

MINUTES 198TH FC MEETING

Thursday June 14th 2018, 10:30 AM – 12:30 PM, Mandeville T03-42

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	EB
Marja Flory (MF) (Chair)	Marc Gijsbers (MG)	Anne van de Graaf (AvdG)
Helen Gubby (HG)	Adri Meijdam (AM)	Dirk van Dierendonck (DvD)
Tatjana Schneidmueller (TS)	Carla Dirks-van den Broek (CDB)	Steef van de Velde (SvdV)
Elisa Vandensteene (EV) (Vice C)	Ad Scheepers (AS)	
Mohammad Ansarin (MA)	Nadine Nieuwstad (NN)	
Tania Bhulai (TB)	Student members 2018-2019	

Secretary to the Faculty Council: Job Heidkamp

1. Opening
2. Agenda

Item 5a is added.

3. Announcements

MF: The FC would like to have a legal adviser for around one day per month, as there are many instances where legal advice is necessary, on the division of rights between the FC and the PCs, for example. AvdG: We are able to provide legal advice and we will look into who could take on this task, also in terms of independency from the school.

MF: The FC is not happy with the budget not being available yet. AvdG: Do note that it is a luxurious timeline and sometimes it takes more time. MF: The FC proposes to have the budget received end of July. The members will send in questions to the mandated FC members by email, followed by a discussion with the business controller. Afterwards, the budget can be approved by the mandated members.

a. On retroactive cutting 30% tax ruling

MA: The government retroactively cut the 30% tax rate ruling for foreign talent. Apart from the legality questions, this decision causes problems for the people involved, as they made assumptions about their future income. Is the EB willing to take action and to bring it up at the meetings with the EUR Executive Board or VSNU? DvD: One has to differentiate between the tax issue and the income issue. The tax decision by the government will be discussed in parliament this fall, so it is still uncertain. We also looked at the possibility to compensate for the income loss, but that has consequences for everything else, as the total budget stays the same. It is also doubtful whether we can compensate in terms of affordability. With regard to the lobbying: yes, the lobby (from VSNU) is as strong as it can be. MA: Would you be willing to bring it up at the EUR Executive Board? DvD: That will not bring added value, as they will say the same, that the lobby at The Hague should be coming from VSNU.

4. Follow-up to-do list last meeting

Everything was done.

5. Approval minutes 197th FC meeting

MF: Please add that I mentioned that I brought up the issue of the student evaluations for years already, since December 2015.

The minutes are approved.

a. Discussion on financial implications Boost the Bachelor

HG asked several questions about similar courses in BA and IBA having very different prices, and about the distinction between knowledge courses, application courses, and methodology courses. AM: The idea is that Boost the Bachelor will be budget neutral, meaning that the new programme will cost the same as the old programme. If you want to implement the tracks in the third year and the other improvements, you have to squeeze everywhere else. The categorisation and decreased costs per course are starting points for the discussions we will have per course. We expect a lot of change.

6. Approval updated Examination Regulations

MF: The FC cannot approve the Examination Regulations yet. It did not get the chance to go over it, as the updated version came in too late. An important issue is the way and the lack of enforcement of the regulations. AvdG: Do note that the proposed changes and the enforcement are disconnected. Also, the Rules & Regulations are the terrain of the Examination Board and the FC has no right of consent on that, and the Teaching and Examination Regulations are terrain of the Dean, on which the FC has a right of consent. MF: We think enforcement and the regulations are connected. HG: The FC proposes to meet with CDB in the week of June 25th. CDB: An invitation will be send.

7. Discussion on the Committee Mols report

MF: There are basically two main questions. One, what is the EB going to do with the five recommendations? Two, how is the EB going to implement the necessary culture shift? SvdV: The main assignment of the committee was to investigate whether RSM was fully independent. They found that there is no direct impact on the curricula or on research. However, there are potential integrity risks, for example about the side job register not being fully completed, which is now, with two exceptions, completely filled in. There are also not so obvious things. Everything you do for the limited companies of the EUR, even within your regular teaching tasks, should be registered as a side job. In the way RSM has organised the governance of its own limited company, guarantees scientific integrity, the risks are pretty low. For the other limited companies, it is a different story. We have no idea what is going on there, we have no sight on contracts for example. That is why the governance structure of the holding will be changed. With regard to culture, it can happen that people do not feel free to speak up, but one has to note that this is pretty common in the academic world. At the same time, within RSM, we implemented all recommendations from a report on culture from 2013 for example. The task force will itemise and map-out all the recommendations of the committee. Some need to go beyond, as some items are not so explicit and result in difficult dilemmas. MF: The FC

proposes to have one of its members in that task force. SvdV: Let me think about that, as, among other things, already seven people are in it.

MF: In some of the departments there is a culture of faction forming, resulting in people, in particular PhD students, not willing to bring up certain issues, and in other cases getting things done way easier compared to others. SvdV: This issue is on our radar, but we cannot mitigate this risk to zero. One of the interventions we did was installing the system of a second promotor, who is unrelated and independent. TS: It is not necessarily about having a second promotor, but more about the politics between professors, which comes down on their PhD students. SvdV: We are aware that PhD students and tenure trackers are in a vulnerable position, it is on our radar.

8. Discussion on policies and regulations teaching/student assistants

MF: The FC would like to have transparency of and regulations on how student assistants (SAs) are being deployed (grading, tasks). AM: With regard to the grading by SAs there is no structural difference in grading. With regard to SAs giving instructions, only a limited number of courses send SAs on training. As we require from staff that they are trained, we propose to require from all courses that all SAs are trained in terms of content and didactics.

MA: What about PhDs not being required to have a BKO (“Base Qualification Education”)? Dvd: That should be put forward to the Dean of Research.

EV: There are multiple other issues that need to be dealt with, the work load of SAs for example. AM: We would need more research on that. EV: A focus group with some (experienced) SAs could be an idea. AM: We will organise that.

9. Discussion on report European practices student evaluations

AS presented his extensive report on the issues with student evaluations, the findings at other universities and other research, and opportunities to improve the system. He also explained the set-up of the project that will tackle the issue within RSM and the timeline of that project. The first step is optimisation within the current system, starting in June this year.

MF: Can the recommendations be implemented in 2019, in my last year as Chair? AS: We want to be very hands-on, some recommendations might be implemented sooner. MF: The first step of the project can go to the PCs and the second step, with the HR perspective, to the FC, correct? AS: We will inform both. MF: But what about the right of consent and right of advice? We need a legal adviser for this.

MA: Are there also improvements possible for the coming year, in September? AS: We hope so, some could already be implemented, based on the first step.

10. Discussion on use student evaluations in appraisal interviews

See 9.

11. Discussion on follow-up Strategic Platforms

MF: I would like to mention that if you ask people to participate, you need to be aware that you have to follow-up. Otherwise people will not participate next time. The Strategic Platform in the beginning of November is an example.

DvD: It is not as negative as you paint, there are several things we already did. There are targeted follow-ups. It is an on-going process.

12. Closing