

University Council
Third Plenary Meeting
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Date and Time: 30-09-2025, 14:00-16:00

Location: Langeveld 1.14

Present in the meeting: Luca Hellings (Chair), Roxanne Austin (Clerk), Floortje Dekker (Minutes), Dogukan Demirboken, Albert Wagelmans, John Hays, Borja Ranzinger, 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

Waiver: Clara Egger

Absent: Rosita Boedhai, Adina Popovici, Max Wagenaar, Manuela Bartolovic

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 minutes

There were no remarks on the minutes, therefore the minutes were set.

01.03 Announcements

New UC office

The Chair announced that on October 8th, the move to the new UC office (A-building, next to the statue) will take place. The current UC office will therefore not be accessible on that day. The new UC office is expected to be accessible from October 15th, and the UC will receive a separate email with further information. UC members can use the same key for the new office. A UC member asked whether this move will be permanent and if there will be sufficient space for the plenary meetings. The Chair confirmed that the move is permanent and that the new office will have adequate room for taskforce meetings, but not for UC plenary meetings.

UC dialogue training

Next week, there will be a dialogue training session on Tuesday.

Member Attending Online

The Chair noted that one UC member will attend the meeting online due to medical reasons.

02 Agenda items plenary meeting UC

02.01 Voting Presidium – Closed meeting

The Presidium was installed, in a closed meeting.

02.02 UC Meeting Schedule

The Chair asked if there were any objections to approving the schedule. No objections were raised.

02.03 Annual report UC 2024-2025

The Chair asked if there were any remarks on this topic. There were none, and the UC members agreed that the Annual Report UC 2024-2025 can be published.

Action point:

- The Clerk will publish the 'Annual report UC 2024-2025'.

02.04 Annual report Legal Procedures 2024

No letter was posted on Teams. The Chair asked whether the UC feels sufficiently informed. A UC member remarked that they had sent questions to the policy maker and received an answer, which they found unclear. Therefore, the taskforce formulated new questions. The Chair noted that topics should ideally be completed within one cycle. However, for this topic, it could be assigned to the HR & Wellbeing Taskforce. It will then be removed from the agenda until the taskforce considers it necessary to bring it back to the UC. A UC member added that everyone is welcome to join discussions on this topic.

02.05 Quarterly update report Labor Inspection

A letter was shared on Teams. A UC member from the taskforce remarked that, following discussions with the EB and policy makers, they had identified some issues which were included in the letter. Two points are highlighted in particular: work stress and a new issue regarding financial support, as the extent of this support is currently unclear. A question about financial support is included in the final part of the letter. Some comments on the letter were posted on teams and have already been incorporated by the UC member. There were no objections to sending the letter to the EB.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the letter regarding '*Quarterly update report Labor Inspection*' to the EB

03 Incoming documents

04 Any other business

04.01 Evaluation Consultation Meeting (23/09)

A UC member remarked that they felt somewhat taken aback by the EB asking whether the person in the wheelchair had complained about the opening of the academic year. They felt this was not a very inclusive response. Another UC member concurred.

Another UC member, attending the Consultation Meeting for the first time, noted that while some conversations were useful, they missed the bigger picture in the engagement. They felt that simply asking questions did not fully allow for a meaningful discussion and members are only permitted to ask questions. They suggested more focus could be placed on topics such as finance and strategy, as few of the items discussed seemed connected to the bigger picture. The Chair responded that the discussions depend on the agenda, such as the upcoming budget, which will be addressed in the next cycle. Another UC member added that they had felt similarly in the beginning, but after engaging more with taskforces and attending additional meetings, the process became clearer.

Another UC member expressed that it should not be necessary to only formulate questions for the EB and that more discussion would be beneficial. However, they acknowledged that topics should first be discussed within the UC before being brought to the EB. Another member added that topics are often more extensively discussed within the taskforces, which also engage with policy makers who advise the EB.

A UC member asked whether the consultation meeting is solely for information gathering or also for deliberation. Another member responded that it serves both purposes, as the UC can also request actions from the EB. Another member noted that Erasmus Magazine is usually present at the meetings, which may make the EB more cautious with their wording. The Chair remarked that there is room for the UC to provide input during consultation meetings, but detailed discussions among UC members should take place during plenary meetings.

The goal of the consultation meeting is to present a common UC view, after which there is room for discussion.

A UC member asked about the focus of taskforce discussions and emphasized the importance of understanding the UC's role. They remarked that it is important to know whether decisions have already been made and what the UC can still influence. Another UC member noted that the UC can question everything, prompting policy makers or the EB to consider points they might not have otherwise, which is where the UC can make a difference. Another member added that the consultation meeting also helps hold the EB accountable, which can have an impact. Another UC member mentioned they sometimes do not have enough time to get their entire question addressed during the EB meeting. The Chair explained that because these were AOB topics, time is limited. UC members can also file an initiative for more elaborate discussions. A UC member asked if topics could be brought up again in the next consultation meeting if questions were not fully answered. The Chair answered they could be. Lastly, the Chair noted that all questions to be asked of the EB will be shared with all UC members so everyone can see which questions will be asked and by whom.

04.02 Any other AOB

A UC member raised a question regarding the EB's response to the topic 'Follow up committee of sensitive collaborations' during the consultation meeting. The EB had stated that the university will be evaluating all collaborations with the Middle East. The UC member asked why this review is focused on Middle Eastern collaborations rather than on other partnerships, such as those with TU Delft, which they remarked could also be complicit in the situation in Gaza. The UC member remarked they would like to formulate questions for the committee of sensitive collaborations regarding this.

A UC member suggested sending a general question about why Middle Eastern collaborations are being reevaluated, rather than naming particular universities. Another UC member asked what was missing from the EB's original answer. The UC member explained that the answer was incomplete and that they would have liked to ask more follow-up questions. One UC member noted that assessing third-party collaborations can be endless, but another member emphasized that it is still important to examine these collaborations and discuss how far down the supply chain the university needs to look.

The discussion concluded with a UC member stating that they will prepare the questions to send to the committee and share them with the clerk.

Action point:

- The Clerk will send the questions to the committee of sensitive collaborations, after receiving the questions from the Council member.

04.03 Reflection on first cycle

The Chair remarked that everyone should include the University Council email when scheduling meetings, so there is a comprehensive overview of all taskforce meetings taking place. The Clerk will also post a reminder about this on Teams. A UC member noted that they had not received any emails regarding the Finance Taskforce. The lead of the Finance Taskforce responded that several emails had been sent and suggested there may be an issue with the email address that needs to be resolved. Several other UC members also reported experiencing problems with their emails. The Chair added that practical questions can be discussed after the meeting. Another UC member remarked that the UC should remain critical about what they can realistically take on and influence.

05 Closing