

Minutes 202nd FC meeting

Thursday January 17th 2019, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM, Mandeville Building T3-42

FC members	Guests	EB
Amy Janssen-Brennan (AJB) (C)	Gabi Helfert (GH)	Dirk van Dierendonck (DvD)
Mary Flory (MF)	Pier Mastroberardino (PM)	Anne van de Graaf (AvdG)
Jonas Kaiser (JK)	Stefano Tasselli (ST) (Skype)	Steef van de Velde (SvdV)
Mohammad Ansarin (MA)	Irene van der Veen-Leegwater (IV)	
Jessica Woitalla (JW)		
Isabel Boekestein (IB)		
Karen Rickers (KR) (V-C)		
Elisa Vandensteene (EV)		
Helen Gubby (HG)		
Tatjana Schneidmüller		

Secretary to the Faculty Council: Job Heidkamp

1. Opening

2. Agenda

Due to the fact that for agenda item 6 a Skype call with ST is needed, this item is dealt first with.

3. Announcements

The EB updated on the timelines of some issues, such as the issues with the remuneration policy and the Parttime Master Bedrijfskunde (Business Administration).

4. Follow-up to-do list 201st FC meeting

The letter regarding the English language as default will be send by the student members. The EB indicated that this would be of great help.

5. Approval minutes 201st FC meeting

6. Follow-up discussion on new MSc in Medical Business & Innovation, with Gabi Helfert

GH introduced PM as an expert in the need of medical faculties and businesses, and the landscape of Dutch universities. He was involved in the process of creating the programme since day 1. ST was also involved in the development of the programme. PM: In the beginning we downplayed the fact that the project is a joint venture between two top schools. We also downplayed that before creating the programme we had meetings with four or five big companies. They indicated that they need the kind of people that have a medical background but are also educated in business and innovation. ST: The idea popped up during discussions with the Dean and came from the feeling that there should be more interaction between both sides of the campus.

GH: Are there any questions left? MA: The answers in the delivered documents were fine. AJB: There is a consensus within the FC to give positive advice.

Next time, if there is a rush or not enough members present in the meeting, we will postpone it to the following meeting, in order to prevent inefficiencies. The letter of advice will be sent in the beginning of next week.

7. Discussion on new policy for conflicts of interest caused by amorous or family relations, with Irene van der Veen-Leegwater

IL introduced the subject by indicating that family or amorous relations might influence fairness and objectivity. RSM nor EUR had a policy on this, there were only ad-hoc agreements. There are limited possibilities, except for disclosure and a management plan.

JW: Are SAs also included in this policy? DvD: Good point and yes, I expect them to be included. AvdG: There should be an emotional attachment, including regular friends would mean too many people would be included. I will also check with Adri Meijdam whether this issue is addressed in the courses all the SAs have to follow now.

HG: The issue of privacy does not seem to be covered in the policy. Given the privacy regulations these days, it should be clear who has confidential information and what their obligations are with regard to privacy and confidentiality. IL: Good point, we will look into that.

TS: Will this policy go into force retrospectively? IL: Yes. TS: What about a relation between a PhD student and his or her supervisor? DvD: We will have to look into that, usually a third person comes in. MF: What about an assistant professor and a full time professor as chair. DvD: He or she should not be a direct supervisor and with regard to HR, promotion and tenure, the chair steps out and the Dean of Faculty steps in. IL: The question is always: is there a conflict of interest? MA: Why is the relation between an employee and a PhD student explicitly stated, considered that PhD students are employees too. DvD: We will have to look into that too. MA: HG just informed me that it could be external PhD students. DvD: My first reaction is that it is about supervisors and PhD students. MA: It might be better to have stated in a more general sense: when there is power or a hierarchal relation between people. AvdG: We will reread this paragraph.

8. Discussion on new policy for Senior Faculty Positions

HG: The FC feels you have to be quite a superhero for this position. DvD: It is about balance, being all-round. You cannot be the best in everything, but you do have to build up skills in your career.

JK: How do you measure good teaching, how is it evaluated? Right now it is only student evaluations, it could be an idea to have external evaluation. DvD: Agreed, but other things, such as contributing to innovation are measurable. At the same time, being good in teaching is more than having good student evaluations. EV: At ESADE for example, every once and a while inspectors came in. DvD: I would say the issue of evaluations is a separate discussion.

JW: Since the positions are very demanding of people, the demands should be measurable but they are not really specific. SvdV: With being more specific you actually set a higher bar, while with being less specific you can be more flexible for individual cases. We also use the advice of both the Dean of Education and the Dean of Research to understand how people are doing in both fields and give those fields the same weight.

MF: First, as an applicant you want to know the weight of the criteria. Second, asking from applicant to have a BKO while current professors do not have one is quite strange. Third, there is no possibility for appeal and this hits especially younger people who are afraid to step up for themselves. SvdV: You have to realise that this is not an automatic process, where you can tick the boxes and get the position.

There is a limited amount of positions but those positions can be created. MF: Who decides on that? SvdV: Within RSM the idea is that you do not have to wait until the current full time professors on chair positions leave. We ask departments whether they have talent, not on an individual basis but on the basis of being able to create content within a certain area. RSM has a career principle and not a formation principle. On top of that it was also not clear how to go from associate professor to full professor. We should not be too specific in this competitive environment, otherwise people will game, as other universities are not specific either. MF: Can you understand that people who receive positive advice from everyone but a no from the Promotion & Tenure Committee (P&T) have trouble understanding it? How is it possible? SvdV: If P&T would have no option to say no, we could cancel P&T. I also have the possibility to overrule the advice from P&T and this happens very occasionally.

HG: If you go from tenure to associate professor but not to full, do you still have a right to remain? DvD: Sure, you have tenure and you are valued by RSM.

TS: Why is this aimed internally and not aimed at hiring externally? DvD: We have a policy to have possibilities to grow, to have an internal labour market. Hiring externally happens occasionally if no one is found internally to meet specific needs. We should also be able to give a better offer than what their current university offers them.

JW: There seems to be a perceived culture in which research is seen as more important than teaching. We should give people support, the right tools, and the right incentives for teaching. DvD: Currently, we are busy with a strategy on how to incentivise and improve attention for teaching. SvdV: We ignored the 'Keuzegids' (study choice guide for upcoming Dutch students) too long, to a point that you cannot ignore it any longer. This has to do with the fact that the Bachelor programmes are owned by the whole school, while the Master programmes are owned by the departments, who, if the student numbers go down, have to shrink in. On top of that there is a lot of junior faculty and tenure trackers teaching in the Bachelor programmes. Many of them like to do research, while research is actually paid by teaching. Together with the Dean of Education, we are busy with a plan to counter this. HG: It could be an idea to have hybrid positions, like in Leiden University, where they have certain time to do research in. SvdD: That could be an idea.

9. Any other business

AJB: The FC proposes to have a special meeting on the budget, in order to give a more informed advice. AvdG: We could organise a briefing on the processes for the three people involved.

AJB: The FC also feels that not enough legal advice is consulted before things happen, things are not always thoroughly checked and there are quite some examples for that. AvdG: Before people enter into contracts we now have a test that checks for the financial and legal implications. SvdV: It also hard to have everything checked, as you sometimes do not know what might be wrong.

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	Done
Send letter to EUR EB on English language	FC (students)	In progress