

Minutes 249th FC meeting

Tuesday September 12th 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)

EB members

Daan Stam (DS)
Myra van Esch (ME)

Other guests

Daniel Feenstra (DF)

Agenda

- [1. Opening \(1 min\)](#)
- [2. Agenda \(1 min\)](#)
- [3. Announcements \(10 min\)](#)
 - [- Faculty model](#)
 - [- Internationalization](#)
 - [- Starter- and incentive grants](#)
- [4. Follow-up minutes 248th meeting \(1 min\)](#)
- [5. Budget \(25 min\)](#)
 - [- Introduction](#)
 - [- Presentation](#)
- [6. Recruitment Deans \(only introduction\)](#)
7. Follow-up to-do list 248th meeting (not covered)
8. Progress FC (not covered)
9. Any other business (not covered)
10. Closing (1 min)

Opening

Introduction round

Agenda

No adjustments to agenda

Announcements

LJ: These three announcements have led to some serious discussions in the past. Is it wise to keep these topics in announcements or is it better to create separate agenda topics in the future?

ME: For now, we can briefly tell you about the plans that we have made in the first couple of weeks of the year, but at a later stage we would like them back on the agenda and have a longer discussion.

DS: I think it is good to keep them on the agenda every meeting, since they are so important. This way, we can give regular updates, but there will be a moment where each of them will require an entire meeting to discuss.

Faculty model

DS: This will be something that will stay on the agenda for a long time.

LJ: What is the timeline on the decision?

DS: In July, the decision was that we would not continue with the faculty model that was there, so we had to make changes. We are working with the steering group every two weeks on a new version of the model to put forward. With this model we will move to the heads of departments and the EB here, and then communicate towards the wider school. So, there will be a moment that we will come to you with a document. The first one was too elaborate, district, too much like a choice menu. We have created one that works better, but there will be a lot of discussion on the details. My hope is that we can bring this to the EB and the heads of departments within a month and in between we will also bring it here. A final timeline is hard to predict.

ME: My suggestion to you would be to form a committee like you do for the finance to take a good look.

DS: Creating the faculty model is an open process. If anyone is interested, you can always let me know and I can always update you outside of this meeting.

LV: One big change is about lecturers and senior lecturers. I believe you have said that in the new model there will be room for tenured lecturers. I think the lecturers are mostly the ones with short temporary contracts, so they have some concerns about their future and would benefit from some rush in the process.

DS: It is going to be impossible to create a model in one go, but we see the rush as well. Each element of the model that is decided upon, will still need to be implemented and will still need more details after the initial decision. We will focus on some elements earlier than on other elements. The ones about lecturers, as well as senior lecturers, are elements people are really waiting for, so they will be the first immutations of the model.

LV: And what if in the meantime the temporary contract of a lecturer ends? Is there a possibility that it already can be extended to a tenured contract?

DS: There is no legal issue with that. I discuss this with the head of department then. If they really want to, we already have some lecturers with non-temporary contracts now.

LV: But there is a difference between having to come to you to ask or communicating to everyone that this is a possibility.

DS: The heads of departments know about this, so they should be able to tell our people about this possibility. This is different than saying that every lecturer can receive a non-temporary contract, because that is not the case either.

Internationalization

DS: The discussion about internationalization is about the teaching that we do and whether the government will require us to teach more in Dutch. Essentially, we do not know yet. Last week we have had a session about this with faculty since we heard that people are really worried about this. We will likely do this again and especially if you find that there is a need for something like this, let us know. My experience with the dean of faculty doing faculty meetings about this kind of topics, has been positive. People want to hear about this and the conversations we have are very constructive and helpful, so we are more than ready to do this more. What did strike me is that there were not so many people, around 30 people. The reach was not so big, but this was maybe due to the timing, so that is why I want to stress that we could really do this again if there is still the need for it.

Also based on the conversations that we have had, there are two core elements. There is lots of reasons why these kinds of policies are coming up, some are good, some are based on xenophobia. We as a university strongly oppose this xenophobia. Another important element is that, as an international business school we really value our international students and international faculty. Of course, if there is new policy we will have to adhere to it, but in everything that happens we will always keep backing our international students.

DF: Then a more formal announcement: There was a consultation round from the government this summer. RSM has delivered input for the EUR document that was sent. It all had to be flattened out to the essence of our message, so it was difficult to highlight the specifics of RSM. We did stress to EUR Central that they have to look at us as an international school instead of a regional business school for the Rotterdam area. It could be expected that this topic is declared controversial as our government has fallen, but according to the document from the EUR yesterday, at this moment it is not going to be controversial. This means that the parliament will discuss it and then in January it can still decide to make it controversial. It looks like it is going to be an open discussion in the parliament.

LJ: With regards to controversial topics, do you have any (informal) updates regarding the new BSA-rules and whether they are declared controversial or not?

ME: I think I heard Michelle say that they are declared controversial, but I am not quite sure so we will ask confirmation.

One other thing about internationalization, there is a general feeling, also with our CvB that at some point we are not going to play nice about this discussion anymore. At some point we will be more action-oriented to make our points known. We have tried it in different ways now, but it is difficult to make your point if the other party does not want to hear it. I have felt that we as EUR are generally moving in a direction of compliance and I do not think that is the way to go yet. It might be that we are going to do something creative at some point and be more vocal about it. My focus is RSM and this is a very important, if not the most important topic right now.

LV: I think one thing that came up during the meeting is that some people feel some difficulties in getting Dutch lessons.

DS: Yes, that is a good point. The HR-department is already moving forward with this to figure out what we can offer exactly and how we can make that as flexible as possible. They have also reached out to other schools to see if we can do this together.

LJ: I can also remember from a previous meeting that we talked about some lectures for the Dutch BA being taught in English, because of a lack of Dutch lecturers. The question we asked was whether the RSM has enough facilities to offer their employees to learn Dutch.

DS: Two things about that. First, there are already facilities to learn Dutch, but we are now looking at whether we can invest in them in order to make them more flexible and better. The second thing is that getting people to learn Dutch does not necessarily lead to them teaching in Dutch. Even if you learn Dutch, it does not mean that you are a good teacher in Dutch. The level of Dutch you need is quite high.

LV: Yes, but in the meeting I heard quite some people who wanted to learn Dutch just for their personal life in Rotterdam.

DS: Also, there are two sides to this. What I have heard is that people do not feel very welcome here if we start telling them that they need to learn Dutch. People come here for an international faculty and community where they do not need Dutch, so we try to make this a voluntary thing, but also more flexible. However, this is difficult since the options are limited (eg. Large groups, at night on campus). That is not very feasible, so we look at whether we can get it in the office during the day for example. That is the main effort.

Starter- and incentive grants.

DS: For the starter grants, we have granted four of them. That does not mean that they are arranged yet. The framework from EUR on how to deal with the grants is not completely ready yet, so we cannot move on and do much with the money at this point, but at least we know that they are granted for four people. Moreover, this year we have already given tenure unofficially to twelve people who had a positive midterm. The decision on granting tenure has already been taken, but they are still waiting on the signed letter, so that is why I said unofficially. In the fall there is another six candidates in the midterm and another two candidates that go up for promotion and tenure, so in total 8 more people for tenure. That gets us to quite a large number of people this year that will be granted the starter grant. For the stress level of these people, it really means a lot.

DF: Also, in terms of the budget it is important that we use these starter- and incentive grants as we have proposed. We have now appointed one officer to arrange the framework of the grants, since EUR Central is not able to arrange that for us. We have to come up with the entire scheme ourselves. Carolina van der Werf will take on that task. She is responsible for implementing as well.

LV: You said that we are waiting for university approval, so where in the process is it delaying.

DF: In essence, they say this is an administrative task so every school should arrange its own framework. We think that, at least from the legal stance, there should be a framework from the EUR such that not every school has to think about this itself. Furthermore, we first have to work on the starter grants before we can move on to the incentive grants, but internally we have already had discussions about distribution of the grants. For the incentive grants it is more a matter of timing than it's a matter of amounts or recipients. For starter grants that is the other way around, since in the near future there are more grants than we can absorb given the employees that we have.

DS: You should also realize that, despite not yet knowing how to exactly arrange them, we are already granting them.

LV: I remembered that we could give 17 starter grants this year, but you were saying we give 24 this year. How does this work?

DF: The average per year is 17, but from previous years we still have some amounts on the balance sheet, so we can absorb some more now. Indeed, on average we can give between 15 and 17 grants each year. Where we take a risk is that we can give grants now with a starting date next year. That way we can give grants with a starting point in time on for example 1st of January, which is a new fiscal year meaning we receive new money. In the long run we cannot absorb all of the grants, since we cannot hire 15 new tenure trackers each year, only sometimes as an exception.

XWG: I remember at some point the option was mentioned to hire people and give them the starter grant straight away, but that would not really be in line with the new tenure track, so is that still under consideration?

DS: No, the idea is that starter grants are meant for assistant-professors with a tenured contract. When we hire assistant-professors, they do not have a tenured contract yet. We used to give the tenure only with promotion after six years. The option was giving it immediately or after 3 years and we decided to go for 3 years for a couple of reasons. One of them is to distribute the risk between the employee and the school. What we see when we give everyone a tenured contract immediately, is that the school departments become very conservative and only hire people who have 5 years of experience in academia. So, we get this whole group of younger people that cannot get a job as assistant-professor. However, we also want to create the possibility of taking a risk and hire young talented people without requiring them to do all these postdocs. It is tragic that this kind of policy from the government creates only more of the behavior that they want to oppose with their policy. That is the reason why we said half-way, after three years.

XWG: I am in favor, but I was wondering: this limits our ability to absorb all the money, right?

DS: Not so much. In the short run, this can be the case since there are some people that will be in between the first and the third year. In the long run it does not inhibit it much.

ME: There is also a EUR-wide discussion that there is always a possibility to exchange our starter grants for stimulerings grants with other faculties. So, the important thing is that we as EUR absorb all the money that has been given to us.

DS: At EUR we see some schools with lots and lots of tenured assistant-professors. We are a school with lots of tenured associate-professors. So, I think we can much easier get the incentive grants and give away some starter grants, so hopefully that is going to work out.

LV: I got approached by people who said: 'I recently got tenure and now I still get only very little personal budget, while all these new people get a 40k research budget.'

DS: We really thought about this. The majority of money goes to helping the research system and the workload system in our school. So, much of it goes to hiring new people and to investing in research infrastructure. Now, clearly the people that get the grants can co-decide about this, so that is something new that is really exciting. It is research infrastructure money that benefits also the people who do not get the grant. Furthermore, people who just got tenure will of course be the first ones to absorb also the incentive grants. But, in the end there will be a difference indeed between these people. What we have done is minimizing these differences. It is something that we will see with the incentive grants as well. Some people will get them earlier than others, since we only have so much money. This means that some people will have them, while others get them after two years. We try to make it as fair and transparent as possible, but there will be differences between people and what they get.

XWG: I understand. Nevertheless, those starter grants came with the incentive to alleviate workload in particular for assistant professors. That is something we discussed in the previous meeting as something we would like to see as a faculty council. After the first year we would like to see some numbers in terms of actual numbers about the actual workload for tenure trackers.

DS: I agree. The comparison group is very difficult. You could say the workload should be lower than now, or you could say the workload should be lower than without the grants. Nonetheless, I think it is good to start seeing where this money goes to and how it helps to hire people that we could not hire if we did not have that money.

DF: One of the other schemes that is not on the list is that of 'sectorplannen'. That is where we decided last year that all the departments get 15 FTE additionally, so that should alleviate workload.

DS: There is two things there. One is the budgeting system and how much money goes into workload reduction. A second thing is how is this money spent and does this actually lead to workload reduction. It is

something that we are worried about and something that we cannot always control. It is really something where heads of departments come in.

Minutes

No comments

Budget

Introduction

ME: For all the new members I can do a bit of an introduction. There is a yearly cycle of the budget of the RSM. EUR gets money from the government and they have an allocation model about how this money is distributed to the different faculties, it's called 'the Erasmus perspective'. Each year, it is presented to us in May, so then the whole counting part of the year starts for Daniel and his team to see how much money actually lands within RSM. Then there is a bottom-up process mostly based on people that we have on staff, which is the largest portion of our budget where we sort of bring the two together and that will be the budget. The 31st of August we have to deliver the budget to Central. This is the concept budget, because there is also the process that involves the FC to have an opinion about it.

This year it is a bit tricky because of all the different systems and allocations of the money which is much more specific than it was previously. Another challenge is the substantial increase in our salaries that will not be compensated by the government, so for us that means a 10% reduction in everything that we can do because we pay more to our employees. This leads to a pretty negative budget for the coming years, substantially negative. These negative numbers can also be seen at other faculties. In the short run this is not really bad news in the sense that there are enough reserves within the university to cover this. However, it does mean that we have a year to figure out how we are going to deal with this for the longer run, because we need to be financially sound again. The CVB has promised to cover us this year, but they also want us to come up with scenarios. Part of the scenarios will be that we are going to do less. So the scenario is not going to be that we increase the workload and say we are going to do more with less people. We significantly need to look at what are we all doing in terms of teaching, extracurricular activities and quality assurance and we need to figure out what the bare minimum is and take it from there. This is going to be a huge exercise which is going to involve everyone in the school.

LV: The last meetings this was under embargo, so it had to be kept in the room, but from now on it is public?

ME: The budget is public, so there is no hiding. What I do not want is people to think that we are going to fire people, because that is absolutely not where we are now. And if we are, there is plenty of time to talk about what that would mean. But right now, that is totally not what we are thinking about. We are really looking at for example whether we have too many electives – the answer is yes. And then the question becomes how many can we cut and what is the cutoff point. We are at the beginning of those discussions so we have not decided on anything.

DF: I think it is indeed important to mention that it is not RSM's problem alone, we are together with EUR. EUR is setting up a working group at board level to address all these problems.

ME: And it is not even a Rotterdam problem, but a national problem. Every university in the Netherlands is dealing with this. The VU has a minus 20 million budget and a hiring freeze. We are not doing that, we are still hiring, we are still moving forward as planned. We do think we are going to make some changes but that is a delicate process for which we will take our time. We also do not want to make major changes now and then discover that two years from now money is coming in again because student numbers are rising. Then we would have done stuff for nothing meaning we could have dealt with it the way we are doing things right now.

DF: It is very unpredictable. It is challenging times. We have a discussion on internationalization and on the BSA, how will they impact our finances. The 'topambtenaren' in the Netherlands are looking at major budget cuts, that could be potentially quite impactful. The budget that we have composed comes from a bottom-up process and we would like to say to you and to the CVB that you should mainly look at 2024, because that is a year that we are more certain about than 2025 and 2026. Those budgets are more strategic budgets and the

operational budget is from 2024. The budget for 2024 would be some sort of baseline instead of fact, in my opinion. There is many things we have to change.

Presentation

LJ: I see that the budget is minus 6,9, but earlier I heard some rumors that it was going to be minus 8, so it has already gone into the right direction a bit?

DF: That is right. That is based on the amount of starter- and incentive grants that we are using to keep our staff in. A rule of thumb: one FTE costs 100k. The total change of 4,6 million of staffing costs is based on the collective labour agreement, the 9% that we have. We also see that there is a lot of vacancies in our budget, that is something that we have to analyse. I relate that to high workload and what needs to be discussed is: do we really need it or is it nice to have what we are doing. And there is 1,5 million increase based on 'sectorplannen'. Last year when we presented these numbers to the FC, we said that the starter- and incentive grants would all be free money, but afterwards it was earmarked. To give an example, now about 20% of our income that we receive from EUR Central is earmarked money, so how should we spend this money? I find that very difficult if you are in these challenging times, but still have one arm at your back and have to do your work. Another difficult thing is the budget cuts from OCW that could be coming our way. We also see that we already had some challenges. For example, in the result of 2022 there was a 2,8 negative due to several causes. The forecast for 2023 is at least going to what we see in the budget, which is minus 1,5. This has a large impact on our own reserves and I can assure you that our equity won't be enough to cover the 6,9 million for next year, so we need EUR Central to support. That is the reason why started the discussion with EUR Central quite early after we had seen the first numbers. It took us some time to really deliver the message and now EUR Central is finally recognizing that it is a university-wide problem and not an RSM problem. But still, we have to do some work given the fact that we have made losses last year and this year is not doing great either. We are doing as expected in the budget, but that budget was negative this year.

LJ: Does OCW cover none of the salary increases by the CAO?

DF: Partially, EUR Central is counting at 6% of the 9%, but that has already been taken into account in this budget.

ME: It is very unclear and it has been unclear for a long time. I find it very annoying that all this time it has been fully compensated, and the first time there is a large salary increase, then the government is suddenly saying that they are not going to cover it entirely. It is going up and down and that is frustrating.

LV: Why have the universities taken this approach? The primary and secondary schools said: we don't get compensated, so we do not offer it to you, leading to strikes. But the universities, MBO's and hogescholen have decided to just give the increases and hope for the best.

ME: In my opinion, the universities are always very compliant towards the government. Even in the internationalization discussion, at EUR level the question is how we can comply with this request, while we are still in the stage that we think it is a ridiculous idea. I think the same holds for this increase, where it is almost as if the universities just say it is fine. It is not fine, it is 10%, a huge amount of money that we all have to compensate for, that we cannot hire extra people for, that we have to work harder for. It is a nice to have the extra paycheck, but it comes at a great cost, while we are already overburdened. I don't know why universities take this stance, maybe academics are really nice and conflict-avoiding. I think we could speak up more.

DS: That is also what I said about the starter grants. The idea there is to lower the workload, but with this in mind it is also tough. By the way, for the minutes: BSA is controversial, so it stays at 60 ECTS at this point until there is a new government.

LV: Regarding the unfulfilled vacancies, I am a bit scared that at the moment some people think we have a vacancy, so let's work hard for one more year but then it will all be nice. The reason that the vacancies are not fulfilled is because it is difficult to fill in the vacancies at the moment, and not because we do not actually need an extra person, so please be careful in reconsidering vacancies.

DF: I will not be the one to say this one yes, this one no, but it should be an open discussion. Now, in the bottom-up process, everyone is doing wishful thinking: 'oh let's add an additional FTE, that will help me'. But we have to look at it from a school perspective. We have 40 vacancies and we need to ask ourselves in which domains are these vacancies and do we really need them in that area. I think that should be an open discussion with the EB and the heads of departments.

DS: At this point, we have not rejected a single faculty hiring that was necessary. If a department loses a faculty member, we just allow them to hire a new faculty member. When there is a request for a new strategic chair that does not really add much to the workload, but adds additional activities, we are thinking that maybe now is not the time to hire them. At the moment workload is completely on our mind when we look at these vacancies.

DF: What we have done this year is we have divided the school based on portfolios within the EB. So, dean of faculty, research, education, engagement and partnerships, operations, dean. Then we have RSM internal distribution, that is the place where we distribute all the money through our school. There is also the service unit. There are some Erasmus initiatives, such as impact, where we as RSM are keeping the books but we do that for EUR Central as a service, so that one has zero impact on our budget. Based on these portfolios it is clearer to see where the challenges are within the different areas of attention. Large negatives in distribution means that we hand out too much money to the school, which we do not have. Still, if you look at the faculty where workload is an issue, you still see that there is a negative result over all departments, so we look at that as one portfolio.

LV: How should we interpret internal distribution, since the distribution of money is already part of the other columns right?

DF: Lines are dropped. You see for the faculty there is a total number of 27 million, which is not shown here in my table, but that is the teaching allowance and research vouchers and bestuurs- and governance fee that we hand out. But should have been shown, sorry for that.

LV: If we have a 5 million loss in internal distribution it means we pay too much on the vouchers and teaching allowance, so it actually means that in ~~on~~ some of the other pillars we still make a larger loss, right?

DF: The system that we currently have is that we distribute based on the teaching allowance. What we could have done is saying well we have minus 5, so teaching allowance and research vouchers will be impacted negatively, but what I find more important is that we have a discussion on how to redistribute our money. Which department should receive which amount of money. That should be based on what should we do and where should we stop doing things. That is not only in professional sight, but that is school-wide.

LV: And I see 2 million for the dean, but I hope that is not all for the dean.

DF: No, that is also for all the payments for the faculty council or other registry roles that are paid for by the dean. If we hand out all the money to each department so it is more of a small piggy bag.

LV: I remember from something like two years ago that there was an exercise, since also then there was the prospect of a negative budget. It was an exercise about where to cut the budget, an activity analysis. The year after it was more: 'okay we get so much money, we don't even have to look at that anymore. And now I have the feeling that we have to start over this again, or will we use the activity analysis?'

ME: We will certainly use the activity analysis, but I also think that we need to go a lot deeper than that and go to the level that we ask: So what is everyone actually doing and are these activities all necessary?

DF: The activity analysis had a target of 2,5 million.

ME: Yes, so it can help us a little and makes sure that we do not have to begin from scratch, but I think we need a more in-depth-discussion and at some point at a personal level as well. We all love our autonomy, but it comes at a cost, so I think we have to move to a model where autonomy also has its boundaries. Right now, autonomy is really broad and as long as it benefits the school, you can have a lot of activities, but then in the

end we can get overburdened and I feel we really have to deal with that. The activity analysis did not really help. In terms of finances it did restrict it a little bit and found savings at some point, but in terms of workload it did not do anything at all. Perhaps it made it even worse. I think the baseline now needs to be workload and hopefully that will have a positive effect on finances as well.

XWG: So you have someone looking at the old activity analysis, what is your timeline?

ME: We have agreed with the university that we will have broad scenarios ready by the end of this year, so that is the timeline for the first quick wins. Then, together we need to figure out which scenarios are most likely to have the most positive effect on both finance and workload, and then we need to dive deeper into implementing and calculating these scenarios. We have discussed with EUR Central to take a full year for this, so for the next budget year we would show what the implementation would be of the preferred scenario. That means we have another half year to figure that out. We want to do this carefully without wrecking the system that we have. We only want to make adjustments to what we already have. Although it may sound like huge amounts of money, compared to the total budget it is also relative, especially taking into account the 10% increase. I know we have to deal with it and I don't want to make it smaller than it is, but it also something that we could outgrow, which would also be acceptable. Maybe there will be an outline that we cannot fix it in 2025, but we can in 2026 and we are all very confident that we are using the right number.

LV: Officially, it is a 3% increase right? Since 6% is being compensated.

LJ: Had that increase not been there, would be at a deficit as well?

ME: Yes, but the deficit would be smaller than it is right now.

DF: We see that student numbers all still growing and we have a system where we pay out the academic departments for the student numbers that we have in the current year, but EUR is paying us for the students that were in two years ago.

ME: And we are not hiding, we had problems before. They have just become very apparent, since we always had extra budgets for them to cover it. We did not have to face them, but we do have to face them now. But still, I see it as a possible development, not something that is going to restrict us. I think we are going to be a better school because of it, in the end. Maybe I won't be able to hold that up, I don't know, but right now it is my first way of thinking. When Daniel and I are talking about these things, we get really excited. We really want to make a difference now and really start discussing what we need to discuss, instead of fixing it somehow with some upward wins from the government and then not having to deal with it while it is still on the table for everyone. This workload discussion is not something that we can hide from anymore. I think long ago already we have reached the limit of the work that we can do with the current population that we have. There is two ways out of this. One is hiring more people, which is not possible because the mountains do not go up into the sky anymore. The other way is do less, it is that simple.

LJ: One of the things that we have heard earlier is that we have too many electives but a new academic year has started and there is still the same number of electives. I have heard it before and nothing has changed.

ME: Yes, and that is the risk of naming one possible scenario. Another possible scenario is we could ask people that are very close to retirement to retire earlier. Financing that would be a one-off cost and next year they will not be on the payroll anymore. If that gets stuck in your head next time you meet a professor that is close to retirement you are going to think: oh, you are not going to be here anymore. We want to do this carefully without making a mistake.

LJ: I understand but I am also thinking about decisions that have to be made, but that are delayed quite long, for example the faculty model.

ME: We need to understand the full impact first, for instance with the elective system. One of the reasons we have these electives is that we have a system that when you come in and start teaching, you need to find a position for yourself where you can earn your own salary back in some departments. So, it is not interesting for you to say to your colleague, who is already teaching: let me help you. This way, you are not earning your

money back. Therefore, we have to reorganize the system around the electives that creates a backward incentive to start more electives. So, I could say: if we have 11 electives, let's make it 3, but we have to change something about the system as well. The difficulty in our complex system is that changing one knob, the whole system in the background changes with that.

LJ: You also wanted to move away from money to hours, how is that developing?

ME: That is indeed all part of the same equation and that needs time because it is not as simple as canceling a couple of electives or telling some people to retire, which we are probably not even going to do. It is really thinking through the different scenarios, what are the implications and what needs to change about the way that we deal with things.

XWG: But what has been quite surprising is that the outcome of the activity analysis from 3 years ago was that the single activity with the largest proportion of working hours is the thesis trajectory. It has been widely recognized among students and faculty members that there is room for improvement there. So why has that not really been a top priority. We keep asking this question every single year.

ME: For me that is also another scenario that we need to look at. Up until now I really believe that we identified it but there was not enough of an incentive to change it, but now there is. It is the system that forces us to make changes and I see this as a positive development. There are these things clearly lying on the table that we have not dealt with before, but where we really have to deal with right now. This is so clear that there is no way that we can go on as we are doing now.

LV: We are talking about education all the time, but research sounds for me very difficult, because that is also part of the perceived work pressure. And while in education a course at some point is done, in research the sky is the limit, so you can do another publication and another one. So, there it is difficult to change things, relaxing vouchers is for example not good for your cv.

ME: It is indeed difficult. I do think we need to think about all aspects of someone's job description and not just tackle one. The tricky thing is also that we don't want to control what research is being done, that is a really fundamental principle in academia. It should be really up to the person, we don't want to restrict it in any way, we rather want to enable it, but we also want to be smart about it. For that kind of things we are going to look at you all to say how can we make the system better or is it enough.

LV: Is that also the reason why there is still no new membership charter of the voucher system?

DS: The membership charters are there, the new one, so that is not the reason. Just as often is the case, you need certainty for a longer period so when you made a change in something, you stick to it for a couple of years and then you make a change to it again. Actually, you'd need continuous changes all the time but that is unfeasible as an organization.

DF: For me, the difference between the activity analysis and what is mentioned now, is that we now face a more integral approach. We have to look at the system instead of one-offs. One of the things that we did from the analysis is increasing the number of students in IBA, but that was all incremental changes and we need a disruptive change.

Regarding the results for 2025-2027, for me they are not that meaningful given the changes that we have to face. There is no way for 1,3 million negative, it should be at least more than that. The way we do our budgeting is bottom-up, instead of on RSM-portfolio level, which leads to minus 1,3 million, but I am not making a bet on that one.

LV: And that is because in these types of budgets you assume that in future years salary increases are compensated again et cetera?

DF: The standard for EUR is that we do not take indexations into account, only for next year. So from then on, it is based on the indexation that we already have. In our budget there is an amount for the increase of the collective labor agreement for next year. Since that will be somewhere around April/June, for part of the year

this will be covered, but for 2025 we do not make assumptions, not on the income side and not on the cost side.

ME: So, in terms of the process what I suggest is that we deliver this presentation and the budget plan as we have delivered in concept to EUR Central. Then you look at the content and give us feedback about anything you want to discuss outside of this meeting. Then next meeting we can have the discussion about whether or not you approve.

DF: However, the timeline is a bit stricter than your proposal. The 30th of September we have to deliver the final budget to EUR Central. We have some slack, so we need your approval around that date. If you have questions, please come directly to me and I can answer these questions in a separate meeting.

Recruitment deans (introduction)

LJ: We only have four minutes; I do not know if four minutes is enough for the deans.

DS: I can give you a short update and then we can talk about it more in next meeting. At the moment, we are the most pressingly looking at the replacement of the dean of research and the vacancy for the dean of engagement. We are finalizing the profiles, so that they can go out. Then we hope to have new people for next year. By next meeting we can have the profiles ready to present to you. Then you can see what we are up to, especially interesting for the engagement vacancy, since there has never been such a profile before. The dean of research has already a clear profile, so not much surprises there.

LJ: And the dean of executive education?

DS: If we discuss the dean of engagement, you will see that we also discuss the dean of executive education.

ME: Also, you are of course going to be part of the selection process, which is the next step after the approval of the profile.

XWG: Maybe this time that can happen a bit more orderly, since last time there were quite some surprises about our involvement in the process.

DS: What we want to propose now is that one of you actually enters the search committee to ensure a strong connection with the FC.

XWG: That sounds good. The question remains: how much is that person allowed to communicate anything with the others, that was the big question.

ME: I think to name the elephant in the room, the tricky part is that we have seen in the past that if somebody puts their hand up for a certain position, there is also a risk involved in that because somebody is put in the organization simply by putting their hand up. We are trying to think of ways for that not to happen and if you have any thoughts, I do not mind you guys discussing this. But if that is an element in the negativity surrounding people putting up their hands, in some way, I think we have to deal with that. I do not blame you, since it is some sort of cultural thing that we apparently do, but we need to welcome people that put their hand up. Een if they are not elected, we should put them up on the preferred list and put them on a pedestal and say: great that you are willing to work even harder in a government role. We need to make sure that we are sensitive to that aspect.

LJ: And for the open dean roles, are we talking about internal recruitment or also external recruitment?

ME: Internal only, for the full dean, but that is not on the table right now, it will be an open position.

DS: At least I want to address that in the search I hope that we put extra effort in more diversity.

ME: I would love that, so if you could talk to people, please do.

LV: We have to carefully think on how to promote more diversity.

DS: One of the issues that we face, is that we want more diversity, but the thing that we need to face is that there simply is not enough diversity in the top of our school at the moment. Meaning that if we have diversity in all our administrative positions, we completely overburden our women and minorities. That is something they are not waiting for either. The most important thing there, while I completely agree with you, is to quickly make gains on getting the top of our organization to be much more diverse. It stays a very sensitive subject.

LV: Something for some next meeting then.