

Minutes 246th FC meeting

Thursday May 25th 2023, 10:30 AM – 12:00 AM

FC members	EB	Guests
Luca de Jong (LdJ)	Daan Stam (DS)	Annemarie Kersten (AK)
Jacomijn Klitsie(JK)(Vice-Chair	Myra Van Esch (MvE)	Michel Lander (ML)
Silvija Prancane-Verhoef (SPV)		Inga Hoever (IH)
Edward Oldenburgr (EO)		
Luuk Veelenturf(LV)		
Anass Boukakar(AB)		
Max Meuser Bourgognion(MMB)		
Helena Suarez Groen (HSG)		
Boudewijn Pieteron(BP)		
Xena Welch Guerra (XWG)		

1. Opening

2. Agenda

3. Announcements

- Faculty model

DS We conducted open Q&A sessions where 150 out of 200 faculty members participated. We received a lot of valuable feedback, which was highly beneficial. Originally, we had planned a strategic platform meeting, but considering the substantial feedback and the attendance at the Q&A sessions, we decided it was not necessary to proceed with the platform meeting. Most of the individuals who would have attended the platform meeting had already participated in the Q&A sessions. Additionally, we had a productive meeting with the heads of departments regarding the faculty model, and we will incorporate all the feedback received to improve it.

Furthermore, there was a positive response to the increased flexibility and focus on career orientation. People appreciated the recognition that there are multiple career trajectories beyond the traditional path of an excellent researcher. However, some individuals expressed hesitation, primarily concerning the necessity of having multiple tracks. It is important to note that achieving consensus among all individuals is unlikely. One of the concerns raised is the perceived complexity of the faculty model.

Moreover, it is crucial to strike a careful balance between flexibility within the model and the recognition that unlimited freedom of choice may not be feasible. This relates to how individuals transition between different areas, the decision-making process, and the roles of leadership and individual autonomy.

The original concept was centered around a single dominant career path, where research and education are balanced, and individuals are evaluated based on their research productivity and student evaluations. However, we are now considering alternatives that incorporate additional measures of engagement and educational leadership, and there is general agreement on this approach. While the overall goal of the model remains the same, there will be changes implemented.

JK How will this affect the timeline?

DS At this point, we are uncertain. We will convene next week to discuss the feedback received. While we still hope to adhere to the planned timeline, we prioritize quality over speed. It is my desire to stay on schedule, but I cannot provide a definitive answer at this time.

JK I find it disappointing that we encounter obstacles and subsequently slow down the process. We have a pool of experts, and if necessary, we can consider hiring external consultants to expedite the process.

DS Our intention is still to complete the implementation before summer. However, I firmly believe that maintaining quality takes precedence over speed, and it is possible that we may not meet the deadline. In such a case, the first FC (Faculty Council) meeting would take place in September.

LdJ We have a dean on an extended term, but the extended term is now almost six months. Additionally, we were wondering about the dean of engagement and the recruitment of the new dean.

MvE Regarding the DoR, there is no end date yet, but it is all in agreement. However, he wanted to stay on during the transition of the new dean.

LV The faculty regulations state that we have to give advice to the reappointment of a new dean.

MvE If this is the case, you should follow the formal procedures. However, he is not officially reappointed because there was no official election. It was mutually decided to extend his term for now.

LdJ The faculty regulation specify that the term is four years and the term has ended. To be sure, we can formalize the extension in the next meeting.

MvE I will come back to you when the end term is known and then we can discuss the process of the new dean recruitment.

MvE Regarding the dean of engagement, there is no process and no interim dean. Only the engagement centers are now taken care of by Dirk van Dierendonck. If you want to address something regarding the engagement portfolio, the dean, Werner, is officially responsible.

LdJ There was some discussion on whether the dean of engagement will remain a separate function. Has this discussion been resolved?

MvE No, we will propose a new structure when this has been resolved and come back to you.

MvE Regarding the dean position, there is unclarity about the duration of the current Dean's term. When there is clarity upon this, we can start to plan the process for replacement.

4. Follow-up minutes 245th meeting

5. Diversity and inclusion (With Inga Hoever)

IH I prepared something based on the questions and concerns I received. I will start with the survey results and recommendations. I would also be open to discussing the full report when you have received it and discussing the recommendations in more depth.

If we look at the overall scores, we see that the average is slightly above the midpoint of the scale. Note that it is a bipolar scale, so 1 means totally disagree and 7 means totally agree. The

results are not disastrous, but also not much to write home about. The second thing that I want to draw attention to is that we have enormous amounts of variation in the school. For pretty much all of the subscales, there are people who totally agree and people who totally disagree. We are trying to find out where this variation comes from.

The highest score in the survey was to what extent people feel like they can be themselves at RSM. For areas of improvement, we see two main concerns. One is about equitable employment practices, mostly about receiving equal pay for equal work. The other one is inclusion in decision making, mainly based on the way that top-management uses input from the school.

We also looked at group differences in terms of variation. We see clear differences as a function of gender, which tends to be concentrated on equitable employment practices and on resources for conflict resolutions. This is more pronounced in academic staff as opposed to professional services staff and more pronounced at RSM EUR than RSM bv.

Furthermore, we see clear differences as a function of sexual orientation. Our LGBTQ+ colleagues score considerably lower in all dimensions, except for the integration of differences, which is more about how your colleagues treat you. Additionally, we found differences between tenure rank and contract type. The mid-level career rank group feels disproportionately less included. Around cultural background, it was difficult to find or interpret for a variety of reasons. We had the lowest response rate and the most difficulty coding this.

Finally, we see that there is a group of people who did not fill in any of the person-related questions. We see that people who do not answer these questions score substantially lower than people who answer all questions. This speaks to the sense of a lack of social safety. We have strong safeguards in terms of identifiability, but there is still a critical number of people who do not answer these questions. We also have 12% of people who report accessibility-related barriers in terms of the workplace, work facilities, and so forth.

These were the main results. We have discussed a much longer report with the EB, and we are now moving towards finally sharing this with the organizations. Alongside this, we are also sharing recommendations, of which I will give you a high-level overview first.

First, we want to engage in dialogue where we do not have a full understanding of what is going on. Second, we want to have formal structures and policies in place. Once we have this as a basis, we will focus on professionalizing management and leadership, enabling them to utilize, navigate, and disseminate these formal structures and procedures. Then, we will turn to our people more broadly to create and nurture inclusive behaviors.

We have different, more specific approaches for the different groups, which are included in the full report. For some groups, we do not have clearly defined plans. We need a lot of learning and dialogue to reach a point where formal procedures and policies are in place.

The idea was to discuss with participatory bodies and have other sessions where we can collect input. In parallel, we want to combine this with insights from the WVS, the BV engagement survey, and the EUR-wide engagement survey.

JK It is great to see that there are very concrete steps.

IH I would be very keen to meet with a subgroup of people to discuss the recommendations in more detail.

JK We have an HR subcommittee, so they could set up a meeting with you.

IH A condensed version of the full report will be shared with the entire school. I believe we should also make the complete version available, as I don't see any need for secrecy.

6. Advice on changes in the management instructions (With Anouschca Bholanath)

LV In some parts, it is mentioned that people have the right to spend a certain amount of euros per year or for a period of four years or less, but shouldn't this be "and." There is an example of this on page 15, 3.B.

AB I think this is a lower limit; you have to either pass a threshold in terms of money or reach a four-year mark. But I will look into this more closely after the meeting and correct it if necessary. What is the formal procedure for this in general?

LdJ We will send you a letter regarding our advice.

7. Corrections in faculty regulations (With Anouschca Bholanath)

JK We have been informed about an upcoming significant revision of the faculty regulations. Our initial assumption was that the current version was an intermediate version, with the comprehensive revision planned for the future.

AB This revision is not the extensive one we anticipated. We have identified some obvious mistakes that needed correction, and it was expected that everyone had already reviewed the corrected version.

JK When the comprehensive revision of the faculty regulations takes place, we would be delighted to actively participate.

LdJ Do we have any information regarding the timeline for the extensive revision?

AB Noted. Unfortunately, I am unaware of any details regarding the timeline at this point.

LV I have noticed two errors in Article 2.1, specifically in point 2. It refers to Article 2.1 "lid j," but I believe it should be "lid 1." Additionally, I suggest adding a sentence that excludes the program committee from this regulation.

AB Regarding the exclusion of the program committee, it doesn't need to be explicitly mentioned because the revised statement is more general and allows for deviations. Therefore, I prefer to keep it in a more general form.

LV In the same article, at point 5, it states: "The positions referred to in Article 2.1 paragraph 1, subsections a up to and including i, cannot be members of the Faculty Council, the Programme Committee, or the Examination Board." However, it should be "up to and including h" instead of "up to and including i," as it currently excludes members of the program committee and examination board from being members of that same committee, which doesn't make sense.

LV Furthermore, in Article 6.3.3, it states that the P&T committee is solely responsible for promoting and granting tenure to faculty members on the tenure track. However, don't they also handle promotions for senior lecturers?

DS Sometimes they do.

LV It would be beneficial to include that aspect in the comprehensive revision.

AB I will add it to the list for the extensive revision.

LdJ Thank you for attending. We will send you the letters addressing both topics.

8. Master thesis (With Michel Lander)

ML Currently, there are two ongoing pilots in different MSc programs aimed at integrating the thesis more seamlessly into the courses. This approach reduces the thesis's perception as an additional burden at the end of the master's program and may alleviate work pressure as well.

LdJ Does the pilot in strategic entrepreneurship affect the workload for coaches and co-readers?

ML The pilot extends over a longer period and is better integrated into the master's program.

XWG The first question pertains to the specified number of meetings outlined in the manual. Some aspects appear somewhat ambiguous.

ML The examination board prefers a minimum of six meetings in total with the coach and co-reader combined. Currently, there is a requirement of at least three meetings with the co-reader and six with the coach. If we aim to reduce workload, this is an area worth exploring.

XWG With a large number of master theses requiring coaching and coordination, it becomes burdensome for departments already operating at full capacity. Additionally, there is considerable inconsistency in the quality of feedback received by students.

ML How much time do you spend on a thesis?

XWG For students who don't reach out much, a minimum of two or three meetings is typical, excluding reading. I have also experimented with hosting office hours, and some students attend consistently, with a few even meeting with me 20 times.

ML When I used an objective measure in a specific master's program, the results indicated that the majority of time is dedicated to theses, with a norm of 30 hours per thesis. How much time do you allocate for this?

LV Is this allocation for the coach and co-reader combined?

ML No, the coach receives 30 hours, while the co-reader is allocated six hours.

ML I plan to conduct a similar measurement for all programs to determine where we invest the most time and whether we find it sensible.

XWG The previous director of operations conducted an extensive activity analysis, which revealed that thesis coaching accounted for the largest proportion of workload.

ML It's important to consider this activity analysis from a different perspective as it was primarily driven by cost-cutting measures. While it offers an effective way to reduce costs, it doesn't necessarily enhance quality. Instead, I believe we should engage in a discussion to determine an appropriate time allocation for educational activities.

XWG I would love to have that discussion, but the primary concern lies in the ambiguity surrounding the time spent on thesis supervision, leading to inconsistent feedback quality.

ML We need to establish what level of quality is deemed acceptable and define the necessary conditions. Consequently, we must ensure that the time allocated for supervising each thesis is accurately determined.

XWG There are certain thesis checks that need to be conducted on 10% of the total number of theses, and it appears that departments receive funding for this. However, I am unsure about who is responsible for carrying out these checks.

ML It is the responsibility of the academic director and the thesis coordinator to organize these reviews. We recommend reviewing two theses in the lower performance range, two in the middle range, and two top-performing theses. However, it is up to the departments to arrange this. The budget allocated for quality control, which you mentioned, is intended for organizing these reviews.

LdJ Departments receive 1500 euros for a thesis coach, and they have the flexibility to decide whether to hire an external coach and how much of the 1500 euros to allocate to the external coach. However, there is a lack of consistency among departments in this regard.

ML This practice is not limited to theses but also extends to courses. I believe this raises concerns, and we need to establish a uniform policy. I will conduct an analysis to determine how the funds are being utilized and the extent of this practice.

LdJ According to the TER, master theses are stored for seven years. In the library, they are likely kept indefinitely.

AK The seven-year rule is mandated by law, and the library's approach may differ. Students should have the option to opt out if they wish.

LV Presently, it is quite challenging for students to opt out.

SPV We can consult with the examination board to explore the opt-out procedure.

9. TER

LV We are pleased to note that our concerns regarding perusals and the options for resits/improvement have been clarified in the TER. The only remaining issue is the discrepancy between the Bachelor's and Master's programs regarding perusals and the resit/improvement options.

AK Achieving alignment among all parties involved in the discussion of perusals was challenging, and we wanted to avoid rushing through the decision. Therefore, we have postponed this matter to be addressed by the programme committee at the beginning of the next academic year. I will make efforts to advance the article you mentioned regarding the resit/improvement option. I expect it to be approved next week.

LdJ It should be specified in the TER that registration for perusals is only required for non-digital perusals. Can this be included?

AK Certainly, if you have a specific suggestion, it can be included in the TER.

JK We recently introduced a new track called "Financial Strategists" in the Bachelor's program, which was not included in the version you reviewed. This addition aims to alleviate the workload pressure on the other financial tracks.

LV I foresee an increase in workload due to the addition of three more courses.

JK Funding has been secured for this.

LV Have the positions been filled already?

JK Yes, new hires will be made to support the new track.

10. Follow-up to-do list 245th meeting

11. Any other business

LV What is the current status of the revised tenure track?

DS Pursey is currently working on a revised version, which will be available soon. Once it is ready, it will be shared with you.

LV What is the timeline for implementing the revised tenure track?

DS The plan is to implement it in the autumn, and that is a firm deadline.

LV After the implementation, are we proceeding with the starter grants?

DS We have already started working with the starter grants. The first three grants have already been allocated. These individuals have chosen to pursue tenure first and then receive a promotion three months later, while also receiving the starter grants during that period. We can invite Pursey to the next meeting to discuss the starter grants and tenure track in more detail.

LdJ We will include it on the agenda for the meeting on June 15th.

ML There is an idea to have a student assessor present during the nationwide Business Administration/Economics meeting, which takes place twice a year. The student representative should be from our faculty. Who is interested in taking part in this?

JK We should also discuss this with the new faculty members next year. Please share the information, and then we can have a discussion about it with the new faculty council.

ML I will do that.

12. Closing

