

207th FC external meeting

Thursday July 11th 2019, 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM, Mandeville Building T3-42

FC members	Guests	EB
Amy Janssen-Brennan (Ch) (AJB)	Mira Danadharta (MD)	Anne van de Graaf (AvdG)
Tatjana Schneidmüller (TS)		Dirk van Dierendonck (DvD)
Mohammad Ansarin (MA)		
Jessica Woitalla (JW)		
Isabel Boekestein (IB)		
Elisa Vandensteene (EV)		
Helen Gubby (HG)		
Dr Marja Flory (MF)		

Secretary to the Faculty Council: Rixt Baerveldt

1. Opening
2. Agenda
3. Announcements
4. Follow-up to-do list 206th FC meeting
5. Approval minutes 206th FC minutes
6. Budget

The FC has several questions about the budget to ask to the EB. MD has prepared a small presentation about the budget of 2020 - 2023. There is an increase in the money coming in to EUR Central. RSM also expects that there will be more students in the coming years, and therefore they will be compensated more because of the discount that first year students get. At this moment, the van Rijn proposal is not taken into account in this budget, as in the coming few years it will not affect RSM and it is too hard to take the impact under consideration for the years 2022 and 2023.

There are no changes in policy. The distribution is exactly the same as RSM has always done it. The main division principles did not change. The most important areas are education, research and talent management.

JW: As I understand, a part of the money is kept by EUR Central. Why this is not first distributed and then paid? With this strategy, we do not have any leverage money. AvdG: The new model is that the money first goes to the Central Operators, and the remainder is going to the faculties. These payments have always been compulsory so that has never been leverage. However, Central Service provision is kept.

AJB mentions that the FC noticed that there is a good breakdown on the second and third money stream, however they cannot see where the money of the first money stream is going to. There are guidelines to how to spend this money, and we cannot see if these guidelines are followed. AvdG: There are several components, the education institute, the research institute and the overhead and professional services departments. The strategy is unaltered, but the EB will provide the breakdown of the first money stream on these three components.

JW: We would also like to see the breakdown to of the money allocation to the different departments.

DvD: This is in the teaching allocation money. All departments get the same amount of money, they should know how to allocate it. There is no differentiation in the budget but this depends on how the departments use the budget.

AJB mentions that number of planned Staff FTE is going down. DvD: Be aware that this category are temporary lecturers. At the moment, RSM wants fewer people on a temporary contract, but we want to allocate them to fixed contracts. The total FTE will still be dedicated to HOKA. The aim is to get more two-legged persons at RSM. We follow the allocation money. MD will provide a default format for these numbers. JW: This concerns the FC, because the number of Student Assistants will probably rise. The quality of education is drastically different. AvdG: The student assistants also do jobs that are not classroom related, so there is no change of policy for that. MD will give a breakdown for academic and service TA's for more clarity on the allocation of the money.

MF: The plans of HOKA are vague, we expect that there should be an increase in teachers. However, there is not an increase in teachers in the budget. DvD: The money of the HOKA is not explicitly visible in the Teachers breakdown. It is not only the lecturer's number that will go up. Several departments are looking into hiring more senior lectures. There are some lecturers that will be senior lecturers, but they are not on the radar, and therefore not shown in the budget, however they will be in a few years. MF: The FC wants to make sure that the teachers have a heart for teaching, not for research. DvD: These lecturers do mostly teaching, and sometimes some research for their teaching. JW: Can this model be clearer in terms of numbers? Right now, this system is not clear enough. Can the budget be changed to give a better overview of the allocation of the money? AvdG; We can give you an overview of the people in the categories and their division of research to teaching. The budget sheet cannot be changed into the format you asked, as the format used is a default format of EUR central. For level of detail on individual level is simply not available. We can only provide information on how many research vouchers these teachers get. MA clarifies that the FC is asking for a breakdown per person, but of the salaries multiplied by the hours of teaching. This way, the FC can compare these totals. AvdG mentions that the individual level is decided in the departments to optimize their time, and that this information cannot be aggregated.

EV: When there is no top-down approach to this money, how do you ensure that the HOKA money is spent on the right elements? MD mentions that the money of HOKA is allocated in the right way. Everyone has to write hours, and if the hours do not make sense, this money is not allocated. It is not possible to fill in timesheets for teaching. We try to monitor it by communication between program management and the professors of the courses. AvdG: From next year on, we will give you updates about content-related information. From the numbers of this budget you cannot derive the information you are looking for.

AJB: Why will there be a large increase in part-time PHD students. DvD: This is partly funded by private money. The other part of the money, we only get in the end of the process, when the student has defend their PHD successfully. Therefore it is an investment. However, with the part-time program, there is a different arrangement and we get the money earlier. As a supervisor you get money for the

coaching upfront. MF: Does the money we get for the PHD-program goes directly to the PHD-program? AvdG: Money first goes to central and part of that is allocated to RSM. After that, a part of that goes to the department of the coach.

MF: You say that there will be an income of PMB in 2019, however this income will not be there. MD says that this is because the forecasts is done a couple of months ago. We will have to change this and will therefore this will be adjusted in the next version, as it is too high at this moment.

AJB: We miss the provision for the money we have to pay back on PMB. AvdG: What is not included in this budget, is the amount of money that will be paid out to students, we are working this out now and try to absorb that in 2019. In terms of the budget, this situation will not have an on the budget, but it will have impact on the equity.

AJB also mentions that the support staff percentage is relatively high, is there a reason why and where does the support staff go? This does not adhere to the Kadernota of the EUR. AvdG; currently there is no compulsory benchmark RSM needs to adhere to. At this moment, there is a strategic priority related to supporting staff. The percentage figures are stable, and support staff are creating value. The money spent on the service staff is not spend on teaching, however we will look at the real figures in August to get a better notion of how RSM is developing.

The EB and will send the forecasts for the budget a few times a year, as the final budget is late every year. EV and MF will be the committee to give consent to the budget.

7. Any other business

8. Closing

To do before next meeting	Person responsible	Progress
Breakdown of first money stream	MD	Done
Allocation money to teaching and research overview	MD	Done
Overview of teaching teaching vs research	MD	Done
Adjust forecast PMB in budget	MD	Done
Overview Student Assistants academic and professional	MD	Done