

MINUTES 152ND FC MEETING – 7 NOVEMBER 2013

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Jan Sirks	Bas Louwman (STAR)	Frank van der Kruk	Karin Bongers
Gabi Helfert		Peter Elsing	
Jelle de Vries			
Jules Maitrepierre			
Miruna Carlugea			
Chandro Kandiah			
Patrick Lefebvre			
Joost Vlot			

1. Opening

Jules opens the 152nd meeting officially at 11.10 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

Four announcements by Frank:

1. There has been an internal discussion about the integration of the career services of the BV and the school and the corporate alumni relations of the BV and the school. We are drafting a memo to ask the FC's advice about the reorganisation, for the integration of these four departments. So a request for advice will be sent to the FC. This will ideally be discussed during the next meeting.
2. There will be a possible reorganisation of our finance department, which will be moved to the shared service centre. It is a little delayed, but the board still plans to realise it somewhere in April hopefully. The CCAR integration is also coming up.
3. The new SAP system has been implemented.
4. Anne van der Graaf will not attend today, the reason is unknown.

One announcement by Gabi:

1. The FC is going to write a letter to the EFB about the food contract with Albron. The biggest concern now is that people with certain dietary needs, food preferences, allergies, or other restrictions cannot be served at the university.

5. Proposal to hold an annual meeting between MT and FC to discuss the state of RSM

-

6. Budget – information on HR facts and initiatives needed

The FC is interested in the strategy behind the figures in the budget and how the figures are constructed the way they are constructed. The FC would like to have more information to proactively influence the choices that are made regarding the figures in the budget.

The first point concerns the temporary workers. The FC thinks that all people with a primary task should have a permanent contract. People are important, because people are basically the only asset within the faculty. Therefore we need a backbone of people; otherwise we cannot do our job. The second point is that the FC would like to see a capacity plan. We would like to know how many people retire, how many people have a temporary contract, etc. On the other hand, there is the demand for labour. There should be an assessment of departments regarding what they need, so it can be explained why people with a certain position are working in a certain department. The FC would like to discuss with the board about the planning regarding why the capacity choices are made. The third point concerns diversity. In the annual report we read about this topic, but the FC would like to see the figures. How many female candidates were involved for example, and also how many international people? – so we can see how these figures can be improved in the future.

The board would like to plan in a meeting to discuss the budget in February and confirms that they will have sufficient time to prepare it regarding the figures. However, it should be made clear by the FC what kind of figures the FC wants the board to prepare, maybe even with a smaller part of the committee. The board comes up with one constraint, namely that the HR and the Finance department are in the middle of an SAP implementation. It has to be operational on 1 January 2014. That is priority one over everything, because it is a very hard deadline and a lot of work needs to be done. So, the board is very willing to prepare the meeting before February. The figures will show where RSM is at this moment, and then we can discuss about the choices that were made in the past and the choices to be made in the future.

The FC would like to discuss the budget with the board in February at the latest, before the budget for the next year is constructed. The board agrees that February is an option, but the board would like to know which figures to prepare before the meeting – maybe in a smaller group, to be planned in December preferably. For the FC it is highly important to get reliable figures, with a clear definition, and to have the figures per year. In that way, it is clear which project is running or not, and how much can be spent per year.

7. Programme Committee issue / intention to file for arbitration

The FC regrets the reply of the board regarding the letter. Last year's members of the FC did their best to come up with an agreement, considering all the letters sent out. The FC regrets that there is no board member available in this meeting who has the mandate to discuss this topic, although everyone was well informed in advance about the agenda points. All in all, the FC concludes there is a difference of values regarding the PCs. The board seems to be concerned about the efficiency and therefore proposes one single programme committee. The FC is concerned with the representation of all the programmes. There is a deadlock and there is nobody from the board available to discuss it. Therefore, the FC came to conclusion decision to send a letter to the Board about it. We will ask the Board to support us in that letter.

8. Any other business

Labour Issue

Some temporary workers were approached by their supervisors regarding being employed not by the EUR but by the BV instead. The FC has concerns about the differences between the salary scales, pension regulations, commuting rules, the bonus regulation, and also the number of holidays between the EUR and the BV. The FC wonders what the reasoning is behind this decision. There is the Berenschot benchmark about the number of support staff of the total faculty. According to this benchmark, the EUR is too big. The CvB agreed upon a target with the Ministry of OC&W to get the support staff percentage to a certain level. The benchmark is valid until 2015, but the board of the RSM will not accept this benchmark after 2015. The benchmark is the worst one to choose, because we have a high headcount but the amount spend on support staff per student is very low. So we have to

lower the headcount within our school. As long people are working for the school or the BV, the policy is that we ask people to change their contract to the BV. The board knows there are differences in employee benefits and we are looking for harmonisation. All in all, the employee benefits should be similar if you work for the EUR or the BV. Currently, two people from the marketing department and one person from CCAR have been approached to move from the EUR to the BV. A number of contracts already have been transferred. It is likely that more people are going to be asked. New people will be hired in the BV if applicable, and temporary personnel will be asked to work for the BV if their contract is extended. It is not the intention of the board to move whole departments to the BV. Besides transferring people, the board also does other things to achieve the target.

The board says the focus is on quality and if an employee does not want to move from the EUR to the BV for several reasons, it is possible an exception will be made. However, the employee should have good reasons before the board will make an exception. It is not the intention of the board to end the contract of someone they want to move from the EUR to the BV. The discussions will be held at the end of November, or beginning of December. The requirements of the OC&W should be met at the end of 2015. If the target is not met, the financial support from the state will be reduced by around €10 million. The FC asks how it works with the extension of a temporary contract if the employee is moved to another company (EUR to BV), because legally an employer can only extend a temporary contract twice and then a permanent contract should be offered. However, if the employee moves from EUR to the BV the counting starts all over again. There is a case now at the Free University in Amsterdam. The board makes sure these practices will not occur at Erasmus University.

Collective Agreement

The current CA will expire in January. The FC asks if the conditions of the CA will change for the BV, but the board does not know that. The FC and the board agree that everyone should be informed about the new CA. There are separate CAs for the EUR and for the BV. There will be differences between the employee benefits, but some differences will be harmonised too. The CAs are not connected to each other and the employees moved from the EUR to the BV should be informed about the differences between the CAs of the EUR and the BV.

9. Closure

Jules closes the meeting at 12 pm.

Next FC meeting 5 December 2013 1.30 pm in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Task	Person Responsible	Progress
Write a letter to the board to ask for arbitration.	Juup	Pending
Plan in a meeting between MT and FC (send a shopping list in advance by FC to the MT).	Karin	Pending
Plan in a pre-meeting about the budget in December (attendees: Frank, Martin, Peter, Juup, Jan, Gabi, Jules).	Karin	Option: 26/11
Plan in a meeting about the budget in February.	Karin	Pending
Write a letter to the board about the TER (see e-mail of Anne).	Juup	Pending
Explanation (by e-mail) about the things in the advice of the FC on the budget about projects.	Martin	Pending
Prepare the topic of the food offered by the canteen on campus.	Gabi	Pending