

Minutes 250th FC meeting (ext)

Tuesday October 10th 2023, 10:30 AM – 12:00 AM

FC members
Luuk Veelenturf (LV)
Luca de Jong (LJ)
Hidde van Gelder (HG)
Mira Nikolova (MN)
Xena Welch Guerra (XWG)
Karthik Rapaka (KR)
Jessie Lee (JL)
Robbie Steegman (RS)

EB members
Myra van Esch (ME)
Werner Brouwer (WB)
Daan Stam (DS)

Agenda

Opening & agenda	2
Announcements	2
Faculty model	2
Internationalisation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Starter- and incentive grants	4
Minutes and publishing financial information.....	4
Financial update	6
Measures	8
Dean recruitment	13
Communication	16
Tenure track.....	17
Progress FC	22

Opening & agenda

LJ: As we have a pretty busy agenda, I suggest we get started.

So are there any comments, remarks, any changes to the agenda to be desired? And if not, then I suggest we move on to the announcements already.

Announcements

Faculty model

DS: Yes, I'm happy to see the three are still there and they keep being there. So, the faculty model, we've been looking at this closely of course and now we've decided in the steering group to start moving on elements of the faculty model because the faculty model as a whole moves just too slowly. So, we start moving on elements of the faculty model with a first focus on the educational track. Then you can expect a lot more movements. I'm not sure when the next meeting is planned, the FC.

LJ: I think it's in November the 16th.

DS: Yeah, so given the date today, I think that there's a good likelihood that we'll be coming then with a proposal that's been discussed by heads of departments and me as well around the educational track. And if we don't make it right then, it will be the next one likely. But then I'll update you again.

So, we're going to move on at least the educational track part.

LV: So just for clarification, what do you mean with educational track? We have an educational track in the research, so in the faculty, and an educational track of lecture.

DS: It's a combination of those two that we'll talk about.

LV: Yeah, since I think that is the one who is really now on pressure. And I hear from a lot of colleagues that they're very worried about all the uncertainty. I think internationalization is one of the uncertainties, and of course the financial situation, which will be published.

DS: We feel it as well, and I think everyone in the school feels it. And at this point, I also personally feel that we can't wait with that element of the model. We can't wait for the rest of the model anymore.

We now move with this part of it, but it is embedded into a larger idea about the faculty model. So next time we'll meet, I'll tell you a little bit more about this, give you some contours of what the general idea is, and then some details about the educational part.

LV: But does it then mean that for the lecturers, there's clarity before the end of the year?

DS: I still hope, but we'll have to see. You as FC also have to say something about this first, but this is something I'm still trying to move towards, yes.

LV: Okay. That's great to hear, then. Because I think it's very important for the lecturers, to have some certainty.

Internationalization

DS: Exactly. When it comes to internationalization, I guess I have three updates from my side.

So, one of them is that this is a topic that is quite uncertain for us. And we're trying to stay on top of it, but it's not completely clear how the country's going to move. This is something of which we keep trying to feel what's going on. I think the most important thing is that we're in especially close collaboration with the economics faculty.

So, the two schools try to work together on almost everything. And that helps a lot to get much more information in and to have more processing capacity for this, et cetera.

The second thing is that in the school itself, the HR organization has organized walk-in meetings for faculty and staff. To see what's going on with our faculty and staff themselves, what are their problems and issues around the internationalization, to get a good feel of what's going on.

And the third thing is that we're strongly busy with our offering of Dutch courses, because that's been an ask from the faculty.

So my hope and my expectation is that in the next faculty meeting, I can tell you exactly what that offering is going to be. And also, to ask you whether you have comments or ideas for it. But I think the good hope is that early next year we can start with offering these in good fashion.

LV: So you say before the next meeting, but I also saw that indeed there will be some information sessions for international faculty soon. Do we then already have that information?

DS: No, I think the walk-in sessions are more about just getting together and seeing how people feel about the topic itself.

I think we've done one of those sessions and it was good to see how people thought about this. I think it was insightful for us as well to figure out what the community feels and thinks about this. They're also oriented towards offering information and help and guidance on where to find what you need to find in the organization, support for lots of things. So the language training certainly falls under that. Whether we already know exactly what that's going to look like, we don't know yet.

So it was not the intention of these meetings per se to communicate on this. If we do know, we're certainly going to tell it then.

WB: At this stage, I mean there's still a lot of uncertainty also about the law. Some of you saw Pieter Omtzigt, who in the polls is not unlikely to become one of the biggest, if not the biggest, new party. The types of things that he indicates as his vision for the university certainly does not coincide with my vision for the university.

Unfortunately for all of us, he's a bit more powerful in that sense than I am. Which just indicates that this is a really uncertain thing still. And even the current law, whether or not it will be approved within the current government or later on with a new government. And whether it's better to have it now or later. I think those are questions that everybody is struggling with at this moment in time. So the only thing that we can do is to the best of our knowledge prepare.

And we also try to find the right types of arguments to fight some of the sentiments that are currently ongoing. And that is something that we're also doing together with the other business schools and the other economics faculties in the Netherlands. In order to really have a story that we want to tell about why we feel internationalization, both of students and of staff, is crucial in a scientific way.

Starter- and incentive grants

LJ: And then I think the final announcement on Starter and Incentive Grants?

DS: Yeah, I think there's not a lot to say there other than that we have a strong working group now with the Starter and Incentive Grants that coordinates everything together. The interesting thing of that, again, is that we work very intensively together with the School of Economics to pool resources so that the coordinator on both sides is actually the same person. That way, we have lots of insights together with these areas and we can move faster, which is necessary because at this point we're developing things and at the same time the frameworks from the government and from the university aren't still completely clear.

So it's really an exercise of trying to figure out as much information as we can from the environment and then trying to prepare for it as much as we can, such that we can move fast when we can. But it's still a balancing act and we don't want to do too much based only on certain information. At this moment we are well positioned to move if we can.

LV: You say you don't have news, but we got some news from Myra and Daniël last time about the Incentive Grants and some intentions. And I think also in our letter on the budget we made some comment about that. Is that something you want to discuss now?

ME: Under the budget update.

Minutes and publishing financial information

LJ: Then are there any comments, questions, remarks on the minutes of last meeting? If not, then I have one small remark. During the meeting where we discussed the budget, it was suggested to already start communication towards RSM faculty on the financial situation as the minutes will now be posted. And we were wondering to what extent that has already happened.

ME: No, you would have known.

I think we want to be careful with that. We're preparing something, but we also want to make sure that the views of the central office are also included in that.

And we're not there yet, which we'll talk about in a minute. So that's a sensitive issue.

LV: But if the minutes are out, then they read it that way and then it's not careful.

ME: One way to go about this is to set a deadline together and agree on that. And then we can communicate and you can publish the minutes.

LV: Since what is the delaying or what is now the issue that you need still some confirmation from central on this? I think also a lot of other universities and schools are already announcing a lot of things.

ME: We could do two communications, but then it might create unrest that you don't want to have. So if we can communicate it in one sweep and say this is the situation, this is what we've discussed with central, this is the end state of what we're moving towards, I think that would be very helpful.

It was promised to me that the CvB would communicate something, they would develop something to communicate to us last Thursday. So, it could be any day that we receive something. It could also take another two weeks. I don't know.

LV: That would be too late, right?

WB: Just from my experience on the other side in my old life where we had to reorganize at a certain stage, announcing financial issues without suggesting something like a plan typically creates an unrest that, if at all possible, we would want to avoid.

If we would just say, well, you know, we have a shortage of money, we have no reserves anymore and we're going down for four and a half million next year, just hypothetically speaking, I don't think we do our service at all. I think that will create a type of unrest that, again, I feel would draw on the staff beyond a point that I would consider to be careful enough also from the organization side. So ideally, you would want to have one point of communication in where we say something about the issue and the size of the issue, but also already can indicate something about the next steps that we need to take.

And hopefully also already be able to indicate that there are also hopefully certain steps that we do not need to take, because I think that combination would really be the preferable one. And then the question is timelines. To some extent, like Myra said, the timelines are not completely in our hands, unfortunately.

But I think we need to set a date anyway. So if we can agree on that and then publish the minutes, even though I know that that is not nice, or you can leave out a part of the minutes for now, I think that would really be better for the organization.

So it's not about us or about me or about anything, but it's just if you put this out there without any context, I'm afraid about what the consequences might be.

ME: So next week is school off week. I don't want to send people off to a vacation. If it was completely up to me, I would say we communicate after fall break. So that would be one week later. The week of the 23rd.

LV: But then we can put Monday.

ME: Yeah, we can work towards that. I mean, it's not like there's no pressure felt at EUR Central, because right now the budget is not approved by you. So, it's not like they're resting comfortably.

They want to move forward as well. There is an incentive for them to react, but I don't want to, in Dutch we say, overplay my hand by pushing them too hard.

But I think the 23rd is reasonable. So, if we want to set that as a deadline, we can.

LV: I agree with you on setting it after the holiday

ME: Yeah, what you want is that if somebody's worried that they're coming to you, talking about why they're worried, and if everybody's off, then where do they go?

LV: I think it is especially important, once again, for the lecturers with temporary contracts.

ME: Exactly.

JL: What happens if EUR Central does not give the information needed.

ME: Then our budget is not approved.

JL: But in terms of communication?

ME: Oh, well, then we should find a way around that. I hope by then there has been some communication lines where we know what we can communicate and what we cannot communicate.

JL: Do we have confidence in that from EUR Central at this point?

ME: Yeah, I do.

LV: I was looking at the university council minutes, but I could not find anything about finance. I think also as a university, they should communicate at a certain moment, right?

ME: That's weird. I don't know.

LV: But maybe they will discuss it at another meeting this week.

Financial update

ME: Well, maybe we can go into the financials now. Would that be okay?

Based on a letter that you sent us, thank you for that, there was a meeting about the budget with all the directors of operations and all the service managers. And so, the budget was presented there, along with the entire situation of EUR. They presented that, whereas

originally there was a minus of 41 million, it was now reduced to minus 23 million. This was done by various means, for example by bringing the incentive grants up in time, but also because they said to the service departments that any deficit won't be accepted there. So they had to bring their budget back to zero, which was a huge effort.

And the conclusion there was, if we can bring this to their representatives, the Raad van Toezicht, then that is acceptable for now. It's still a huge deficit, but it's within boundaries. Ellen van Schoten, a member of the CBB, said she feels comfortable enough to bring this to the Raad van Toezicht. When she asked, as she was the head of that meeting, if there were any other things to mention, I mentioned the budget not being approved. And me being worried that there were some worries from the faculty council and we could not move forward.

What then happened was that she said, yeah, it's an interesting discussion because you talk about our reserves, the reserves of RSM. And she said, technically, there are no reserves of RSM. There is one bucket of central reserves. So then if we approve the budget, it means that the deficit is a deficit that we all feel. And there are enough reserves.

So, you end up with an end result where you've contributed to the reserves being less. But that's it then. If that is true, it means that this is a communication step.

LV: So could you then confirm to us that this is the situation? That we never have to pay it back.

ME: If I listen to it correctly, it would mean that although we have a deficit next year, we will end up with the zero after 2024. Mind you, there is nothing in me that believes that this is actually the case based on legacy. However, if this is how we think about this, your issue, apart from pulling the incentive grants forward, would be resolved.

Because then, basically, we're covered by central. So what we ended the meeting with is that the head of CPC and Ellen said to each other, we need to write up a letter for RSM. And that this should be sent this Thursday.

So I'm hopeful. I'm not naive, but I am hopeful that this will be confirmed. And Ellen actually said: 'it's something that irritates me because everybody talks about deficits and they're allocated to specific areas of the school. And it's fine that you count that way, but it's not how it works. There's one deficit and one reserve.'

It's not like a savings account that you can pull money from if you need it. It's something that we need to agree upon what you're spending it on. So it's different from having a savings account where you store money to spend at a later date.

And actually, the fact that it will be a vacation week next week can work in our advantage because I'm sure that they want to have this resolved before then as well.

They still have a couple of more days and that's why I'm not overplaying my hand. On the one hand, I'm reminding them that we're at a standstill right now and that we need something from them. On the other hand, I want to give, especially Esmee, the head of CPC,

the leeway to come up with a formulation that's okay for everyone. Because she knows what the situation is here and what we need.

LV: Okay. At least it's good to hear that. It seems we get a kind of promise. Hopefully, we don't want them in the future asking to pay back this 8 million or 6 million.

ME: I know. So right now, we're closer to 5 million because of the incentive grants. Knowing full well that this is window dressing, of course.

We are actually leaving after this meeting to have a strategy meeting with the EB. And tomorrow, a large portion of that meeting is allocated towards working out scenarios how to deal with this. And I've been preparing this with Daniel, so we have a full scale list of possible things that we could do to control the budget, especially for 2024. And we also know what we need to do for the years after.

So, I feel confident that we can arrange things, but we have to be smart about it. How we want to move forward, not just for 2024 but especially for the years after because we want to turn this over into a positive or small positive as quickly as possible.

LV: You don't need a small positive if we don't have our own savings account, right?

ME: Yeah, you would want a zero, right? Or a slight minus even if they cover it anyway, I mean there are other faculties with large savings. So, we're working on that.

But anyway, what we what we need to do between now and say halfway through November is develop these scenarios. So, we as we're sitting here we need to talk about it because we it needs to be part of the package of measurements that Ellen wants to take to the Raad van Toezicht. She can say I'm presenting you with the deficit for 2024 but we have enough reserve so it's not the issue and these are the measures that we're taking as a university to make sure that 2024 is the end of it.

So we're developing those. It's not rocket science but you need to make choices, hard decisions. Are we going to travel less or are we going to do something about...

Measures

XWG: What about the electives? Are those something that are part of the discussion?

ME: Yeah, but that will be part of the more structural measures. There are things that you can do right now where you can say we won't do any meetings with lunches anymore, we won't hire any people externally that are helping us on the short term, how many student assistants do we have? However, there are also things that you want to work on for the long run and that's about how many electives do we want and what is the cutoff point where you ask yourselves how many people should be in elective, is six enough, or ten, or fifty?

XWG: Right, but I mean what would be the earliest point in time that something related to the electives could actually be implemented.

ME: Implemented? Well implemented you can only do it next academic year.

XWG: Yeah but, that would be a sensible point in time right?

ME: Yes, so for 2024 most likely we will do like the easy things that are going to hurt but are easy and on the short term. Then for 2025, or the year 24-25 as the first academic year, it seems like we have a lot of time, but we don't because if we want to cut out electives we need to actually kind of know it now or at least before the year ends.

XWG: I mean the next academic year is starting in 2024, which is also the next fiscal year, and that starts in three months already. At least the minors in the bachelor take place at the end of the year and I thought that there's also quite a convoluted portfolio there.

ME: Yeah and then the sooner we can start looking at the portfolios of what we want to change, the better we can make sure that we absolutely make those changes most effectively be seen in the full fiscal year 2025, because for 2024 you only have half a year if you can even get it done everything arranged before the new academic year starts.

So, that's the long run, and those are the most important decisions that we need to make. We have a little bit more time for that and we can sort of put a dot on the horizon before halfway through November, but we don't have to have everything explicit then yet.

Our own deadline for the CVB is first quarter of 2024 because they want to make sure that we include it in the budget for the year 2025, but for us we need to look at other deadlines meaning if we're going to cut certain parts of programs we need to know it as soon as possible because if we don't that it won't be effective starting the new academic year 2024. We have shorter deadlines than the CVB has in that sense, so we're working on two tracks.

One is short term. What do we absolutely need to fix and quite frankly what can we get away with and the other part is how do you want to structurally change the school so that we can all be in have black numbers instead of red numbers starting the fiscal year 2025.

XWG: Yeah, but clearly many topics are topics that we have been discussing at least since two or three years, right? Take the activity analysis that we've done, and there's the whole master thesis topic. There are some programs where I know they would already like to make the master thesis much leaner which would clearly also come with savings.

ME: This is a clear sign of never wasting a good crisis, because all those signs were there but there was no real incentive to actually take care of it until now.

XWG: Yeah because clearly we would prefer those type of improvements to other ones right.

ME: Yes but the matter is: will it also have an effect on 2024 in terms of if we do it now when will we actually notice it? So those are things that we absolutely want to do need to do will be better for everyone and hopefully it will reduce workload and then the rest of the deficit there are some other things that we can do that will be for the short run. Let's say we travel less that will not be a sustainable solution. We can do it for one year maybe two years and then it comes to a halt because it's an important part of who we are what we need to

do so then we need to go back to allowing people to actually go to conferences and present their work.

LJ: Now I hear that there's kind of a hard deadline for next academic year, can we then also assume that a decision is going to be made on something like the electives and something like stuff like that was discussed before?

ME: Yes, it has to be.

DS: I mean clearly the electives for next year are already arranged so that's fixed; you can't change that anymore. The electives for next year are going to be arranged likely before summer so we need to be able to do something before that. With regard to minors, I think there's already been quite a bit of differences in the minor portfolio so there's a difference in structural financing of the minors and I think the portfolio itself has been a little bit smaller than it used to be and the incentives there also transition slightly, so I think that's less of something that we can deal with. Electives has not been done yet.

WB: But they are typically announcing your rules and regulations also towards the students so you need to know before the exam year starts what it is that you want to do. I think it's also important to just highlight again, and that also indicates the complexity, that there is a difference between let's say the internal allocation of funds and the external way of actually earning money. So, if we would cut down on electives that would save workload in a direct sense. If you keep the same number of people that you had before that especially then reduces the workload, but it doesn't necessarily immediately translate into reduced costs.

That's also signaling an important issue that one of the incentives now currently in the budget system is that it stimulates doing these types of things whereas it doesn't necessarily increase the income of the total school and trying to align those things means looking at the whole system and school rather fundamentally, which makes this an interesting and complex exercise.

LJ: That's also going to happen concurrently then with the decision on the electives?

ME: Yeah, because it's like a knitting work where you pull one thread and everything starts.

LJ: So, you have a very tough job ahead with a very hard deadline.

ME: Yeah, but we don't start at zero and that's actually what you're referring to. There's been a lot of work done over the years looking at this issue because it's not new so we can learn from that and some of the suggestions that were made earlier that were never actually implemented we can revisit and see what it will lead to and whether or not we want to include them now. But this is a big undertaking and it's going to change some of the fundamental settings that we have right now within the school.

So, it's going to have impact, but we feel it's necessary. We can no longer shy away from it. So, we're up for the test and hopefully we're done before the end of this academic year.

XWG: Sounds good.

LV: Yeah so I have two questions.

The first question sounds easy but you said: okay now we hope the CVB will write a letter and the loss will be covered. So why exactly are these direct temporary measures, like less traveling, needed? It says in the budget you did not take any measures now.

ME: You're absolutely right, but the fact that the CvB will give this guarantee comes at a cost. They want to see that we actually take measures to reduce it. So, they say okay we'll accept that there's a deficit but if there's anything you can do to reduce that within reason we want you to at least try to do so. Of course, we want to be clever about that because in theory, you can always reduce, but then it's really going to hurt.

So, the question is how do we find that balance for the next year. Perhaps we want to keep some stuff up your sleeve. I mean there might be a little disaster that we don't know of yet, who knows what happens with internationalization.

Maybe you don't want to give away all your poker cards just yet, but you want to keep some of them so that you at least have some leeway. That's the dance that we need to do and they know this. This is how these things work, it's a negotiation.

LV: So you mention two paths. The short-term path, you say it's before November.

ME: We need to have the scenarios. So, we're not going to implement it. But we need to show the CVB what kind of measures are possible and what the impact would be.

LV: Yeah both for the short term and the long term.

ME: Yes but for the short term it's November and for the long term it's the end of Q1 2025.

LV: To present them to their board?

ME: Yeah to have them fully financially sound. Because right now, if we say we are going to reduce workload by looking at less work for instance for professional services, we need to figure out what that is and what that means and what does that mean for our employees.

Will we have less or will we have the same or what will we reduce and how will we reduce it? Will it mean that we just stop hiring externals or do we not hire new ones if people leave. All those kinds of measures we need to weigh them and also see what the impact is. So that's why we have time until the end of Q1. But it's no rocket science.

There's a limited number of things that you can do. I mean if you and I would start brainstorming we would have like the gross list in 10 minutes which wouldn't be very different from what we're looking at.

But again, what we want to avoid is letting people go that we weren't planning on letting go. So, there's a difference if somebody leaves and you say okay we're going to work around it and not going to replace that person. It's very different from telling somebody that may have been here for a while that they're no longer needed.

And that's the thing that we absolutely want to avoid. And that should be part of the communication.

LV: Yes. And how are we going to be involved in this?

ME: Well what I propose is that if we've had this meeting with the EB and we have the plans prioritized and sorted out, and we've written down the scenarios, we discuss them with you before we go to the central office and the CvB.

LV: But then we need maybe to plan a separate meeting then.

ME: Yes. Just like the budget. Because we want you to be involved but it's never going to be something that we in that detail are going to communicate to the entire community, in broad strokes we will, but not in the detailed version. And we do want you to be involved in that.

LV: So it might be smart to start the planning process since you have clear deadlines. And maybe Reinier can take it from our side.

JL: I think that's it on the financial update.

LV: There is still the incentive grant. We don't really know, at least that's what we hear from you, that we don't really know a lot about how it will look like, what the rules are, etc.

ME: Yes. So there are several ways that you can look at this.

One thing is if we do something that in the end doesn't seem feasible, then the risk is on the CvB if they cover us, right? That's one way of looking at it, maybe a bit short-sighted.

Another way is: If we can come up with savings and we don't need them, we don't need to use them, right? So, I see it as a backup plan where we say: if we need to use them, we will use them. On the other hand, we may find something that we can do more easily and then we don't need to do it.

And the third one is that Central might not need us to do it.

It's both ESE and us, so we're in the same boat. But if they know that this is taking a loan from the future, it will be high on their priority list to avoid this. So, if they can make ends meet, they're still calculating, it will be avoided.

Central said to me that they will let me know and that, maybe, we don't even need this to happen.

But so far, we put it in the mix because they asked us to and if we can avoid it, we will.

LV: And it cannot happen that they say: if we haven't used them, they go to another school?

ME: No, that won't happen. I don't think that's likely. What can happen is that they force us to use it.

LV: What if you don't have a candidate. Or candidates refuse?

ME: We don't know. It's a bit uncertain. But everyone agrees that it's not ideal, also EUR Central.

LV: And they asked all the schools to do the same?

ME: ESE and RSM have the same way of working.

LJ: Any further questions on the budget slash financial update? Then if not, then I suggest we move on to the Dean subject.

Dean recruitment

DS: So, this is about the recruitment. Two vacant positions, the Dean of Research and the Dean of Engagement and Executive Education.

So when it comes, at first we thought of placing these together. But it turns out that we're already able to place the Dean of Research earlier than the Dean of Engagement. And given that we really want to have these positions filled, we've discussed this with the heads of departments and others.

And we've got strong advice to continue more quickly than with that. So now we have two trajectories. One is for the Dean of Research vacancy.

This is the one that you've seen, I think.

ME: Well, they haven't.

LJ: We received it like during our meeting, ten minutes before the meeting started.

DS: It hasn't changed for the last week or so. So, I think the coordination can still improve. Because you could have gotten this, I think, last week.

It's a version of this document that's been discussed already within the EB. It's discussed with heads of departments. And it's pretty much ready to go out upon your approval, I think. Then we can start looking for the Dean of Research.

When it comes to the Dean of Engagement, we have a version that is pretty far. That still needs to be discussed with the heads of departments. I think that will happen on the 24th of October. This means that next meeting with you, we will likely have a final version for you to check as well. And then we can start looking for Dean of Engagement as well.

The idea for the Dean of Research is that it is not a very changed profile. The responsibilities are pretty much similar to what we had. The main changes have been in the procedure of getting a person.

So, who's in the committee? As you've seen, I think, faculty council representation is also important. And the actual hiring of the Dean of Research, that will be the same for the Dean of Engagement.

I think for the Dean of Engagement, there's more changes. Our proposal there is to combine some of the duties of the prior Dean of Engagement and the Dean of Executive Education into one profile. And that's something that you'll see, I think, next time in more detail.

That's where we are with those two profiles at this point.

LV: So, you say that almost after we have approved it, you can start the recruitment process. I'm curious how you do that. Because I think that last time, there were sometimes issues there. Furthermore, how can we stimulate more diversity in this role? So how are you going to recruit people who are interested for this job? Profile is one thing, but sending one email is maybe not.

DS: I think one of the key things is, of course, to announce it first. I mean, it needs to be clear. And we're looking for internal candidates. So, we announce this first so that we know that everybody gets it. And we'll announce it through different means. We'll be talking to potential candidates as well.

And we see people that we feel are candidates that are eligible for this and that might fit the profile. We'll also actively start talking to them, which is usually also a very good means of getting people to apply. This is simply only to get them to apply. The process for the actual selection is clear, but I think those are the main two routes that we're going to use.

And us is not only the EB, but we'll also take into account that the department is very clear as well. We'll be also asking them to figure out who in their groups might be good candidates for this and urge them to talk to them and make this an active effort to look for the best Dean of Research and Dean of Engagement that we can get. I think those are the two main ways.

One is a more passive way: We communicate this and make sure that we keep communicating it. It's not just an e-mail to the entire school. We're announcing it in a different town or other places as well to make sure that we get it.

But we also actively approach people and say, hey, isn't this something for you? Why don't you apply? Have you thought about this? Do you need more information about this? Et cetera, et cetera. Those are the ways that we think about it.

LV: Is there a special effort in sharing to increase diversity?

DS: I mean, we can't ensure more diversity because the efforts that we'll put in, we can only put those efforts into people applying. And essentially, from my perspective, I think we serve diversity if we get more people to apply. And then there's a selection procedure, and I think that's a formal procedure where we don't have full say on what's going to happen.

But in that selection, it's clear that diversity is an issue. It's there in the profile as well, but I think in that selection committee, diversity is clearly also one of the things to look at. I think the most important element there is actually getting more people to apply leaves more choice for the selection committee, and then it's easier for them to choose to take diversity into account.

LV: Yeah, and then especially the active encouragement one of the things that research suggests is that some people, especially some less assertive people, might not even think of

themselves as suitable for a role. Therefore, I think that that's a really also important part of that strategy.

DS: Exactly, and this also is a call out to the faculty members of this group. If you think of people, let them know as well, or send them to us. If you even just think about it, go talk to them, go talk to them, go talk to Percy, see what this is, and see what they think. I think that's important.

WB: So, especially in the active encouragement of people, diversity, of course, also already is a consideration. And that's also why ideally I would have wanted these two positions to be a bit more parallel even, because at the end of the day, you know, if we have two positions filled, about September 1st, three positions filled, then what you would like to see, of course, is a more diverse EB after the dust has settled again. And that's what we strive for.

Of course, we're dependent on who applies, but we can encourage also people from not represented or underrepresented groups currently in the EB to just hopefully encourage them to apply even if they may have not thought about themselves as candidates before.

DS: And just to be clear, that doesn't mean that we're going to dissuade people that are not from those groups to apply. We want more people to apply, and that holds for all demographics. We want more people to apply so that we have more choice. That's the most important issue. In that sense, it's also important for people who think they might not be ready yet to come to us as well. Even if they think not this time, but maybe in four years, let them contact us as well.

We already start talking now also for diversity in the future because this is where it starts. People don't think about doing these types of positions on a certain day. They need to be groomed into this and start thinking that this might be something for them years ahead. So, if we get applications from people that are really not ready yet, that might actually be a very good sign for us.

And we would also, I think, in the aftermath of this, go and talk to all of those candidates. For example, we say: you didn't get this role now, but we're super happy that you applied. Applying to these roles is a good thing. It signals that you do something, and I think that's important for people to understand, and we see it, and we remember this.

I think it's an important thing also to make people, feel good about having applied. So, that's a second thing that we can try to do to make sure that people keep applying and see this as something good.

WB: This helps building their CVs in order to pinpoint where the gaps might be and also where we can help in order to fill those gaps.

LV: My final question was whether the Dean of Research will also be the vice-Dean, but I have to admit, I did not read the profile carefully in these 15 minutes.

DS: That will likely change. So, this is only a profile for a Dean of Research.

I think traditionally the vice dean in the school has always been the dean of faculty. When I started at the beginning of the year, this was not the case. I think this is something that we're reconsidering now.

Communication

LV: Okay. Thanks, Daan. And then maybe, indeed, on the dean of engagement one, question is that we at least have the profile a week before the meeting.

DS: Yes, I agree.

LJ: We also talked about this shortly in the agenda meeting where you already mentioned that it was almost done.

DS: Yeah, and it was. I think we sent it already last week, but it didn't reach you, unfortunately. So, I think that that is an issue that needs tackling, I think, in different ways.

One of them is clearly that we need to make sure that it gets to where you need it. And the other thing is if you don't get it, don't assume that it's not ready yet. Also assume that maybe it's somewhere.

ME: But, we'll do better next time. Yes.

JL: Or even just clear communication on the end. If there's a deadline set and it can't be met, let us know it can't be met. I mean everyone's really making things happen, but I think the gist that I've gotten from conversations is that it's been quite often that receiving documentation has been kind of like floating in a gray area where a time frame is given, it's not received, and then we're also not informed of why it wasn't received.

DS: It happens sometimes that we get lots of things in between and then we don't make the deadline, but we can give clear communication indeed. In this case the problem was that nobody knew you didn't have it. So if I would have known you didn't have it, I could have sent it immediately.

ME: We're lacking secretary support in that.

WB: Well, then final point, sorry. Have we settled then also on a procedure to get your opinion about the current profile of the dean of research?

LJ: I think we have to do that. Yeah, I think we just have to read the profile.

DS: Yeah, and then whether you have any comments. And if not, whether you can approve or condition something.

DS: And if not, under which conditions you would approve. Because I do think it's important for us.

WB: Because one of the things, of course, is that the current Dean of research, as you might know, has already been in overtime.

ME: A year and a half.

WB: He's reminding all of us.

So, I mean this is our fault, right? It's not to put unfair pressure on you, but if we could make a bit of progress on this, that would be nice.

Also, because I see there's a bit of unrest in the organization about how these types of procedures actually function within RSA. And every now and then I get the question: have you already appointed somebody? Is there an open procedure? So, I think being able to announce it will also help to reduce some of that type of pressure that we are a secret type of movement that makes all kinds of decisions without due process.

Tenure track

LJ: Well, if that was it for this topic, then I suggest we move on to the tenure track. Yeah, originally we invited Percy, but we realized internally that there weren't enough questions to justify his presence. So, we let him know and also you in cc.

But we still have a few questions that we hope you can answer and all that.

XWG: Yeah, so we noticed that there are a little bit less questions rather than comments. And what we noticed when we talked to our colleagues is that many feel under-informed.

DS: In terms of?

XWG: We feel under-informed in the hiring process. What can we tell new applicants about what will apply to them? This is clearly the group that started rather recently. So, not those that did now get their midterm evaluation transformed into a permanent contract, but those that started under the assumption that they would have a five-year evaluation period and now will have one coming up relatively soon.

And for those, as far as I know, they now also are obliged to come up with letter writers, right?

DS: No, not necessarily. So, what we do at this point with everyone that's in that position, is that they will get a choice. So, we're not forcing anyone to go into a new tenure track system.

People always have the choice to go with the old system or the new if they're hired in the old system. We ask everyone before they go up: do you want to go up in the new version or also in the full version that we're getting now? And we've also allowed so far everyone, even if they want to go up for the new one, to just keep the procedures the same as the old version. So, they could still hand in just the normal ones.

XWG: Now in autumn, right? But I thought that in spring already the new procedures will be in place.

DS: Yeah, but even there, I mean, people that were hired under the old regime are going to be asked whether they want to migrate to the new regime. Now, to be very honest, all do because it's much better for them and there's really no downside to it.

This means that the people that got an on-track have all been granted tenure now. And the people that are up for midterm now, if they get an on-track, they'll all be tenured too. So, this means a lot of tenured people in our school, which is very good, I think. Before next year, but this will be after the P&T, there will be a communication to everyone that is in the tenure track that was hired under the old regime to say: do you want to migrate? We did one open session at a certain point on the tenure track. We'll likely do that again as well to make sure that people understand what it means.

But I think what you make is a very good point that this has been only communicated to the Heads of Departments, but I think it's good to make this a little bit more and to communicate it beyond the Heads of Department to the management teams of the different departments. Normally, our assumption is that if the Heads of Department know, it also flows down into their groups, but in reality it might not. So, let's make sure that we communicate it to the management teams of the different departments as well.

LV: I have an example that indeed our section chair showed this new graph. But I think you have a document, so, maybe is the document public somewhere or not?

DS: I'm not sure whether it's public at the moment, but it should be. It could be.

So, I think the point of: let's communicate it much more widely is a very good one. I think one of the reasons we haven't is because we also have to deal with these people that are in transition. And we don't want to confuse them and say suddenly, look, here's the new tenure track while then there's still an option for them to be in the old one. So, I think that's a bit of a tough play. But I think communicating it by now is a good idea.

So, we'll make sure that we start communicating it more widely.

LJ: Is the tenure track document now final? Because I also heard that there were some people who have received the tenure track document that was still a draft and that also made some people unsure.

DS: I think it's now final.

XWG: Yeah, so, I also feel relatively well informed, but that's also because I'm sitting here and I received those documents typically twice. But yeah, so, people who like me migrated to a new contract, they were then figuring out that, hey, I actually don't really know what exactly my new contract now entails. And the only tenure track document that they received was at that stage announced as a draft.

DS: So, we will enhance or extend the scope of our communication efforts here to move beyond that department.

WB: Perhaps a meeting like we had before so that they can just directly hear it is good. Personal contact typically takes away some of the unease or insecurity a bit faster.

DS: I think that's a good idea anyway, to meet those tenure tracks. So far, we're trying to do this much more regularly. We promised this as well, to have more regular meetings with faculty and to discuss topics.

And so far, our experience with this has been very positive, and we've had the feeling that people liked this.

XWG: Yeah, there's no doubt about that. But I think I would like to come back to this particular topic about people, because obviously, it's so attractive that everyone, at least that I've been talking to, is very happy about migrating to the new tenure track system. However, it does then mean for the cohort that started relatively recently, that they now, on relatively short notice, need to come up with letter writers, right?

DS: I'd have to check that as I am not sure

XWG: I mean, it's spring and if I would be in the situation that I would know that by spring, I'd need to have my letter writers, then it's something that I preferably would have known years ago and not... well, like one or two years ago. It's something that requires a bit of, particular for shy people, some long-term relationship building. And you don't want to suddenly sit there and hear: okay, by spring

DS: So, I'll have to check that.

XWG: And how many is it? It's at least three, right?

DS: I don't know whether it's required in the midterm.

XWG: The midterm is not a midterm anymore, right?

DS: It's a different decision than a promotion decision, so I'd have to check in the document whether we actually require letter writers at the midterm. I'm not sure. It could be. We'd have to check that. I think so far, we've been also quite lenient in that. In the first batch, we said, you know, you can just stick to the regular documents and it's fine.

And if we get communication out that says: for the spring, that would also be the preferred option and only start moving towards the new four months, for instance, end of next year, the fall P&T, I think that's certainly an option for us. That would not be an issue.

XWG: I assume if you would be announcing that very, very soon, then clearly many people would feel very relieved. But I think all of those issues are a little bit lacking clarity. That's my impression.

DS: Okay, clear. It all comes back to the communication efforts. So, we'll enhance that. Thank you. I think that's good advice.

LJ: Good. Yeah. Any further questions?

LV: I had only one question. Do you already generally monitor some data about all the promotions and tenures, etc.? Like, things like what is the average age or average time after promotion someone gets tenure?

Do we monitor that? At least with the new system, I was a bit hesitant because I have seen at all the universities that motions were being delayed.

DS: Yeah, of course. I mean, we can't say it now. I mean, certainly we'll get data about this.

LV: Yeah, but did you collect in the past data about this or not? Or does it mean it needs extra effort?

DS: So, I mean, clearly we have data on much of this, but different data, right? So, the only data that we have is that we can see if people were on track or not and whether they got promoted at the five-year window, right? I think those correlates are very, very high.

So, people, they're getting on track. By and large, 90% of them got tenure in time. I think Corona changed this a little bit, but I think that's not to do with the system itself. I think when we see the first people getting promoted that got tenure at the midterm, we can really start comparing, and our idea would be that it shouldn't delay at all. The mentality should still be exactly the same, that we are in a track towards a social professor, and we're not going to delay that decision at all.

I don't actually think it gives us any advantages to do this because the only downside to this is a salary change, which is a minor cost and I think what's much more important for us is the retention of our faculty.

So, in our school I don't think it is in anyone's mind that we would want to delay promotion towards a social professor because it would give us money, because retention is so much more important for us. It's a good point that we do have to check this, but we don't have the data right now because we haven't seen anyone that got tenure in the midterm, but it shouldn't delay at all.

XWG: I mean, it's now one year longer, right? The track, at least the normal evaluation is now six years.

DS: I do think another thing that we are going to check, I think that is important, is to see whether less people get an on-track evaluation now in the new system because it's tied to tenure. I think that's, for us as an EB, more important. I think this might take like two or three P&T rounds to say something meaningful about this, but let's keep this in mind and come back to it as well, to evaluate whether anything happens there. It is important as I don't think we should get to a lower percentage of on-tracks only because we now provide tenure.

WB: That mechanism, I think, is more real than the other one. So, it's not just about retention, it's also about fairness. If this is the way in which it has been announced, it should work like that.

I could also see that, since your question pointed a bit more towards the organizational side of things, you could also imagine that for the personal side of things, people might also feel a bit more comfortable to delay certain things because they're still in a position that you have tenure. So, some of the pressure of meeting the deadlines and then getting to an associate level, for some people, in certain stages of their life, might be just a bit less prominent than it was before.

So, I think those things could happen, and it's good to monitor them. I think the suggestion of seeing what happens, both at what used to be the mid-term and now the tenure decision, and the final one is an important one.

DS: I think that's a good point also because we now explicitly tell people that they have another shot at tenure. They have another shot at promotion two years after the normal deadline, might actually lead some people to say, okay, I'll just go for that one. But we'll have to see.

I think the only data we have so far to see whether there's any change in how we feel about the mid-term as an organization is that we had the 12 mid-terms on track that we had to decide upon to take a tenure now because they weren't assessed for the tenure in mind. So, we moved to all the departments, had talks with each department about these candidates, and for all 12 the departments said, yes, they should get tenure in hindsight. So, now they've all got tenure. It seems to me, at least up until now, there's not been a major change.

LV: Maybe for our next meeting when I will think about it, it could also be nice since you also triggered me with, you say, you now see delays in promotion due to COVID. It's also interesting.

DS: No, I think what happened there is that we gave people the option to go up a year later, and this we now sometimes see. So it's very hard to see whether that's because we don't ask more, which I don't think so.

I think that if I'm in the P&T committee itself, I really don't see the standard change. I really think it allows people to get another year to really work on their profile.

LV: But you could also say maybe we could have put the standard a bit lower to compensate for COVID, and now let's say that the employee pays the price.

DS: I think this has been a discussion we've had, and I think it's well done, at that point in time. I don't think that the standards have changed. What might happen, and that's something I think to also carefully look at one point, is that it might be that people that are slightly uncertain just delay for a year, even though they might have gotten already tenure after five. And that's something that would be sad. I always hope that people go up anyway. My door is always open for people to also come and talk about these things.

I try to actively talk to the heads of department about this as well. If they are not completely in the know about a candidate, I tend to tell them: look, you can go up now and in a year again, that's also fine and don't worry too much about this.

This is something to monitor. My suggestion is that we first implement the entire thing. I think after spring next year, it should be fully implemented, and the next things will be continuous. And then we can really start doing that.

LJ: Any further comments, questions on this subject? Thank you, by the way, for your time. If not, then I suggest we move on to the Progress FC topic.

Progress FC

LJ: We first have a few announcements from ourselves. One is we have had a discussion internally, and we have decided that the best course forward for the Faculty Council would be to start recruiting an external chair for meetings and for our business of doing things. So that would mean that we would have to be in contact with you with regards to the potential hiring of someone to do the position on a part-time basis to better keep track of meetings and deadlines and stuff like that.

XWG: So for now, we'll both be vice chairs. So until we have found someone, we will run things. I was thinking that with regard to compensation, we would also share the chair's compensation as long as there is no chair in place. Yeah, so we, of course, also extensively discussed that it might be very difficult to find someone. At least this has been our experience so far.

Nevertheless, we think that it will have a stabilizing impact on our work as a council also because there will be a longer-term serving person, hopefully, and so it will be one further person sitting here. So we think that would be good.

DS: Just for me to understand, that would be a relatively permanent position.

LV: We cannot decide for next councils, but we hope that that will be indeed the case.

XWG: We have to vote every one year in the beginning of the academic year. And first, the first vote is about do we want to have an internal or external chair. And only if we vote for an internal one, then we see who among ourselves is up for it.

DS: And does it require any change of regulations if we want someone to do this more permanently?

LV: No, if you want to do it more permanently, you have to change the voting. How do you vote for the chair? But I think, yeah, to be honest, if you start with a new council and you have a chair already there, it is improbable that he is sent away.

It can happen, but...

XWG: It's really the knowledge transfer problem that we have every single year. And we already see that it is difficult to attract people to sign up, which is a second issue that we need to discuss.

But in addition to that, we are struggling with knowledge transfer every single year. So we think it would have a very stabilizing impact.

WB: And by chair, you really mean chair? Or do you also mean the person looking after all the different materials that come into the meeting?

XWG: Well, we also have the secretary, right? And there is a division of labor between the two, which is to some extent specified in the code of order. But we also notice that there's some gray area with regard to how this division of labor is specified there.

LV: And I don't think the documents say that the chair cannot be a secretary.

DS: How big would that position be?

LV: Normally, for us, it would be 0.2, but then you're a member and chair.

LJ: Secretary is 0.2, I think. And then just purely chair, so not member, but purely chair would be, I think, 0.1.

XWG: Yeah, true, because chair and member in addition is 0.1. Because I think you get 0.1 for member, 0.1 for chair, I think.

LV: Yeah, but then I think you have some economies of scale, so maybe 0.15 is that more. But that's our details, I think you have to find out.

WB: Just one more question.

With external, do you mean external to the people voted in? Or external to RSM?

LJ: No, it's also in the code of order that it has to be someone from within EUR. So that's not. It could be somebody from another faculty.

LV: It can be from RSM, someone who still has some time left. I don't know. It's hard to find these days.

DS: I would say that we hire for it. This is a request for hiring once a year or something, additional capacity, right, in school.

Which I think is fine.

LV: It's not extra capacity for the school. If I take it up, then I also get the extra FTE and someone else needs to take it up.

DS: So whatever we do, we get additional work. And that's okay, I think it's fine. But that's the request, I guess. Let's look at it.

XWG: We asked for help before, right, in the hiring process of our secretary. And we felt pretty let down in that process over the summer. We also felt let down by the election organization. We have Karthik, for instance, who already applied in April...

LJ: Yeah, end of April. And I think we received the confirmation. And he also only received it, I think, in September. Well it's really late. And only after Luuk called for it was it sent. Normally you're supposed to get it, I think, within a month.

And even there, RSM was the latest faculty to send out the declaration of you've been elected. And especially the situation with our PhD member was unprofessional.

XWG: What about Claudia's role? Like, is there anyone... Is she back? Is anyone else there?

ME: Well, she is reintegrating. So she's not fully back yet. Yeah. And we've hired somebody for the EB. That's an external person. And we haven't extended her hours to also include the faculty council.

So that's something we could think about. Yeah.

LJ: But could that maybe also be the case for why, for example, a profile that's already done doesn't get sent out? Is that usually stuff then that Claudia did?

ME: Yeah. Definitely.

LJ: Then I can understand.

ME: So time-wise, maybe we've been penny-wise, pound-foolish. I don't know. We need to figure that out, but let's discuss.

XWG: Yeah, because it was really, really difficult over the summer and now at the beginning of the academic year, many things were really horribly delayed. And that's then, of course, also not great for the few new members that we have.

LJ: And we also discussed internally one final point, which is with regards to some other faculties, members of the faculty council, at least student members, they get sort of a hospitality agreement.

And we also discussed this internally, and we think that this also might be wise to keep FC-related material on RSM accounts because what is currently the case is that as students of the RSM faculty council, you mainly just use your student's email address. And we also discussed internally that, especially with regards to, for example, confidential material, it wouldn't be wise or it would not be desirable to keep that on student accounts. So maybe it's also...

I don't know how that exactly works and you're probably way more in the know on that. But, like, for example, such a hospitality agreement is really convenient in that you really keep all FC-related material on an RSM account and that once someone also leaves the council, that all that material is also gone and that someone doesn't have access to it anymore.

ME: Yeah, we can do that.

LJ: Yeah we had, of course, this discussion also within EUR, student compensation, and it was a bit of a mess in what is clear and stuff. There aren't that many areas where I'm quite shy on, but, like, asking for compensation is one of the areas where I'm quite shy on.

For example, with regards to the chair position I had last year, is that it wasn't really clear. Like, it's very clear that, like, if you're an employee and you do the chair position, you get 0.1 FTE extra. But for students, there isn't really any guidelines for that, and I also was, like I said, kind of shy because I didn't want to, like, ask for money and be like, hey, I'm doing this, and how about the money?

But it's quite unclear on that front. That is of course, for example, with regards to the chair position, but also with regards to, like, general compensation, I think there's, like, this bestuursbeurs from EUR Central, but then some faculties decide to supplement it with a meeting fee because they think it's too low, and other faculties don't, and it's, yeah, it's actually kind of a mess, and that's also what we discussed internally.

XWG: And we calculated the hourly rate, and it was ridiculously low, right? Now, of course, I don't remember what it was.

LJ: Yeah, I think it was something like 7 an hour or something that we calculated internally. Yeah, and that doesn't compare to other university salaries, so that was basically the thing we discussed, and we were also wondering whether you would have any, I don't know, information or any possibilities with that regard.

ME: Well, we can certainly find out. I mean, this is the first time I'm also not that experienced, so this is the first time that I'm hearing it. We can at least listen to some of our counterparts and see how they're doing it. I think we need to be consistent as a university.

LV: Yeah, so I think the university tried. That's what I remember, that when I was not officially a member, there was a document that the university council tried to unify things, but there were not things like, what if a student member is a chair? There should be some documentation.

ME: We'll try and find out.

WB: So it's good to put it on the next meeting's agenda?

ME: Yes, put it on the next meeting's agenda.