

# Minutes 241<sup>st</sup> FC meeting

Thursday December 15<sup>th</sup> 2022, 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

FC members	EB	Guests
Tom Verlijdsdonk(TV) (Chair)	Myra van Esch(MvE)	Daan Stam(DS)
Jacomijn Klitsie(JK)(Vice-Chair	Ansgar Richter(AR)	
Edward Oldenburger(EO)(Vice-Chair)		
Silvija Prancane-Verhoef (SPV)		
Luuk Veelenturf(LV)		
Xena Welch Guerra(XWG)		
Max Meuser Bourgognion(MMB)		
Luca De Jong(LdJ)		
Boudewijn Pieteron(BP)		

1. Opening
2. Agenda
3. Announcements

**TV** The vacancy for the empty Faculty council seat has been filled by Anass Boukakar.

**LV** I want to thank the board for their positive e-mail including the 200 euro voucher. This is really appreciated.

**SPV** Several people could not join the town hall meeting due to limited capacity. We think that is strange that not all staff members can attend due to this reason.

**MvE** It is always hard to figure out a balance between making a lot of capacity available and then people cancelling or not registering on time. You can end up with huge costs in the latter case.

**AR** I have seen in the European business school ranking that we rose from place 17 to 14, so that is nice. The other thing is that we received an award from the association of MBA's.

4. Follow-up to-do list 240<sup>th</sup> meeting
5. Follow-up minutes 240<sup>th</sup> meeting

**JK** The new dean of faculty has been mentioned by name, but I do not think that it has been officially announced who it is. Also, something about appointments is mentioned but it should be reappointment.

6. Partnerships and Engagement(With Daan Stam)

**TV** We have prepared some question that you already received. Did you prepare something?

**DS** I will come back to the questions at the end of the presentation.

What we are trying to do with engagement is an important element here. We have two major goals. The whole idea behind engagement is working and collaborating with outside stakeholders. On the one hand, we are trying to get everyone in the school to work with these external stakeholders. On the other hand, we want those external stakeholders to come to us when they have questions or ideas. If we do this well, our research and education will be better, we can get revenue streams from the stakeholders and this will all lead to more impact.

There are a few highlights for strategic projects that we are working on. The first one is strategy formulation, which is about figuring out what kind of impact we want to have and how we want to measure it. We had a strategic platform meeting where we presented an impact model based on all kinds of interviews with stakeholders. We are currently finalizing it and hopefully, by the summer, we will have a good idea what our impact should be and how we want to measure this.

The second important thing is about the engagement unit and center restructuring on which you also asked a question beforehand. What currently happens is that centers are owned by individual professors and they are everywhere in our organization which does not work well. We want to try to get them together in a central place. The benefits of doing that would be that they are much more visible, you create synergies between the different stakeholders-centers, you create economies of scale, you can offer an overview of information about engagement, you can provide more influence and power to the centers and groups and you can create a standardized way of working. We are not there yet, but I think that we will be working towards this in spring and the blueprint will also have to go through the faculty council when it is there. There are some centers that have been taken out of some departments already because they asked for it.

The third thing is about the faculty model & development track, but this has come to a standstill because there is no dean of faculty.

The fourth thing is on part-time PHD. This is one of our main vehicles for engagement. This is a very cool program where practitioners complete their PHD in six years. We have had a very large review of the program to see what the weaknesses are. We now have ten points to improve the program and the new academic director is now implementing these improvement points into the program. At the same time, we spend a lot of time to getting EurCentral to create a policy around part-time PHD's. They now have more rights and it also means that we have a legitimate basis for what we are doing.

The fifth element is on links with outside parties. We have a lot of contact with the Leiden, Delft and Erasmus collaboration. This really leads to help with especially space, horticulture and sustainable finance. We also have a very strong relationship with the Erasmus research center, including a shared business developer.

Now the questions. *"What does the engagement budget look like?"* That is a difficult question because it falls under a hundred different budgets. I can say that the budgets are mainly oriented towards the centers. They have their own budgets, but we wanted to give them some more leeway. We always had a 50k discretionary budget, we have a 250k investment budget for those centers as well and we have 50% employment costs for a business developer.

*"What is the status of the development of the independent centers?"* I believe we have discussed this a bit already but I hope we can really get this going in spring and get them together physically on the fourth floor of Mandeville.

**JK** A lot of the people in the centers are on non-permanent contracts, right?

**DS** Yes, it is very difficult to deal with this.

**JK** What is your plan for this then?

**DS** In all honesty, most people that have temporary jobs and post docs contracts have a contract that ends.

**JK** You and I both know that people have been out of commission for six months doing something separate and then came back.

**DS** That is indeed a terrible situation and we will never do that again.

**JK** So what are you going to do?

**DS** It depends on what they want. We are talking with them about tenured lecturer contracts and some of them are more interested in a research career. That is a difficult situation and then we try to help them as good as possible to find a research job outside of the school. For me, the most important thing is that post docs come for a period of time and then they leave again. The idea of getting them out for six months and then coming back should not be done. The main problem is getting them into an academic career, but we can let them stay on a lecture contract and they can become tenured full faculty members.

The third question is " *What is the current view on objective 3.3 'Lasting, multi-dimensional and well-managed partnerships with diverse corporate and non-corporate partners established by 2025, especially in the region' given the political climate and for example the very recent Occupy visit to campus. Real question: does the RSM (still) actively pursue corporate partnerships?*" Yes, we do because we are a business school. Our firm belief is that we can make a positive impact on this world with companies. The other question is whether we work with any company. There the answer is much more multilateral. One of the aspects is that our academics have the freedom to work with any company. One the other hand, as a school, we are not helping companies further their agenda if that agenda is not aligned with our agenda. It is very tough to say that we will not work with certain companies as a school because that collides with academic freedom.

**AR** We are not working, for example, with arms dealers or tobacco companies, but the fossil fuel industry is much more trickier in many respects. It is important that we do not give these companies, that are under attack for good reason, any influence on decision making rights in this school. The notion that Shell is influencing the university is nonsense. We work with these companies in a way that does not make us dependent on them. We also do not receive any money directly from Shell, but they are part of an energy transition initiative. We are working on this project with the purpose of moving away from fossil fuel and this is funded by 16 companies, of which Shell is one. This does not give Shell any influence and it also does not further the interests of these companies to stay in fossil fuel.

**DS** To add to that. I want to stress that I believe our students have the full right to disagree and demonstrate. We can talk about this, but that does not mean that we have to agree with them.

**JK** I just want to make a comment about the fact that I see very little progress in the plan of the research centers.

**DS** That is true and I am very frustrated about this. A part of this is that this is a bigger move than you might think. Also, there are a lot of people who want to have a say in this and these processes are taking a lot longer than we hoped.

**JK** You said it would be finished in spring, right?

**DS** Yes, I think that you will find a nice proposal for this in spring.

## 7. RSM strategy

**AR** I am happy to say a few things about this and I received a list of questions. I do not think it is realistic to answer every question in detail.

**JK** These are all valid questions.

**AR** I agree, but I cannot answer them all in this meeting. I want to give you a bit of an overview on where we stand. We finalized the strategy one and a half years ago. It is meant to be a strategy that gets us to the end of 2025. Some of the objectives and initiatives have progressed very nicely. There are others that are falling much more into the line of being delayed and there are also some aspects that are not irrelevant, but I deem them unrealistic to achieve within the 2025 time frame. Let me give some examples of those things that I believe we made progress on and then we get to the categories

where we have made less progress on. Overall, we have had much greater emphasis on engagement and impact. However, there are also specific initiatives. One of your questions was whether there were any school level impact initiatives and an example of that is the energy transition initiative I just alluded to. We have also gained much greater visibility in the area of engagement than we ever had before. The second question was about grants and I cannot give you any figures about grants yet, but there is much-increased grant activity at the school.

Another area where I believe we made progress relates to the question about greater selectivity for student admissions. We are for the first time in recent years not growing in total student numbers and some of that has been a conscious choice. We have discontinued some programs and were very selective in developing new programs, especially in the flagship programs. There was also a question about embedding the school mission into all of our programs. We are well underway and I hope Michel can say more about that.

The faculty model is an area where we have become delayed for all sorts of reasons. We have to realize that we are operating in an environment that has thrown us some curveballs. I do not try to be defensive, but the 'bestuursakkoord', the money coming from that and reconciling the existing career models makes it difficult to have these conversations at the same time.

**JK** It is also something where there is now a deadline, because the money is coming in. Other universities have fully worked out offers that they are making to their candidates. I think it is super urgent and it is not okay to say that we are not there yet.

**AR** I respectfully disagree with that. As far as the 'bestuursakkoord', we are hiring and have made a lot of offers.

**JK** I know there are committees, but are they doing something? I know that my department is hiring on the premise that there will be a contract that might be temporary or might be full. There will be a salary that matches that, but it is a vague promise. I know people are doubting to come here on that premise.

**AR** That is an issue we cannot remove overnight. I believe that the reason why you say that other faculties are further advanced is because we have been far more wedded to our tenure track model and it has served us well. A school or institution that is less wedded to it will have much less of a problem. It is a position of strength that has made us careful. I also speak with the deans of the other schools every day and UVA is facing at least as many problems. We are also working with economics and we are very much in sync with them at this front.

**MvE** I want to add that the change that we want to make impacts new people, but we also have the responsibility to the people who are currently here and that is a huge change. It may seem like just changing a temporary to a permanent contract after one year. It means that we need to create an HR system that allows for very careful consideration very early in the process. The biggest issue will be what will we do with people that received a permanent contract and are not delivering up to par. In the tenure track, we could let them go and now we need an HR system in place.

**JK** It might be useful to involve us into the process because we need to approve this.

**MvE** There is a group working very hard on this and I think it is a good suggestion to meet up with them and involve you in the thinking process. I will convey the message to them.

**AR** There are also some aspects of the strategy that I deem unrealistic. I believe that the construction of an iconic building is not realistic within the 2025 timeframe. For the university, this does not seem to be a priority at this point.

Another area that is not realistic to achieve in 2025 is about having 50% or more of our income generated from sources other than our first revenue stream. There are two reasons for that. One of them is that the main source of 'other' income is in the private area (in particular RSM b.v.), and we are currently reducing the size of our MBA programs, which means that the income from this source will be reduced. The second reason is that we see a greater increase in the first money stream income. I think we are well on track to achieve the overall intention of becoming less dependent on these streams, but the 50% target will not be met.

Some areas are progressing very well and some have not made enough progress. I very much support the idea to have a midterm strategy review process and I am very happy to work with you on that in 2023.

8. Digital assessment  
**Moved to next meeting**

9. Any other business

10. Closing

Task	Person responsible	Deadline
Deliver proposal for research centers.	DS	Spring
Inform faculty model working group that we want to meet up with them.	MvE	January 19 <sup>th</sup>
Have a midterm strategy review for the RSM strategy.	AR	Halfway 2023