

# 212<sup>th</sup> FC external meeting

Thursday February 27<sup>th</sup> 2020, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM, Mandeville Building T3-32

FC members	Guests	EB
Jacomijn Klitsie (JK) (C)	Ad Scheepers (AS)	Anne van de Graaf (AvdG)
Alexandra Bul (AB) (VC)	Anna de Waard-Leung (AWL)	Dirk van Dierendonck (DvD)
Mohammad Ansarin (MA) (VC)	Elmer Smaling (ES)	Claudia Rutten (CR)
Malin Holm (MH)		Ansgar Richter (AR)
Caron Schaller (CS)		Eric Waarts (EW)
Marja Flory (MF)		
Helen Gubby (HG)		
Mattia Basile (MB)		

Secretary to the Faculty Council: Rixt Baerveldt

1. Opening
2. Agenda
3. Announcements

## PMB

AvdG: the 'coulance regeling' (compensation package) has finished and 95% of the students took this offer. We do not expect any court cases from this group, only from older cohorts. We have to see what these court cases will bring us. As soon as we have news on that, we will let you know.

## Dean of Engagement and Partnership

AR: I have proposed a new Dean position. The school should be more active on engagement partnerships and boundaries for this. I would like to discuss this position in the next meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of April. The job description will be distributed in advance.

## Dean of Executive Education

Also, we are recruiting a new dean of executive education. This is not a new position, similar deans have existed. There are a lot of synergies between the degree side and the non-degree side. I think it is better to have these responsibilities under a common leadership. There has been a job-description which has been discussed and agreed. We are now in the search for a person in this position. The application deadline for the position is in around two weeks.

## RSM Strategy

AR: The strategy was developed for RSM. The exercise of the strategy was never quite finished. In a way, the strategy has not been finalised as dimensions were missing. For example, there should be aspects as innovation and entrepreneurship. We prepare our student for the next generation, so it is important. We are now in the process of strategy refinement. There are a number of focus groups taking place at the moment. There is contact with different stakeholders. When the strategy is pushed

further, I would like to discuss this with the Faculty Council around may.

### **Dinner**

AR has invited the Faculty council for dinner. A date will be set. We will do this at the beginning of the next year as well.

### **Corona virus**

The employees have received information on the corona virus. The university has scaled up to a crisis-team. They are monitoring development and are developing scenarios. We will do the same for RSM, to see which larger scale events are coming up and what scenarios are necessary. A taskforce for this will be formed.

### **4. Follow-up to-do list 211<sup>th</sup> FC meeting**

The extra meeting about the compensation policy.

There is a budget for the pigeonhole. It will be set in motion.

Hong Kong situation has not been followed up; it will be set in the new to-do list.

### **5. Approval minutes 211<sup>th</sup> FC minutes**

Minutes are approved without further comments.

### **6. HOKA budget changes - With Anna de Waard-Leung**

AWL attended the meeting to give a presentation about the changes in the HOKA budget.

AWL: On the 2019 figures, there have been some administrative changes. The overall spending remains more or less the same. I want to highlight that we are around 440K underspend in total. This money will not be pulled over to 2020. We did not get solid confirmation on what happened if we underspend so that is why we did not include it.

For the 2020 budget, I have looked at the budget allocation. The amount allocation to the scholarships is to be changed to the feedback project Bsc5. There are a few pilot projects that can use this allocation.

For the Msc budget, there is more money to spend. For 2020, we went to the users to align the budget closer to the plans they have in mind. We made a bit more detailed budget. The change of the title does not change the KPI's or the goals. After more reflection, we feel that we want to use the tutor pool for the small-scale intensive education. With the change of title, it will allow us the freedom to reach the goal more effectively.

There is an idea to open an intranet page to raise awareness on HOKA and inspire faculties with new innovations. The draft will be done hopefully next week. It will give more overview. AWL will send it whenever it is ready.

We are making more progress. We are pending approval from the steering groups, but we already have projects going already. We have identified some managers to lead some of the projects. There is a dashboard available so that the steering group can check how the projects are going. It will give department heads an insight on the current situation. There is another dashboard for MSc.

The second part, in the left corner, is a visual on the financial principles we have agreed on as per the PQI implementation plan. We have talked about allocation and if further actions needed to be taken.

In order to keep the engagement going we will keep you updated by the HOKA Working Group, composed of representatives from the FC and Programme Committees. For the participatory body

there is a reflection paper that will be due in spring, prior to the 'bilo'. The template of the reflection paper is not yet available now, but it will be available within the next few weeks. I will come back to the FC for the reporting, and I will show what is needed in the reflection paper.

The FC has some questions to ask.

JK: HOKA funding is for Dutch students, what happens if it is used for a program in which there is a majority of international students? AWL: In the last overview that I have, most master programmes have almost 50-50 Dutch - international student ratio. There is one master program which does not get HOKA funding, as there is a majority of international students. There is a bachelor -master 70-30 rule that we have to adhere to. With the masters students I am still keeping tabs on the student ratios.

In the MSc budget, we saw the shift from MSc4 to MSc1, why is this trend. AWL: the reason for the shift is because for the small-scale intensive we still need some more time to prepare for it. With the mission side, we have completed the research and analysis phase. We know which programs need to be targeted. In 2020 we can enforce this, based on the analysis we did. I expect that the budget will be shifted back, depending on the outcome of the analysis. F&I is the first program to align it with their redesign as well. We want to make the changes more structural. The shift to MSc1 is to dive more into the redesign and to enhance mission integration. I would expect the money to shift back to MSc4 later. MF: HOKA money is to improve the teaching. How is the enhance mission program doing this? AWL: we want to enhance the programme, its learning objectives and curriculum design so students learn what the mission is and how they should do this. With the redesign, it is done in a constructive way. Furthermore, it is to allow the teachers to do a better job while integrating that. Those hours on regular programme maintenance will not be compensated by HOKA. It is to improve the program's delivery of the mission.

There used to be funds allocated to scholarships, these were taken out. The budget was declined, so they wanted to use the money somewhere else.

AWL: I am trying to thrive people to push the HOKA projects, but these projects are running across 12 months. Therefore, during the annual reporting I will show which projects are falling behind, and I would like to ask for the flexibility to immediately re-allot budget when necessary. If there is a discrepancy in de budget, this is to safeguard on our HOKA budget.

MF: I missed the ambassador in your document. AWL: It is not among the project. We have a proposal to install an innovation ambassador role, to have a staff member with fixed tasks to activate the faculty regarding the innovation. We hope to use HOKA to get more proactive outreach for innovation and cross-department learning. This will make out projects more cost-effective as well.

Before the next update, AWL will meet with the HOKA working group before.

Approval for investments in 2019: Note that the HOKA budget should be used 100% next year.

## 7. Student Evaluations – With Ad Scheepers

AS attended the meeting to explain something about the student evaluations

AS: Some time ago RSM decided to see if the Student evaluations can be optimized. We got inspiration from reports and created seven guidelines to optimize the evaluations. We had a taskforce and we

discussed the process. We came up with seven suggestions to reach these goals and these were discussed with the program committee already. They eventually agreed with the proposals and we started implementing some of these suggestions. In the BSc, we are still in discussion with how to implement. In these proposals, there are two proposals that are HR-related. The first one is the survey. We have chosen to shorten it. Another one is the taskforce.

For the first proposal, is to implement the short-version questionnaire. In the last program committee, they agree to use it and we are looking at how that goes. CS: have you seen any difference? AS: the response rate seems to be a bit higher, but the results just came in. I do not have any conclusions on it yet. Students need to get used to the new version. We took out the course-specific questions, as for each course the questions were different. These are set apart and they are included in proposal six; in-class evaluations. The questionnaire will be used for HR-purposes. MF: if it is for HR-appraisal, the Faculty council can give consent if it is an official change to HR policy. AS: there is not really a change, as the same information is in the proposal.

DvD: there is implicit consent, as it has been used for more than 20 years. We need information on people are doing, and we are looking for the best way to do that. We have been using the short version to have the least interpretation, I am struggling what the question about the consent is going to. MF: as faculty council, there has been discussion about the evaluations. First it was only for educational purposes, but now it does include HR-related issues. Therefore, it will be used as an HR-instrument. There should be used more instruments and there are concerns about it. AS: these concerns were all about the reliability and that is why we are changing the evaluations. DvD: not everything has been resolved, but I see it going into the right direction. We are seeking feedback from the faculty council, to see if you think that we are going into the right direction as well. We are trying to find the middle ground on what direction we should go to.

The 7nd proposal shows that we are looking for another way to gather information. The HR-aspect was not included in the first taskforce. We are trying to make a second taskforce. We want to make sure that reliability and response rate improves. We also want to improve the response quality. We want to prevent abuse of language and for students to be more aware of the usefulness of these evaluations.

JK: our largest concern is on the HR-part. The taskforce has not been set up yet? AS: no, this document is a bit older, so we had to delay a few deadlines. When a new taskforce is started, it might be a good idea to include faculty council members. DvD: we are looking into these things, and I think that working with the FC is good for making a change. We share an idea, and we are trying to find the best solution here. JK: we have not been involved in any of the changes and given the sentiment it would be a good idea to involve the faculty council. AS: Yes, that was also what I was thinking. CS: what other options than student evaluated were explored, and why were those not selected? For example, more direct evaluation by the program committee as they have a member per program. If they would set up a working group with students that could work. AS: That is what is happening in the bachelor already. There are always focus groups and surveys. They are mainly used to improve the courses, not for HR-purposes. These are internally used. There is potential to use this for HR-purposes, and that is what we are trying to look at now. Peer reviews are also possible and more measures taken on the pedagogic side are possible. DvD: we need information to improve things, but this is not the same as using it for HR-purposes. I agree that sometimes there is a mismatch and these things need to be acknowledged. We need the feedback from the programs to improve. AS: it is complex, and that is why we need made seven proposals. We never knew what were the right questions to be asked and get clear data. All of these points have to be taken into account to make the

process to be more clear.

JK: we would like to be involved in the follow-up of the process.

MF: one of the questions was 'did the lecturer spark your interest?', someone asked me to get the questions out. AS: we discussed this question and in the end we decided to leave it in but added more specific questions about the lecturer.

## 8. Any other business

MF: I would like if you could set up a committee to look at the burn-out issue. From my perspective, it is more an issue than you have said in last meeting. AvdG: we can put it on the agenda next time and explain about it. DvD: I feel like there is a lot of attention to it. It is complicated as it is very multifactorial. We are happy to ask someone to give you an overview to show what is happening at the moment and the numbers at the moment.

## 9. Closing

To do before next meeting	Person responsible	Progress
Update on the Hong-Kong situation	EB	