

223th FC external meeting

Thursday February 11th 2021, 10:00 PM – 11:00 PM, Online via Zoom

FC members	Guests	EB
Jacomijn Klitsie (JK) (C)	Adri Meijdam (AM)	Anne van de Graaf (AvdG)
Mohammad Ansarin (MA) (VC)	Anna de Waard-Leung (AdWL)	Claudia Rutten (CR)
Malin Holm (MH)	Willen Koolhaas (WK)	Peter Roosenboom (PR)
Silvija Prancane-Verhoef (SPV)		Ansgar Richter (AR)
Helen Gubby (HG)		
Marja Flory (MF)		
Tristan Davanzo (TD)		
Mathilde de Jonge (MdJ)		
Keisha Mathews (KM)		
Absent: Younes Assou (YA)		

Secretary to the Faculty Council: Rixt Baerveldt

1. Opening

2. Agenda

3. Announcements

JK: We were wondering, regarding the work pressure. Do you have a current plan for working on work pressure and what is the status there? We heard that RSM is not endorsing the EUR policy. PR: I am not aware on that. We are meeting up tomorrow with a number of EB people to talk about it. We are trying to get some more funding to the departments to relieve work pressure. HG: In the UC we were being informed that RSM has its own plans with the plans of EUR central. AR: I am not aware of that. I am very surprised by this. We need to work harder and are doing harder to alleviate work pressure. The numbers for 2020 are not out there for finance, the budget results look more positive than we expected them to be. What PR referred to, is that we are making plans to reallocate this money to reduce workload. We definitively not countervene any university policy. HG: They are not saying that you are working against it, but they have developed an approach, and 4:000.... AR: I am surprised by this.

4. Follow-up to-do list 222nd meeting

5. Approval Minutes 222nd meeting

Minutes are approved.

6. HOKA 2020 finances

JK: We are happy that all of the funds are allocated. We are supposed to approve that spending as well as your position being funded through HOKA. We calculated quickly that you definitely funded yourself by doing that. AdWL: As you mentioned, we are all very happy that we have received all the funding. For 2020, that mission has accomplished. We have the majority of our HOKA funding going

to student assistants. We are looking into it if there are further actions needed to be taken to insure good allocation. This could also be a flipside of corona, so we are looking closely to that. For some programs there has been more teaching allocation, and the steering committee is reaching out to the relevance program and myself and learning innovation teams are working with those programs. For 2021, the summary is that we continue to make budget available for COVID-support. The budget is smaller than last year. We told the departments that. For this year, we expect that the smaller budget will be sufficient to support those relatively needed efforts. That is the 2021. With the financing of my role, I hope the overview gives you the idea that this is a small amount of the projects. This is in line with other faculties. Impact at the core is the central HOKA program, and they have roughly three million per year. We got their support in implementing some impact-driven experiential learning bachelor. We are looking at three separate projects that will be financed by them. The FC and EB support of these projects are necessary. I wanted to provide you with this summary, and if the projects are here, I can provide you with the project plans. I hope that the timeline could be a bit faster. That is the brief summary of the presentation that you have received.

JK: It is very clear. It is going smoothly because you have these pre-meetings. You will receive the letter of approval shortly.

7. IBA Numerus fixus IBA

JK: Can you say something about the chances of the procedure? If you would change to additional requirements, you would need grades to play a dominant role in the selection. We are allowed to also select on grades, but the question is if we should do that. We should write carefully. We will focus on the elements of an international classroom, and we will elaborate on the importance of ambition and great performance. The outcome is uncertain, as multiple parties are involved.

JK: We saw that you included the letter from the programme committee. We understand the 650. What are the chances for the increase to 750? AM: In the plans, one of the ways we could go is increasing the capacity of IBA. It is far from decided yet. We think that decision-making might take place and it could impact the policy for 2022. AR: it is one of the proposals of the activity analysis. If we do so, it seems more likely to do so on the IBA side. That would not be necessarily a massive increase. We have grown much faster than that on the master side. We have to look at the trade-off on where we increase the studies, in the master side or the undergraduate side. We have to see what will happen in terms of workload and so on. We will come to this committee for advice. AM: You are allowed to still change the capacity until the first of December. JK: We would like to keep informed with that process.

JK: In the current situation, the combination of the IBA groups and BA groups in the boost the bachelor program? Students that will be in the 'aanvullende eisen' program will be mixed with the BA program, have you looked at the legal possibilities? AM: There is no legal restrictions, but it might cause challenges. The backgrounds are different, so it might bring some problems. JK: students that are applying to the BA programme are applying for a Dutch program. Is mixing it with IBA not against that? AR: We checked with the ministry, and with the law if we are formally allowed to do so. With regards for information to students, we started two years ago to students of BA that their third year will be in English. MF: I know that students are well-informed. But they are still going for Dutch Educations. I think that informing is not enough. We have raised it several times, be aware of this. This has happened before, and we are paying a lot of money now. AM: We have made provisions to prepare them. We have different English level tests to make the change.

8. Institutional rates (Non-EU)

WK: I hope everybody had the chance to read the letter than AR send to the FC. In essence, it means

that we have not paid any attention to our fees. We are now trying to look at our competitive situation. Students say that they are looking at other schools and out competitive positive, and we are trying to make a good fee in relation to that. It would make a good increase in our income and that would help us to alleviate the pressure on the staff. Another element is that we want to make sure that this is not a school that only rich students can afford. We continue to offer waivers and online courses. Because this fee increase is relatively modest, we do not expect to see a significant change in applications. AR: We are by far the largest business school in the Benelux area. As a public university, we should put a high premium on accessibility as well. We need to make sure that we can provide students with quality education and shoulder our workload. We have to realize that for a lot of non-EUR students, getting an education is a commercial activity. They are comparing different schools on the basis of their prices. As WK has outlined, as compared to our competitive schools, we are significantly under-priced. If you go to the UK, my previous institution ranked below the likes of RSM and it had a higher price. We are underutilizing the source of income from those students. We are proposing a tuition increase to kick in at 2022.

MA: Our main concern is what the impact would be on students that have might have more financial need. Have you considered any changes to other aspects of the admissions to offset the effect it would have for those groups? For example, increasing the amount of total waivers available for the tuition fee. WK: We do have tuition fee waivers available. We are looking into ways to make that more available. First, it is performance based, and after that it is needs based. We should not compromise on needs of students. There are waivers of tuition fees available. It would have an immediate effect on our income. AR: We already have a number of waivers in place, but it is important to realize that for Dutch and European Union students we are not allowed to give waivers. Our ability is in that sense quite limited. I would be quite happy to consider more tuition fee waivers in order to give students the chance to study at RSM. This would increase our diversity as well. The imagery that a lot of those students is frankly speaking wrong. However, I am very open to this and it is one of the discussions we have had already.

MA: We were primarily talking about the non-EU students. It would be nice to set up some kind of system that is needs based. Adding those waivers could change the situation of this. WK: I would suggest that we come back to the Faculty Council with an overview of the preference system and maybe we can follow up on that based on the data of that. MA: That sounds like a great idea.

MA: The second issue RSM has a very good reputation, and a strong value for money position. This goes against what we read in the slides of the activity analysis. RSM its reputation has been declining in the past few year. These are two conflicting narratives, why are they saying different things. AR: I do not think that is a correct reading of the activity analysis. We have seen a decline in the MBA programs. That is something that we are addressing. In other aspects, are ranking positions are actually increasing. We are now in a top-5 position with our MSc in management. We have top research rankings, and they have increased significantly in the last few years. If you look at what is going on in the minds of students, one of the things they look at is that students wonder what is wrong when the school is under-priced. They rather pay more and are ensured of good education. In terms of the total investment that they have to make, that is only a fraction of the total costs. HG: You say on your slide from the townhall meeting that the reputation as a business school has declined the recent years. It is a very strong statement. It does not seem to matter in the letter we just received. AR: we have to realise that as much as our position has decreased, it is still very strong. In the MSc area in particular, it is easier to make that link to the research. We have a lot of applicants from non-EEA countries. WK mentioned that they do not see that declining. WK: If you look at the overall business school ranking, that is a meta-ranking of several ranking, is shows more of a nuanced ranking. AR: One of our key competitors is in Paris, they have moved into new masters earlier than we do. That is

the kind of competition that we are talking about and their e-master is more expensive than we are.

MA: Non-EEA students are a small percentage in the programs. It should be higher for a school like us, why are they so low? AR: It has to do with the nature of our admission approach, which gives preference to EEA students and gives them the first right to say. AM: The non-EEA market is a difficult market. Many of those applicants want to know if we have scholarships before they want to apply. At that moment, we have already lost a lot of non-EEA applications. What we know from our competitors, is that they have a better scholarship program.

9. Activity analysis

AR: A summary of the strategic developments have been sent. It was included in the materials as there was a link to the activity analysis. Next to that, there was a presentation that makes the link more clear. There is one chart with a matrix, that provides an overview on how we see that link. I can put the slide up. If we are thinking about resources, the most important resource is the collective time of our people. You need to be more conscious in allocating the time of different responsibilities in terms of education teaching, research, knowledge, and also the area of engagement. This matrix looks at two dimensions of research allocation. The time allocation for professional service colleagues, and the way our faculty members allocate their time. At the moment, we have that current positions where we have a low degree of differentiation for our members of our academic staff. The majority of our academics are both in research and education. At the same time, we are a school that is relatively rich in professional services and the share of professional services has grown in recent years. This position symbolises where we are. If we want to develop more, we want to make a slight shift towards to greater differentiation with respect to the academic staff. For example, by developing a more fully fledged career trajectory for those members of faculty that spend a majority of their time in the classroom. We are not building an only-research faculty. In terms of our professional services, we see a slight move downwards. The costs with the professional services are higher, and we have to change a bit more in that respect. We should also bring the support closer to our departments to reduce workload. I would want to leave it at this point. Maybe colleagues have further comments, but this is a brief update. In terms of further steps, we will discuss in a platform meeting, and bring this to the faculty council meeting in March. Also keep the school informed somewhere in March. PH: If you look at the graph, it shows where we stand. We also have to realize what it means if we do not move. We are finishing the year of the budget. It seems like we are making ends meet, but there were a lot of things that we could not do. We have cut back on material costs, we have cut back on travel, we have limited means to address work-pressure issues. The last thing is that we are underspending for pedagogical renew, to accommodate the shift to for example online teaching. To free up these resources, we have to somehow find a way to change the school.

SPV: Do you have an update on the external consultant of T5? AR: I do not have a content update, but the timeline for that is that it should be done by the end of march. We expect some interim results at the beginning of March. AR: Most likely we can talk about it in the meeting in April.

MF: You are looking at staff, are you also looking at how you can reduce staff? AR: Probably now. There may be one or two cases at the edge. It will mostly take place through natural processes like retirements or resignments. It is more a matter of internal reallocation. The factor this school has grown, we are already putting everyone under pressure.

10. Any other business

AR: Somebody mentioned ranking. We have a new ranking for our MBA program. We have moved up slightly, but effectively it is very small.

11. Closing

To do before next meeting	Person responsible	Progress
Follow up on work pressure	PR	