

MINUTES 165TH FC MEETING – 5 FEBRUARY 2015

Attendees

| FC Members | Guests | MT | Official Secretary |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Gabi Helfert | Marcel Tuijn (on behalf of FC member Jelle de Vries) | Frank van der Kruk | Joy Kearney |
| Jan Sirks | | Abe de Jong | Liz Derks |
| Frederieke Dijkhuizen | | | |
| Andrea Petrini | | | |
| Youming Ma | | | |
| Lance Cosaert | | | |
| Samer Abdelnour | | | |

1. Opening

Gabi opens the meeting at 10.33 am.

2. Agenda

Due to the fact that Jan Sirks needs to leave at 11.00, agenda point 6 regarding the Communication and Consequences of Results EUR employee survey from May 2014 will be discussed first.

3. Minutes

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

4. Announcements

Abe and Frank make three announcements on behalf of the EB:

1. In the past two months RSM has looked into the opportunity to take over a small private school in the Netherlands. The EB has had meetings with this school and studied the opportunities and liabilities. In the end, it was decided not to continue the discussions with this school about a potential takeover.
2. On January 24 Johan van Rekom, assistant professor in the Marketing department, has passed away at the age of 51. We will remember Johan as a kind, giving and scientifically driven colleague with broad and deep interests and a nice sense of humor. Many colleagues attend his funeral, where Ale Smidts spoke on behalf of the school. The department is in contact with the family of Johan.
3. The reorganization plan for the RSM generic support staff was submitted to the EUR EB. They approved the plan, and so did various advisory bodies, such as the University Council. The RSM EB is currently waiting for the last paperwork but is already preparing for execution.

Gabi makes one announcement on behalf of the FC:

1. The candidacy period for the next RSM FC will take place from the 23rd of February until the 9th of March. In order to attract sufficient members, the FC decided on some marketing measures to be taken. In addition, the FC would like to ask for the support of the EB in spreading the message to the employees in particular. The students will be actively approached by the FC itself as well as through the program managers of the different programs. The EB will be provided with information so it can be distributed. After the candidacy period, elections will take place in May 2015.

5. Communication and Consequences of Results EUR employee survey from May 2014

Jan briefly introduces the topic and explains that in May 2014 a survey was held among the employees of the EUR. This was the second time such a survey was conducted and many of the outcomes were more negative than the year before. The EUR told the different faculties to communicate the results of the survey to the employees, which was to be done through the department heads. However, until now, it seems that no action has been taken at the

RSM. The FC would like to know whether something will actually be done with the results, as many employees feel they filled out a survey for nothing. Although all departments are different, a general approach could be taken whereby the EB asks for plans and feedback within a certain timeframe from the department heads based on the department-specific results. Based on the feedback and plans the EB can provide support to the department where needed and this way the employees will get the feeling something is done about the indicated issues. Frank disagrees with the statement that the results were more negative compared to the last survey. According to him, at the EUR level overall results were indeed lower, but at RSM the results remained the same on average. However, the EB does agree with the concern, which is why the work and actions to be taken were divided over Frank and Abe. Abe explains that he has met with each academic department chair and provided them with the survey outcomes for their department, benchmarked to the RSM, the EUR and the results of the previous survey. Afterwards, together with someone from HR they went through these results and identified possibilities for improvement. Each department chair has to report back to Abe after having discussed the results internally. Overall, Abe noticed two things in particular:

1. The response rate was a lot lower than for the previous employee satisfaction survey. Some departments had response rates as low as 9%, which is really an issue.
2. When looking at the different groups of employees within RSM, the tenure track assistant professors are in particular dissatisfied. Abe will schedule a separate meeting with the tenure track assistant professors to discuss the results with them in more detail.

Together with Peter Elsing, Abe decided to post the overall results of the survey, including an explanation, on the intranet. Gabi mentions that the results were indeed published, however, without any accompanying message or explanation. Abe replies that this is Peter's responsibility and will probably be done soon. Gabi wonders whether Abe has received some initial feedback already from department heads on which actions to take or whether there is a follow-up procedure in place for these meetings. Abe mentions that two out of the 7 departments have reported back so far, however, no specific plans have been brought up. He will keep in touch with the different department head and remind them to send their feedback. Jan emphasizes that good communication will contribute to higher satisfaction; since people will notice something is actually done with these results. Abe agrees and he will make sure the message on the intranet will include a section on the procedures and steps taken in dealing with the survey results. Furthermore, Frank and Peter Elsing have talked to all department heads from the various support departments. The overall results within these departments were lower compared to the educational departments, probably as a consequence of the upcoming reorganization. The same procedure applies here; the results will be discussed internally and a plan of action will be submitted somewhere in March. An update of this issue will be given in the April meeting, provided all department heads have sent back their feedback.

6. Results Focus Groups on Internal Communication and Next Steps

Marianne Schouten is the person responsible for internal communication and the focus groups. She also attended all the focus group meetings and was therefore invited for today's meeting. Unfortunately she is not able to attend today's meeting as she is sick. Both Marianne and Willem will be invited for the next FC meeting to discuss the matter.

7. Status update faculty regulations

Frank indicates that unfortunately this is taking longer than expected. The regulations will be reviewed by the Dean either this or next week. The final version will be provided within approximately two weeks so they can be discussed during the next meeting.

8. Status Update Development of Diversity Policy for Faculty

Abe explains that they have found people willing to participate in an RSM diversity committee that is going to write a proposal for a more explicit diversity policy. The members of this committee are Abe, Peter Elsing, Gail Whiteman, Marta Szymanowska and Merieke Stevens. They will have a meeting on the 10th of March with professor Takkenberg from the Erasmus MC, which has a lot of experience with diversity. The meeting is organized by Gail Whiteman and as it is a specific RSM meeting, all department heads together with the EB will be invited. Gabi

wonders whether Abe has considered other people to join the committee, such as Inga Hoever or Dianne Bevelander, who both have a lot of experience with diversity. Abe explains that the current committee constitutes five people and from his experience a somewhat smaller group is better in order to get things done. However, he will get in touch with both of them to see whether they would be interested in joining.

9. Status Update Implementation Diversity Policy for Administrative Employees

Gabi mentions there were some steps to be taken to implement a diversity policy for administrative employees, such as the appointment of a diversity officer, defining targets and appropriate measures for the next period and the implementation of a mentoring programme. Frank explains that Yvonne Jules from the HR department has been appointed as diversity officer. Frank still needs to discuss the task division with her and an update will be given during the next meeting.

Any Other Business

The FC has reviewed the draft version of the mentoring programme for faculty and was very pleased with the initiative and the content of the programme. Feedback has already been sent to Yvonne Jules, who is in charge of the programme. The only question that remains is when the programme will actually be launched. Abe answers that the aim is April 1st; however, the bottleneck is the development of a web-based platform that will connect mentors and mentees. Several providers of such platforms have been approach, but more in-depth talks have taken place with Dwillo, who also provides similar platforms for other EUR groups.

11. Closure

Gabi closes the meeting at 11.04

To do before the next meeting

| Task | Person Responsible | Progress |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Update employee survey: FC meeting April Focus groups with Marianne and Willem: FC meeting March Faculty regulations: FC meeting March Diversity policy for administrative employees with Yvonne Jules: FC meeting March | Liz | |
| Talk to Dianne Bevelander about diversity committee | Gabi | |
| Get in touch with Inga Hoever for diversity committee | Abe | |