University Council
Second Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 28-10-2025, 14:00-17:00
Location: Langeveld 1.02
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, Iwona Gusc, Caressa Bol, Lourdes Wansink Mangiano, Bodi Winkler, Simon Maas, Deniz Alican, Hans van Oosterhout, Joseph Ayinla, Jaap Cornelese, Manuela Bartolovic,

Absent: Rosita Boedhai, Adina Popovici, Max Wagenaar, Borja, Ranzinger, Clara Egger

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda
There were no remarks on the agenda, therefore the agenda was set.

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

01.03 Announcements

Absence Student assistant
Floortje is absent today due to exams.

Office warming
The Chair remarked that after the meeting today there will be an office warming in the A building.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 BBR EUR 2026
No technical questions were submitted for this topic. A UC member from the taskforce remarked that they have three points they wish to raise with the EB. The first point concerns the Doctorate Board. The member explained that they wish to ask a question about this due to the dean of RSM not being a full professor. The Chair noted that this issue might be more appropriate as a technical question rather than a question for the EB. However, since the deadline for submitting technical questions has already passed, which makes it more difficult. The UC member then elaborated on the other two points. The second point concerns several references in the document to AI, as no internal regulations on this topic are included. The third point relates to several terms in the document that are open to interpretation.

Another UC member remarked that regarding the first point about the dean, the UC should ask the EB for clarification. As the UC was informed that these regulations are a summary of existing ones. Given this, it is peculiar that this situation exists. The UC member remarked they want to ask the EB what they propose for next year.

Another member emphasized that the use of open or ambiguous terms is an important issue to raise with the EB. A further remark was made that the document refers to many other regulations, which themselves could be subject to change. The Chair noted that the issue of ambiguous terminology could be raised as a general point and mentioned that the consent letter could include a table providing an overview of all points that the EB should review. A UC member also remarked that they had expected a legal officer to examine the document more thoroughly before it was sent to the UC. The following questions were formulated:

- *We understand that, according to the new BBR, only full professors can now serve as members of the Doctorate Board, whereas previously deans could also hold this position. Could the Executive Board clarify whether this interpretation is correct, and if so, what the implications are for faculties such as RSM where the dean is not necessarily a full professor?*

- *Some terms and formulations in the draft BBR appear to be open to multiple interpretations (see attached). These ambiguities will also be addressed in the UC's letter of consent. The Council kindly asks the Executive Board to take note of these points and clarify where possible.*

- *Articles 11.5 and 11.6 refer to the use of AI but do not provide concrete internal regulations, referring instead to the AI Act in general terms. Is the Executive Board planning to develop specific EUR-wide guidelines or regulations on the use of AI in doctoral research?*

There were no objections to asking these questions to the EB.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the questions regarding *'BBR EUR 2026'* to the EB

02.02 LDE – joint regulation
No technical questions were shared. A UC member from the taskforce remarked that they had spoken with a policy maker about the questions they had, focusing mainly on the financial regulations. The policy maker explained that each university contributes the same amount of funding, but that these funds are pooled with each university being responsible for its own portion. However, this arrangement is not explicitly included in the regulations. The UC member also raised some questions about the use of English terminology in the document. The policy maker clarified and explained why they used this terminology. All questions were addressed by the policy maker, and there are no further questions for the EB.

02.03 Termination of the Research Master in Public Administration
A UC member from the taskforce remarked that they had discussed this topic and will draft a positive letter of advice, as the rationale for terminating this master's programme has been

clearly explained. They mentioned that they had some questions, but these were sufficiently answered by the policy makers. A UC member asked whether it is necessary to elaborate on the reasons for issuing a positive letter of advice. The Chair responded that this is not required, as there is a standard format for such letters. However, if the UC wishes to highlight specific points or remarks these can be included in the letter of positive advice.

02.04 Central budget allocation for the Participation Act 2025 to 2026
The Chair remarked that the technical questions had been shared with the policy makers and answered. A UC member from the taskforce noted that they still had both technical and political questions. The Clerk suggested setting up a meeting between the policy makers and the taskforce to discuss these further. The UC member added that they have the remaining technical questions in writing and will share them with the Clerk. The taskforce would also like to raise the following questions with the EB:

- *In choosing to secure central budget for the Participatory Act, one consideration seems to be the additional work involved in having these staff rather than the monetary constraints. Could you clarify this consideration?*

- *Given the choice to not grow the FTE within the P.A.; has it been considered how the the scaling down of the growth ambitions and potentially decrease in FTE reflects on the impact goals of the university?*

There were no objections to asking these questions during the consultation meeting.

Action points:
- The Clerk will set up a meeting with policy makers and the '*Central budget allocation for the Participation Act 2025 to 2026*' taskforce
- The Clerk will send the questions regarding *'Central budget allocation for the Participation Act 2025 to 2026'* to the EB

02.05 Development of a voting guide (stemwijzer)
The Chair remarked that the technical questions had been shared with the policy makers but had not yet been answered. However, the policy makers appear to be positive about this initiative. A UC member from the taskforce mentioned that they might consider rephrasing the first technical question into a more political one to address it to the EB. The Chair asked whether this would be necessary, as it seems the taskforce can continue working directly with the policy makers on this topic. The UC member agreed that it was not necessary and confirmed they will proceed by collaborating with the policy makers. There were no further remarks.

02.06 Mechanisms/Options for students and staff from Gaza to work/study at EUR
The Chair remarked that the technical questions had been shared with the policy makers but had not yet been answered, as the questions were quite elaborate. A UC member from the taskforce noted that they will wait for the policy makers their responses. Therefore, this initiative will be postponed to the next cycle. Another UC member asked whether this was necessary and if questions to the EB could already be formulated. A UC member responded that no meaningful questions can be developed without first receiving the answers to the technical questions. The same member added that the policy makers are welcome to reach out if they require additional information to help them formulate their responses. As the taskforce may have some new input. The Chair remarked that the Clerk will inform the policy makers that the UC has potential new information available should they need it.

Action point:

- The Clerk will inform the policy makers about possible new information regarding *'Mechanisms/Options for students and staff from Gaza to work/study at EUR'*

02.07 Governance structure Impact & Engagement
The Chair remarked that no technical questions were shared. A UC member from the strategy taskforce remarked that no meeting has been held yet on this topic, but the discussion will still take place. The Chair remarked that the taskforce should consider whether they wish to move this topic to the next cycle and whether there is sufficient capacity to do so.

02.08 Policies on undesirable behavior, breaches of academic integrity and code of conduct
The Chair remarked that the technical questions had been shared with the policy makers but had not yet been answered. A member of the taskforce noted that they had received a response stating that the KNAW process is independent from the EUR Code of Integrity. However, all other questions remained unanswered. The UC member asked when these questions would be answered. The Clerk replied that no deadline had been set yet but confirmed that the questions will be answered.

A UC member then asked why the questions had not been answered so far. The Clerk responded that the policy makers had not provided a specific reason. The UC noted that they had a more political question regarding this topic. Since the KNAW process is independent from the EUR Code of Integrity, it is unclear why a feedback round was initiated by EUR policy makers. They questioned why EUR policy makers are organizing a feedback process on a KNAW matter if it is an external and separate process. The Chair clarified that the university has no formal role in the KNAW process and that this had already been communicated to the taskforce in an earlier response. A UC member commented that they would like to ask why the UC was not involved in the informal feedback process for the KNAW. The Chair replied that this question may be more appropriate to address to the KNAW rather than to the EB. The UC member remarked that EUR policy makers had asked EUR researchers to provide feedback to the KNAW but had not involved the participatory bodies. The UC member formulated the following question:

- *The KNAW has requested feedback on the draft Code of Conduct. Could the Executive Board clarify how this feedback was gathered and what the consultation process entailed?*

The Chair remarked that if this cannot be completed in the current cycle, it should be moved to the next one. The Chair also noted that, in the future, UC members wishing to develop an initiative could first meet with the policy makers to help prevent delays in receiving answers. A UC member then remarked that they would like to review the draft of the social media policy before it is approved. Another member suggested that this could be raised as a point of concern during the consultation meeting. The UC member emphasized that it is an important issue as it could potentially be grounds for dismissal. The following question was formulated:

- *Is there a separate code of conduct or set of guidelines regarding the use of social media by EUR staff (and students)? If so, could this be shared with the University Council? The Council would appreciate clarity on how social media use is regulated within the university context.*

There were no objections to asking these questions to the EB.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the question regarding *'Policies on undesirable behavior, breaches of academic integrity and code of conduct'* to the EB

02.09 Preparation Consultation meeting (04/11)

Demonstrations on campus
A UC member remarked that the recent demonstrations at EUR have received media attention and would like the EB to reflect on this. The Chair emphasized that it is important to keep this discussion general, as the UC should not go into individual cases.Another UC member commented that the topic could also relate to the social media code of conduct. The Chair suggested that this should instead be discussed under the existing initiative regarding the social media code of conduct to avoid confusion.

A UC member noted that some topics discussed by the UC seem to already be ongoing, while others have multiple dimensions. The member asked how such complex topics could be discussed in the most fruitful way. The Chair responded that the UC should ensure thorough preparation and gather all relevant information through the technical questions. A member proposed that the UC ask the EB to reflect on the recent protests. Another UC member expressed that they did not see the added value of requesting such a reflection, as it is not within the EB's role to authorize demonstrations. However, another member remarked that gathering information is always valuable. As there were objections to asking this question, a vote was held:

- In favour: 17
- Against: 1
- Abstain: 2

Therefore, the following question will be raised to the EB:

- *How does the EB reflect on the recent demonstrations on campus?*

RSM reorganization
A UC member remarked that they would like an update on the RSM reorganization. The Chair noted that this topic should be concluded during the consultation meeting. The UC member formulated the following question:

- *Last year, the University Council issued a positive advice on the intended reorganization of RSM. Could the Executive Board provide an update on the* *developments since then, including the current status of the reorganization process and any next steps foreseen?*

There were no objections to asking this question to the EB.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the questions regarding *'Preparation Consultation meeting (04/11)'* to the EB

03 Incoming documents

03.01 New evacuation procedure
The YC received an e-mail regarding the new evacuation procedure and concerns regarding this. A UC member remarked that a response should be sent, as they ask a question in the e-mail. Another UC member commented that they believe the UC is not the appropriate body to answer it, since the question concerns whether the new policy complies with the law. The UC members agreed that this should be addressed by the relevant people instead. Several UC members noted that this topic requires follow-up. Another member mentioned that they intend to create an initiative in the next cycle addressing fire safety, in which this issue could also be included. The Clerk will inform the sender of the e-mail about the upcoming initiative and connect them to the UC member that will create this initiative. The UC member added that anyone with questions is welcome to join them in preparing this initiative for the next cycle.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send out a response regarding *'New evacuation procedure'*

04 Any other business

Update HR taskforce
A UC member remarked that a meeting with the Arbeidsinspectie (labour inspection) will take place on December 4th. They mentioned that a subset of staff members is invited to join and encouraged any interested staff to participate. A preparatory meeting will be held on November 11th.

05 Closing