

MINUTES 112TH FC MEETING – 9 JUNE 2009

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Frank Wijen	Ale Smidts	Steef van de Velde	Catheleyne Jurgens
Martine Schey			
Jan Sirks			
Vinay Tiwari			
Bart Ariëns			
Linda Huinink			
Gianna O'Brien			

1. Opening

Frank opens the 112th FC meeting and welcomes everyone.

2. Agenda

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

3. Minutes

Eric Waarts has remarked that on page 3 it is mentioned that “*the CEMS Programme is 8th in FT ranking*”, this should be “*our MSc programmes*”.

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

4. Announcements

The MT makes one announcement:

- A “reorganisation” has been announced within Executive Education to cover the big financial loss. Two reasons behind this decision are: the financial crisis and the start of the MBA programme in January (instead of September). Two measures will be taken: (1) temporary contracts will not be prolonged; this involves 8 people, and (2) among the remaining staff tasks will be reallocated.

The FC makes one announcement:

- The FC Elections were quite successful with a turnout of 34% staff, and 15% students – which is high in comparison with other faculties. The ‘old’ and ‘new’ FCs will have a joint meeting on 1 September.

5. Quality of Research

A small committee (consisting of Vinay, Linda, and Frank) has prepared a presentation on enhancing research quality. Frank goes through the presentation, which raises relevant issues – in particular, developing shared databases, assessing and interpreting research quality, providing enough good PhD courses, presenting research findings to students, and providing lump-sum annual conference budgets for all ERIM researchers – and offers suggestions for improvement. Ale then responds to different issues and suggestions. With regard to the question ‘Does the ERIM list correctly assess quality?’, Ale explains the composition of the ERIM journals list. The list has been reviewed every 2 - 3 years in order to see if some qualifications need to be adjusted. RSM/ERIM policy and requirements are similar to those of leading business schools such as Wharton and Harvard, albeit more lenient. For instance, the ERIM journals list

offers a much broader list of journals (\pm 300) in which ERIM members may publish in order to achieve their ERIM Membership. Moreover, someone's personal profile and pipeline are also taken into account. Furthermore, senior professors still need to publish enough articles, which is not the case at Harvard.

'Demonstrating impact of publications' is an additional indicator besides the ERIM list requirements. It is not just about counting the number of publications. Within the tenure track system, researchers need to show that they have the potential to develop into a senior researcher with academic impact. The views of other scholars and external reviewers who are independent and who recommend young scholars, as happens in the USA, is a fruitful idea, but this takes more time and effort. Harvard has a long history, while ERIM has only existed for 10 years; this entails a stronger need for guidelines. Nowadays the vice-dean speaks with every tenure-track candidate on what is expected from her/him in the annual meeting but also in midterm reviews. Just producing three P* publications is not enough, because this will not move the school forward. External recognition is very important. RSM's strategy is to have more people in the departments who go for quality and impact. Frank emphasizes that many faculty members are obsessed by the list and that a clearer communication on this balanced view would be favourable. He also stresses that book (chapter) publications are important – many seminal publications in management are books or book chapters (!) – and that the ERIM publication criteria do not recognise these publications as fully as journal articles.

ERIM focuses on needs regarding offering PhD courses. For example, ERIM tries to provide a skills course if many PhD students ask for such a course. Students can voice their needs through the PhD council or by directly communicating with the director of doctoral education. ERIM is informed regarding the evaluation of courses and discusses the outcome with lecturers. RSM is a research-driven business school, so incorporating research in teaching should be a spearhead for all lecturers. The problem is that students do not identify incorporated research in teaching. ERIM should point out this issue to lecturers, so they can place more emphasis on their own research in teaching courses. Consequently, research will be more strongly promoted among students. What ERIM already does concerning promoting research and establishing closer relations with students and the business community is converting academic articles into more readable pieces.

6. Word of honour

The Word of Honour has been developed over the last couple of months by Theo Backx (executive in residence). It takes more time than expected because many factors need to be carefully considered. The Rector has given an interview in the Dutch newspaper 'Financieel Dagblad', outlining the fact that he is much in favour of introducing this Word of Honour, which increases the pressure to deliver this Pledge. After the MC meeting, where the idea of the Word of Honour was presented, Gianna sent an email with recommendations to George. A small committee, including an FC representative, will further look into the issue in order to develop the idea into a well-considered plan.

7. Financial update – May 2009

Because of time pressure the issue is postponed.

8. Operations

Because of time pressure and the absence of Dominique Campman, an update on ongoing operations will be considered at the next meeting.

9. Any other business

No further items need to be discussed.

10. Closure

Frank closes the meeting at 12.35 hrs.

Next FC meeting: 30 June 2009, 10.00am in T03-42.

Action points FC meeting 9 June 2009

- The FC will write a letter of advice to the MT regarding the Quality of Research.