

Minutes 201st FC meeting

Thursday December 6th 2018, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM, Mandeville Building T3-42

FC members	Guests	EB
Amy Janssen-Brennan (AJB) (C)	Steven Sweldens (SS)	Dirk van Dierendonck (DvD)
Mary Flory (MF)	Chrysoula Papacharalampou (CS)	Anne van de Graaf (AvdG)
Jonas Kaiser (JK)	Wilfred Mijnhardt (WM)	
Mohammad Ansarin (MA)	Gabi Helfert (GH)	
Jessica Woitalla (JW)		
Isabel Boekestein (IB)		
Karen Rickers (KR) (V-C)		
Elisa Vandensteene (EV)		

Secretary to the Faculty Council: Job Heidkamp

1. Opening
2. Agenda
3. Announcements

AvdG: We are in the middle of the strategy process. The extended strategic platform will be on February 14th. Invitations, also for some of the FC members, are on the way.

AvdG: RSM is being investigated by the Inspection of Education from the Dutch government regarding the Parttime Master Bedrijfskunde (Business Administration), as they reopened the investigation from last summer. An in-between press communication will follow in the coming two weeks. There is disagreement between RSM and the Inspection with regard to what is allowed and what is not allowed. In the wake of this, Finance & Investments Advanced is also investigated. MF: Are the students currently enrolled informed? They are wandering and asking me questions. AvdG: In summer they were informed but I will check when the last formal communication was sent.

AvdG: For the recruitment of the new dean, the last version of the profile brochure is being drafted. After that, the hiring company will start recruiting and interviews will take place in February and March, hopefully. A copy of the brochure will be sent to the FC.

AvdG: Lastly, in reaction to the Committee Mols report several action lines were set out, one of those being that a revised faculty incentive system will be proposed to the EUR Executive Board (EB).

MF: Did you see Pauw (a Dutch talkshow)? They were basically saying that the Prime Minister based his decision to abolish the dividend tax on a report by RSM. DvD: It is getting annoying, as it is taken out of context. AJB: Should this negative press not be countered? DvD: We want to, but it is way more complicated that, actually.

4. Follow-up to-do list 200th FC meeting

-

5. Approval minutes 200th FC meeting

Approved without further comments.

6. Discussion on new MSc in Medical Business & Innovation, with Gabi Helfert

GH presents the new programme extensively, covering the material she provided beforehand. Among other things, the market survey, labour market perspectives for graduates, and the curriculum were presented.

MF: If I look at the WHW (Law on Higher Education), only the Institute, in this case the EUR, can start a new programme and thus the University Council would be the one to give advice on this. AvdG: Legally, you are right, but in practice the EUR EB asks for input. They want to know what the FC thinks. The RSM EB wants to know this as well. In all of this, the procedure as set out by the EUR EB is followed.

MA: Compared to other programmes currently being offered, how is this new programme different in terms of course material? GH: Those details are in the CDHO ('Committee Expediency Higher Education') application. I will get back to you.

The FC will await the additional information from GH.

7. Discussion on intention to terminate Research Master, with prof. Sweldens and Chrysoula Papacharalampou

SS introduces himself as Director of Doctoral Education of ERIM and explains further on the philosophy of the intention to terminate the Research Master (RM). In short, the RM is fundamentally unsustainable because of three reasons. Firstly, the RM is different from other programmes, in the sense that other competing universities promise (their own) students a PhD position directly. RSM wants to offer an international PhD programme, suitable for all, meaning that RM students have to compete with international students for a PhD position.

Secondly, the recruitment is troublesome. Applicants need to have a profile that shows that they are great researchers already. A lot of those people are scooped out by lower-ranked PhD programmes, as most of them do not have the vision to go for the RM first (and do a higher-ranked PhD later).

Thirdly, there is a problem with the placement of RM students into the PhD programme. There are some highly talented RM students, but they go to other higher-ranked PhD programmes. All in all, a lot of time, effort, and money is spent, while the returns are low.

CP explained further on the procedure she started to follow after she joined RSM two months ago, as also set out in the documents she delivered to the FC beforehand. Right now, as the PC just sent in their advice, all relevant stakeholders are consulted. All students currently enrolled were also consulted and during those conversations they were officially informed by RSM about the intention to terminate the RM.

AJB: When will everybody be finished? CP: We are still recruiting for 2019, so it will be 2022 and if nobody is recruited for 2019, the end year will be 2021. Transitional arrangements will come back

to the FC. AJB: Why are you still recruiting? SS: The RM is not officially terminated yet, but we are extra careful when applying the recruitment standard. Applicants are fully informed about the intention to terminate, but are welcome nevertheless.

MF: Does the RM have an individual CROHO? AvdG: Yes it does.

MA: I need to represent the needs of the students, to see whether all their concerns are being met. Based on the documents and your explanation here I could cross-off most questions. Did the RM, which started in 2004, not fulfil its purpose? WM: I think you can state that. The idea was that with following the RM, students could compete for a PhD position at ERIM with external students. Also, opportunistic people used the broad waivers to follow certain courses. SS: We actually recommend our graduates to not take our PhD programme. Since they receive one year less of funding, it is not in the best interest of the student. Of course, this goes against our own programme, so there is a conflict.

MF: I know one drop-out, who wanted to follow the RM because it was her believe that it would lead to easier enrolment into the PhD programme. This was the way it was advertised or the way she perceived the advertisement. SS: It is true that there is a disconnect between what we told applicants and practice.

MA: In 2015, ERIM concluded that the RM would continue, combined with some revamping of the programme, in order to have stronger applicants. Where did they go to? SS: To other PhD programmes elsewhere. MA: Why was the RM not cancelled earlier? SS: That is a good question, but just like with a brand, people invested in it and with tweaking it, they wanted to keep trying. CP: Also, to have reliable data, a longer time period was needed.

The present FC members have the intention to give a positive advice on the intention to terminate the programme. The letter of advice will be send after all members are consulted.

8. Presentation on Programme Quality & Innovation, with Wilfred Mijnhardt

WM introduces himself as the Policy Director of RSM and explains further on the draft of the PQI he delivered to the FC beforehand. The PQI is on school level and covers the complete portfolio of the Learning & Innovation Team and Quality & Innovation. It covers all degrees, both public and private, and should deliver a systematic approach for the whole school. The PQI adapts the logic of RSM to the HOKA, the Higher Education Quality Agreements, between the EUR and the Dutch government. HOKA is the follow-up on the studievoorschotmiddelen (Study Advance Grants). PQI should deliver more transparency on how the approximately €2 million will be spend and divided. In the HOKA there is an explicit role for the PCs and the FC, in both decision making and co-creation. That the draft of the PQI is put to the table right now, is part of a two-step approach. First the draft is discussed with the relevant stakeholders. The input coming from those discussions is used to update the draft and then the final version will come for final advice to the relevant (participatory) bodies.

AJB: As we have FC working groups that cover this topic, we suggest that they meet with you to provide and discuss the feedback of all FC members. WM: Sounds like a good plan.

9. Any other business

-

10. Closing

-

To do before next meeting	Person responsible	Progress
Send letter of advice on termination Research Master ERIM	AJB/JH	Done
Send letter of advice on new MSc in Medical Business & Innovation	AJB/JH	In progress
Send letter to EUR EB on English language	FC (students)	