University Council
Third Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 18-03-2025, 14:00-14:00
Location: Polak 2-09
Present in the meeting: Luca Hellings (chair), Hugo Speelman, Sebastiaan Kamp, Achraf Taouil, Bachar Farousi, Jaap Cornelese, Albert Wagelmans, Luna Becirspahic, Ernst Hulst, Aleid Fokkema, Esra Kahramanoglu, Deniz Alican, Federica Violi, Max Wagenaar, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Floortje Dekker (Minutes), Linda Dekker, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen, Reinier van Woerden, Jasper Klasen

Absent: Daan de Boer, Sara Ouljour, Jaron Buitelaar, Katarzyna Lasak

Waiver: 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 minutes, therefore the minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

Start candidacy period
The candidacy period for the UC started yesterday.

Departure Ernst
This was Ernst his last meeting.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Action plan report labor authority
A letter was posted on Teams. A UC member emphasized the importance of this topic and noted that the UC should keep an eye on it. Additionally, the UC member suggested reaching out to the people starting the project group to ensure UC involvement before policy documents are drafted. The Chair agreed to keep track of the issue. As there were no further remarks, the UC consented to sending the letter to the EB.

Action point:
- The Clerk will send the letter regarding *'Action plan report labor authority'* to the EB

02.02 NVAO-application for accreditation (Toets Nieuwe Opleiding) for Master Development Studies (ISS)
A positive letter of advice will be sent. As there were no remarks or objections from the UC, the letter will be sent as is.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the positive letter of advice regarding '*NVAO-application for accreditation (Toets Nieuwe Opleiding) for Master Development Studies (ISS)'* to the EB

02.03 Research strategy
The Chair asked whether the council felt sufficiently informed. The UC members agreed they were, but one member suggested sending the minutes of the consultation meeting to the guest speaker who had presented on the topic. The Chair agreed with this suggestion.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the minutes of the consultation meeting to the guest speaker

02.04 Employer vision EUR
The Chair asked whether the council felt sufficiently informed, and the UC members agreed that they were.

02.05 EUR campaign budget rules
A letter was shared on Teams. The UC member who wrote the letter remarked that smaller lists receive more funding per candidate than larger lists and advocated for a fairer allocation system. The UC member commented they hope that changes could still be made before the upcoming elections. However, the Chair responded that it was unlikely any adjustments would be implemented in time. Another UC member pointed out that a similar discussion took place last year, noting that the same UC member who now supports the proposal had opposed it at the time. In response, the UC member explained that their current stance is based on experiences they had since last year. Another UC member mentioned receiving feedback from smaller parties, stating that the current campaign budget was already insufficient and should be considered. One UC member argued that since this topic was discussed last year, further discussion was unnecessary, while another disagreed, emphasizing that this proposal represents a new initiative.
Due to objections from some UC members regarding sending the letter, the Chair called for a vote, resulting in the following outcome:

- In favor: 9
- Against: 2
- Abstaining: 7

Therefore, the letter will be sent as proposed on Teams.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding ***'****EUR campaign budget rules'* to the EB

02.06 PhD Council
A letter was posted on Teams, thanking the EB for their positive stance toward establishing a PhD council. A UC member raised a question regarding the PhD seat and whether it would be implemented. They referred to a letter about the KRUR, which also mentioned the PhD seat for the UC. The UC member then questioned the necessity of having both a PhD seat and a PhD council. In response, another UC member clarified that the PhD council would not

hold a formal position, whereas the UC does. The PhD council would serve as a place to discuss topics, while the PhD seat in the UC would be valuable in ensuring that important topics are formally addressed. A UC member inquired whether the PhD council would receive a budget. Another UC member responded that the EB would consider providing a budget once the PhD council presents its plans. As there were no objections, the letter will be sent as proposed on Teams.

Action point:
- The Clerk will send the letter regarding *'PhD Council'* to the EB

02.07 PhD survey
A letter was posted on Teams. The UC member who drafted the letter explained that the results of the PhD survey are not currently shared with the participatory bodies. This initiative requests the EB to share the survey results with the relevant participatory bodies and to provide a reflection on the findings. As there were no objections, the letter will be sent as proposed on Teams.

Action point:
- *The Clerk will send the letter regarding 'PhD survey' to the EB*

02.08 Eurekaweek duration
A UC member commented that, although they could not attend the meeting last week, they had received all the relevant information. They posted a letter on Teams, which includes a request that the EB schedule a meeting with a UC member once they have an answer to a question that could not be addressed during the consultation meeting. Another UC member expressed support for the letter but disagreed with the part about scheduling a meeting with a UC representative, arguing that all UC members should receive the information. The UC member who drafted the letter responded that the meeting notes would be shared with the entire UC. The Chair added that an announcement would be made if the meeting were to take place. The UC member then asked how they would receive answers if the EB refuses to hold a meeting. The Chair replied that, in that case, a letter would be sent with the question. As there were no further objections, the letter will be sent as is.

Action point:
- *The Clerk will send the letter regarding 'Eurekaweek duration' to the EB*

02.09 Diversity Travel
There were no new updates. A UC member mentioned that there are ongoing discussions within the faculty councils regarding the diversity travel initiative. They encouraged other staff members to have similar conversations within their respective faculties. A UC member proposed continuing the discussion on this topic in the next cycle and sending out the letter as soon as possible. A UC member inquired about the rule requiring initiatives to be resubmitted if they are to be continued. The Chair clarified that since the deadline for submitting initiatives had already passed, it is okay to continue this iniatiative without resubmitting it this time.

Action point:

- The Clerk will add *'diversity travel'* to the agenda of the next cycle

02.10 Security Compensation
The UC member who drafted the letter apologized that it was posted late. Another UC member pointed out that the letter does not reflect what had been previously agreed upon within the taskforce, as the letter includes giving some events a special status, which they do not agree with. They clarified that in the taskforce discussions, it was agreed that events should not receive a special status and that the framework for this status should be revised. The UC member further explained that organizations facing difficulties should approach the EB directly, rather than granting special status to certain events. However, they expressed agreement with a tailored approach. Another UC member expressed concerns about allowing the EB to designate certain events with special status. They also requested that the EB share the framework they currently use, as it is not known at this point. They supported the idea of a tailored approach based on the student association's budget. The UC agreed that the two UC members will draft a new version of the letter and send it to the EB.

Action point:

- Two UC members will draft a new version of the letter *'Security Compensation'* and inform the Clerk once it is ready to be shared with the EB

02.11 Promote and support student parties
The Chair remarked that the second paragraph regarding arranging photos on the website is not something for the EB to decide, so there is no need for it to be included in the letter. Therefore, it should be removed. A UC member asked about the 12 million from OCW allocated to participatory bodies and how this budget is distributed. The Chair explained that the money is allocated for staff to support the participatory bodies and their general functioning. Another UC member clarified that this money is distributed among multiple universities. Another UC member pointed out that the staff does not receive a salary for being part of the UC, and this funding does not directly benefit the staff members. One word will be changed in the letter, another word will be removed, and paragraph 2 will be deleted. There were no further objections, and the letter will be sent with these adjustments.

Action point:
- The Clerk will send the letter regarding *'Promote and support student parties'* to the EB

02.12 Initiative for a flag protocol: promoting unity and shared values within the university community
A UC member remarked that this topic was a continuation from the previous cycle, and a middle ground had now been found. However, another UC member disagreed with sending the letter. Therefore, the Chair proposed a vote. A UC member inquired whether they could cast a vote on behalf of another UC member who was not present. The Chair clarified that this was not possible, as they had not received a waiver, and the absent member needed to be online to vote. The vote resulted in the following outcome:

- In favor: 17

- Against: 2
- Abstaining: 1

Therefore, the letter will be sent as is.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding *'Initiative for a flag protocol: promoting unity and shared values within the university community'*

02.13 Gowns for all
The Chair proposed two changes to the letter: in the first paragraph, to change "advice" to "initiative," and to delete the second paragraph regarding communication and procedural issues. A UC member clarified that the proposal in the letter is to allow more people to wear gowns and requests that the EB reconsider the idea of restricting gown-wearing to only those with *Ius promovendi*. The letter will be sent with the adjustments from the Chair.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding *'Gowns for all'* to the EB

02.14 Including important religious holidays in examination scheduling guidelines
A response letter was drafted, and there were no remarks. Therefore, the letter will be sent. A UC member inquired whether this would be discussed in the Good Conversation. The Chair confirmed that it would be.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the response letter regarding *'Including important religious holidays in examination scheduling guidelines'* to the EB

02.15 Reflection Consultation Meeting (11/03)
There were no remarks from the UC regarding the consultation meeting.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 VVZ 300.640 Response to 38800 Decision on closing of buildings Campus Woudestein
There were no remarks.

04 Any Other Business

Sending an email to the sensitive collaborations committee
A UC member inquired whether it would be possible to send an email to the advisory committee for sensitive collaborations when they publish advice on Israel collaborations. Another UC member wondered if the same could be done for relations with the USA. However, the Chair clarified that the UC had already sent a letter requesting the EB to look into relations with the USA, so sending an email on this would not be useful. Therefore, only an email will be sent to the committee inquiring about the timeline for publishing advice on Israel collaborations. The Chair also added that the EB will be informed that the UC is asking about this timeline.

Topics next cycle

A UC member inquired whether All-Gender toilets and the planetary health diet would be on the agenda next cycle. The Chair responded that All-gender toilets will be on the agenda, but the planetary health diet will not, as it is still in the governing cycle of the EB. The UC member expressed disappointment with this and requested that the presidium apply more pressure on the matter. Another UC member asked why there was a sense of urgency from the other UC member, who explained that they had put forward an initiative on this and would like to see it completed this academic year, as they are still part of the UC this year. Another UC member suggested that the UC could send a letter to the EB asking when the issue will be addressed. The Chair remarked that they did not see the need for this, as they had not been formally informed of any delay.

Last meeting of Ernst
The Chair expressed gratitude towards Ernst as it was his last meeting. Ernst has been with the UC for multiple years. Ernst thanked the UC as well.

Action points:
- The Clerk will send an email to the advisory committee of sensitive collaborations
- The Clerk will inform the EB an email is being sent to the advisory committee of sensitive collaborations

05 Closing