

**University Council
Third Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam**

Date and Time: 22-04-2025, 14:00-16:00

Location: Polak 2-18

Present in the meeting: Luca Hellings (chair), Hugo Speelman, Sebastiaan Kamp, Achraf Taouil, Bachar Farousi, Jaap Cornelese, Albert Wagelmans, Luna Becirspahic, Aleid Fokkema, Esra Kahramanoglu, Deniz Alican, Max Wagenaar, Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Linda Dekker, Rosita Boedhai-Jansen, Reinier van Woerden, Jasper Klasen, Nawin Ramcharan, Clara Egger, Jaron Buitelaar, Daan de Boer

Absent: Sara Ouljour, Katarzyna Lasak

Waiver: Federica Violi

01 Opening

01.01 Setting of the agenda

A UC member asked whether all the letters were posted today before 9am. The Chair responded they were posted on time.

01.02 Setting of the previous minutes

The minutes are not available yet. The minutes will be on the agenda of the next meeting for approval.

01.03 Announcements

Jury Seat Appointments

The Clerk previously shared a request with the student members of the UC Council regarding two open seats on juries. Esra and Nawin have agreed to fill these positions. A UC member inquired whether the EB had followed up on an earlier meeting during which the possible expansion of the prize criteria was discussed. The Chair responded that the current status of this will be looked into, as there was an action point for the EB.

Chair's Absence at Next Plenary

The Chair announced that they will not be present at the upcoming plenary meeting. Jasper will be the Chair for the next meeting.

Action point:

- The Clerk will follow up on the status of the action point regarding the expansion of the prize criteria

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Reflection HoKa

There were no remarks. Therefore, this reflection will be sent to the EB.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the HoKa reflection to the EB

02.02 EUR Profile

No letter was shared in advance. After the consultation meeting, all questions were answered. A general letter of positive advice will be sent out. There were no further objections from the UC.

Action point:

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

02.03 All Gender Toilets

A UC member from the taskforce shared that the topic had been discussed within the taskforce and a draft letter was created and shared in Teams. The UC member provided context on the letter. Another UC member expressed surprise at the mention of the women's toilet, feeling it singled out a specific gender. They also questioned the recommendation to conduct a survey, suggesting it may appear to purposely seek out complaints. A taskforce member responded that, although no complaints had been received formally, that does not mean there are none. Another UC member clarified that the aim of the survey was not to solicit complaints, but to gather perspectives from the broader EUR community on the all-gender toilets.

There was also discussion about the line stating that "the UC Council received complaints." A UC member clarified that the UC as a whole did not receive complaints. Only individual members had. A taskforce member agreed to amend the wording to "UC members received complaints." A UC member disagreed that the survey was seeking out complaints. Another UC member pointed out that all policies receive some complaints and does not agree with the current phrasing. Another member emphasized the importance of how the evaluation of the all-gender toilets is framed. For example, by avoiding the use of steering questions in the survey. A taskforce member added that the taskforce unanimously agreed an evaluation is needed, as there is currently no data.

There was a brief note from a UC member to remove “the” from a sentence, which another member supported. Additionally, a UC member mentioned a decision from the taskforce to include a directional sentence in paragraph 2 of the letter. There was some discussion within the taskforce about this sentence, and a more neutral version was also drafted which some members preferred. However, one UC member felt the so-called neutral version was not actually neutral, and stressed the UC should be clear in its position. They supported the directional recommendation to convert one all-gender toilet into a women’s toilet, as most complaints came from women. They added that an all-gender toilet would still remain available. In contrast, another UC member questioned the recommendation, noting that the letter does not define what constitutes a woman and preferred the neutral version. Another member agreed with this, seeing the neutral version as a middle ground.

A UC member proposed voting first on the version with the neutral sentence. The Chair responded that the version with the directional sentence would be voted on first, as it was the one proposed by the taskforce. One UC member disagreed with this approach, arguing that the neutral sentence was too vague. The UC member who had suggested the neutral sentence clarified that it was intended to leave room for evaluation, as the UC is not a policymaking body.

First, there was a vote on the letter as proposed in Teams. This version will include the adjustments that were previously agreed upon during the discussion. The vote resulted in the following:

- **In favour:** 11
- **Against:** 8
- **Abstaining:** 2

As a majority voted in favor of sending the original letter, there will not be a second vote on the version containing the more neutral sentence. The letter as proposed on Teams, including the adjustments, will be sent to the EB.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding ‘*All Gender Toilettes*’ to the EB

02.04 EUR Doctoral Regulations

A letter requesting a delay in responding to the EB was shared on Teams. As there were no objections, this letter will be sent out.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding the ‘*EUR Doctoral Regulations*’ to the EB

02.05 Diversity Travel

A letter regarding this topic was shared on Teams. A UC member from the taskforce noted they had not yet received answers to the questions previously asked but confirmed that the letter is ready to be sent. It was mentioned that the topic could return to the UC, as some questions remain unanswered. A UC member expressed concern about the letter's recommendation to suspend the diversity travel policy, calling it unrealistic. In response, another member pointed out that there are multiple issues with the diversity travel policy and noted that evaluation moments are built into the process, with the next one scheduled for April 30th. For that reason, they supported sending the letter now to communicate the UC's

stance. Additionally, a UC member raised a concern that the refusal of policymakers to allow the UC to view the contract agreement may be a violation of the UC's rights. They asked the Chair to look into the matter. There were no further remarks or objections, and the letter will be sent out.

Action points:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding '*diversity travel*' to the EB
- The Chair will look into the UC's rights regarding viewing contract agreements.

02.06 Functioning of the EUR website

No letter has been shared on Teams. As the technical questions have not yet been answered, this topic will continue into the next cycle.

Action point:

- The Clerk will put '*Functioning of the EUR website*' on the agenda of the next cycle

02.07 Request for review of collaborations with US universities

A UC member from the taskforce made some adjustments to a letter that was shared earlier, based on the consultation meeting. Another UC member commented that they felt the EB does not perceive the situation as involving significant risks and suggested including counterarguments to the EB's stance in the letter. There was also some critique of the DEI policy, though it was noted that this fell outside the scope of the issue at hand. A UC member remarked that citing sources was important. Another UC member argued that citing sources was not necessary in this case, as the topic had been widely covered in the news. They emphasized that the letter should still be sent. Another UC member expressed a desire to send the letter but felt it was not yet in a good form. They suggested removing the last sentence of the third paragraph and adding a section about academic freedom. The Chair requested that a sentence be added indicating that a productive discussion on this topic had already taken place with the EB. A UC member from the taskforce will implement these changes. There were no further objections, and the letter will be sent out with the agreed-upon adjustments.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send out the letter regarding '*Request for review of collaborations with US universities*' to the EB

02.08 Reflection Consultation Meeting (15/04)

A UC member remarked that they would have appreciated being informed earlier that the EB had to leave the meeting early. They remarked that they would not want this situation to repeat in the future and suggested this be discussed in the 'good conversation'. Additionally, the UC member felt that the responses from the EB are not always satisfactory, a comment with which another UC member agreed. Another UC member mentioned that they felt the discussion on 02.07 was quite positive. A further clarification was made by a UC member, who specifically felt that the answers regarding the all-gender toilets were unsatisfactory. There were no further remarks.

03 Incoming documents

03.01 Response to 38804 KRUR 2025

A UC member expressed disappointment with the response letter. They stated that the issue is being postponed due to the formation of a PhD Council. However, they pointed out that this council is an informal body and, therefore, not a valid reason to exclude a PhD seat from the UC. The member asked the Council for advice on the best course of action and emphasized their desire for this matter to be addressed within the current academic year.

They also inquired about the timeline needed to make that possible. The Chair responded that they will look into organizing a meeting between the taskforce and the CSB. Another UC member suggested that this meeting should also be open to other interested UC members. The Chair asked whether there were any objections to organizing the meeting. There were no objections from the UC. The Chair then asked who would like to join the taskforce.

- Taskforce KRUR 2025
Jasper (lead), Hugo, Timo, Nawin, Achraf, Luna, Reinier, Rosita, Aleid

04 Any other business

New government regulations on university spending

The government has introduced new regulations restricting universities from spending money on private funding, which includes areas such as sports facilities. A UC member proposed sending a set of questions to the EB regarding this issue and invited other members to co-sign. Another UC member asked why the UC member didn't just start an initiative. Another member agreed that creating an initiative might be more appropriate, given the importance of the topic. One UC member remarked that sending questions now would be useful, and that an initiative could follow later. In contrast, another member felt the questions might be premature, as the news had only just been released. The Chair reminded the UC that all UC members have the right to send questions. A UC member added that it would be helpful to send the questions now so that the answers could support preparation for the any other business of the upcoming consultation meeting. Another member reiterated their preference for starting with an initiative. It was concluded that an initiative will be proposed before Friday. The technical questions will then already be shared and sent earlier than normal.

Changes to ESSB Programs

A UC member remarked that the International Psychology program will be discontinued starting in 2027. Furthermore, two other programs will see a reduction in their numerus fixus to limit the intake of international students. A UC member expressed concern that the UC had not been adequately informed about these decisions. It was noted that the EB discussed these changes with UNL, but not with any participatory bodies. The Chair responded that the UC holds rights concerning the closure of academic programs and stated that this matter will be further investigated.

Action point:

- The Chair will look into the rights of the UC regarding closure of academic programs

05 Closing