

University Council  
Third Plenary Meeting  
Erasmus University Rotterdam

**Date and Time:** 11-11-2025, 14:00-16:00

**Location:** Polak 1.21

**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, Max Wagenaar, Borja, Ranzinger, Rosita Boedhai, Albert Wagelmans, Wesley Hennep

**Absent:** Clara Egger, Iwona Gusc, Deniz Alican, Borja Ranzinger

## **01 Opening**

### **01.01 Setting of the agenda**

#### **01.02 Setting of the previous minutes**

A UC member remarked that in the previous minutes under point 02.02, it was stated that a UC member wanted to ask a question because the dean of RSM is not a full professor. The UC member clarified that this was not the reason for the question, but solely an example.

#### **01.03 Announcements**

##### *Reflection – “Good Conversation”*

On October 9th, the Presidium held its first Good Conversation with the Chair of the EB. This meeting, which takes place three times a year, is meant to reflect on the collaboration between the UC and the EB. It was a fruitful first exchange, mainly focused on getting to know each other. The first Consultation Meeting was also discussed; the EB Chair expressed positive feedback about how it went. Of course, there is always room for improvement, for instance, the current format can sometimes feel rather static. Finding the right balance remains a challenge: a less rigid format allows for more openness but also risks going off track or including questions not formally raised on behalf of the UC. Another point discussed was the Council's aim to send fewer letters and instead focus more on earlier and more frequent conversations with the EB. This approach was positively received.

##### *Poffertjes Event*

On November 17th, Kayla and Anne will organize a campus visibility event from 14:00–16:00, where free poffertjes will be offered to students and staff. All UC members are warmly invited to join, engage with the community, and discuss the Council's work and current topics or concerns on campus.

##### *Participation Day*

On November 20th, a Participation Day will take place for all participatory bodies within EUR. The goal is to connect, exchange knowledge, and share experiences. The Presidium has prepared a presentation for one of the workshop sessions.

*Student assistant attending online*

Floortje will join the meeting online due to an injury.

## **02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC**

### **02.01 Payment Regulations UC**

There were no remarks. Therefore, a general letter of consent will be sent out. The Chair asked if there were any objections; there were none.

#### **Action point:**

- The Clerk will send a letter of consent regarding '*Payment Regulations UC*' to the EB

### **02.02 BBR EUR 2026**

The Chair remarked that this letter was shared yesterday due to a last-minute discussion with the Presidium and the policymaker. A UC member elaborated on this letter. The UC member noted that during the consultation meeting, the EB mentioned that the feedback would be incorporated in the revision of the BBR 2027. The UC member commented that they found this answer slightly worrying. The taskforce had several remarks on the regulations in general. The taskforce did not want to send only a letter of consent, as the remarks could be ignored by the EB, and they wanted to ensure their comments were incorporated. Therefore, the UC Chair reached out to the policymakers, who agreed to change two of the points raised by the UC. The Chair asked the UC member to further elaborate on the two points that would be changed.

The first point to be changed concerns the use of text taken from the AI Act. It mentions "high-risk systems" but does not refer to the AI Act and does not clarify to whom or what this poses a high risk, making it difficult to interpret. Therefore, the taskforce requested a clear reference to the AI Act, where it is clearly explained what high-risk systems are. The second point concerns the responsibilities of the CIO, as it is currently unclear in the regulations what the responsibilities and limits of the CIO are. The Chair remarked that UC members would have time to read the letter during the break, and this point would be revisited shortly afterward in case anyone had any comments.

After the break, this topic was revisited. A UC member from the taskforce remarked that a comment had been posted suggesting it should refer to the AI governance; however, this does not exist yet, so it cannot be referred to. A UC member then remarked that it should be left out altogether, as the answer would be that there is no AI governance yet. A member commented that as soon as an AI governance procedure exists, it will be sent to the UC as an addition to the BBR. Another UC member clarified that their remark was not about the procedure already in place but that they suggested the advice be limited to the procedure regarding information systems. A member from the taskforce remarked that they would remove this part and adjust it accordingly.

A member clarified the procedure around the BBR. This is mostly a recap of the regulations that are already in place, and if changes are made throughout the year, these are separate

decisions of the EB. The UC has the right of advice or consent on these as well but should remain alert to ensure that nothing slips through. Another member suggested that if there are any remaining comments, the UC can continue working on the BBR so they are not taken by surprise when the new version is presented. The UC could also ask the policymakers to involve them at an earlier stage so they are informed in time. The Chair remarked that it is always possible to ask the policymakers for earlier involvement if the UC wishes to do so.

**Action point:**

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

**02.03 LDE – joint regulation**

No letter was shared on teams. The Chair asked whether a standard letter of positive advice can be sent. A UC member from the taskforce remarked there were no more updates on this topic and everything was clear after a meeting with the policy makers. The Chair asked if there are any objections to sending out a letter of positive advice. The UC members had no objections.

**Action point:**

- The Clerk will send a letter of positive advice regarding '*LDE – joint regulation*' to the EB

**02.04 Termination of the Research Master in Public Administration**

A standard letter of positive advice will be sent regarding this topic.

**Action point:**

- The Clerk will send a letter of positive advice regarding '*Termination of the Research Master in Public Administration*' to the EB

**02.05 Central budget allocation for the Participation Act 2025 to 2026**

A letter was posted on Teams. The UC has the right of information on this topic, but they have written a letter with unsolicited advice. A UC member from the taskforce elaborated on the letter, which addresses the commitment to continuity, as there are strategic commitments previously made by the EUR, such as inclusion. The second point concerns avoiding negative impacts on the most vulnerable members of the EUR community in light of the budget cuts. In the letter, the UC recommends investigating alternative funding streams to compensate for these losses.

A UC member posted a comment on Teams, which will be incorporated into the letter. Another UC member asked whether the intention is to safeguard certain groups from any dismissals in the coming years and whether there are reasons to prioritize these groups over others. A UC member from the taskforce responded that, by law, the EUR is required to reach 128 FTEs, which the university has not. Currently, the university has 88 FTEs, which will be maintained, but there will be no expansion. The EB also stated that if any of these 88 FTEs leave, they will not be replaced. The taskforce believes that these positions should be replaced, as some departments have made significant investments in training, and would therefore be disproportionately affected. The UC member emphasized that this is not about prioritizing specific groups but about avoiding an "easy exit" for these individuals. There were no objections to sending out the letter as it is currently posted on Teams.

**Action point:**

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding '*Central budget allocation for the Participation Act 2025 to 2026*' to the EB

**02.06 Development of a voting guide (stemwijzer)**

A letter has been posted on teams. A UC member from the taskforce remarked that they had spoken with policymakers earlier, who seemed quite positive. Three comments were posted on the letter in Teams. The first comment concerned adding the sample size in some figures, as this is needed to interpret the percentages. For example, 26% of 500 is different from 26% of 1,000. This will be adjusted in the letter. The second comment concerned the ten key issues for students. The UC member suggested keeping this section very short (2–3 sentences). Another UC member asked whether this might be too short. The member who made the comment responded that it would be better to keep it concise. Because if all parties or candidates provide lengthy viewpoints on each key issue nobody will read it, and too much information would make it difficult to create a clear voting guide. The Chair remarked that the taskforce could discuss this further with the policymakers. Another member suggested changing the wording to “a set of key issues” instead of “ten key issues,” and other members agreed. The third remark has already been incorporated.

Another member remarked that the letter currently states that the guide could be developed in collaboration with Erasmus Magazine and asked what the purpose of this would be. The members who wrote the letter clarified that it will be shared with EM, but not created together with them. The wording will be adjusted to reflect this intention more clearly. The Chair asked whether there were any objections to sending out the letter with these adjustments. There were none.

Another member remarked that there are also elections for employees, and that there is a code outlining how employees can communicate during elections. This code states that university platforms cannot be used for self-promotion. A UC member noted that there is a difference between students and staff, as students can vote for any student, whereas employees can only vote for candidates within their own faculty. Therefore, it makes less sense to have EUR-wide promotion. Another UC member remarked that the code also applies at the faculty level, meaning that university platforms cannot be used for promotion even within the faculty. They added that they thought the code was too strict. Another UC member asked whether it is allowed to mention the names of candidates. The Chair replied that they were unsure, but this could be looked into, and that a voting guide could also be developed for staff. Another member remarked that it is permitted to send personal emails to colleagues, which is allowed under the code. A further member suggested creating an impromptu taskforce to review the code and examine how it is applied within different faculties.

**Action point:**

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding '*Development of a voting guide (stemwijzer)*' to the EB

**02.07 Governance structure Impact & Engagement**

A UC member remarked that the strategy taskforce is working on this topic and that an update will be provided in the future.

### **03 Incoming documents**

#### **03.01 VZ 300.741 38903 Response to Quarterly update report Labor Inspection**

A UC member remarked that in the last point it is stated that it is too early to discuss financing, as a newly awarded fund for work pressure has just been introduced. The UC member commented that several taskforces are already working on this topic, and anyone interested is welcome to join these discussions.

#### **03.02 Suggestions on university**

The Chair remarked that this is a letter sent by a student of the university. The letter includes two suggestions. The Chair asked whether there were any remarks. A UC member commented that both suggestions are interesting, particularly the one regarding lockers. They mentioned that they are considering creating an initiative around lockers, as they saw many people use them at their previous university. Another member remarked that the sleeping pods had already been discussed previously in the UC and had received negative feedback due to the difficulty of keeping them clean. Another member agreed that the locker proposal could be further explored. A member suggested bringing up this topic in the “Tomorrow’s Campus” taskforce, and other members agreed. A member also remarked that a response should be sent to the student, thanking them for their suggestions.

#### **Action point:**

- The Clerk will send a response regarding ‘*Suggestions on university*’

### **04 Any other business**

#### **04.01 Evaluation Consultation Meeting (04/11)**

A UC member remarked that the room was too small. Another UC member commented that it was unfortunate that the EB could not stay for the drinks. The Chair agreed but noted that this might have been due to the short gap in time between the end of the meeting and the start of the drinks.

#### **04.02 Reflection on Cycle**

A UC member remarked that they were impressed by the professionalism of the new members and that everyone prepares well. Another UC member noted that the meetings sometimes finish quite early, suggesting there should be more room for discussion.

#### **04.03 Professorial policy**

The policymakers are currently working on revising the professorial policy and would like to have an informal exploratory meeting with two Council members in advance. A UC member asked why this topic is being brought up again, as a new document on professorial policy was created two years ago. They expressed curiosity about why it is being revisited now. The Chair remarked that the policymakers would like to gather feedback from the UC at an early stage.

### **05 Closing**