University Council
Third Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 04-02-2025, 14:00-16:00
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, Luna Becirspahic, Ernst Hulst, Nawin Ramcharan, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Floortje Dekker (Minutes). Esra Kahramanoglu, Timo Zandvliet, Deniz Alican, Reinier van Woerdt
Waiver: Hugo Speelman

01 Opening

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

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

01.03 Announcements

Waiver UC member
Hugo has a waiver for today and will be joining online. Timo will be speaking and voting on behalf of Hugo. A UC member commented that some letters were handed in too late. They argued that since these letters were allowed, another UC member who handed in their waiver too late should also be allowed in the meeting. The Chair disagreed with this. The UC member commented that this issue had not been discussed in the presidium.

Timeliness of Letter Submissions
Some letters were handed in too late. The Chair urged the UC members to submit letters on time. A UC member commented that they did not feel they had sufficient time to read the letters they would be voting on today. Another UC member suggested that more UC members should write the letters, as they are largely written by only a few members.

Motions in the Second Chamber
Some motions were accepted in the second chamber. As these motions could potentially affect the university, one UC member expressed a desire to discuss them with the EB. Another UC member commented that this is not relevant for the UC, as these motions do not directly involve the UC.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Reorganisation regulations EUR
A taskforce member stated that they are willing to consent in principle, and that the policymaker confirmed that the necessary adjustments will be made in the final documentation. Although this has not yet been received. The UC consented under the condition that the documents are adjusted accordingly and will request confirmation of these changes.

Action point:
- The Clerk will send the letter of consent regarding '*Reorganisation regulations EUR*' to the EB

02.02 Central crisis plan
A proposed letter was posted on Teams in which the taskforce advised positively. The Chair asked if there were any remarks on the letter, but none were raised. As a result, the UC unanimously agreed to send the letter.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter of advice regarding *'Central crisis plan'* to the EB

02.03 Decision on closing of buildings Campus Woudestein (Building FGQ, V and N)
The taskforce lead reported that a meeting was held this morning and confirmed that the early closure of the buildings would result in cost savings of two million, a positive step given the budget cuts on real estate. As a result, the taskforce supports a positive advice on the early closure but raised two points: alternative meeting spaces should be arranged for study associations to ensure minimal disruption for faculties, and events should be organized for students before the buildings are demolished. A UC member emphasized that these events should be brief, while another clarified that this was merely a suggestion in the letter. With no further remarks, the UC approved sending the letter.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding '*Decision on closing of buildings Campus Woudestein (Building FGQ, V and N)'* to the EB

02.04 Results E&E scan 2024
The Chair remarked that this topic was for information, so no letter had been shared. The Chair then asked the UC members if they felt adequately informed on the topics discussed. One UC member expressed a desire for an unrequested letter of advice, noting that some new information had been provided on the subjects. In response, other UC members pointed out that if the member had wanted a letter, they should have raised the issue earlier, as the taskforce had already discussed these topics in detail. The Chair commented that it was now too late to prepare a letter and suggested that if the UC member still desired a letter, they should submit an initiative.

02.05 20-week minor at EUR
The taskforce decided to wait for a letter from the policy workers, as it contains important information. Once received, they will proceed with drafting their letter. They will work together with the faculty councils to finalize the letter for discussion in the next chairs meeting. Additionally, a UC member noted that Max was not included in the taskforce in the overview.

Action point:

- Max will be added to the taskforce in the overview

02.06 Initiative for a flag protocol: promoting unity and shared values within the university community
The taskforce met this morning to discuss the letter. A taskforce member commented that in the letter the word "protocol" has been replaced with "guidelines." However, a UC member in the taskforce expressed that the current letter does not accurately reflect the UC's position, leading to the creation of an alternative letter, which was recently posted. This letter states that a protocol should exist, but its contents should be left to the policymakers. Another UC member raised concerns about the letters' late posting, suggesting that many UC members may not have had time to review it. Additionally, they noted that parts of the letter might conflict with Dutch law. In response, a UC member in the taskforce explained that replacing the term "protocol" with "guideline" was meant to resolve this issue. They also clarified that the letter was posted on time, but comments were made later. A UC member requested a five-minute reading break, while another argued that the terminology change did not fully address all concerns and that giving advice with potential legal implications for the university

was unwise. Some UC members were in favour of the general letter advocating for a protocol without specifying details, proposing a vote on the second letter, which simply states that the EB should establish a protocol. The Chair suggested the following: postponing the vote to allow more time for review. While one UC member insisted on voting today, another argued for a delay due to the absence of many UC members. In response, another member pointed out that attendance is the UC members' responsibility and that a quorum was present, allowing a vote. They proposed giving members time to read both letters before voting. Another UC member suggested not sending a letter at all, as the EB had already committed to considering a protocol.
After a short reading break, the Chair proposed two rounds of voting: the first to decide whether to vote immediately or postpone, and the second to vote on the two letters, with the first letter being voted on first. If neither letter received a majority, no letter would be sent. The first vote resulted in the following:

- In favour of voting today: 6
- Against voting today: 10

The topic will be tabled again for another cycle as the vote leads to a postponement. A UC member cautioned against setting a precedent for delaying votes on controversial topics, to which the Chair assured that this would not become a standard practice but was necessary in this case. Once the initiative is ready to be tabled again, the initiative lead will inform the Clerk. The Presidium will decide when the topic will be added to the agenda.

02.07 Ius promovendi
A letter has been shared in Teams regarding this matter, and the taskforce recommends sending it. A comment made in Teams, which the taskforce supports, along with another comment, will be incorporated into the letter. Additionally, a UC member suggested that *Ius Promovendi* should not be explained in the letter, and the taskforce agreed. As the UC could not reach a consensus on sending the letter, a vote was held:

- In favour of sending the letter: 11
- Against sending the letter: 3
- Abstaining: 1

Action point:
- The Clerk will send the letter regarding *'Ius promovendi'* to the EB

02.08 Promote and support for student parties
The letter was posted very late. Therefore, the Chair proposed to postpone the vote due to this delay. A UC member suggested instead of postponing, the topic should be removed from the agenda, with the option for someone to propose it again if needed. Another UC member agreed that the late posting made voting today unfavorable. The UC member agreed with postponing the topic but without revisiting the topic in the first and second plenary. They suggested sending the letter to the presidium once it's ready. It was concluded that once the initiative is ready to be tabled again, the initiative lead will inform the Clerk. The Presidium will decide when the topic will be added to the agenda.

02.09 Reflection Consultation Meeting (28/01)
A UC member raised several points for discussion. They expressed concern that there was little opportunity to ask follow-up questions to the EB regarding initiatives and felt that the UC had not been consulted beforehand. They requested better communication regarding this in the future. Additionally, the UC member was dissatisfied with the EB's response regarding academic freedom, believing the issue was not being taken seriously. The UC member

stated it is insufficient to only include one question in a survey. They proposed sending a letter to the supervisory board, stating that the UC feels the EB will not take further action regarding academic freedom. Another UC member disagreed, stating that while the EB may have a different approach from the UC's suggestions, this does not mean they disregard academic freedom. They also noted that the EB takes additional actions beyond the survey. Therefore, they advised careful wording in any letter. Another UC member suggested focusing on specific actions they want from the EB, as threats to academic freedom largely stem from external sources. They also recommended waiting for the E&E scan results to assess the issue. A UC member noted that this survey only includes employees. Another UC member reminded the group that this agenda point was meant for brief reflections rather than extensive discussions. Additionally, one UC member commented that some within the UC were putting pressure on academic freedom themselves, a statement that was met with disagreement from another member. Finally, the UC member requested that the presidium discuss the matter with the supervisory board, to which the Chair responded that the presidium shall discuss this. No further remarks were made on the topic.

Action point:

- The presidium will discuss bringing up academic freedom to the supervisory board

03 Incoming documents

03.01 Response to letter UC 38794 Regulations Camera Surveillance Erasmus University
A UC member noted that there will be future developments on this matter. According to the letter, the policymakers will reach out to the UC to initiate a conversation, so no action is required from the UC at this time. Another UC member expressed interest in reviewing a draft of the new guidelines. The Chair responded that the policymakers intend to gather feedback from the UC before drafting the guidelines. A third UC member commented that the policymakers are still in the early stages of creating the draft.

03.02 Response to letter UC 38793 Including important religious holidays in examination scheduling guidelines
Several UC members shared their remarks. One UC member expressed dissatisfaction with the response and stated they would draft a reply. Another member disagreed with the EB's reasoning. A different member noted that the EB did not address all the points raised in the UC's letter, which another UC member agreed with. However, one UC member stated they were satisfied with the letter and agreed with its content.

03.03 Response 38790 Budget Proposal Administrative Agreement for Education.
There were no remarks.

03.04 Response to 38795 KRUR 2025
A UC member expressed strong dissatisfaction with the letter, stating that it was sent too late and lacked sufficient content. They also noted that the UC's arguments were not adequately addressed. Several UC members agreed that the letter was unsatisfactory and should be discussed in the presidium. The UC member further commented that it sometimes seems as though the EB forgets its role, emphasizing that the UC does not write policy.

Action point:

- The Clerk will add *'Response to 38795 KRUR 2025'* to the agenda of the presidium

03.05 Z 275.815 Response to 38789 Confidential agenda item
A UC member noted that they had not yet had time to read the document, so a short reading break was taken. Another member remarked that the response seemed satisfactory for now, as more information would become available later. One UC member expressed concern that some members were not being respectful and urged the Chair to respond more promptly. The Chair acknowledged this and stated they would do so in the future. Another UC member reiterated that the response seemed sufficient for the time being.

04 Any other business

Preparation of meetings and responsibilities UC members
A UC member remarked that members are paid to prepare for meetings and should read the letters in advance, making additional reading time unnecessary. They also emphasized that letters should be posted on time. Additionally, the member stated that UC members should disclose if they are no longer students or staff members, expressing concern that this may not always be happening. In response, the Chair stated they would look into who is responsible for verifying whether UC members are still part of the EUR community. Another UC member countered that, in this case, the extra reading time was reasonable. They also suggested that the timeframe for sending letters might be too short.

Ties with American Institutions
A UC member suggested that the university should reconsider its partnerships with American universities in light of current political developments. The Chair responded that the member is welcome to propose an initiative on this matter.

Diversity travel
A UC member raised concerns about the recently introduced travel system, called Diversity travel. The Chair responded that the member is welcome to propose an initiative on this matter.

Meeting room
A UC member brought up the closure of a meeting room and expressed their intention to raise this issue with the EB.

05 Closing