

# Minutes 272nd FC-meeting (ext.)

Thursday 20 November 2025, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

Faculty Council (FC) Members	Executive Board (Executive Board) members and guests
<b>Jason Roos</b>	<b>Aukje Hassoldt</b>
<b>Birgul (Rose) Arslan</b>	<b>Mirko Benischke</b>
<b>Sara Rodrigues Soares</b>	<b>Myra van Esch</b>
<b>Kristina Strezoska</b>	<b>Claudia Rutten</b>
<b>Viktor Nosyk</b>	<b>Daniel Feenstra</b>
<b>Chintan Kella</b>	
<b>Daan Peeters</b>	
<b>Amalia Capmari (Online)</b>	
<b>Patrick de Koning (Online)</b>	

## 1. Opening (1 min)

## 2. Agenda and minutes (1 min)

Addition of (8) uniformity of pay scales across departments.

## 3. Teaching capacity for Business and Society Management (15 min)

The Faculty Council raised the concern that the faculty at the Business and Society Management department are asked to increase their teaching load by 20% to cover their salaries. This is the proposed solution to the problem of decreasing department income and increasing salary expenses. The Faculty Council argued that this approach is against the first principle of the Future Proof Program, which was to maintain workload. The second concern of the Faculty Council is that RSM is treating their faculty across departments differently, offering different working conditions. Finally, the Faculty Council suggested that making individual faculty members responsible for their individual profit and loss statement is against academic principles.

The Dean of Education argued that the teaching capacity of departments is not necessarily related to Future Proof; but it is a topic that the Executive Board is working on as part of the Capacity Model project which will streamline the allocation of teaching load among faculty. The Dean of Education also expressed that the department is being supported through ongoing talks with the Department Head. The department is not offering new electives but coordinating with the Strategy Department to cover some of the latter's teaching load. The Dean of Education will follow up with the comparison the teaching load of the faculty with those of the faculty in other departments.

The Executive Board will follow up with the travel budgets of the faculty members in the department.

#### **4. Update: Status and discussion of the salary document (10 min)**

The Executive Board informed the Faculty Council that key stakeholders have been involved in the process of the policy making, and the document will be sent to the Faculty Council.

The Faculty Council informed the Executive Board that the Faculty Council has formed a sub-committee for the task and is looking forward to working with the Executive Board on this policy.

#### **5. Update: Tenure Track clarification (15 min)**

The discussion of the topic has been postponed to the next meeting for a discussion in the presence of the Dean of Faculty.

#### **6. Update: Housing Project (20 min)**

The Faculty Council reached out to the RSM Community whose working conditions will be affected by the move from floors 4 and 6. The conversation revealed cases where affected teams expect that their working conditions worsen, potentially resulting in lower quality of work or higher stress. Also, some employees were affected by the lack of communication or by lack of participation in decision making, whereas others felt in control. This has further indicated a divide between different departments and groups within RSM in terms of management principles.

The Director of Operations and the Faculty Council agreed to go over the inventory of the issues identified, such that the Executive Board can take preventive measures.

The Director of Operations informed the Faculty Council that there are no concerns regarding the practicalities of the move, and that all working stations will have standardized equipment (e.g., two screens, docking station, keyboard, and mouse).

#### **7. Budget questions regarding Future Proof (20 min)**

The Faculty Council pointed out that the budget presented has a negative outcome and asked the Executive Board's stance on it.

The Executive Board indicated that between this draft budget plan and the next one, extra funding is expected to cover the negative outcome for 2026.

The Faculty Council brought up the observation that the budget involves a slight increase in external hiring costs and asked whether the school is making a strategic decision to keep the teaching assistants at current levels. The Faculty Council also raised concerns about the extra costs of EURFlex hiring, as well as the one-time charge of EUR 1200 for each new student assistant.

The Executive Board explained that the external hiring costs seem not to be decreasing because student assistants with internal RSM contracts have been moved to EURFlex, therefore seemingly offsetting the decrease in total external hiring costs.

The Executive Board will follow up with the one-time cost of hiring student assistants.

The Faculty Council asked about budget for the later move (after the current moving to different floors). Executive Board will assure after finalization of the current move, plans will be made for the necessary refurbishments, so that the REF budget for refurbishments can be reserved.

---

## **8. Uniformity of pay-scale rises**

The Faculty Council raised a concern that the criteria for moving from pay scale 11 to 12 is not clear for faculty. They have received concerns from individual faculty members that differences in the application are observed.

The Executive Board indicates that while pay scales are decided by the Heads of Department, they are supported by policy on UNL, EUR and RSM level, by support from HR and also by intervention between the Heads of Department for situations that are not directly clear.

The Faculty Council urged for a common policy to promote transparency and equity within the RSM community.

## **9. Closing (1 min)**