

MINUTES 170TH FC MEETING – 3 SEPTEMBER 2015

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Gabi Helfert	Ben Schotpoort	Frank van der Kruk	Joy Kearney
Samer Abdelnour	Suzanne Bickes	Abe de Jong	Liz Derks
Marja Flory			
David Unterdorfer			
Marina Arnaudova			
Mike Jennekens			
Andrea Petrini			
Kevin Ren			
Dominik Scherrer			

1. Opening

Marja opens the meeting at 10.35 am. As this is the first meeting of the academic year 2015-2016, the meeting starts with a brief introduction round.

2. Agenda

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

3. Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting are approved without further remarks or amendments.

4. Announcements

On behalf of the EB, Frank and Abe make three announcements:

1. Erasmus Trustfonds and the Erasmus University have announced a new endowment fund during the start of the academic year. RSM is also involved in this project and supports the endowment fund in growing it into a sizeable fund so new projects can be financed. The Erasmus Trust Fund is very ambitious in its goals and is putting a lot of effort into setting up a structure to raise money for the university as a whole, and as such, also for RSM.
2. In previous FC meetings the internal communication of RSM has been discussed. One of the outcomes of these discussions is a newsletter that was sent around in July, which informs both faculty and staff about new developments within RSM.
3. The EB welcomes Gabi to the Dean's office in her new role of policy advisor from the 1st of October onwards.

On behalf of the FC, Marja makes two announcements:

1. Due to her new responsibilities as a policy advisor for RSM, Gabi will not be the chair of the FC this year. She will remain a member of the FC, but during the internal meeting it was decided that Marja Flory will be the new chair. Student members Andrea Petrini and Marina Arnaudova will share the position of vice chair of the FC.
2. In a meeting at the end of August the new faculty regulations were discussed between Frank and Gabi. The outcomes of this meeting were sent around to the other FC members and were discussed today during the internal meeting. The FC still has some reservations regarding the role of the Dean of Education and would like to request a meeting before the new faculty regulations are officially presented to the FC.

5. RSM Budget 2016

Ben Schotpoort briefly explains the RSM budget 2016, which is part of the longer-term budget for 2016, 2017 and 2018. In this longer-term planning 2016 will be a negative year, 2017 will be slightly positive and 2018 will end with a very positive result. In 2016, a big investment/value-creation programme will be carried out, which is the main reason for operating a loss the coming year. Over the coming years there will be an increase in the external income and productivity figures. Additionally, the current reserve position of €4.6 million will be expanded to €5.6 million in 2018.

The RSM budget for 2016 was discussed with the FC in May and August. Gabi presents some remarks that were sent by Paolo Perego; a member of the FC who unfortunately could not attend today's meeting. The first remark refers to the forecast of the employee development. The fte budgets for 2016 and 2017 are based on a static forecast of employees. The FC wonders to what extent promotions/dismissal of current tenure trackers or other significant shifts in fte's could be included per department to reflect dynamic changes in fte levels over time. The second remark refers to the part-time PhD programme. The fees to be charged are not indicated and a short explanation of the expected number of candidates in comparison with similar Dutch/International programmes would be helpful. Regarding the first remark Frank explains that the departments have their own expectations about tenure trackers and other possible fte shifts and these estimations are estimates at this point in time. These figures are too detailed to be taken up in the budget; however, the EB does have an overview of the fte numbers per function per department, so these could be supplied if required. Additionally, Abe mentions he has attended budget meetings within each department. Their budgets and expectations are very thorough and precise but always involve some uncertainties as people may leave both expectedly but also unexpectedly. However, Abe also emphasizes that this information is too detailed to be publicly published. For the second question the FC is referred to Vareska van de Vrande, the Director of the part-time PhD programme. Abe suggests inviting her to one of the next FC meetings, so she can present the programme and she can most certainly answer the questions the FC has regarding comparisons, numbers and figures of the programme. Abe does know that the fee structure is quite complex as the amount that is advertised is not necessarily a fixed fee and may deviate for individual cases. The FC agrees to invite Vareska to one of the next FC meetings. Overall, the FC decides to give a positive advice regarding the budget 2016. Next week a letter including possible remarks will be drafted by the finance committee of the FC and will be sent out to the EB.

6. Diversity Policy Academic Staff

A while ago a committee was installed as a task force to work on this issue. The committee, chaired by Marta Szymanowska, will deliver a report/proposal by the beginning of October. This report was originally scheduled to be available in July; however, the committee has asked for extra time in order to do a good job. Abe suggests inviting the committee to present the report to the FC as soon as the report is available. This will probably be during the November meeting.

7. Training Budget for RSM employees

There is a difference in training budgets between faculty and support staff. For support staff there is a policy on the education budget. In general, 3% of all personnel costs per department can be spent on education of support staff. In addition, 2 days per person are reserved for the purpose of development and education. However, one must keep in mind that this might give the impression of a personal budget, but this is not the intention. It is decided per department who needs which extra skills, training and education, which means one could one year receive no training at all and the following year receive a heavy training. This will still average to 3% of all personnel costs (being salaries) of the department and 2 days per person per year. Abe mentions that some courses are compulsory for new employees or employees that shift to a certain position, such as associate professor. Abe

recently had a discussion with Peter Elsing regarding the training courses and they came to the conclusion that there is a lack of knowledge, among the faculty in particular, about the different courses that they can follow. Often the department chairs are also not fully aware of the array of courses that can be done. As a result it was decided to circulate an email around the 1st of December amongst the faculty listing the courses that are offered by the EUR internally, the courses offered by TOP, which is the collaboration of the universities of Leiden, Delft and the Erasmus University and external courses that can be followed. This timing is done purposely so during the Development & Performance meetings people can indicate that they would like to follow a course. Samer indicates that he thinks this is a very good development and perhaps in the future this can be done on a bi-annual basis.

8. Action Points Following the EUR Employee Survey

For this meeting a memo was sent to the FC by Peter Elsing. Frank adds to the information in the memo that RSM will start an initiative that is called “A great place to work”, which intends to improve the employee satisfaction at RSM. The top of the RSM is involved in an extended SP (Strategic Platform) meeting on the 6th of October, which will also be the kick-off in creating actions to make RSM a better place to work. Gabi wonders what the criteria are to be invited to this meeting, as she was also invited. Frank replies that she was probably invited because she is a part of the FC. Now that Marja is the new chair, Frank will check with Mark and Steef if she can be invited as well.

Marja mentions that the memo states that “the work load and a good balance between work and personal life will be a continuous point of attention for all departments and department chairs”. From her own experience and other people’s experiences she knows that there are quite some people with a burn-out, which is often not only a burden for the individual but also for the department and direct colleagues as they have to take over the responsibilities of this person. She adds that replacement, re-division of the work and financial compensation should be arranged by the department, but clear rules and procedures are currently lacking, which is putting a lot of pressure on both the people on the verge of a burn-out and the people within the department. Abe states that in general, indeed, the autonomy that a department has in giving rewards to faculty is quite significant. The school has confidentiality advisors to make sure no unethical decisions are made in this respect and people are encouraged to talk with these advisors, especially in case of a continuous issue. Moreover, he mentions that the workload issue will also be discussed in the extended SP meeting to which the FC was deliberately invited. Marja would like to know more generally what the policy for RSM is when dealing with someone with a burn-out. Abe explains there is a serious trajectory in place for these cases. Usually someone with a burn-out calls in sick and together with an external medical expert the course of action will be decided. If needed, the person will get some time to recover after which the support process of getting the person back to the work floor will be started. These are standard rules and processes, which apply to most universities and probably to most work environments and organizations. Gabi reformulates the question and asks what the procedures are regarding the workload that someone with a burn-out leaves behind. Abe explains that usually a solution is found within the department. If a long-term solution cannot be found within the department, a meeting with the EB is planned to see how replacement should be arranged. Abe adds that, as it is often case-dependent, there are no fixed rules for this process but that it is usually carried in good mutual communication.

Marina brings up the high differences in percentages between departments of people answering the survey. This might lead to skewed results and she wonders if RSM is actively encouraging people to take part in these surveys. Frank explains that RSM is really trying to stimulate people to take part in these surveys. In general, Frank observed a difference in faculty and support staff filling out these surveys. Support staff is usually more willing to answer these questions, whereas academic staff is more dedicated to their research and teaching commitments. Reminders for the questionnaires are often sent out but Frank emphasizes that people fill out these questionnaires on a voluntary basis. The differences between departments can often be explained by different cultures within

departments or department chairs stimulating people to fill out the survey. In addition, employees receive quite some questionnaires and with an increasing number of questionnaires, the motivation to fill them all out decreases.

Samer wonders if the EB has analysed why tenure trackers score significantly lower on a number of the items that were asked in the questionnaire. Abe explains that the position of tenure tracker often involves uncertainty regarding what is expected of them and often also have uncertain prospects. Many questions in the survey tried to measure these expectations and prospects and therefore tenure trackers indicated lower numbers.

The memo also indicates that the greatest “dissatisfier” for employees is the paid parking. Marja wonders if there will be any action taken to change this. Frank mentions that this dissatisfaction is brought to the attention of the EB or the EUR but so far there are no planned actions to do anything about it. The university wants to stimulate people to come by public transport or bike, but in addition is also to finance the parking spaces they have built. Additionally, there is a hardship clause for people who can show they really cannot afford it. Gabi mentions that she thinks this is a good policy to stimulate sustainability. Moreover, the university had to build these parking spaces; it is a requirement of the municipality which applies to all institutions. It only seems fair that the people who use it have to pay for it.

Lastly, Gabi wants to know if there is currently any more information available about the “Great place to work” initiative. Abe explains that this will really be the topic of the extended SP meeting; there is not yet a fixed plan or certain ideas. With this meeting they really try to create a discussion and to stimulate interaction with different parties to create a better place to work.

10. Any Other Business

Gabi mentions that the FC this year will work in sub-committees. The division will also be announced on the website and is as follows:

General issues A. RSM Internal organization B. RSM Strategy C. Reorganizations	Andrea Petrini Dominik Scherrer
Education A. General/Quality assurance B. Bachelor programmes C. Master programmes	Samer Abdelnour Marina Arnaudova Marja Flory Mike Jennekens Andrea Petrini Kevin Ren Dominik Scherrer
Research A. General B. PhD related issues C. Scientific integrity	Samer Abdelnour Paolo Perego David Unterdorfer
HR issues A. General B. Formation & Career development C. Labor conditions D. Diversity	Marja Flory Gabi Helfert Kevin Ren
Finance A. Budget B. Other issues	Mike Jennekens Paolo Perego David Unterdorfer

FC organization A. Visibility/webpage B. External relations C. Back office	Marina Arnaudova Gabi Helfert
---	----------------------------------

11. Closure

Marja closes the meeting at 11.37 am.

To do before the next meeting

Task	Person Responsible	Progress
Schedule meeting regarding new Faculty Regulations	Liz	
Draft positive Letter of Advice regarding budget	Mike, Paolo, David, Marja	
Invite diversity committee for November meeting	Liz	
Invite Vareska van de Vrande for November meeting	Liz	
Ask Steef and Mark to invite Marja to SP meeting on October 6th	Frank	