

MINUTES 183RD FC MEETING

Thursday November 3rd 2016, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM, Mandeville Building T03-42

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Secretary
Marja Flory (chair) - MF	Peter Elsing (PE)	Steef van der Velde - SvdV	Job Heidkamp
Joey Johannsen - JJ	Eric van Heck (EvH)	Anne van de Graaf - AvdG	
Helen Gubby - HG	Ting Li (TL)		
Marien Rodriguez LdIC - MR	Saskia Bayerl (SB)		
Rashko Angelinov- RA			
Domenica Salazar - DS			
Kyra Heidemanns - KM			
Tatjana Schneidmüller (TS)			

1. Opening

2. Agenda

Agenda item 9 will be dealt with in an external meeting.

3. Approval Minutes 182nd FC meeting

Approved without any comment.

4. Announcements

No announcements were made.

5. Update by Marja Flory on election PhD member – introduction of Tatjana Schneidmüller

Tatjana introduces herself and is welcomed by the FC.

6. Update by Saskia Bayerl (Associate Dean of Diversity) on diversity since her appointment

Saskia presents the developments and efforts in the field of diversity at RSM. These were positively received and discussed by the FC. She is asked to give the next update in March 2017. The presentation will be send to the FC afterwards.

7. Update by Peter Elsing (Director P&O) on progress (pilot) new P&D cycle

Peter gives an update about the progress of the (pilots of the) new Performance & Development cycle. This comes in a version for support staff and one for academic staff. The pilot for the former went very well and is planned to be rolled out in the first of quarter of 2017, EUR broadly. The pilot for the latter went less properly, because the set-up needs to be fine-tuned. Generally speaking the differences between the old and the new forms of the P&D cycle are not that big, because most of the new form is an automatic and digitalized version of the old form. However, an important difference is that binomial grading (“does meet the requirements” or “does not meet the requirements”) is

changed into a gliding scale of five. In order for the FC to compare the old and the new form, it is promised that both versions will be send.

8. Questions towards HRM on low sickness absence compared to perceived work pressure (see attached documents)

MF: there seem to be differences between the results of the survey and the image that arises when walking around, so other ways of doing research on this topic need to be explored. Because the report resulting from the survey is quite extensive, the FC decided that it would like to have a separate meeting with HRM on this report. AvdG: it could be an idea to await the results of this year's survey (2016), which are expected in January, and the new Dean of Faculty who should be in function towards that time. Moreover, during that time a comparison between the results of last survey (2014) and those of the coming survey will be made. The FC agrees.

MF: after the new results come in, who will take action on these? AvdG: there are various actors who take action, among others, the MT, the Chairs of the Departments, HRM and the Dean of Operations.

MF: who took action after the results of 2014 came in? AvdG: the Dean of Faculty and the departments. However, because the results were quite good, not too many actions were taken. PE: the Chairs of the departments were to pick up things and HRM monitored whether they actually did this.

9. Questions towards Eric Waarts (Dean of Education) on the big groups in lectures, personal interaction, the ratio between lectures and tutorials and Boost the Bachelor

This subject will be dealt with in an external meeting by the Education Committee of the FC.

10. Questions towards Eric van Heck (Chairman Department of TOM) on increased student numbers BIM and measures on that

Eric is joined by Ting Li, the Academic Director of BIM. EvH: we are dealing with a pressing situation. We want to maintain the quality of the education, with for example small groups, while we have student numbers that are almost equivalent to a Bachelor programme. At the same the workload for the department is of concern. There are various reasons why the programme attracts so many students: the transformation of big companies, which leads to demand of people who graduated in BIM; the RSM BIM programme being one the better programmes in the Netherlands and Europe; the salary levels after graduating; and the besides the large growth from within RSM, the influx of students of Dutch (technical) and foreign Universities. TL: several actions were already taken to take on this difficult situation. Extra staff, student-assistants and faculty was hired or is being hired and the programme is being redesigned to give it a quality boost. What is needed for next year is a cap on the student numbers, in order to be in control. For this year various actions were taken as well: because the classrooms were too small, the lectures of the core courses are being taped and the amount of electives is doubled by asking lecturers within the department and external lecturers, with a certain expertise within BIM. With regard to the thesis system, for which 400 supervisors and co-readers are needed, internal and external staff are called upon.

For now the department does what it is capable of and for the long term it needs to be in control again, both towards the Faculty and the students. Three solutions are possible: 1) an internal or an external cap - the latter capping a group of only 80 students 2) a cap on both internal and external students, with a maximum of 250 students, which is still workable 3) a maximum of 250 students, but with selectivity, by ranking them.

MF: as soon as the proposed option is clear and the meeting with the Education Committee took place, the FC will read the proposal in order to give consent. The FC advises to opt for the third option in combination with a 'tiered' grade criterion for the BIM course in the Bachelor programmes. To illustrate: an 8.0 or higher for that course would mean guaranteed access, between 7.0 en 8.0 will result in a higher chance of admission, etcetera. It has to be solution where the members of the department feel comfortable with.

HG: what about the Tenure Trackers within BIM? They have a fixed amount of time for their track, but also need to do more work in this situation. EvH: they get the full support and for example, the department tries to link the subjects of the theses to the research they are doing. If the workload increases for them, maybe extra time will be given. Over time BIM will attract more lecturers to take over teaching activities of the Tenure Trackers. He promises to check whether Tenure Trackers with the old contract of six years get more time.

14. Any other business

No any other business.

15. Closure

Next FC meeting December 1st 10:30 AM in Mandeville T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Task	Person Responsible	Progress
Invite chairwoman SR	JH	Done
Meet with Gabriele Jacobs and/or Erik van Raaij	Education Comm.	Done
Send old and new P&D form	PE	Done
Send presentation of Saskia Bayerl to FC	JH	Done