

## MINUTES 141<sup>ST</sup> FC MEETING – 4 OCTOBER 2012

### Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Rik Hendriks (STAR)	Frank van der Kruk	Joy Kearney
Sharmayne Schneijderberg	Tim Ficheroux (EM)	Steef van de Velde	
Marnix de Kool	Paul Willaert		
Lizzy Veldt	Anne van de Graaf		
Niall Deasy	Jan Willem Huising		
Thomas Eichentopf			
Pascal Redaoui			

### 1. Opening

Juup opens the 141<sup>st</sup> FC meeting at 10:30 am.

### 2. Agenda

There are no questions or further points to be added to the agenda.

### 3. Minutes

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

### 4. Announcements

There are no announcements.

### 5. Reorganisation BIT

Juup mentions Frank's remark at the previous FC meeting regarding the BIT reorganisation and how concerned the FC was about this. Frank then said to ask Jan Willem for an update on the process and the timeline. Jan Willem handed it over to project manager Paul Willaert to explain the integration of IT services.

Paul, as project manager, is responsible for the changeover and design of the new IT services and service transition. He explains that there may be more people needed in support roles, so there will be vacancies as well. Juup asks what happens if people are not qualified. Paul doesn't think that will be the case, that would be a pity. A total of eighteen FTEs is needed. Redundant staff members will be placed in roles. Nobody gets sacked. There is a guarantee that everyone has a place in the new organization. Juup asks if that is still the case when there is over-capacity or lack of qualification. Paul and Jan Willem confirm. Jan Willem further explains that there was no growth for them presently as was made clear in the responses in the employee survey, so now we provide new opportunities for them. Some now do system maintenance and administration, but there is a new innovation section and they would like to be involved in this. Juup suggests that not everyone will get a position, so then there must be a surplus.

Jan Willem explains that the plan will be finalised by beginning of January 2013, all people will be in new organization and the number of vacancies will be available. Juup feels that the transition process will take a lot of work, but what happens afterwards? Frank replies that a number of those people will have applied for new challenges. There will be no new reorganization needed, but we cannot guarantee this. Juup thinks we must look ahead in time, the reorganisation must be done properly otherwise another one will be needed in a couple of years. Paul says there will be ample work for everyone in 2013 and no one will be surplus. Juup asks if there is an

official plan. Paul answers there will be a plan and timeline available by the end of October. Juup states that BIT will be 15% or 16% of new proposed SSC; this is what we advise in our proposal to ensure staff will be received warmly and they will have security. Paul says he can assure the FC there will be challenges enough for the people in their new jobs. Frank adds that there will be a few people who are not satisfied with any reorganisation. Sometimes the demands do not always have a connection with the reorganisation, but the plan is set up carefully with everyone in mind.

## **6. Proposal Programme Committee (PCs)**

Juup claims that solid advice is needed from relevant parties. We would like to improve the way programme committees operate. Anne wants to improve quality control in the Masters. It would be good to have a stronger quality in general. We want to ensure there are sufficient venues where signals can be given, directors should sit with students, programme managers etc. so they are keyed in to what is needed. Directors also meet with master study clubs regularly. Stronger teams should be built in the Master programmes, though transaction costs will be much higher and there will be more bureaucracy. Will we not be doubling up with the new proposal? Hesitance is shared by the chair of PC, there will be overlap with regard to small programmes. Is the reason purely with regard to the case that there will be a conflict? We will become a very expensive faculty if we have to adopt this proposal as it stands.

Steeff asks if the envisaged platform will be similar to this. Anne replies that it will be a less formal proposal with less legal standing. Steeff asks will you design a template for this. Anne answers there will be guidelines; each Master programme should have a regular exchange between lecturers and directors. An overarching committee can deal with urgent issues that need addressing.

Juup explains that our proposal carries a more judicial tone; we have concerns about the informal nature and lack of transparency of existing proposal from programme committee. Juup asks if all signals will reach an overarching PC adequately. Juup has doubts about this. Legally speaking every programme is different and needs a distinct clear set of examination regulations, formally such things require advice from a faculty council. No reasons are given for the structure of the programmes. The PC with an informal status is not fully capable of judging the nature of arguments suggesting changes the programme etc. It is too general and too distant from each programme.

Anne explains that for the content of programmes, full descriptions were made for the accreditations, descriptions of learning objectives and course contents are all provided to decision-making channels. Where we have checks and balances, there is a system of control between academic director, programme management etc. and we sit together if there is a problem, this is built in there. We want the programmes to have the same structure, unless there is a very good reason to deviate. From a pragmatic point of view there is no need for this elaborate structure. Anne says she can't pull this off.

Juup replies that he is sure all kinds of issues are being addressed in a private discussion circle, but it does not involve transparency regarding the interests of students and their problems. Anne says there are also the student representation and the master study clubs. Juup confirms, but they sit together and talk but have no real say on issues affecting them. Sharmayne adds that the students attend informal meetings, but they have no legal power. Anne promises to look at ways of involving students more radically. Juup summarizes that they agree on the fact that we need better signalling and a better dialogue. What is the status of dialogue if it cannot give advice on exam regulations etc.? The committee has to advise on about sixteen different programmes, you have to give them the standing and the power to do so. Steeff adds that you have many stakeholders, you have the accreditation bodies and all these stakeholders have to have a voice. Juup thinks in the larger structure of the organization there are

ways; alumni have a clear interest for example in ensuring quality of the programmes. For corporate stakeholders there is already a council: the advisory board. You could bring this closer to the shop floor; the academic community should be adequately represented in the school. We must ensure participation, we have sixteen separate programmes, but not enough participation rights within each one. It is about the quality of participation. Anne thinks a separate PC for Bachelors and Masters makes sense, not a separate PC for just IBA. Juup thinks it would be an interesting point to have advice about from the point of view of programmes. The current PC would be reduced to PC for a Bachelor programme. Anne feels the legal address is problematic, theoretical issues and how we should address them. Would you be willing to have a commitment from RSM faculty to address advice from the PCs in a formal manner? Frank says if students are not taken seriously you can already escalate to the Dean of Masters or to the Dean himself – you should address it by escalating to the PCs. Juup claims there are far too many opportunities to side-step the issue. Anne says we are not talking about veto rights. Juup says no, but the advice from PCs is not taken seriously and the FC should be able to seek further arbitration if they adopt the PC's advice. It is a recognition that we are not in a situation where interests of students and staff are parallel. The FC has been given the mandate to seek advice on behalf of the PCs. Steef replies that we do not want to work in that way. Anne thinks the FC underestimates how the PC works, they take all issues seriously. We will come back to the FC after a discussion about this. Steef would like to see a proposal on how Bachelor/Master PCs would operate ideally from the FC's point of view. Anne states that involvement of alumni belongs to the possibilities (meeting in evening for example). Steef asks how salient these discussions are. Juup replies more about programme structures, weight given to certain exam formats, course manuals are an integral part of TERs; we do not have the extent of the weight of what we are consenting to. Now we are in the phase of detailing all the plans, what we need as FC is substantial information on specific requirements for each programme. Give PCs the standard they deserve and transfer to common TER framework.

### **7. FC webpage**

Sharmayne would like to start a blog. The I Will statement with a poster could also be a way of gaining exposure. Posters saying, for example, "*did you know...*", and then quoting from the faculty regulations. The web page on the RSM website is hard to find, we need to address this.

### **8. Data for new meetings**

New meeting dates:

- 10 January 2013
- 7 February 2013
- 7 March 2013
- 4 April 2013
- 2 May 2013
- 6 June 2013

All meetings take place in T03-42 and start at 10.00 am for members. From 10.30 am onwards the meeting is open for public.

### **9. Any other business**

- Niall expresses his concerns about the quality of BSc.IBA. Last year in mathematics, they had a bonus system and they could bring an A4 cheat sheet. There is a general concern that we are losing quality by compensating. Juup thinks this cannot be the intention of N=N. Anne will pass it on the directors of Bachelor programmes. Steef states we don't want to relax any of the standards we have. Anne proposes to speak to Adri to find out what the facts are. Steef says that AACSB is very important. We passed with flying colours this time. Steef will provide the report but it is embargoed at the moment. Juup says as soon as you get to the

substance, programme material, etc. you have a problem. Student clubs of master should have direct line to the PC. Niall thinks an internship is important part of education and a deciding factor in choosing a school. Juup says we have to make sure these issues cannot be side-stepped.

- Anne says they want to decouple the Bachelor from the Master in Finance & Investment by requiring a minimum GPA of 7. The plan should be ready early December. Niall asks when this will be implemented. Juup states they have too many applicants; that is the 'problem'. Niall feels students need to be told on time (third years for instance). Juup states a former secretary of education is to decouple all masters from bachelors, so no automatic follow-up. The first proposal will arrive in December and we shall see.
- Monitoring progress and integrity. Pascal asks if N=N is being monitored at the moment. Sharmayne states there are no students involved in this. Pascal says there was also a problem with this in the PC meeting. Juup adds that the FC and UC have regular meetings too. Niall feels the focus is on results (rendement) but not on quality. Juup thinks the bonus assignments should be restricted. Niall confirms; answers are available on the internet. Juup says it's the quality of the programme, not on the teacher. We can draw up our own proposals, we have the right and we can exercise it. Students should have a voice and they should be partly responsible for quality maintenance.

#### **10. Closure**

The meeting is closed at 12:30 pm.

**Next FC meeting 1 November 2012 10.30 am in T07-67.**

#### **To do before the next meeting**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>
Quality BSc	Ask Adri Meijdam to clarify	Anne
AACSB report	Send the document to the FC members	Steef