

# Minutes 232<sup>nd</sup> FC meeting

Thursday February 17<sup>th</sup> 2021, 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

FC members	Guests	EB
Marja Flory (MF)	Michel Lander(LM)	Ansgar Richter (AR)
Xena Welch Guerra (XWG)	Mirko Benischke(MB)	Peter Roosenboom (PR)
Shihao Lin (SL)	Adri Meijdam(AM)	Myra van Esch (MvE)
Jasper Oosting (JO)		Claudia Rutten (CR)
Cesar Wapenaar (CW)		
Bas Crombag (BC)		
Stephan van Roon (SvR)		
Edward Oldenburger(EO)		
Boudewijn Pieterse(BP)		

1. Opening
2. Agenda
3. Announcements

**PR.** There is a new gender and diversity report. It is backward looking and provides outlook for the future

**AR** I feels that it is disappointing that student attendance in many online classes is low. How can we fix this, given that some online classes will stay, even once the restrictions are lifted?

**AR** The development of several sector plans (e.g. one for the Humanities and Social Sciences, one more specifically for the Faculties of Business and Economics in the Netherlands) is underway. These sector plans will help to channel some of the extra funding promised by the new government to the universities / faculties involved in these sector plans. RSM is taking an active role in these developments.

**AR** We have received low scores for the MBA program. In addition to lots of communications, a project for the renewal of the MBA program is underway.

**MvE** The financial result of RSM was almost exactly 0. A good result! In terms of personnel on the faculty side we grew slightly (this is to be expected when student numbers also go up), for professional services the results were similar to last year. This is also in line with the activity analysis.

**MF** I have a question about the P&T committee. If you want to go from lecturer to senior lectures, it also goes through the P&T committee. All of the heads of department are in this committee. They are very well known because of their efforts in research, not in education. The dean of education only has advice in this committee. Talking about diversity, is there another way to do this if it is about becoming a senior lecturer. Also, is it true that if you do not agree with the advice of the P&T committee, you cannot go in appeal?

**PR** I also discussed with the P&T committee whether it would not be better if there was another committee to evaluate these types of cases. We are definitely considering a new committee when it comes to making the step from lecturer to senior lecturer. That is an answer to the first part of your question. The second part of your question is about the appeal. It is important to note that it is an advisory committee, it does not make the decision.

**MF** I know from experience that the dean never goes against the advice of the P&T committee. The former dean told me that he is not going against the advice of the P&T committee.

**AR** That is factually incorrect. There have been cases in the past where the dean has decided otherwise.

**MF** This happened twice.

**AR** I am not going into the details, but it has happened.

**PR** There is indeed no possibility to go into appeal against the advice of the P&T committee.

4. Follow-up to-do list 231st meeting

5. Numerus fixus(With Adri Meijdam)

**AM** We are finalizing the document for additional requirements. We are rewriting it partly, following external feedback. Formally, the NVO is allowed to take a maximum of three months to make judgements and we are within this timespan already because we are closer than three months from the 1<sup>st</sup> of May. This is the moment that it needs to be handed in at the ministry. For this reason and the possibility for rejection, it is advisable anyway to get a back-up request for numerus fixus. If we have neither the numerus fixus and additional requirements, the admission to IBA will be open. This would cause some challenges. The document is quite similar to the previous years. We have learned how to fill the capacity. For this reason, we have proposed to go 750 people in order to end up with 650. We have also decided to stabilize at 650 and not go for 750 next year already.

**SL** I have a question about math A and B. Personally, I think B is much more difficult. Do you take this into account?

**AM** We take this into account. For mathematics A, a seven will do and for mathematics B, a six will do.

**SL** Also seeing the different tiers, there is no significant difference between tier two and tier three. If I got it correctly, the mathematics level is the most important.

**AM** There is no life beyond tier one. When you are in any tier below one, you are missing at least one of the requirements, and thus are chance-less to get selected. Tier one is already filled with fully qualified students.

**XWG** How shall we move forward with this one?

**AM** I need a short written advice that the faculty council agrees with the proposal for numerus fixus. This proposal together with the advice of the program committee needs to be handed in with the executive board of the Erasmus university before the first of march. I will write a letter for the dean so we can bundle all of the documents and make sure they arrive on time. If I can get the letter from the faculty council on time, I will be happy.

**XWG** We will do that.

6. HOKA funding future (With Mirko Benischke and Michel Lander)

**MF** First of all, when the 'basisbeurs' comes, HOKA money will probably not continue. A lot of projects that are funded by HOKA are not structural. I have heard that Michel is not going to say yes to certain project due to this. How are we going to make sure that successful projects become structural? How are we going to budget this? The other question is that I see that the PDT one and the PDT two projects are already gone. Now, we are already installing another program. I think that is really strange.

**MB** There are two elements to the first question. First, you correctly pointed out that HOKA money was never intended to supplement structural funding in the program. It has been project based funding. There is a transition of successful programs into structural programs. That might mean that in some courses we have to adapt the structural funding, In the past, this has not been an issue. To answer your question, we are fully aware of the challenges of HOKA project funding into the structural funding. Concretely speaking, there are two things we are looking at, at the moment. One is that we are looking at funding model for year three and specifically the minor funding. The second part of the answer is that we expect our structural budget to improve slightly as a result of the intake of extra IBA students. Structural money will specifically be used for supplementing HOKA funding transition things, that we think are valuable. In the past, we have given an equal amount of money to every course. Now we specifically look at the needs of each course. We are confident that there is a plan to retain the successful HOKA projects.

**MF** And my second question about PDT one and PDT two.

**MB** Could you specify your question? You said it's strange and I am not sure what that question means.

**MF** This project was supposed to make students get more interaction. I have seen that students were pleased with it, especially with corona. I think it is strange that you are going to terminate the program after two or three years. A lot of money and effort has been put into it.

**MB** It was never a plan or discussed to discontinue PDT. There will be a redesign of the professional development trajectory. Looking at the student feedback and issues that we have identified, we decided that now is a good moment to do it. This also has to do with HOKA funding. Now we have the project money to free up capacity of PD one and PD two by adding one person. As you also pointed out, we are not sure whether we have project money afterwards. In short, there are two reasons. First, we have strong signals that the set-up of PD one and PD two does not work. Second, we are working on a redesign and not a termination of the program.

**ML** I want to make it clear that we are talking about more competence based education. Removing PD from the program would be missing the point of what we are trying to do here. If you would ask me, it should even come back in year two and year three. There is no way that we are going to cancel PD.

## 7. Work pressure plans.

**MvE** We looked at all of the information that was gathered on this topic in the last few years. There also were some recent questionnaires that provide us with some information. Based on that, we have already proposed some changes to relieve some of the work pressure. We also hired an external organization to help us with this. We had a workshop with them. The heads of department, heads of professional services and the EB were present. They have given us some attack points that have to do with leadership. So there certainly a lot of things that we can do. We are also going to start a working group with representation from all different elements of the organization to come up with concretization of those results into actual plans. We are also organizing a listening session, so we can gather information from all employees on how to make the workload more manageable. Another recommendation from the external company is to gather more information. We need to focus more on involving our employees in these kinds of measurements.

**PR** One addition might be that we have asked the departments to share their workload allocation models. We have received this information and we can start analyzing it. Another thing worth mentioning is that we are looking at the teaching free period. We already set a meeting and e-mail free period during the Christmas break.

**XWG** Thanks a lot. First of all, it is great to hear that you also have in mind to very deliberately make this a bottom up process as well. We are always a little bit afraid that you might be too far away from how exactly or from what people on the ground are suffering. I'm also very happy to hear that Peter was able to compile the list of all the different workload allocation systems from the department. How long will it take to analyze and come up with conclusions based on that comparison?

**PR** We are planning to have meetings with the heads of department later this month. We have the numbers, but we would like to understand how these processes are being organized within departments. One of the other things that I'm planning on doing is selecting a number of people in a similar situation. For example, an incoming tenure tracker. And then to look across departments what their workload exactly is. That will be taking place later this month/march.

**XWG** I understand that the talking is also necessary. Nevertheless, I find that they are already quite telling. I think one can relatively quickly come up with some initial conclusions on those key differences by simply comparing what the guidelines and targets are for those different groups across the departments. However, I am very happy you are working on it. I have two more questions. First, what is the current stage with the thesis process reform? Second, will there be a new process that will already be rolled out for the next academic year?

**PR** It is unfortunate that Michel logged out, because he is in a better position to answer that question.

**XWG** I have more questions in that direction. We can park the question and otherwise address it in the next meeting, specifically with him.

**XWG** The next thing is about the interaction with teaching support staff or program management. At the moment, I don't know any colleague who is not having nightmares from having to arrange online exams. This seems to be one of the sources of the workload. I think it is important to always be aware of the

importance of those teaching support functions because we all rely on them in order to get our work done. I am aware that their people were sick and people were on burnout in those teams as well. It seems to be super important to make sure that the processes are running smoothly and make sure that there are enough people for support in the organization. I was wondering who is taking action on those issues?

**PR** This is again something for the dean of education, but my understanding is that these teams have been reinforced the best way the best possible way. They have been organizing sessions where they instruct people on how to set up assessment.

**XWG** As a teacher, I am attending all those mandatory meetings where I am invited. I was surprised to see that some of the changes made it more efficient on the admin side, but more workload from the teacher side. This is because admin used to enter the grades and now the teachers have to do it themselves. Another thing that I was shocked about is that the course manuals will be checked for 30%, instead of 100%. It seems to be there are some efforts being made in terms of making those teaching support processes more efficient from the admin perspective. However, I don't quite understand yet what the overarching purpose is or how this is contributing to the organization more broadly or how this is helping with workload reduction.

**PR** I'm also a teacher myself. I also run in to exactly the same issues that you have just been describing. I think it is good to talk to the Dean of Education on these matters. I do recognize some of the things that you have been mentioning. Some of these might also be due to rules set by the board level at the university. It might be good to invite him (Michel Lander) another time because a lot of these questions relate to the education portfolio.

**XWG** It is important to look at very concrete sources of workload pressures and try to alleviate them.

#### 8. Faculty grid

**MF** I heard that senior lecturers first have to move to an associate professor position before becoming a professor. This is different from the perspective that was presented to the lecturers over the past few years. In the plan of Dirk van Dierendonck, there was a perspective from lecturer and senior lecturer. If this is not the case, it is really demotivating. You do not have to answer it right now, but I just want to have it mentioned. If you can come back to it, next meeting, I will be very pleased. Also, for more than three years we have been asking about the number of people who have a burnout. We have a right to know how many people have a burnout due to too much pressure.

**PR** This is a complex discussion. The faculty grid does say something about an associate professor of education. It does not say that a lecturer is someone who could become an associate professor of education as such. It is also important to mention that the faculty grid is a vision document. It was also shared with the faculty council for information purposes, but it has not been formally adopted. It is a document where there are things being described, but it is not fully adopted. I would also much rather talk about recognition and rewards rather than the words faculty grid. It is also important to realize that the recognition and rewards initiative is primarily focused on the assistant associate to full professor trajectory. I share the worry that there is not much attention paid to the people in lecturer positions. I am also planning on looking at the lecturer to senior lecturer trajectory.

**MF** If the board thinks it is okay. Let us have a separate meeting with you, me and Jacomijn. Is that all right?

**PR** That is fine, because it requires a bit more time. There are really some technical issues with careful explanation. The second part is relating to your burnout question. I asked HR some time ago and they said it was five.

**MF** I can tell you that the number is higher now.

**PR** Of course they only see the ones that are with the company doctor and called in sick. I agree this might be the tip of the iceberg.

Any other business

#### 9. Closing

To do before next meeting	Person responsible	Progress
Letter of Advice numerus fixus to Adri Meijdam before 1 <sup>st</sup> of March	JK/XWG	Done
Share adjusted document with FC	PR/BP	Done
Invite Michel Lander for next meeting.	BP	Done
Jacomijn, Peter and Marja meet separately about recognition and rewards initiative.	MF/PR/JK	Done