

MINUTES 155TH FC MEETING – 6 MARCH 2014

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Bas Louwman (STAR)	Eric Waarts	Joy Kearney
Gabi Helfert	Anne van de Graaf	Abe de Jong	Karin Bongers
Jules Maitrepierre	Jeroen de Jong		
Miruna Carlugea			
Chandro Kandiah			
Jelle de Vries			
Jan Sirks			
Joost Vlot			

1. Opening

Juup opens the 155th meeting officially at 10.30am and welcomes everyone.

2. Agenda

Point 10 will be postponed to the next meeting when students experienced TOP.

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

3. Minutes

The minutes are approved without further remarks or amendments.

4. Announcements

There are no announcements.

5. Name change MSc. Eship

The FC is glad to see the well-documented proposal about the name change of the MSc. Eship. The intention to attract more students and to improve education is clear and the proposal sounds very promising. Jeroen claims that they need to grow the programme according to RSM strategy. The departments of entrepreneurship and strategy recently merged into one department with the advantage that all entrepreneurship people work under the same umbrella with regard to teaching. In addition, the perspective is broadened by focusing on corporate entrepreneurship besides entrepreneurship. To make sure the 'market' sees it as an adequate name for the master, potential and current students as well as alumni have been approached with questions about the proposed new title.

Legally, the name change is a switch from one day to the next so no transition period is possible. The date of the name switch will be most likely January or February 1st. Current students can be given extra time if they want to graduate with the old name on their diploma. After the Executive Board and the University Council approve the proposal, it is sent to the NVAO hopefully within a week. The MT aims to have the confirmation shortly before the summer, so the new cohort that starts in September 2014 will get the new name on their diploma. The content of the courses is not drastically changed, but it is merely relabeling so the name of the courses better reflects the content (as corporate entrepreneurship will be included). It is modifying rather than changing.

6. Update MSc. ChEB

Committee OOS discusses the discontinuation of the MSc. ChEB with Steef, Eric and Anne. This committee will advise the University Council, and the University Council will discuss this at the end of March. That means that we are in the last stages of the procedure to discontinue the programme. The Executive Board has already informally given advice that supports the closure of MSc. ChEB.

Regarding the letter the FC received from the MSc. PC, it would be useful to have a procedure in place so everyone knows what should be done when another situation arises. Anne hopes EUR will take a lead in this. Other universities have it too, but we have to decide about the level of detail and the room for interpretation in the approach.

The FC states that we have to see about the criteria in the approach, because it is possible that several RSM MSc programmes of RSM do not meet the performance goals (i.e. 30% external students, >50 students). We have to see what is ultimately going to happen if small programmes structurally cannot meet these criteria and what kind of consequences that might have. Leiden, for example, has fifty different programmes in one Faculty and some of them run on an intake of three to four students per year. These have continued to run anyway, because a certain social value is recognized in these programmes. Anne adds to this that these programmes receive extra funding, because they are the only university that offers that particular programme in the Netherlands. It is a trade-off between the social relevance and economic viability. In addition, Juup states that Leiden has around 45 different PCs for these 50 programmes.

The FC requests an official statement from the MT to current students. The reason is that current students are afraid about what happens if they fail and need an extra year to graduate. The MT promises to do so, as a matter of fact it is part of the decision documents. The current students are given the time to graduate until September 2016. The official statement will be made after the final decision has been made, and it will be in the TER as well because it is a transition period.

7. Update PC/Faculty Regulations

The FC asks when we can expect a proposal from the board. The MT had a re-debate in the strategic platform last month, because it is important for people to understand what it entails before deciding on something. It is rather complex, so the MT decided to write a white paper and it is debated in the strategic platform again next week. The white paper explains what the school thinks of the faculty regulations in general with documentation and the details accompanying it. The MT hopes to deliver the white paper at the end of March.

The FC proposes to have a look at the original proposal and see where the problems lie. The MT states that the text is not a problem, but rather the subtle implications and implementation. In the end, the FC thinks it is important for all programmes to have a representation to prevent other programmes suffering the same fate that happened to ChEB.

8. Scientific Integrity Policy

PwC conducted research two years ago, a task force has been appointed and there is a special procedure in place now for researchers with regard to data storage. The FC is interested in the effects and outcomes of all initiatives at EUR and RSM to ensure scientific integrity and if there are more initiatives still in the pipeline. To what extent do the EUR and RSM think scientific integrity is safeguarded at this moment on the measures that are proposed now? The report of the task force emphasizes the great individual awareness of integrity issues and less on the institutional environment. Researchers tend to obey the requirements of journals (e.g. the use of p-values in the

methodology), otherwise their articles are not published in the journal. The FC would like to know what the school thinks about the scientific integrity policy at this moment.

The Diederik Stapel affair in 2011 already created awareness, and later there was a case at our own school as well (Dirk Smeesters). Hard controls are easy to measure and from the moment they are implemented everyone has to obey these rules. An example of a hard control is the better storage of data at a place that is available to more people, so that researchers get the chance to defend themselves against false claims regarding mistreating data. A second effect is that if researchers know that their data is available to more people, they will think twice before they mistreat data. The EUR is very much orientated towards hard controls, but this school felt that soft controls are also important. Therefore, PwC did a culture scan by interviewing people at senior level to see what we want to be the core values of this school. These interviews have also been conducted at all levels to obtain a good overview of potential mismatches about what we hope the core values are and what they actually were. All recommendations in the report have been implemented and the school is thinking about additional improvements. The general idea is that in a professional organisation, both hard and soft controls are needed. The school is doing well on the hard controls, but there is some work left for the soft controls.

As a researcher at RSM you are given freedom and autonomy. You should have autonomy in sharing your ideas with students and colleagues, but it is also important to be professional in your job. Abe thinks that the terms 'professional' and 'autonomy' are often confused and that they have to be in place at the same time.

The dean of RSM, Steef van de Velde, proposes six actions.

1. The MT will visit all departments to talk about core values: how the core values are implemented and about potential concerns and input.
2. Appointing integrity coordinators. There will be two people you can visit if you want to talk about something and you are seeking advice. This is confidential. Muel Kaptein fulfils this position for the university as a whole, but the RSM wants two integrity coordinators (m&f) in the school.
3. Coaching structure: every faculty member in the school will have a mentor. It is important that expectations are managed for both mentors and mentees.
4. The current performance and development evaluation structure allows for a broader perspective (e.g. includes student evaluations). It should be a discussion. Department chairs will be checked.
5. Integrity declaration. Note that all scholars who are employed by Dutch universities already have to adhere to the "Integrity Code" which has been developed by the VSNU, the Association of Dutch Universities.
6. Orientation days for new faculty members on which it will be emphasized that we find the culture very important at this school.

There are several other initiatives. For example, within ERIM, Methodology Interest Groups (MIGs) are created to discuss methodological issues in research. They consist of people that have a lot of interest in research and they also advise other researchers. The FC thinks it would be even better to include research institutes besides ERIM as well. In that way, forces can be joined to introduce new research techniques to the table of journals for example. Abe thinks this is an interesting discussion, but not something ERIM is going to do. It is very important though that the methodology in research is not dictated by certain institutions. Juup states that certain journals are predisposed to certain methodologies and that you need to use a certain methodology to get your article published in most primary journals. A brilliant paper with a different or new methodology will never get published in these journals, which is an issue.

The FC asks how the scientific integrity influences students and teaching. Abe thinks it is hard to say, but there is at least awareness created in the importance that you teach ethics and that there is also a limitation to your knowledge. In the supervision of the master thesis it will be more apparent compared to bachelor programmes with regard to ethical and political issues in research. The FC has concerns about the awareness of students regarding research integrity. A discussion would contribute most to the awareness of students.

The FC would like to have the opportunity to talk to the appointed integrity coordinators about their role once they have been appointed and trained. Abe agreed to arrange such a meeting.

To be continued.

9. Budget cuts

The FC asks when we can expect concrete plans for the school and how this is going to be implemented. Steef said that RSM would contribute with extra earnings on one hand and increased efficiency and productivity on the other. How does that influence the work pressure on employees?

Abe says that the university as a whole is putting slightly more pressure on the school and that the school is now thinking about how to deal with it. A key challenge is to increase the revenues of the school. This is expected to be the main choice, and it is the job of the dean to convince the university that this is going to be our main approach. With regard to work load for employees, Abe thinks that it is very hard to predict. It might be that some people need to shift their activities, because they will probably also become involved in other kinds of teaching – but it is up to the departments to maintain a reasonable work load for everybody and also an interesting mix of activities.

Juup asks a question referring to his department versus the finance department. The department of finance is in a luxury position because they have many students in the MScFI, but this is a mixed blessing, because it is a challenge also to meet the expectations of the students. For other departments it might be more difficult, because they have smaller programmes and funding partially depends on the number of students. It is the responsibility of the MT and the department chairs to deal with this. RSM is in a favourable position because of the healthy financial situation as opposed to other schools within EUR.

10. Discussion: Implementation TOP

To be discussed in the next meeting 3 April.

11. Any other business

Juup brings up two points:

- The FC would like to come back to the HR discussions, to see how we are doing on the scores and to what extent HR can be improved with regard to career development and tenure issues. The personal turnover seems to be very high, which is a problem in some departments.
- The FC would like to introduce a yearly meeting to discuss the state of the school, any general issues that are up for discussion, future plans; the big picture.

12. Closure

Juup closes the meeting at 12.05 am.

Next FC meeting 3 April 2014 10.30 am in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Task	Person Responsible	Progress
Plan in an internal meeting	Karin	Done: 02/04
Respond with any amendments to the faculty regulations	Eric	Pending
Share the white paper from MT with FC about faculty regulations	Eric	End of March
Send a letter to the board about Career Services	Juup, Jules	Pending
Clarify the selection procedure and the final decision made regarding the fulfilment of the vacancy dean of faculty.	Frank	Pending
Make an overview of all labour conditions at the EUR and the BV to make comparison possible.	Peter	Pending
Draft a document about the communication from the MT to the employees	Gabi	Done