

MINUTES 185TH FC MEETING

Thursday January 12th 2017, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM, Mandeville Building T03-42

Attendees

| FC Members | Guests | EB | Secretary |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Marja Flory (chair) - MF | Jannet van der Woude (JvdW) | Dirk van Dierendonck - DvD | Job Heidkamp |
| Joey Johannsen - JJ | Adri Meijdam (AM) | Anne van de Graaf - AvdG | |
| Helen Gubby - HG | Gabriele Jacobs (GJ) | | |
| Marien Rodriguez LdIC - MR | Erik van Raaij (EvR) | | |
| Domenica Salazar - DS | | | |
| Kyra Heidemanns - KM | | | |
| Tatjana Schneidmüller (TS) | | | |
| Paolo Perego (PP) | | | |
| Johannes Ottmann (JO) | | | |

1. **Opening**
2. **Agenda**
3. **Approval Minutes 184th FC meeting**

Since the recent remarks are already incorporated, the Minutes of the 184th meeting are approved.

4. **Announcements**

MF: The FC is busy with drafting its annual report and its year planning.

DvD: The results of the employee survey did not come in yet. Possibly for next meeting the results can be discussed and for the meeting in March Peter Elsing (HRM) is invited to discuss the measures taken by the chairs of the department.

DvD: All Faculties have to appoint a diversity officer and draft a plan of action for diversity. RSM already has an Associate Dean of Diversity (Saskia Bayerl) who is working on this plan. At RSM the focus is not only on diversity in gender but also in a broader sense. She will be invited for next meeting to discuss the progress on this plan and will update the FC around every half year.

AvdG: Right now RSM as a healthy financial surplus of around 0.8, 0.9 million. There is still some uncertainty in this amount because of uncertainty about leave days. The process of the new budget will start soon. Since the FC wants to be informed and involved as soon as possible, the Finance Committee of the FC will be involved by the EB in the early stages.

DvD: Right now ERIM is under review for its accreditation and the preliminary results will come in this Friday. On a later moment the final results will come in. In relation with this announcement TS raises the point that PhD students at ERIM do not receive sufficient training in teaching and instruction while they are obliged to give lectures and courses. At ERIM they say it is too expensive. DvD: This should be raised with Marno Verbeek, the Dean of

Research and Academic Director of ERIM. Moreover, there are differences between the departments about what they ask from PhD students with regard to teaching. The EB will take this up and come back at it.

5. Questions towards Dirk van Dierendonck on the education policy (see document)

An essential part of the discussion comes down to the question whether there will be a parallel path for staff focussed on teaching besides the path for staff focussed on research. DvD: RSM and EUR were and will stay 'two legged' (research and education), meaning that for example, doing well in teaching is, besides doing research, of importance in the tenure track. Right now, the RSM can provide teaching focussed staff only with temporary positions but I am looking into ways of providing fixed positions. As a university it has to be required that this 'teaching tenure trackers' have a PhD and a BKO (Basic qualification for education). MF: Some of our (non-student) Teaching Assistants (TAs) do an excellent job, but do not have and sometimes do not want to have a PhD. Can they stay? DvD: If they want to stay, they need to have PhD. I do not want to go back in time. MF: But with them leaving, knowledge is draining away from RSM and at the same time it is not decent towards these people. DvD: Expectations management is important in this case. RSM needs to be clear about the requirements and with regard to a PhD the research does not necessarily have to be a published, for example. It is the responsibility of the departments to keep the knowledge with them.

HG: We also need to look at the practice of RSM. A lot of (student) TAs are being used for various (teaching) tasks, we cannot have these requirements and at the same time using all those TAs. DvD: For me it is a no-go to not have those requirements, we are a university. HG: So, why not use people with a PhD more instead of TAs? AvdG: Attention for education is high on the agenda. Ways to incentivize teaching are being looked at. The FC will monitor this.

6. Update by Marja Flory/Anne van de Graaf (DoO) on new regulations Programme Committee

AvdG: The drafting of the new regulations on the Programme Committees (PCs) is now with the PCs themselves. In the meantime RSM is busy with a (textual) revision of the Faculty Regulations, which will pass through the FC.

7. Update by Jannet van der Woude (ED BSc BA) on 'studievoorschotmiddelen'

JvdW: For the end of January finalization of the plans on the 'studievoorschotmiddelen' is planned. After informing the different academic directors more plans on the improvement and innovation of education were sent in. At the same time – since more budget became available – it is needed to keep pushing for additional plans. Additionally, the information was also send to the Learning and Innovation Team (LIT), in order for them to look for further possibilities. The departments were slow in their update, so the current amount of budget allocation could have been more. It is necessary that departments step up, otherwise the funds have to be returned to EUR Central. The submitted plans were not always of the desired quality and not always innovative enough. This needs to be improved this year.

MF: BIM did not apply, but is really in need of additional funds, maybe they need help with the application. JvdW: The LIT is at their disposal, but we cannot just give them money without good plans. The question is also whether EUR Central is handling the problems Faculties are having with getting the funds spend on innovation. The context of the 'studievoorschotmiddelen' is improving education and using innovative ways to do this, focused on RSM students. AvdG: This issue is on my agenda for the coming meeting with the Master programme directors.

8. Discussion of (advice on) 'Increased Elective Space', introduced by BtB 2.0 Team

ER introduces himself as both Faculty member of the EUR working group on the Increased Elective Space and member of the RSM Boost the Bachelor 2.0 Team (BtB 2.0 Team).

MF: Is it correct that RSM students will not be allowed to take on RSM minors with this plan? AM: For RSM students this is correct and for incoming exchange students this is most likely to be correct as well.

AM: The PCs focusses on four points with regard to this plan: 1) freeing the trimester for minors, exchange and internships is supported; 2) the compulsory broadening by going outside RSM is not supported, since RSM already has an environment of broadening minors; 3) the connecting module is considered to be too complicated to execute; 4) the general idea of the plan is supported.

MF: In a conversation with Sandra Langeveld (another member of the BtB 2.0 Team) the difficulty with forcing English speaking RSM students to go outside RSM became clear, as it is questionable whether enough minors in English can be provided by the other Faculties.

GJ: We should not forget that the general idea and spirit of the plan is welcomed, it is really ambitious. However, the practical concerns are there and have to be stressed.

MF: How is this plan going to be financed, there is nothing about finances to be found in the plan. Another question is how the connecting modules will be implemented. It is a nice idea, but how should it be coordinated, for example?

JJ: For this discussion it is important to have the numbers about students and minor choices. JvdW: Around 2/3 of students taking on a minor come from BA and around 1/3 come from IBA. There are around 80 minors available, of which quite a lot are accessible for (English speaking) RSM students.

MR: Why does the result of a minor affect your GPA, but the result of your exchange not? AM: A couple of years ago the RSM International Office stopped to convert results from exchanges, because it is laborious and because As from American Universities were converted into 10s, which does not really give an accurate image of the exchange results.

MF: To summarise the FC welcomes the general idea of the plan and welcomes the synchronization of the periods of free space in the curriculum and the standardization of the level and quality of minors. Additionally, the FC stresses the fact that support and commitment of various bodies and persons is needed for the successful implementation of the plan. An official advice will be send to the EUR working group.

JJ: For these kind of ambitious plans in research, EUR has research institutes like ERIM, but for teaching plans these do not exist. MF: This should be discussed with the Vice Dean of Education, it is a good idea.

9. Any other business

No any other business.

10. Closure

Next FC meeting February 2nd 10:30 AM in Mandeville T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

| Task | Person Responsible | Progress |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Send advice to EUR working group | JH/MF | Done |
| Invite Saskia Bayerl | JH | Done |
| Invite Peter Elsing | JH | Done |
| Come back at issue of teaching support for PhD students | The EB | Done |
| Discuss idea of teaching institute with VD of Education | JJ/MF | Pending |
| | | |