

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

Date and Time: 03/12/2024, 14:00 – 17:00h

Location: Polak 2.07

Present in the meeting: Ivonne Cune-Noten (chair), Roxanne Austin (clerk), Floortje Dekker (minutes), Hugo Speelman, Sebastiaan Kamp, Linda Dekker, Emese von Bone, Achraf Touil, Reinier van Woerden, Esra Kahramanoglu, Bachar Farousi, Albert Wagelmans, Luna Becirspahic, Ernst Hulst, Nawin Ramcharan, Wesley Hennep, Aleid Fokkema, Timo Zandvliet, Deniz Alican, Daan de Boer, Katarzyna Lasak, Jaap Cornelese, Luca Hellings, Jaron Buitelaar, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen,

Absent: Sara Ouljour

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

There were no remarks, therefore the agenda was set.

01.02 Setting of the previous meetings

There were no remarks, therefore the minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

Four policy makers will attend the plenary meeting today to elaborate on agenda topics.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Confidential agenda item – Closed meeting

Action point:

- The Clerk will ensure the points regarding the confidential agenda item will be put on the agenda for the consultation meeting

02.02 Election rules (KRUR) 2025

Two policy makers were invited to elaborate on this topic as there were some questions from the taskforce. A UC member clarified that the current questions are follow up questions. A UC member asked whether the CSB thinks the withholding of subsidies could impact the behavior of the candidates during the election period. To which the policy makers answered that no other measurements are currently available to the CSB other than determining that the outcomes of the elections are wrong. This is a very drastic measure, as it impacts everybody of the same electoral district. The policy makers mentioned that they are looking into creating more transparency during the elections. However, stricter rules would be outside of the scope of the CSB.

A UC member inquired about how the CSB will make sure that well behaved candidates do not get punished as a result of other candidates misconducting themselves. The policy maker responded that should a misconduct take place, then the whole list would be temporarily suspended until it is determined how many people are involved.

A UC member commented that there were discrepancies between two versions of the document. The policy maker responded that this has already been rectified. Following this a

UC member inquired about the timeline of 5 weeks to look at a misconduct. The UC member wondered if 5 weeks was realistic as there was an incident last year where the process took two months. The policy makers answered that this was discussed internally and this was deemed realistic.

A UC member commented that the academic year might end earlier in the future and if the policy makers take this into account. The policy makers agreed that this will be taken into account. Following this the UC member asked whether the CSB can round up to 4 digits instead of two. The policy makers responded that they would consider this. A UC member asked whether the CSB would annul votes if deemed necessary. The policy makers responded that they did not find this measure appropriate as it could violate rights like the right of being chosen.

A UC member inquired about the option of banning a list name should members conduct themselves. The policy makers responded that this rule was not intended for this purpose as banning list names is used for names that are considered offensive. Furthermore, the policy makers mentioned that the CSB might not be the right organ for enforcing these sanctions.

After the policy makers left the UC further discussed points they would like to bring up with the EB. A UC member would like to ask the EB about a seat within the UC that would be reserved for PHD students. A discussion ensued. A UC member agreed it would be good to have a PHD member represented. However, other UC members considered it unnecessary to reserve a seat for PHD students. UC members that disagreed argued that the same argument could be more for other groups within the university as well. Following this, the Chair asked which points should be brought with the board. A UC member would like to ask the EB about how to check if members are still a student or staff member at EUR. Another UC member wants to know how the EB looks at giving the CSB more options for sanctions or their role in the sanctions. Lastly, a UC member wanted to know how the EB sees their role versus the role of the CSB.

After this a discussion ensued about the reserved seat for PHD students. The UC member who made the proposal mentioned that PHD students need to be represented in the UC because they are in a vulnerable position within the university. Many other universities also reserve seats for PHD students. Other UC members concurred. Another UC member responded that first it should be looked into why PHD students are not present within the council. As very few PHD students have tried to get into the UC. Following this a discussion also ensued about the proposal from a UC member to make one big electoral district for the employees. Many UC members disagreed with this proposal as some faculties are bigger than others. The Chair proposed a vote as the UC was struggling to come to an agreement on whether to ask these two questions to the EB. A majority of the UC was not in favor of bringing up these questions with the EB.

The following points will be brought up with the EB:

- How the EB looks at giving the central election office more options for sanctions
- How the EB sees their role versus the role of the central election office
- How the EB will check if members are still part of the community.

Action points:

- The Clerk will ensure the points regarding the KRUR will be put on the agenda for the consultation meeting

02.03 Findings of the pay gap research

There were no remarks, therefore the UC has been sufficiently informed.

02.04 Financial semi annual report Real Estate CIO II

There were no remarks, therefore the UC has been sufficiently informed.

02.05 Erasmus University Rotterdam Administration & Management Regulations 2025 (BBR-EUR 2025)

The policy makers requested that the UC already consents today. This topic was already discussed in the previous cycle, but two concerns remained regarding the rights of the faculty council and the GRC. The taskforce had several discussions with the policy makers. Some changes have been made to the GRC and apart from some details the taskforce agreed with these changes. Therefore, the taskforce recommends the UC to consent to this document and they will send a positive letter of advice. The taskforce still had five points which will be put into the positive letter of advice. The UC consented to the letter of positive advice.

02.06 Budget Proposal Administrative Agreement for Education (Bestuursakkoordmiddelen '25)

In the HOKA transition funds there was about 3.6. million leftover. The majority of which will go to smarter academic year. Student wellbeing has also applied for 110k of extra funding. The taskforce would like extra input from the UC on the extra funding as the taskforce did not fully come to a consensus.

A UC member in the taskforce mentioned that in the grand scheme of things, this is not a large budget. Student wellbeing also serves a diverse population of students and there could be spillover to other students and also staff. The UC member also mentioned student wellbeing has always done well. However, the UC member did mention that student wellbeing would be the only project if they get these extra funds that gets all the fund that they asked for. A

Additionally, a meeting between the taskforce and vice deans took place earlier where the extra funds for wellbeing were not yet mentioned. So, it is quite late in the process. A UC member asked why the taskforce wants to fund this project in comparison to other projects. The taskforce member responded that this project came to the HEQA taskforce for extra funding which is why it was discussed. Another UC member inquired about the sustainability of these projects. The taskforce member replied that all these projects will run for one year. Other UC members agree that the taskforce will give extra funds to student wellbeing.

02.07 EUR Meerjarenplan 2025-2029

The taskforce discussed this topic with the CPC. Most questions were answered in this discussion. The taskforce does not see any big issues with the meerjarenplan. A UC member inquired about the inclusion of academic freedom in the meerjarenplan. Another UC member responded that this is not included in the meerjarenplan. However, another taskforce has discussed this before, and the UC member will look into it. There were some

more questions regarding strategy which are related to the meerjarenplan. The UC member would like to bring up the following points with the EB:

- The board was looking at strategy transitions embedment while the UC member sees dismantlement.
- Regarding the strategic budget that was moved. Why did the board see the need to increase the budget in 2024 without overspenditure at the cost of programs that are in trouble in 2025
- The UC member would like to know how the EB looks at the involvement of the council in regards of the decisions taken for strategic programs. As the council was not involved in many decisions.

Action point:

- The Clerk will ensure the points regarding the Strategy budget will be put on the agenda for the consultation meeting

02.08 Termination of the bachelor's and master's degrees in Fiscal Economics

The taskforce thinks that the procedure was carefully followed. The taskforce is waiting for a new document and this will be revisited in the third plenary and it will not be discussed with the EB.

02.09 Professorial gowns for all!

A letter was drafted and put up on teams by the taskforce. There will be a vote during the third plenary and it will not be discussed with the EB.

02.10 Regulations Camera Surveillance Erasmus University

The taskforce is waiting for the answers to the technical questions and the policy makers are currently working on the new regulations. The taskforce would only like to ask a question to the EB if they do not have the right of consent on these regulations.

02.11 Preparation Consultation Meeting (10/12)

Evaluation of new opening hours

This item is related to the incoming document Letter ESE and RSM on opening hours EUR. The question to the EB is whether they are planning to evaluate the new opening hours.

PhD Portfolios

PhD students are required to compile a portfolio to obtain 30 ECTS, with participation in participatory bodies contributing to this portfolio. However, this information is not clearly communicated to PhD students. A UC member would like to ask the EB whether they are willing to reach out to faculties to ensure this is effectively communicated to PhD students and clearly stated in relevant PhD documentation.

New way of working

The EB told the UC they did not have a right of consent on the pilot of less working spaces. A UC member would like an explanation regarding why this is the case.

Investigation plagiarism

Following a recent public incident, a UC member wants to ask the EB about the reasoning and policy for investigations into former students for alleged plagiarism.

All gender toilets

A UC member would like an update on all gender toilets.

Female professors

The EUR is currently striving for 35% professors. TU Eindhoven however had a quota for female professors which was positively evaluated. A UC member would like to know the position of the EB on this.

Action point:

- The Clerk will ensure the six points will be put on the agenda for the consultation meeting under AoB.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 Verkeersveiligheid rondom Campus Woudestein

A UC member would like a follow up meeting with the policy makers. The following members would like to join: Sebastiaan, Jaron, Esra, Daan, Achraf, Bachar

Action point:

- The Clerk will organise a meeting with policy makers about 'Verkeersveiligheid rondom Campus Woudestein'

03.02 Letter ESE and RSM on opening hours EUR

04 Any other business

05 Closing