Another UC member suggested that instead of continuous monitoring, membership verification could take place once every six months. A representative of the CSB mentioned that monitoring every six months does not prevent the possibility that a member has an illegitimate seat in between those six months. The representative added that UC members should inform the CSB if they are no longer part of their constituency, as this is an expectation of integrity given their elected role. Another UC member pointed out that according to the KRUR, a UC member automatically loses their seat if they leave their constituency. Therefore, they argued that the KRUR should be enforced by the CSB. Another member agreed, highlighting that these are real scenarios that occur that need to be addressed. The EB reiterated that they were uncomfortable with introducing a formal system to check membership status, as this would increase bureaucracy. A UC member remarked that since this process is not mentioned in the integrity code, it should be made clearer. The EB and the UC struggled to come to an agreement on

this point as the EB did not like the idea of a mechanism to check whether someone is still a member, while UC members did think this was important.

Furthermore, A UC member asked whether mechanisms could be introduced to allow the CSB more options for sanctions and how the EB views their own role in this matter. The EB explained that the CSB does not have the authority to enforce sanctions and can only withhold finances. The CSB representative noted that their role is to remain as neutral as possible, similar to the Dutch *Kiesraad*, which also cannot impose sanctions. A UC member questioned who would be responsible if the election office is not. The EB responded that complaints can be directed to the AKB. However, a UC member noted that the AKB can only assess substantial influences in which case the AKB can only recommend canceling the elections entirely. The member argued that minor influences should also be addressed to prevent disproportionate outcomes. The EB countered that minor influences should not lead to a complete cancellation of elections, as this would be disproportionate. Another UC member suggested that if the AKB had more tools to impose sanctions, such extreme measures could be avoided. Lastly, a question was asked regarding the timeline and whether it was feasible. The EB responded that they believe it is feasible. They also emphasized that there should be a focus on personal responsibility, rather than relying solely on more formal mechanisms.

03 Incoming documents

04 Any other business

04.01 Camera regulations

A

UC member that is in the taskforce remarked the taskforce was disappointed with the answers they received from the policy makers. They wanted to bring this to the attention of the EB so this can be prevented in the future.

04.02 All Gender Toilets

A

UC member in the taskforce asked what will happen with the genderneutral toilets. The EB responded that they will receive a proposal regarding this which has adjustments in the numbers and the implementation of the all-gender toilets. The EB will receive this proposal in the first quarter of 2025.

04.03 Evaluation opening hours EUR

The EB

decided to shorten opening hours for sustainability reasons. The UC questioned whether this would be evaluated, considering the downsides for employees. The EB explained that due to financial difficulties, cuts are necessary, and from April to October, around 6% in energy savings was achieved. The Chair noted that these savings are unclear to employees as the figures have not been published. A UC member mentioned that some employees feel the EB is shifting energy costs onto them personally. The EB responded that they disagree with this as there is sufficient space on campus for employees to work. However, the UC Chair pointed out that both employees and students are expressing the dissatisfaction they hear. The fact that both employees and students are not satisfied with this decision, makes the EB realize that they should focus more communicating why certain decisions have to be made in the coming year(s) because of financial restraints.

Another UC member asked about whether the opening times could be considered in regards to the Erasmus behavioral lab. As some of the already funded research cannot be conducted because of the shortened opening hours. The EB answered they will look into it but have to really consider if it's necessary.

Action point

- The EB will look into the opening hours of the Erasmus Behavioral Lab

04.04 PhD Portfolios

Regarding the recognition of participatory activities, a question was raised about whether participatory roles and other PhD-associated committee activities should qualify as eligible activities in the PhD portfolio. The EB responded that they will discuss this further with the vice deans of research and the schools. They emphasized that dialogue is the first priority, but as no decision has been made yet, communication will not occur until further clarity is reached. There will be an update in about six months.

Action point:

- The EB will make sure there is an update on PhD Portfolios in 6 months

04.05 Female professors EUR

The Executive Board was asked about its position on implementing a female quota for professors, following the positive evaluation of TU Eindhoven's quota system. The EB responded that, while EUR has made progress by doubling the number of female professors over the past eight years, significant differences remain across schools. The EB is considering introducing quotas for schools that are not performing well in this regard. However, they also emphasized that diversity on other fronts, beyond gender, is equally important. A UC member raised the issue of the underrepresentation of professors from non-Western backgrounds and inquired whether the EB is addressing this. The EB acknowledged the challenge, noting that measuring diversity in other areas, such as ethnicity, is more sensitive and complex. In response to a question about other diversity programs, the EB mentioned an ongoing program that also focuses on aspects such as ethnicity and sexual orientation.

04.06 Process around plagiarism on EUR

A UC member inquired whether there is indeed no legislation or statute regarding checking for plagiarism. The EB responded that this is likely the case. Another UC member asked why the university decides to investigate certain cases. The EB explained that all theses are now checked for plagiarism using a system that did not exist in the past. In some cases, the Examination Board reviews older theses when there is a specific suspicion of plagiarism. A UC member then asked about a recent case and what constitutes a "suspicion." The EB clarified that the investigation stemmed from an anonymous report. They added that theses are not checked proactively unless a formal complaint is received.

05 Closing