

Minutes 247th FC meeting

Thursday June 15th 2023, 10:30 AM – 12:00 AM

FC members	EB	Guests
Luca de Jong (LdJ)	Daan Stam (DS)	Daniel Feenstra (DF)
Xena Welch Guerra (XWG)	Myra Van Esch (MvE)	Pursesey Heugens (PH)
Silvija Prancane-Verhoef (SPV)		
Edward Oldenburgr (EO)		
Luuk Veelenturf(LV)		
Anass Boukakar (AB)		
Max Meuser Bourgognion (MMB)		
Helena Suarez Groen (HSG)		
Boudewijn Pieteron (BP)		

1. Opening

2. Agenda

3. Announcements

LdJ We had hoped to receive more documents regarding the starting grants. It would make it easier for us to ask questions if we had more information. We understand that the document is subject to change, and it is challenging to prepare, but we would appreciate having as many documents as possible.

PH I would like to comment on the starting grant documents. The most crucial document in this regard is the advising committee of the starting grants, which needs approval from the CVB. I can provide an update on this in an upcoming meeting, but for now, I will provide the information orally.

4. Follow-up minutes 246th meeting

LdJ The minutes are approved.

5. Tenure track (With Pursey Heugens)

PH Something had to change in the tenure track because the starting grants can only be awarded to assistant professors with a permanent contract. The big question is how what you have read right now is different from before and how it impacts the tenure track. Overall, there are three significant points.

The first point is that the transfer to the new tenure track format for current tenure trackers is voluntary. This will not be the case for people who sign their contract after the new policy is approved.

The second point is that, on the whole, this grants several important new rights. Firstly, the majority of tenure trackers will receive a permanent contract several years earlier than what the current tenure trackers receive. Secondly, there is more flexibility when going up for promotion. There are now two to three moments when tenure trackers can go up for promotion with the full endorsement of the system. This allows for greater flexibility as people can go up for promotion when there is more certainty. Thirdly, it codifies the opportunity for a career track transfer. In the past, we had individuals who switched from the tenure track to the senior lecturer position, but this was not officially documented. Now it is formally arranged. Lastly, there is a second chance for senior promotion.

The third point is that we received very detailed comments from the D&I (Diversity and Inclusion) team. There were 72 points, so I will not go over all of them, but I will mention several. For example, the old tenure track document measured teacher aptitude based on teacher evaluations. We have now included other evidence of teaching effectiveness that will be proposed by the teacher. Another thing we have done is make extensions voluntary because an extension means a delay in seniority.

LdJ We heard about a case where someone already had an evaluation last year and is now up for another evaluation this year. How does this work?

PH Again, this is voluntary. The way we have foreseen this in the document is that people get to present their case to the committee, and the committee makes a recommendation to the dean. If the recommendation is favorable, they get tenure right away and a guaranteed promotion three months later. In the three months, we can assign them the starting grants because they are legally an assistant professor with a permanent contract. Then, after three months, they become a tenured associate professor with a starting grant.

LV I was also wondering what our role is in this, because on Monday you are explaining this to the current tenure trackers. If we still have comments or advice now, how can this be considered before Monday?

PH Monday is a Q&A session and not the moment where the document is finalized. Any meaningful advice and questions will be considered, and I am open to that. Getting back to Luca's question, there is a large number of people who are beyond the midway point but who have not gone up for tenure or promotion yet.

LV What Luca also meant is that people who are evaluated in October will only hear this now and have to spend the summer preparing the documents.

DS First of all, this is voluntary. Secondly, we are considering granting people automatic tenure if they already had a positive evaluation, so they do not have to go through this process again.

PH The only people who have to update their packages are those who were given a behind track qualification during the midterm but who have done wonderful things after this.

LV You mentioned that it was discussed with the D&I team. For leaves, there are two options. First, that you are only evaluated on your active period. Second, you ask for the same standards but extend the contract based on the period of leave. However, you have only considered the second one in the document.

PH I believe this is a fair division of risk between the candidate and the school. I realize there are issues involved, such as illness, that we cannot control.

DS If you would see that in six years, we expect 100 publications, and we expect 80 if you do it in five years, it would be relatively simple. For us, this is not the case because we do two or three top publications.

PH I also want to emphasize that we are one of the only schools that are preserving the tenure track. On the one hand, you could say it makes us harsh because other schools are giving out

permanent contracts earlier. On the other hand, we see that roughly half of the people that we hire on the tenure track already have quite some post-doc experience. That is because departments are acting on uncertainty. If we were to abolish the tenure track, we would see a greater shift to greater uncertainty reduction in the end and effectively stop hiring rookies. This system allows for giving younger people who just came out of their PhD a chance to work at RSM right away. I do realize that it might look harsh, but it is also a protection mechanism.

LV Is there room for a part-time position in the tenure track?

PH Working four days a week is no issue whatsoever.

LdJ To what extent can we be sure that we satisfy the criteria? Is there any chance that we do not get the starter grants based on the current structure of the system?

PH We are not 100% sure that this is policy-proof because the committee advising the ministry has not come out with their final report. We do have a representative in the committee who provides us with fairly first-hand information, so I am fairly confident that it is policy-proof, but the final policy has not been announced.

LV Is making someone an assistant professor for three months to get the grants in line with the spirit of the system?

PH We do not always realize how good we have it here. This new policy is meant to solve problems in Dutch academia that we do not have. It is meant to solve the problem that people do not have research time, while everyone at RSM has a guaranteed 50% of research time, which is not the case for 800 people at EUR alone. The other point is that no matter how good you are, you are not guaranteed to go up for promotion and a permanent contract at another place. If you are good enough at RSM, you always get both. The only difficulty is to onboard the money to do this.

DS I do believe it is in the spirit of the grant. At any other school, you get tenure and the grant, but you never get promotion in the next 10 years. In this school, we give people a promotion to associate professor as soon as possible.

PH I understand that it looks like we are gaming the system, but the system is intended to give people a permanent contract and promotion, which they both receive.

LdJ Do the starting grants lead to an increase in research time?

PH No, it will remain the same.

LV In a document from July 2022, it said that researchers could spend it freely, but the people who now got it do not get the full 300K to spend freely. How is that in line with the policy?

PH The policy document outlines 6 points, and one of these points is about that. However, I feel it is better to focus on the tenure track first.

6. Starting grants (With Pusey Heugens)

PH I will give a quick overview of the stage that we are at now, and we can discuss it again together with the incentive grants in another meeting when the documents are finished. The advice from the committee touched upon six points.

The first point of advice is to create a separate side deal with the EMC with respect to their fraction of the grants because it will be very hard to come up with a structure that would satisfy both parties. It seems that this advice has been taken over. It leaves us with the task to fairly distribute the grants over the different schools at Woudesteijn. For the starting grants, we can give one to every assistant professor who has gotten tenure because we have more starter grants than assistant professors. The distribution of the incentive grants is based on the numbers of students at the school for 50%. The other 50% is based on the number of assistant, associate and full professors.

Furthermore, we have advice on what to do with the money which partly answers Luuks question. You can use the money to hire a PhD student, which is particularly attractive for schools who do not have a first money stream PhD program. We are likely not going to opt for this because we do have this as a first money stream. Another way is to use 120K per grant to hire additional teaching and research capacity, which will alleviate a little bit of work pressure at the departmental level. The other 120K is more up to the individual to spend it. They can use 80K for the research infrastructure that they use most. The other 40K is for out-of-pocket expenses related to research, including travel and student assistants, for example.

The other advice is about the 20% indirect costs that can be charged towards the grants. We have fought very hard to get as much money as possible to the schools and not leave it at EUR central. We have done a reasonable job to get a large part of this money back to the school.

BP Is this document ready for revision in the next meeting, or will it happen over the summer?

PH The university council still has to approve this before going to the individual faculty councils. Therefore, it is realistic to plan this after the summer. We do need to act on it before December 31st, otherwise, we lose the grants.

LV You also mentioned that three starting grants were already offered. How does this work?

PH Any candidate that we give tenure and promotions means leaving 300K on the table. With those candidates, we asked them if it is okay if we offer them tenure now and promotion three months later, so we can give them the grant three months later and they all agreed to this.

LV Is there a chance that it changes because the university council still has to approve this.

PH There is the possibility that they can disapprove of this, but the EUR wants us to start handing out the grant, otherwise we leave the money on the table. I am fairly confident they will agree, but I am not 100% sure.

7. Extension Dean of Research (With Pursey Heugens)

LdJ We discussed this internally and we are very happy that you have stayed on in the last couple of months. We wanted to discuss the fact that the faculty council has a role of advice on the dean process. To be formally correct, we wanted to give positive advice on the extension of the term.

PH Thank you for your trust.

8. Follow-up to-do list 246th meeting

9. Any other business

10. Closing