Rotterdam School of Management
Erasmus University

RSM *Erasmus*

FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes 254ᵗʰ FC meeting (ext)

Thursday February 15ᵗʰ 2024, 10:30 AM – 12:00 AM

FC members
Luuk Veelenturf (**LV**)
Hidde van Gelder (**HG**)
Taslim Alade (**TA)**
Mira Nikolova (**MN**)
Maciej Kowalski (**MK)**
Karthik Rapaka (**KR**)
Jessie Lee (**JL**)
Robbie Steegman (**RS**)

EB members
Myra van Esch (**ME**)
Claudia Rutten (**CR)**

Guests
Michel Lander (**ML**) – Dean of Education

Agenda

Contents

To-do list

LJ: Then the to-do list. I don't think that there are many things relevant for now, because most things are already converted into either announcements or agenda points. So I suggest that if there are any to-dos that aren't covered in the end, we will come back to them later, but I don't think that that will be the case.

Then I suggest we immediately start with the first agenda point, which is evaluation of teaching quality. And for that, we have invited our dean of education to discuss.

Evaluation of teaching quality

XWG: This is a topic which was addressed both to the Dean of Education and the Dean of Faculty, and I think it really matters for both sides. There are three sub-points to it, but we could also discuss the topic a little bit more broadly, because we do know that teaching evaluations not only matter for teaching quality, which we all care about, but also as an HR instrument.

Unfairness in portfolio of teaching awards

The first bullet point here was the messiness around the portfolio of teaching awards, which are issued by departments, by the school and by SR. However, some people are eligible for an award and others not. That is point one.

ML: Let's start with this point. I'm not quite sure how to address this, because some of these things are beyond my control or the control of the Dean of Faculty. So whether SR gives out awards or not, I can kindly request them not to do it, or broaden the scope, but that's the extent of our power. The same holds with departments.

The dean of faculty could be suggestive to the heads of departments, saying: 'have a look at department XYZ, who actually has teaching awards in this and this category. Let's also maybe collectively agree what the criteria then should be, so that it's also comparable across the different departments.'
I have no problem with that, but I think that's something between the Dean of faculty and the departments to figure out. I can't be prescriptive on that topic.

The only thing that we hand out is the Teaching Innovation Award. In principle everybody is able to achieve that. There are very clear indicators as to why you can be nominated and what the criteria are. It's really about teaching innovation and it's not about being the rock star teacher in front of the classroom. For now, I'll ask the dean of faculty to follow up with the department to see whether we can do an inventory of which awards are given for what kind of activities. And we'll speak about that next time.

HG: When is the Innovation Award given out?

ML: During Christmas.

LV: So, some are now only eligible for that one, because they're not eligible for the SR ones or don't have a department which hands out awards. Then the only chance on an award is on innovation which creates unfairness.

HG: At the very least, we can make the SR one a little more friendly to professors by knowing what other awards are given at what times. I understand that right now it is a popularity contest for only BA1 and BA2.

ML: This holds for the bachelor, but the Masters don't have a similar organization. We have the program committees and some have program advisory committees, but not all of them. So, it's much more difficult as a program committee to actually have a good view of what happens across the board in all courses.

XWG: I understand that you're saying that it is not directly within your control, but I would really think that the benefits should by far outweigh the costs of coordination because they are an important HR tool. In particular now with the revised promotion policies where we are now luckily moving beyond teaching evaluations.

We do know those colleagues who have won three, four SR awards over the years and then there are others that don't. It makes it look like you are clearly far away from your stellar colleague, which really may not be the case. If you teach in certain programs, you can simply almost never win such an award.

ML: I agree, however, there is a difference. And this is not to downplay the SR award, but it's a popularity contest of who students rate as their favorite, not a professional jury award.

That weighs completely different. If somebody is able to articulate what kind of quality innovations in their education they've done, it is much more telling than whether a popularity prize was awarded so many times. Education has different components. It's delivery, it's design, and it's assessment. If you are great at delivery, it doesn't mean you're a well-rounded educator. It's a different thing. I look more at the description of what they've done, the time investment that they've made in their courses, and the broader impact of that investment to colleagues, to a program, across different programs.

Having said that, I do agree that people use them. I would very much like to discuss that with the dean of faculty to see with the heads of departments whether we can create some unity in that.

If we can set up these kind of departmental awards in line, not just with the popularity contest, but also what made it special, what kind of approach in the teaching or whatever intervention with external parties was very much appreciated, then it both has a quality improvement aspect as well as a signaling effect. I'm very happy to discuss that because then it becomes an important input also for the yearly appraisals.

XWG: Yeah, sounds good. Because, of course, this is not only about internal signaling, but also external.

Tracking performance of thesis coaches

XWG: This point is about the numbers that program management is tracking when it comes to teachers or thesis coaches. It seems that they are only tracking one number, although they collect multiple numbers. So, we would like to have those multiple numbers actually being systematically tracked as well because those numbers were used to flag seemingly underperforming colleagues.

ML: Let me first correct that assumption because what happens in yearly appraisal meetings that I have with the academic directors of the programs, 9 out of the 10 times a thesis coordinator joins.

XWG: In what meetings exactly?

ML: In yearly appraisals. So, every year I meet the academic director of a program, most of the time with the thesis coordinator. Two and a half years ago I joined my first yearly appraisal meetings and back then, the evaluations were at the program level and we looked at student evaluation of the courses. Based on those we would discuss the performance of teachers.

Now what we've done, is using the yearly appraisals to ask ourselves if we are happy with the quality of the program, so not the quality of the teachers in them.
We're training people to go to places after they graduate. If you know what you're training them for, that should translate into intended learning outcomes for your program, which in turn should inform what you teach in the program, and how you teach in the program, and how you assess it. That's the discussion I want to have, and the changes that you want to make to get there.

What we did in year two, is we used the midterm report from the NVAO, so the Dutch Accreditation Organization. We are using that as our talking document, and we update that every year, such that when we have an accreditation, we don't have to create new reports. Now, we have the track, we know where we're going, and we can explain what's happening in the program.

This year, we even took that one step further and made sure that the document that we're using includes all our accreditations. Because the ownership of the document is now at the academic directors, they are principally responsible for the quality assurance and the alignment between teachers in the core of the program. That makes my discussion fundamentally different: "Are you happy with the direction your program is taking? Are you happy with the alignment between your courses? Are you happy with the didactical formats that you're using?"

I'm much less using the SET's (student evaluations of teachers) in that discussion. The only time I look at the SET's, is if I see that for three years in a row, somebody severely underperforms. And that does not lead to a discussion that I have with the academic director. Rather, I have that with the head of the department, where I signal: what's going on here, why do we see consistently low scores, and is that something we can remedy by, for instance, coupling them with a senior colleague.

So, the SET's in my yearly appraisal on a program are not used. In terms of the inputs for heads of departments in their evaluation of teaching, the SET's are used it. The only time I signal is when I see consistent low evaluations.

They are much less leading in the discussion of quality. There are other indicators which I find much more important, which we just discussed.

Second thing is coach and co-reader evaluations. Those are the average of actually four questions that are being asked. And we do have the breakdown of that in the academic directors meeting, and the thesis coordinators have those breakdowns. The questions are:
- Were you provided useful suggestions, help and comments?
- My coach possessed extensive knowledge about the subject area.
- My coach was efficiently available for regular feedback sessions
- I would recommend my coach for other students.

XWG: I was very puzzled, because we have the numbers, we track them and we look at them every year in detail, but my academic director received the email from the Executive director of RSM's MSc Programmes, but you were mentioned in the email conversation as well. The email stated something about a few coaches that performed at a low level over three consecutive years. However, the numbers on which this was based did not add up with the numbers that we collect. After many emails going back and forth, the answer was that you, or the Executive director of RSM's MSc Programmes is going with the overall score only.

ML: We use the overall score, because a low average usually is a good indicator.

XWG: But there's this one question: 'I would recommend my coach for other students' and the number from that question was the baseline in the email where I was finally invited to have a talk.

ML: When we do the yearly appraisals, we have all the numbers and we use them as well. It's the same process as with student evaluation teaching. Since most of the time the thesis coordinator is there, the question becomes: did something specific happen, or in case of external advisors: is this someone you want to continue to work with, or do they need better guidance in order to do a better job? But what you say is interesting for me, because when we do the yearly appraisals, we use all the questions. It's good that you let me know, because now I'll find out what actually gets communicated in the form of documents for the thesis coordinator and academic director and the department at the moment that gets sent through.

Other means of teaching evaluation

XWG: Okay so that was bullet point two, about what data is collected.

And now the third one is other means of teaching evaluation. There are numerous problems with teaching evaluations themselves. We have as low as 1% response rates in some of our courses, like 10 students out of 1,000. And for example, in my teaching evaluation many students thought that a different course was being surveyed. They were commenting about an exam, but I don't have an exam. This is very unsatisfying.

There are two points here.
One is: what can we improve about teaching evaluations? Perhaps also in connection with the response rates.

And the second question is: what else can we do systematically as a means to evaluate quality?

ML: Actually, on both fronts, there are things happening. For instance, in the marketing department, on their request, we experimented with a different evaluation timing. They said that the evaluations are unduly influenced by the examination.

XWG: That is common for every programme now right?

ML: Yeah, for BSc. And at the MSc, it was applied with marketing, also in an effort to boost response rates so that people might be more inclined to respond to the course. However, it doesn't increase the response rates very much, so that's in itself an issue. It is important, but in terms of teaching perspective it not as relevant for how good someone did in his course.

Another efforts that we're doing, is that there is a video that we show to the students in the onboarding week, both in the bachelor and in the MSc. We recommend to the academic directors in their introduction weeks that they show this to remind students: your feedback is an important mechanism for us to continue to understand how we are doing and how we are doing.

XWG: But you're not telling them that the scores are actually important for HR decisions for faculty?

ML: I'm not sure if that's in the video.

LV: Some students use it like that at least.

ML: The video actually says that the idea is that it's constructive feedback and it's not your consumerist behavior that gets to decide who gets to do what. We also changed the format of the last two open boxes. We start with which things work really well and we're happy with, in order to focus more on the constructive feedback rather than improvement first. So, we changed that.

A Project manager from business intelligence has been looking at the response rates, but we do not really see differences, so that's rather unsatisfying.
In the meantime, one of the projects within HOKA is about teaching effectiveness and there, they ran an experiment within the CEMS program where they had expert observations. That is something that was concluded at the end of last year.
There was a proposal written as to what could be the setup here. We had three different scenarios. That's now with the Dean of Faculty and the Dean to decide which one of the three we can use as an alternative means to also provide input for teaching and teachers. I could well imagine that especially for tenure trackers that have redesigned their course for year two, they want to have an expert observation either in year two or year three so that they can show that in their midterm evaluation. That would be a definite group that you want to target early on. My sense is that one of the three will be implemented, but we need to see which form is the appropriate one.

LJ: Before we move on to that, I just have one question. During one of my master core courses, I had one of my lecturers at the last lecture and he really wanted us to fill in the evaluation, but the problem is that the evaluation only gets sent after the last lecture and then at midnight or something the next day. Because he really wanted to get some feedback, in the end he just created his own mentemeter and then just gathered a lot of responses from students to at least have some feedback.

To what extent would it be possible to have the evaluation already available during the last lecture so that a professor who wants to, can ask students during the lecture to just fill in the evaluation? I think if you have some scheduled moment within the lecture, that would already entail a significant boost to response rates.

XWG: But in theory that should be possible, no?

LV: Just like before you start a class, you can say: I'll first take 5 minutes to fill in a questionnaire and then you start your lecture. If it's the last 10 minutes, then people run away.

ML: That is possible, but we cannot force students. It should be clear that there is a choice. You don't have to fill it out, you're allowed to fill it out. I can ask if there is any reason why that is not the case.

XWG: So we are obliged to give grades, but they are not obliged to even fill out feedback.

ML: Yes. We're not allowed.

ME: But I think that also you don't want to force people, since then you possibly get ridiculous feedback.

CR: Another important aspect is that Mentemeter is shown on screen and you can see how many people in the room have filled it in and not, which is less anonymous than having it already ready to fill out during the lesson. So, I think that we should look into that. It should be available earlier.

ML: I'll discuss the timing with the program manager.

LJ: You also mentioned the issue regarding expert feedback from other lecturers. We discussed with each other that it hardly ever happens that if you lecture here, that just some random person like a fellow lecturer or the academic director or just some expert comes into your session and follows your session and then either assesses you or gives feedback afterwards. It could add benefit to courses.

ML: I fully agree. There are some departments that have buddy systems. So, when somebody new comes in, they are paired up with a more senior colleague that sits into their classes. However, it's voluntary at a department level who decides to do that. I know for some other departments, or at least for some other master programs, there are one or two academic directors that actually do that with new courses, especially with new faculty members, but it is not a fixed system.

I think there are very good reasons to do it and I think it's part of your professional ethos. Is it a rule that you want me to institute? Because then it becomes a different story, then it becomes mandatory. Then we have to decide: Is it really feedback or is it also something that you want to have in the HR file or not? I'm fine either way as long as you as faculty council say: we actually feel that this will improve teaching quality, and so we strongly recommend that this gets implemented.

LV: At least you could institutionalize the opt-in option, right? You mentioned three scenarios on this, how is this part of these?

ML: One thing we will definitely do, is that we do the expert evaluation. But that is once every so often, not every year. So, if you say, it would be good for especially junior faculty members in preparation of that expert evaluation, that they have a buddy that sits in, we could look at that.

XWG: Who is doing the evaluations, RISBO?

ML: Part of it would be RISBO representatives, but it can also be experts from other faculties. They're distant and it's an unbiased observation. It's not a colleague that judges your performance and which goes into your HR file.

LV: Now you call it an evaluation, but you can also call it like feedback and create a simple central point where lecturers can go to if they would like more frequent feedback from, for example, RISBO. You mentioned that some departments have arranged it, some others not, but I think it would be good to create a universal point for such requests.

ML: That is definitely something we could put into that proposal, but I would hope that we do it more systematically and that we take junior faculty under our wings and actually have excellent senior faculties just doing that. I think it should be part of our professional ethics that the we have more often juniors looking at how seniors teach and seniors giving feedback on how the juniors do it. If you want me to institutionalize something like that, you can let me know.

LV: I do want to highlight that it's not only for junior. Also for me, it's going to be nice to once in a while get feedback from a colleague.

ML: I fully agree that it doesn't have to be only juniors.

LV: I think it would also be a good balance as opposed to the student evaluations, because that's now the only metric of quality with regards to courses here. And if you then implement a buddy system, then you'll get more feedback from actual experts and not just from the audience, like the popularity contest.

ML: I fully agree and if we continue this line of thinking, I would hope that in your yearly appraisals, you would reflect on the feedback that you've received and try to link that with the student evaluation that you've got as input. Then, you can have a much more wholesome discussion, because now the only metric that academic directors can use is the student evaluation and the open comments. Now, I won't go as far as to say that they will probably not read all those open comments, but you can imagine that that's not always the case. So, they will look at the metric, and maybe if they see it's a two, they'll start reading,

but certainly it's not given that they do so. So, having multiple sources that you can reflect upon for your yearly appraisal would help.

LJ: Yeah, and maybe just to add one final thing to this is the fact that if you have more sit-ins with each other, it also makes it easier to integrate a certain program better. Because for example, we as students sometimes experience that there is an elective that builds on a core course, but then discusses some of the same things as the core course. Some integration, maybe even just something basic as giving the teacher of the elective access to the Canvas course of the core course so that they can also see what has already been discussed, could help a lot.

ML: So, needless to say, I agree, but the question becomes: at what point does this become part of the professionalism that departments and academic directors and teachers should have in education? It's not my job to explain everything.

XWG: They should, but they don't, right?

ML: Yeah, that's true, so one of the things we ask with that yearly appraisal document is for them to articulate the interrelationship between the courses. That is the appraisal talk I have with the academic directors. I'll give you an example.

I was at the Accounting and Financial Management Department last week, Tuesday, to talk about the education vision of EUR and RSM, how that translates into their education strategy. The whole afternoon, they worked on the narrative of their program, looking at how each of those courses actually contributes to that narrative and also at how to be smarter in the way we assess. Now what happens is that we all think about structuring and assessing on a course level. This creates local optimization, but at a program level, it's a mess.

XWG: I mean, that sounds good, but what we discussed earlier was that usually teachers teaching electives don't even have access to the materials of the core courses, so we don't even know what exactly has been taught there or not. I can go on a search quest every single year and ask all the different people to give me those documents, and then I may or may not receive them. So that makes things a bit challenging.

ML: Yes, that's why I mentioned the Accounting Financial Management Day. So, they had a day where they sat together to talk about their program, which was also the moment where the people that teach the electives have a sense of what is happening in the core, and they can align. I think it should just be solid practice that there is a moment to reflect on the curriculum where you can reflect with your colleagues on the streamlining.

XWG: But we are, of course, wondering about what kind of things we can initiate to consistently ensure it.

ML: Yes, so I am pushing for Education Days in every department.

XWG: Education Day sounds nice, but if I still don't know what exactly has been taught because I don't have access to Canvas, not even to the course manual sometimes, then one day also gives me a very fluffy sense only of what exactly has been covered in the core courses.

ML: Let me be really blunt, but then you need to ask harder.

XWG: Yes, but that's also time consuming, right? And it's something that I obviously need this in order to deliver good quality.

ML: Yes, but now you're looking at me to do that. It is your professional standard that should be doing that. Your academic director should be the one that does that. I can create the infrastructure to a degree, but whether people actually execute it, that is the professionalism within a department, and we push for these days where we have strategic talks about what the content of the program is and how things align.

Another thing that we're trying to do is that we now are requesting every program to have an alumni and corporate advisory body. Such a body can meet at least once a year to talk about the quality of the program about whether it is still a viable work field. This is again to make sure that we continuously have that dialogue and to avoid that somebody wakes up after five years thinking that we need something different.

And another thing we're doing is that we are actually working on a course for academic directors together with RISBO. In an ideal world it would go like this: six months in advance, the head of the department signals that an academic director is likely transitioning out. Then we have a discussion on who and what aligns best with the direction that the program and the school wants to go. Then, that person goes into this online self-study course, which basically prepares them indeed for all these kinds of things. I fully agree with you that academic directors are the bottleneck and I also think it's fair to say that it's not necessarily their fault because they haven't been trained for it.

LV: So, there is no formal requirement for an academic director to have the senior UTQ?

ML: Yes, it's there, but if you look at that, it's not about curriculum. It's about innovation, a larger innovation in education.

LV: Okay, so to become an academic director, you need to have some education.

ML: Yes, the problem is, the internal regulations clearly stipulate that I am the one that actually appoints academic directors, and I could enforce this. But at least with the last two appointments, I was informed that somebody became the new academic director. So, we still have ways to go also in terms of making sure that we get the right people on the right positions, and that is also a quality improvement.

LV: And do they get enough time?

ML: Yes, right now 0.4 or 0.5 FTE. It was 0.2, which I thought was ridiculously low. So, for cross-departmental programs or very large programs with more than 150 students, you get 0.5. Smaller programs that are departmental are 0.4, two days per week.

LV: Okay, but if you then have a 0.5 research voucher as well, you don't teach anymore, and with 0.4, barely. Then that should actually also be happening in the department.

ML: And that is what should be happening in the department. You're definitely getting compensated for it by me and from ERIM, so that should cover the cost of the faculty member. And in fact, that's really also in the spirit of the education-focused career track. You want to have those educational experts that are not necessarily the people in the classroom, but also can help in the construction and the improvement of the whole program. So you can well imagine that, for instance, going forward in the buddy system, you want, for instance, education-focused faculty members to be very much part of that.

LV: Yeah, I was just thinking, maybe it might make sense to still do some of the teaching yourself, which would almost be impossible if you have to do your research and this and all.

XWG: There's maybe one thing that I noticed here. If we have academic directors that are relatively distant to research because of their own career trajectory, this has an impact to some extent also on the priorities in the academic programs. We are having academic directors that, for instance, have not been supervising thesis for a long time. But now they are sort of in charge of figuring out what kind of changes we make.

ML: I always hope that it's a discussion, so that's why when you do curriculum revision, you can't do that on your own because you need to agree what the narrative of the program is and how you get there. So yes, they would be in charge of the day-to-day running, talking to the students, talking to externals, making sure that there is alignment between courses. It's not the idea that they sit in their ivory tower, draw up a plan, and then throw it down and say, and now execute.
I simply believe that if you want to make sure that you have somebody that's able to take on the day-to-day responsibilities and make sure that the program goes from strength to strength, one day a week is simply not enough.

XWG: But you know how dissatisfied many departments are with the redesign processes, right?

ML: There again, I know. But if I look at the strategy department, we've seen the redesign process and the first core course has been excellently evaluated with very good comments from the students. The experiential learning element has been average evaluated, but if you look at the comments, they're extremely positive about the fact that it is experiential learning and they get to practice and they get to practice their skills. So the intent of the module actually delivers what they want.

XWG: So this particular thing is one problem out of many there. And I don't think this is right now on our agenda.

LJ: And maybe just going back to one small thing that you mentioned before, is that it's also partly for teachers the responsibility to contact other courses. But I also think: isn't it a lot easier if you just have program management that automatically assigns lecturers for future courses to the Canvas pages of the current course instead of having staff constantly having to go email back and forth with every single core course.

ML: That would mean that you understand the content. That would mean that I know that your two courses actually deal with each other, and that's not information that program management has.

XWG: But all elective teachers can have access to all core courses.

ML: Well, we don't have prerequisites, for instance. It doesn't say: you have to have this core course. So I'm assigning that, but then we need also a way to understand how the learning lines in the program work. If that's not clear, that's not clear in the system as we have it now.

Master's thesis

Rethinking master's thesis

XWG: Maybe we move to the master's thesis topic. So, let's shortcut maybe bullet point one and two because the long story short is just that there's a lot going on in the different programs in terms of discussing, experimenting, rethinking what the master's thesis is or should be. And we would like to be involved.

ML: One of the questions was, is there an overarching vision? As you point out rightly, there are certain departments that say: we would like to have a shorter thesis or a different type of theses. In principle, there was a working group before that actually looked at the variance of the types of our options, in terms of what would not need to be accreditation. Some suggestions came out of that.

What we now also see as a second request is shortening it, which was not something that was in the particular previous group. Now also we have the labor intensiveness of the thesis, which is something to be considered.
So what the Executive director Quality & Innovation at RSM is going to do is that there is going to be a working group that is going to look at the integration of these two things. I am going to investigate multiple options that come out of this working group.
The executive director Quality & Innovation at RSM would like to have FC representatives in there as well.

XWG: Good, because that is what we already discussed last year in May. That there would be someone of us involved in this.

AI in Master's thesis

XWG: Okay, maybe that is enough for now on that. I would really like to very briefly touch on the AI bullet point. We do know now that Examination Board is coming up with a policy to be published apparently in March, so that is already good. Did you have a look at the file that is uploaded to the REP to many Master Theses?

ML: No, I have not seen that. I am aware of it since The executive director Quality & Innovation at RSM actually approached me about this.

XWG: I just want to know, is this what we tell our students?

ML: I was quite surprised because we actually have a standing agreement that things that are being developed for that platform, should be okayed by the academic directors. And that has not happened.

XWG: I would have been surprised if all of the academics have agreed.

ML: It was also a surprise for us. So, this is something I will pick up in discussion.

XWG: But about this file: there is a lot of talk about the platform and it sounds nice in theory to have a platform, but I want people to actually look at the platform and then to agree after they have actually seen it.

ML: In this case, a learning innovation consultant, who also works very closely with CLI on AI in education has looked at the content. And the LIT consultant basically recommended it in print, but there needs to be much more disclaimers because it assumes a level of ability for students to already be able to use AI.

XWG: And research, which is the key learning objective of the thesis trajectory, but this assumes that one would already be able to judge whatever is coming out. And that is what we are supposed to teach in the first place. So, I am a bit surprised by LIT evaluating if this is good because the key learning objective is to do research and academic writing.
So, shouldn't it be someone else to judge if this is inappropriate.

ML: No, I completely disagree there. I honestly think that AI is such a rapidly evolving field that you need an expert on AI and the tools to judge whether the goal and the use of that platform are sound. And that is, for me, a different thing than saying: we invite our students to actually use it, because that is a fundamental discussion: Do you think using AI is part of the learning journey?
The LIT consultant is not saying anything like: 'using AI is part of the learning journey'. But saying something about: are we advising our students to do things that will get us in trouble? That's the advice. Now, whether, again, academic directors want it on the platform, because they actually feel the same much in your spirit, they shouldn't be using it because research is fundamental, is another question.

XWG: Well, I'm not saying they shouldn't be using it, but I'm saying that what they're recommending in this document, I find very problematic.

ML: Yes. So, again, it's about the content of the document, whether that makes sense. The LIT consultant is not rendering a verdict whether or not that's actually appropriate given the things that we want to do. And I think here, I fully agree with you, that's why we should go to the academic directors, they should have a look and say: hey, this advice goes far beyond what we think is actually appropriate for our thesis. So, this needs to go to the academic directors. They need to agree with it. If they do not, it should come up.
So, just for my record keeping:
I will at some point make sure that the Chair of the Master Programme Committee comes to an academic director meeting to inform and invite feedback from the academic directors. The next one is this week, so I doubt it can happen then already.

Second, I will make sure that, I will approach, or have the Executive director Quality & Innovation at RSM approach to ask for FC Representatives for the working group.

Announcements

LJ: Then I guess we're done with the master thesis, and we move on to the announcements.

ME: I don't think there are many announcements from our side.

Faculty model
ML: Well, so for the faculty model, we have an extraordinary P&T for the first four people that have applied to the Associate Professor for Education. Then we have the first group hopefully installed somewhere April, so I am very happy with that.

Internationalization
There were quite a few questions internally.

LV: Yeah. So, there was a document sent from the body of universities together. That said that they wanted a Dutch version for every big program, which we already have, but it says also something about more training of staff in Dutch. So far, the EB has always said: we understand that teaching in Dutch will be impossible for some people, but in this letter, it looks more we are going in the direction that internationals have to teach in Dutch, so what is their vision?

ML: I think that's purposely vaguely written in order for us to be able to determine if we should do that. But what the Dean of Faculty has done with HR is not related to teaching in Dutch.
So, they kept it purposely vague, but the insinuation in the letter is that there always has to be a Dutch equivalent, which basically means for some faculty that they may have to either recruit Dutchies or train people to be able to teach in Dutch. We're not in that situation. The only thing that we have is that we have one third obviously in English because we merge year three, and then we still have one or two courses in year one and year two that are in English. Those we will need to revisit as soon as it really becomes enforced that one third has to be Dutch. That is an unavoidable situation.

XWG: So which courses exactly need to be revisited?

ML: The ones where we have English instructors for a core course in English.

ME: So in general, we're in a pretty good shape, because we both offer courses in the Bachelor in English and Dutch.

XWG: So there are core courses in the BA that are taught in English?

LJ: Yeah, I think Research Project in year two.

ML: Yes, and another quantitative course. I think there's three that are in English. It depends on how you count. So if in year three, we say: after the first part of the year you can actually

choose minors in Dutch, you can do internship in the Netherlands, then the choice of language is up to you. Therefore we don't qualify that as English.
If they buy the argument that students can choose a Dutch minor or internship, then the core courses are fine, since it gives us the flexibility in other elements to actually say: we continue to offer this in English.

LV: But why do we want first and second year courses in English?

ML: That has to do with staffing. For instance, at one point or another we had a Dutch and English candidate for a position to teach in the Dutch BA program. So there, we had the explicit agreement that that person was allowed to train themselves up to C1 level to be able to take that course on. Later, if that would not happen, they would have to find a new instructor, because we simply can't have more courses in English.
Most of the time it has to do with their research interest in the curriculum and the applications received. And then it's not always that they go for the pragmatic option of taking only Dutch applicants for a Dutch course, since sometimes they let research interest prevail.

LJ: So in a Dutch bachelor, maximum one third of it can be English?

ML: That's currently kind of the vagueness in de Wet Hoger Onderwijs that allows us to interpret it that way.

LJ: And how does it work when you have that the lectures are all in English, but there are Dutch language workshops. Is it then an English course?

ML: Again, there is no clear definition. So it will depend on how strict they're actually going to be. Some actually say: if the assessment is in Dutch, you're already good.
So, it's just not clear but the expectation is that it will be like this.

Recruitment of DoEn and Dean
Then there is the Dean of Engagement, which is out already.

LJ: Yeah, we have discussed this internally, and we have decided on the candidate representing us for the selection of the new Dean of Engagement.

ME: Very good. So you probably know more about the process than we do.

LV: Not yet, we were only asked to come up with the name of a representative for the DoEN recruitment.

CR: I will make sure that the candidate will be invited for the Dean of Engagement recruitement.

ME: Yeah, so the Dean of Engagement is out, but the Dean is not out.

LJ: During the agenda meeting, you mentioned that you wanted to say something regarding the process of recruiting the Dean.

ME: Yes, let's all be very vigilant in making sure that there is influence from faculty in the process of finding the Dean. If I want to summarize it in two seconds, that would be my answer.

LV: I was positively surprised by the show-up last Friday. There were a lot of people, also online, coming from all different groups.

ML: Good. But the process is with the CvB. So, also here, we may have to team up every now and again, and sometimes ask what's going on and make sure that you as Faculty Council also stay involved.

CR: But at least you have a formal role in that. So at one point you will be officially heard by the CvB.

LJ: Yeah, we also already partly discussed this process when we had the meeting with the chairman of the CvB. And there we also discussed to what extent is the current EB involved, and he said that it would be the case that you were, to some extent, involved.

Starter and incentive grants

I think the starter grants are now mostly rolled out, because we got a very detailed document last time, but we were still wondering to what extent the progress of the incentive grants is moving along, because most of the times when we ask about it, it's like, yeah, we first have to get starter grants done, and we don't really know that much about the incentive grants, but on the other hand, the incentive grants, at some point, have to be granted.

So I'm also curious: are there any updates on that? Do we know more about the incentive grants now?

ME: No, not yet. But we know that we need to do something about it and some organizations involved think we still have time. We don't want to take the risk of giving out incentive grants and then having to ask them back afterwards, so we want more information first from EUR and the government.

Finances

LJ: And then, of course, we had the meeting with regarding to the finances, so I don't think you have many updates right now.

ME: No, just that we're still moving forward. The reasons we have few updates is that we've been working in different sessions on different layers for the last week and a half, almost continuously. For example we have had vision and strategy meetings, and we were also looking at the different portfolios and responsible people and looking at professional services, what services do we provide, and which services are actually wanted. So, on all these different levels, interesting things are happening, but they haven't led to an update or any concrete things that you can comment on. So as soon as that happens, we will ask your approval.

FC

LJ: Then I suggest we move on to the final topic, which is the FC related, with regards to the external chair recruitment and student compensation. I think we start with student compensation, as that is the shortest one.

We were happy to see the document regarding student compensation. We think it's reasonable, and we also think that it's good that it lines up well with what the TA makes and stuff like that. So, I think that that's all we have to say about student compensation.

CR: Then we only come back to you how we will ensure that you get it, because every faculty has been asked to do it by themselves. And we see that there will be a split between what you get from the 'profileringsbeurs' and what we have to arrange. So we are looking for a more efficient way that you get your money for that. So, we will come back if we know how we can do that the best.

Luca, you are in a group with other faculties, and maybe it's also good that you bring this up from our end, so that there will also be some pressure that it is a little bit strange that we have to do all kinds of efficiencies by ourselves.

LJ: Yeah, that's a good point. Okay, and then with regards to the external chair recruitment, I think our main concern indeed was that we slacked a bit with regards to our own timeline, and that indeed the document was only sent Monday, so we didn't see a vacancy online, but that's of course explainable. Anything else on the chair recruitment?

If not, then any other business?

Any other business

LV: Yeah, so I got an email from scheduling and it says: due to increasing pressure on rooms, we will be creating course schedules in accordance with your working hours based as they are registered with HR instead of based on your daytime preferences. So it feels like: we just follow how you are registered in the HR system, and we don't care about your preferences anymore due to increasing pressure on rooms.

I think we as teachers should also be able to put in our preferences, or at least then also put in our working hours in the HR system, since, as an example, a lecture after 17:00 could be a problem on a day you have to take your kids from daycare which closes at 18:30. . Does this also means that now I never get an exam on Saturday anymore, or none of our colleagues, because I guess nobody is registered in the system to work on Saturdays?

So I think for me this feels a bit harsh to the teachers, like, just be available on your working days, whatever. It should be a bit giving and taking in both directions.

ML: I can speak a little to this. So it's not as black and white as it's written there. I actually was at the academic directors' meeting where we had a long discussion about this. If you need more clarification, there's a video on it.

XWG: Where can we find that? I'm just wondering, are those videos always available for everyone?

ML: Probably on the Teams site for academic directors.
They also had some follow-up questions. So I asked scheduling board: how does that work? I have some follow-up response to that as well, which I will share. So, I can share the same slides with the faculty council if you want. What they will do is start from the current schedule, so they try to make it as close to what we have now, such that it's kind of fairly divided. But what you see across the board, not just us, but everywhere, that everybody wants to work, preferably to teach between 11 and 4 and then you get pressure on the group. The problem is they simply need more wiggle room and the idea is that they're trying to optimize it for everybody.

LV: But then it should be possible that we say: if you have a 40-hour contract, what are the 40 hours in which you can schedule? Since maybe some need to start later at certain days, because they bring the kids to school.
In the HR-system I see only working days, without differentiating between hours.

ME: Yeah, I'll take that on, because I think from what I understand, being very distant from this process, but as you're telling it, I think what you would like and what they are trying to achieve are the same thing. And it makes sense that you don't put it in a different system than the HR system. So if the HR system would allow for hours to be put in, then we're there.