Balanced Recognition and Reward at Social Sciences

Nijmegen, October 2022

Sabine Geurts & Hanneke den Ouden
Project leaders

With the assistance of the steering committee: Roseriet Beijers, Pepijn Burger, Serena Daalmans, Saskia Glas, Jasper de Groot, Sabine Hunniius, Arno Koning, Frank Leoné, Peer Scheepers, Niels Spierings, Eliana Vassena, Lennart Verhagen & Jacqueline Vink
TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 3
  1.1. BACKGROUND: NATIONAL CONTEXT 3
  1.2. RU RECOGNITION AND REWARDS COMMITTEE 3

2. RECOGNITION & REWARDS AT FSS 4
  2.1. MAIN QUESTION 4
  2.2. WHO ARE WE? 5
  2.3. TARGET GROUPS 6
  2.4. APPROACH 6
  2.4.1. Workshop at the away day for FSS professors and administrators 7
  2.4.2. Discussions with Research, Education and Programme Directors 8
  2.4.3. Group discussions 8
  2.4.4. FSS Recognition & Rewards steering committee 8
  2.4.5. FSS Recognition & Rewards website 9
  2.4.6. Recognition & Rewards poll 9
  2.4.7. Recognition & Rewards event 9
  2.4.8. 2022 FSS Employee Survey 11
  2.5. REPRESENTATIVENESS OF GROUP OF RECOGNITION & REWARDS PARTICIPANTS 11

3. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 13
  3.1. VISION AND PRACTICE 13
  3.2. HUMAN DIMENSION 14
  3.3. QUALITY IN RESEARCH 18
  3.4. QUALITY IN EDUCATION 21
  3.5. TEAMWORK AND LEADERSHIP 23
  3.6. DIVERSITY AND FLEXIBILITY IN CAREER PATHS 26
  3.7. MATRIX OF RECOMMENDATIONS 31

4. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? 37
  4.1. RU VISION AND 2022-2026 RECOGNITION & REWARDS PROGRAMME PLAN 37
  4.2. NEXT STEPS FOR RECOGNITION & REWARDS AT FSS: 2022-2026 37
  4.3. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 38

APPENDICES
  A. APPETISERS FOR THE WORKSHOP AT THE AWAY DAY FOR FSS PROFESSORS AND ADMINISTRATORS 40
  B. STATEMENTS FOR GROUP DISCUSSIONS ABOUT RECOGNITION & REWARDS AT FSS 42
  C. WORKLOAD ACTION PLAN FOR FSS 43
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND: NATIONAL CONTEXT

Since late 2019, universities and grant providers (VSNU, NFU, KNAW, NWO and ZonMw) have been pondering this question: How can we create a new balance in recognising and rewarding academics? Until recently, quantifiable and individual research achievements (number and impact factor of publications, number of citations, personal grants secured) have been the main determinants of career opportunities (e.g. promotion from assistant professor to associate professor). But it has become clear that there is a need for a broader interpretation of academic quality in which the historically ‘other’ primary task of universities – namely, providing academic education at the highest possible level – is not only recognised but also rewarded more in terms of development and career opportunities. Universities are also increasingly aware of their significant societal mission: to generate impact through scientific research and education by sharing knowledge with society (e.g. open science) and contributing to solving major societal issues (and where applicable, to clinical practice). It is an academic quality when a scholar is able to contribute to this societal mission. Besides these three academic pillars (also see the Higher Education and Research Act [Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek]), academic leadership is needed at all levels, from supervision of students and PhD candidates to managing a team or department and performing administrative tasks at the highest level (directors, deans). This context also befits the term ‘academic citizenship’: an outstanding scholar also contributes to the bigger picture, whether that be the interests of the team, the research and educational institution, the faculty, the university or the wider university community.

In the memorandum Room for everyone’s talent (November 2019), the organisations involved called for a system of recognition and rewards that: (i) ‘Enables the diversification and vitalisation of career paths, thereby promoting excellence in each of the key areas (research, education, impact, leadership)’; (ii) ‘Acknowledges the independence and individual qualities of academics as well as recognising team performances’; (iii) ‘Emphasises quality of work over quantitative results (such as number of publications)’; (iv) ‘Encourages all aspects of open science’; and (v) ‘Encourages high-quality academic leadership’. The participating organisations are collaborating in a national Recognition and Rewards (R&R) programme coordinated by Universities of the Netherlands (UNL), part of which includes implementing their own R&R projects.

1.2. RU RECOGNITION AND REWARDS COMMITTEE

In 2020, an RU-wide Recognition and Rewards (R&R) Committee was established at Radboud University (chaired by Prof. Paula Fikkert). With the discussion paper You have a part to play! (March 2021), that committee launched a broad discussion about modernising the system of recognition and rewards at Radboud University. In line with the earlier national memorandum, the committee called for:

I. a richer understanding of quality to evaluate our work and to reward achievements. Quality is more than what we can measure and objectify, and quality relates not only to research but to all four key areas;

II. more collaboration in our key tasks in which we reward team efforts and each person’s individual contributions more explicitly;

III. more recognition of the importance of the diversity of academic tasks and more explicit rewarding of the accompanying talents and aspirations of employees – variable across employees and flexible over time; and
IV. a specific focus on the **human dimension** in which mutual trust, open communication, professional autonomy, a manageable workload and a good work-life balance are important basic principles.

The first three basic principles are in line with the national paper *Room for everyone’s talent*. The fourth basic principle addresses themes such as a realistic allocation of hours to *all* tasks we value as a university, as well as autonomy, trust and social safety.

In summer and autumn 2021, the Radboud University R&R committee organised several roundtable dialogues in which the above themes were discussed with employees from all faculties. Based on this input, the RU committee wrote a **vision document** in June 2022. The core of the vision is:

- We need a different, **richer understanding of quality**. This also includes a different way of measuring, focusing on peer review, in-depth analysis, development and discussion;
- We need a clear **shift** from the current emphasis on the **individual** to an emphasis on **collaboration**;
- In addition to attention to diversity and inclusion in the broad sense, a **shift** from an emphasis on **one type of career** to **various career possibilities** is needed, where a good match between the wishes and needs of the organisation and the wishes of and possibilities for employees is key; and
- A **shift** is needed from emphasis on **output**, **reputation**, and **conservation** — at the expense of wellbeing — to **wellbeing as the foundation** and requirement for output, quality, growth.

### 2. RECOGNITION & REWARDS AT FSS

In summer 2021, the memorandum *More balanced recognition & rewards of academic achievements at FSS* marked the start of the Recognition & Rewards project at the Faculty of Social Sciences.

#### 2.1. MAIN QUESTION

This project focuses on the following question: With regard to academic quality at FSS, how can we develop a new balance in recognition and rewards in which we do not exclusively look at quantifiable research performance but take an integrated view of the quality of research and the quality of academic achievements in the other key areas: education, impact and leadership? And how can we translate this interpretation of academic quality into diversity in development and career paths?

This project builds on the **FSS Strategy 2021-2026** and especially on the strategic principles:

- Our education and research are interconnected and of equal importance;
- Our education and research have a scientific and social impact;
- We value quality over quantity in our research;
- Our education and research are committed to team science;
- Our research is transparent, honest, and reproducible (open science and solid science);
- We provide a pleasant study and work environment.

This project is also in line with the **Leadership Practice Pilot Study** previously carried out at FSS, which showed that employees need transparent criteria and procedures for selection, assessments and promotions, as well as diversity in appointments and representation (‘fresh perspectives’ in leadership).
2.2. WHO ARE WE?

The R&R project at FSS is led by Sabine Geurts (full professor, BSI/Psychology) and Hanneke den Ouden (associate professor, DCC/Psychology). They form the writing group, supported by Wouter Brok (secretary, Faculty Office) and Angelique van der Voort (head of HR).

In addition, a steering committee was formed with representatives from the research institutes, study programmes, the Representative Council and the Faculty Student Council. In forming this committee, we also ensured a diverse range of positions: lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors are represented. There were regular discussions with the steering committee about both the approach to this project and the content of the final recommendations.

The 2021-2022 steering committee consists of:
Roseriet Beijers (associate professor, BSI/Psychology)
Pepijn Burger (Master’s student at CAOS, vice-chair of the Faculty Student Council)
Serena Daalmans (lecturer and researcher, BSI/Communication Science)
Saskia Glas (assistant professor, RSCR/Sociology)
Jasper de Groot (assistant professor, BSI/Psychology)
Sabine Hunnius (full professor, DCC/Psychology)
Arno Koning (assistant professor, DCC/Psychology/Representative Council)
Frank Léoné (assistant professor, DCC/Artificial Intelligence, RU Recognition & Rewards committee)
Peer Scheepers (full professor, RSCR/Sociology)
Niels Spierings (associate professor, RSCR/Sociology)
Eliana Vassena (assistant professor, BSI/Psychology)
Lennart Verhagen (assistant professor, DCC/Psychology)
Jacqueline Vink (full professor, BSI/Pedagogical Sciences)
2.3. TARGET GROUPS

In the first year of the R&R project (2021-2022 academic year), the main focus was on academic staff, particularly assistant professors, associate professors, full professors and lecturers with permanent appointments. We had to limit ourselves to those groups that year to keep the project somewhat manageable, given the limited capacity available (0.3 FTE for the two project leaders). We fully realise that the issue of recognising and rewarding achievements – and translating this into more diversity in development and career paths – also deserves attention for PhD candidates, postdocs, lecturers with temporary appointments, and Educational Support Personnel. In this advisory report, we will explicitly push for follow-up paths for these critically important target groups, for which both the approach and the outcomes of the current project will form a solid foundation.

2.4. APPROACH

Throughout the 2021-2022 academic year, we organised various activities to gather input as carefully and broadly as possible. All the R&R activities that took place at FSS in this first year of the R&R project are listed on a timeline below. We included the insights and outcomes from all these activities in the final recommendations. This does not include the discussions the project leaders had outside FSS (with the exception of the RU committee): with the R&R project manager from Wageningen University and the vice dean of research from the Faculty of Science, among others.
2.4.1. Workshop at the away day for FSS professors and administrators

We launched the project at the annual away day for FSS professors and administrators (4 Nov. 2021) with a presentation and workshops followed by a general discussion. Thirty colleagues took part, of which 24 were academic staff (21 professors and 3 associate professors) and 6 were Educational Support Personnel. After an introduction by the project leaders, the participants were assigned to one of the following five thematic sessions: ‘A narrative CV: A good development, or are we throwing the baby out with the bath water?’; ‘Teamwork, or the “five-legged sheep”?’; ‘Recognising & rewarding teaching: a paradox?’; ‘Recognising & rewarding leadership and academic citizenship’; and ‘Which key areas do we want to recognise and reward, and how are they weighted against each other?’ These themes were sent around to invitees in advance as ‘appetisers’; see Appendix A. Each theme revolved around several questions, and discussions took place for over an hour under the guidance of a moderator. Finally, each group gave plenary feedback on the main discussion points and insights. The moderators took minutes of each thematic session.
Two of the five R&R thematic sessions at the away day for FSS professors and administrators

2.4.2. Discussions with Research, Education and Programme Directors
In November 2021, the project leaders met in three separate discussions with the four directors (or associate directors) of RSCR, DCC and BSI, respectively. Again, these meetings focused on the abovementioned five themes, with a somewhat stronger emphasis on the narrative CV, recognising and rewarding team science, and academic leadership and citizenship. In February and March 2022, three discussions were held with seven Programme Directors (including the current Director of Education) of, respectively: (i) Psychology, Pedagogical Sciences and Communication Science; (ii) Sociology and CAOS; and (iii) Artificial Intelligence (the current and former Programme Director).

2.4.3. Group discussions
In December 2021, the project leaders held three group discussions with a total of 15 people (3 professors, 6 associate professors, and 6 assistant professors). In this process, we tried to achieve sufficient distribution across departments, job levels and gender. To give the interviews some structure, we used Mentimeter to present statements (see Appendix B) about five themes (Hirings & Promotions, Vitalisation of career paths, R&R for teaching, R&R for teamwork, R&R for leadership/academic citizenship). The response to each theme formed the starting point for the group discussion. There was also space for contributing additional points.

2.4.4. FSS Recognition & Rewards steering committee
After the initial meeting with the steering committee in late November 2021, a second coordination discussion took place in March 2022, which focused on these questions: How can we involve all FSS employees who belong to the target group, in the R&R project? And how can we ensure that everyone feels heard and can express themselves safely? We decided on a multi-pronged approach: (i) create
an accessible R&R website for FSS; (ii) circulate a short, anonymous R&R poll with several open questions; (iii) organise an R&R event where we wanted to continue the group discussions with as many stakeholders as possible; and (iv) set up an R&R email address where anyone could reach us at any time. During a third coordination discussion on 30 September 2022, all the draft recommendations were discussed with the steering committee and the recommendations were further refined on that basis.

2.4.5. FSS Recognition & Rewards website
In early May, the FSS Recognition & Rewards website was launched in Dutch and English. It outlined the background of the R&R project and explained the main points of discussion, the main question, those involved (project leaders, steering committee and writing group), the target groups for 2021-2022, the timeline and the deliverables. It also announced the R&R poll and the R&R event along with a registration/participation opportunity.

2.4.6. Recognition & Rewards poll
Everyone in the target group (academic staff with permanent appointments) was invited to participate in the R&R poll in early May. The poll contained several open questions which the respondents could answer anonymously and use to express their views on or concerns about recognition and rewards for academics at FSS. Fifty employees completed the poll: 13 professors, 6 associate professors, 20 assistant professors, 9 lecturers, 1 researcher, and 1 respondent who preferred not to disclose their position. The majority showed a reasonable to (very) good familiarity with the subject of R&R for academics. In addition to supplying some demographic data, the poll respondents answered these open questions:

Are there issues (e.g. perspectives, ideas, worries) you would like to share with us regarding recognising and rewarding academics? Would you like to share with us specific experiences (positive or negative) on a personal matter related to recognition and rewards? What do you think could be improved in recognising and rewarding academics within our faculty/university? And what would help to realise this? The responses to the poll were summarised and clustered according to the four themes that also guide the RU-wide R&R project: R&R for quality in research and education, R&R for leadership/academic citizenship/teamwork, diversity and flexibility in career paths, and a focus on the human dimension. In section 3 (Findings and Recommendations), where applicable, we will use quotes (see blue italics in the boxes) from the R&R poll as examples.

2.4.7. Recognition & Rewards event
On 16 June 2022, together with the steering committee and with help from the Radboud Young Academy, we organised a Recognition & Rewards event for as many academic staff as possible. The goal of this meeting was to explore together how to improve the recognition and appreciation of our work. The invitees were told that the output from this meeting would be important in eventually arriving at a widely supported set of recommendations about R&R for our academic work at FSS.

The programme spanned one half-day session that was conducted twice on the same day: in English in the morning, and in Dutch in the afternoon. 17 employees took part in the morning programme and 30 employees took part in the afternoon programme (in both cases, these totals exclude the two project leaders and 10 moderators, five of whom were members of the steering committee).

Attendance at the event was lower than we had expected and hoped for. This was partly due to circumstances that caused some delay in communication about the event, and partly due to many competing activities on the same day (including the 100th anniversary of sociology and a large neuroscience conference). We also received quite a few cancellations from colleagues with
coronavirus symptoms. In our opinion, it would be unfair to interpret the relatively low participation in the event as a signal of low interest in the R&R theme within our faculty. Many employees expressed regret that they could not participate on 16 June and they explained that R&R is extremely important to them and they are happy the faculty is now paying a lot of attention to it. During the event itself, we also noticed how much the topic of R&R resonated with the participants and the great passion and dedication they brought to the discussions on various R&R themes. We also received very positive feedback from many participants after the event.

After the project leaders opened the event, two steering committee members (Frank Léoné and Serena Daalmans) led a relaxed, dynamic and interactive plenary session. This ‘icebreaker’ was mainly intended to promote an open atmosphere in which the discussions could take place. Group discussions followed. In these discussions, under the guidance of two moderators per group session, we wanted to give colleagues space to share their views, opinions and concerns around R&R for academia with each other in a safe setting. The four themes here were identical to those in the R&R poll with one difference: in the afternoon, the ‘diversity and flexibility in career paths’ theme could be split into parts 1 (assistant professor → associate professor → full professor) and 2 (educational career paths).

Minutes were taken of each group session. Each group was asked to distil one or two statements from the group discussion on which there was consensus or division. In a plenary and again interactive and dynamic conclusion session, those statements were presented and the participants were invited to express their opinions on them. The event was concluded by one of the project leaders, followed by a group lunch or drinks. The minutes from each group session were shared with the participants in that group the following day, via Google Docs. The participants could (and did) revise the minutes after the event for the sake of transparency and completeness.
2.4.8. 2022 FSS Employee Survey
A RU-wide employee survey was distributed in February/March 2022. We requested the data for FSS employees (n=239) for a selection of variables – including (causes of) perceived workload, overtime and work-life balance – and we compared these to data from other faculties at Radboud University.

2.5. Representativeness of the group of Recognition & Rewards participants

The table below shows how many employees from each job group participated in each of the R&R activities (excluding the general staff survey) and how this compares to the total target group at FSS. After we correct for ‘double counting’ (employees who participated in more than one activity), about 155 employees were involved in one of the below R&R activities and thus were able to comment on the R&R themes. Of the 155 participants, we counted 137 employees from our target group of professors, associate professors, assistant professors and lecturers with permanent appointments (excluding the project leaders themselves). This is 44% of the total target group at FSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer/researcher</th>
<th>PhD/FSR student/Postdoc/other</th>
<th>Educational Support Personnel</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Away day for professors/administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; education directors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R event</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R poll</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>49 (36%)</td>
<td>26 (19%)</td>
<td>40 (29%)</td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137   (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of number of participants in each R&R activity at FSS
The figure above shows that professors and, to a slightly lesser extent, associate professors, were overrepresented (36% and 19%, respectively, in the R&R response group compared to 22% and 11%, in the FSS population contacted). The lecturer/researcher group was the most underrepresented (16% in the R&R response group compared to 34% in the FSS population contacted). We think this is unfortunate; we had hoped to reach the latter group in particular with the R&R poll and the R&R event.

This skewed distribution in our response group may have influenced some of our findings. Where we think it may have had an impact, we will explicitly mention this. We will also take this into account as much as possible in our recommendations. Finally, we will make recommendations for increasing the involvement of the less represented group in future decision-making at FSS.
3. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project leaders have written draft recommendations based on all the information gained from the abovementioned R&R activities. In doing so, we were guided by the four themes that are the focus of the Radboud University R&R committee’s vision document (human dimension, quality, collaboration and diversity). We split the ‘quality’ theme into ‘quality in research’ and ‘quality in education’. These themes are very similar to those that also emerged during the various R&R activities at FSS. The draft recommendations were sent to all steering committee members in mid-September with a request for feedback. Google Docs allowed all steering committee members to share their feedback in the document. On 30 September, the main points of the draft recommendations were discussed in detail and coordinated with the steering committee. The recommendations were also sent to the chair (Paula Fikkert) and the programme leader (Maria Verschoor) of the Radboud University R&R committee for feedback. In October 2022, this report will be handed over and explained to the faculty’s Executive Board.

In this section, we will start by outlining the main findings per theme (‘scenario’) and illustrate them using quotes from the R&R poll. We will then present recommendations for each theme. In section 3.7., we will present the recommendations in a matrix, distinguishing between Part A and Part B. Part A concerns recommendations that are already quite concrete and relatively easy to implement (‘low-hanging fruit’). Part B concerns proposals that require further thought and elaboration before they can be implemented. Finally, we will make recommendations for follow-up processes. Hereafter, when we use the word ‘people’ we mean it to refer to the FSS employees we heard from in the context of this R&R project.

3.1. VISION AND PRACTICE

An important overarching observation is that the current rewards structure and practice is, in some respects, still insufficiently aligned with the vision and values FSS aims to promote (as described in the FSS Strategy 2021-2026). We have observed that this discrepancy often leads to frustration and increased workload (‘they say they think it’s important, but I don’t get time or recognition for it’ / ‘it doesn’t contribute to my promotion opportunities; rather the opposite’). Several recommendations will relate to bringing practice more in line with FSS’s vision and mission. It is important to note that the use of ‘reward’ here refers to available work time and selection and promotion opportunities, as well as publicising achievements via digital screens, newsletters, websites and press releases.

Quote from R&R poll:

‘There is a glorious discrepancy between good intentions and actual practice....’
3.2. **HUMAN DIMENSION**

**SCENARIO**

**Realistic allocation of hours**

Recognition and rewards come down to allocating time (hours) to the tasks we deem important and providing the necessary support to perform these tasks. Only then will there be a match between the values and ambitions that are communicated, on the one hand, and day-to-day practice, on the other. Radboud University and FSS promote research, education, impact and leadership (and, where applicable, patient care) as important key areas (FSS strategy: ‘Our education and research are of equal importance’; ‘Our research and education have a scientific and social impact’). At FSS, there is explicit recognition of time for teaching, but not for the other key areas (research, impact and leadership/academic citizenship). Contracts at FSS are generally divided into FTE for research and FTE for teaching (50:50 for most professor/assistant professor/associate professor positions). However, because the 50% for teaching is fully assigned and the tasks related to the other key areas (e.g. leadership, academic citizenship, impact) are either unrecognised or under-recognised in terms of time, those tasks by definition are fulfilled at the cost of available research time and/or carried out in the employee’s own time. In addition, the hours allocated for teaching tasks are widely perceived as fewer than the hours actually required. Both aspects (essentially only allocating hours for ‘teaching’ hours and underestimating those hours) result in many people working overtime and experiencing high workloads, which puts a strain on work-life balance.

*Quotes from R&R poll:*

‘We are paid to teach and/or do research. Yet all aspects of knowledge transfer need to be squeezed into the already limited research time (above and beyond administrative tasks, obtaining grants, supervising PhDs, reviewing, and oh yes; analysing and writing).’

‘In my view, the main improvement would be fair compensation for education in terms of the number of hours allocated to tasks. Right now, there are too many tasks (including extra committees, ethics approval etc.) that need to be done in just too little time available for them. The fact that this is well known and not remedied makes me feel ‘unrecognised’ or not taken seriously as a professional.’

‘I am known to be successful in knowledge transfer. Yet, I have to teach >50% of my time and cannot use this teaching time for the knowledge transfer tasks. Instead, all of these tasks have to be done within the <50% research time. I think the RU should also attribute time (and thus money) to these extra tasks instead of just expecting people to do them and maybe ‘recognise or reward’ them for doing so.’
**Workload**

That people perceive a high workload at FSS is apparent from both the information we collected as part of this R&R project and the results of the 2022 employee survey. In that survey, almost two-thirds of the respondents (65%) from FSS indicated that overtime is regularly/often/always necessary to be able to function well, while 61% mentioned a good work-life balance as an important condition for being able/willing to keep working. These percentages are also high among the other faculties (for overtime, they varied from 64% at FFTR and FNWI to 76% at FM; for work-life balance as a condition for continuing to work, they varied from 53% at the FFTR to 65% at FdR). 64% of the respondents from FSS also indicated that work is regularly/often/always left unfinished. This percentage is higher at FSS than at the other faculties (where it varies from 49% at FFTR to 61% at FdL).

Among supervisors at FSS, 42% indicated that their managerial tasks are not easy to combine with their other duties. Here, the faculties vary widely (ranging from 14% and 16% at FNWI and FdL, respectively, to 50% at FFTR; at FdL and FM, the percentages are 36% lower than at FSS). What is striking here is that 42% of the supervisors at FSS reported experiencing insufficient support in carrying out managerial tasks. Here too, FSS stands out unfavourably compared to the other faculties (at other faculties, this percentage varies from 14% at FFTR to 28% at FNWI).

**Quote from R&R poll:**

‘And I think that each department should get a manager so that people in higher positions, such as associate professors and full professors, don’t have to do all the management anymore. I think it is ridiculous how much management I have to do as full professor.’

Overall at FSS, the main factors that were said to increase workload were: ‘teaching duties’ (56%), ‘peak demand’ (39%) and the ‘combination of tasks’ (33%). In the discussions, employees regularly stated that, in practice, they spend considerably more hours on teaching than are allocated to it. Employees also frequently mentioned that (partly digitised) administrative activities (e.g. entering grades in Osiris, setting up or transferring a Brightspace environment) are experienced as time-consuming, unpleasant and not in keeping with the job level. In addition, employees stated that ICT systems too often determine what is or is not possible in teaching. They do not feel that these systems are set up in such a way that they consider user-friendliness and extra workload for the lecturer.

Another thing that emerged from the discussions was that study programmes deal differently with hour allocation for teaching tasks: for example, whether or not they allocate more teaching hours for new (or taken over) courses or to new lecturers and novice assistant professors. Some study programmes offer extra hours for this but others do not.

As for workload, we refer here to the document *FSS reduces workload in education* (June 2019, see Appendix C). It provides a clear analysis of the key factors that increase the workload in education and makes concrete recommendations in five areas (teaching tasks, ICT systems, assessment and appraisal, educational support, and accountability and quality assurance). Many bottlenecks identified in 2019 (e.g. a need for extra time for novice lecturers or new courses, user-unfriendliness of RU systems, and a need for more and better support in administrative tasks) continue to feature prominently in this R&R project.
Trust
In the many R&R discussions and the R&R poll, the theme of ‘trust’ came up regularly (this touches on the FSS ambition: ‘We provide a pleasant study and work environment’). Many employees experience a lot of control and little flexibility and trust in actions that are low-risk in terms of consequences (e.g. expense claims in BASS). This causes frustration and is unnecessarily time-consuming. Another point mentioned as a source of frustration concerns limited flexibility around acquired funds for external services, for example. These acquired funds must be used formally in the same calendar year and cannot be accumulated and spent over a longer period. Employees struggle with the fact that allowances for such tasks cannot be used later in a calendar year due to this restriction, and that their services mainly benefit the ‘reserves’. This makes it attractive for employees to be paid privately for external services. Some research institutes offer a bit more flexibility in this respect than others (e.g. funds must be spent no later than in the following calendar year instead of in the same calendar year).

Increasingly, supervisors, in their role as ‘competent authority’, are an essential link in various digitised management and HR processes. They would like to be able to transfer some of these tasks in confidence to, for example, management support staff.

In the discussions, the theme of ‘trust’ was often related to creating a safe and open academic culture in which employees feel heard and dare to speak out. Unfortunately, they do not always experience such a safe space. Many employees also appeared to have questions about, for example, the background and rationale behind certain policy decisions and would like to share their questions and ideas with the faculty’s Executive Board.

Quotes from R&R poll:

‘Decision making at the RU is definitely not open, and trying to make it more open is not appreciated. I am worried that the RU is not a safe place to address self-interest driven decisions by the management.’

‘The management should be explicit about the objectives of our organisation, and act accordingly. Far too often, the management acts according to a hidden agenda that is motivated by personal interests.’

‘Many colleagues have good ideas, and it would be nice if there were more conversation with people about this so they can share their ideas more broadly.’

‘What could be improved is a less conservative and more open-minded vision and conduct of the Faculty Board, and more two-way interaction.’

The information we gathered also shows that many employees feel there should be more recognition and reward for all their activities in the annual appraisal interviews. People feel the emphasis is mostly on research performance, while time for this is under pressure, and ‘impact’ and ‘academic citizenship tasks’ are not discussed at all (or much less). And some people do not experience the annual appraisal interview as a safe space. For their part, several supervisors said they found it difficult to conduct proper annual appraisal interviews and were uncertain how to deal with matters like an employee’s request for promotion or salary increase.
Quote from R&R poll:

‘Evaluation of teaching courses only receives attention when evaluation is low (requires teacher reports, etc.), but does not receive recognition when evaluation is high.’

‘Although more attention is given to, for instance, knowledge transfer, this is hardly part of the yearly assessment.’

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Realistic allocation of hours**
  - Create a distribution of hours that does justice to daily practice that is characterised by a variety of tasks (research, education, leadership, impact and academic citizenship). In doing so, also take a close look at the perceived shortage of hours allocated to education. Different distributions of hours among various tasks are conceivable. One example could be a 40%-40%-20% model (40% research, 40% education and 20% management/impact/academic citizenship, as is currently the case at the Faculty of Science). Different emphases could be placed within this 20% (e.g. on supervisory tasks, generating impact, sharing knowledge with a lay public, or tasks that fall under academic citizenship).

- **Workload**
  - Utilise the document *FSS reduces workload in education* (June 2019, see Appendix C), which clearly identifies the key factors that increase workload, especially in education. Make use of the attached appendix with concrete action points. Many of the action points from this list have not been implemented (or not consistently so), with the result that employees still perceive the workload as unrelentingly high and working with ICT systems as very time-consuming and frustrating.
  - Identify the differences in educational task models between the various study programmes at FSS. In doing so, try to apply the same basic principles as much as possible and evaluate existing overarching educational task models. For example, some study programmes already allocate hours to developing a new course or to educational development for new lecturers, but all study programmes should be doing this.
  - Ask supervisors for what kind of tasks and what kinds of support they especially need to fulfil their supervisory role. Conducting annual appraisal interviews seems to be one area in which more support is needed.

- **Trust**
  - Reduce monitoring of low-risk operations, thus conveying trust to employees. For example, when declaring expenses related to conference attendance, offer employees a ‘per diem’ option in BASS that only requires them to submit receipts if they exceed their daily allowance. Give employees more flexibility as to when they can spend funds for external services. And give supervisors more opportunities to share or transfer authority, especially with regard to digitised administrative and HR processes.
  - Create a safe academic culture. Follow the recently published (2022) guide to *Social Safety in Dutch Academia: From Paper to Practice*, written by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) at the behest of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. That guide focuses on the prevention and early correction of undesirable behaviour, using various
tools and tips. It is essential that ‘behaviour in the workplace’ becomes a permanent topic of discussion. That requires a cultural change that is rooted in a different leadership style.

- Offer more support from FSS (HRM) in creating a safe setting during the annual appraisal interviews. Support supervisors in conducting these interviews. Key questions here are: What purpose does the annual appraisal interview serve? What is included in it (recognition, rewards, development opportunities, support) and what is not (requests for promotion)? How can the annual appraisal interview be designed and structured so employees really feel heard and seen (also see section 3.5, ‘Using team input in evaluations’)? How can the supervisor create a safe setting? When can employees discuss their desire for promotion (if not in the annual appraisal interview)? Make the four key areas (research, education, impact and leadership/teamwork/academic citizenship) an explicit part of the annual appraisal interview (without the employee feeling they have to ‘score’ in all four areas) and adjust the annual appraisal interview form accordingly. Add an appendix to the annual appraisal interview form that gives an overview of possible ‘academic citizenship tasks’ on which employees can indicate which tasks they perform and in what scope/frequency.

- Conversation
  - To facilitate conversation between faculty’s Executive Board and a broad group of employees, away days could be organised once or twice a year for all job groups. For example, associate professors could be invited to the annual away day for professors and administrators and an additional away day could be organised, once a year or biennially, for assistant professors and lecturers/researchers. These away days could have several goals: keep administrators in touch with what is going on among employees, answer employees’ questions about policy choices and procedures, and make employees feel heard. The programme for such an away day could also be set in consultation with employees and tailored to their needs.

3.3. QUALITY IN RESEARCH

SCENARIO

People generally agree that in research, quality should take precedence over quantity. However, in evaluating and rewarding research, the emphasis needs to shift from encouraging as many publications as possible to promoting high-quality research. Assessing the quality of research and researchers for hiring and promotion decisions also requires a good balance between qualitative and quantitative indicators.
**Stimulating quality of research**

As discussed earlier (see ‘human dimension’), many employees’ research time is threatened: all the tasks that are not recognised in the educational task model (e.g. impact, academic citizenship tasks and a great deal of management tasks) are by definition carried out at the expense of available research time. Even when employees obtain research grants and thereby extra research tasks and obligations (e.g. to grant providers), it is not a given that this will translate into an increase in research time (and thus a reduction in other tasks). Employees believe it is important to recognise that extra research tasks also take extra time, and this extra time should not come at the expense of their personal time. To maintain a manageable work package, they need a reduction in other tasks. In this regard, we see that the three research institutes have different policies.

The FSS strategy emphasises the value of robust, replicable, open and impactful research, with an important role for team science (see strategic principles: ‘Our research is transparent, honest, and reproducible’). To promote Open Science (OS) research, it is important that the reward structure and practice (in terms of time, selection and promotion opportunities, and communication) reflect these ambitions, especially since this type of research (e.g. doing replication studies, pre-registering studies, preparing data and analysis scripts to make them suitable for sharing) is time-consuming and pays off less (quickly) in terms of number of publications. Yet employees perceive little encouragement in the direction of OS research.

Research takes many forms. Researchers who conduct practice-oriented research and/or are partly employed in the field are widely used in our education and are greatly appreciated by our students. Moreover, their research often has considerable social impact, and their experience and network in outside the academic environment can be of great value to research of colleagues at the university. However, the various discussions and the poll reveal that many researchers in this category feel isolated and like ‘second-class’ researchers at the university.

Quotes from R&R poll:

‘I think it is very important to work in clinical practice alongside my work as a researcher and lecturer... Although my research has impact in practice and practice adds value to my research, the combination makes me less effective as a scientist. I have less time to actually publish, and this type of research tends to be less valued.’

‘I don’t feel like the university appreciates the things I do for society and for clients. I only get paid for my work as a lecturer and not for the impact I have or for originality.’

‘I am a teacher and a practice-based researcher, who has been looking for valorisation opportunities in the past years, which has disqualified me to fulfill a significant role in the FSS academic community.’

**Assessing quality of research in terms of hiring & promotions**

We found a lot of support for the narrative CV in the various R&R activities. People see it as a good opportunity for the candidate to better explain less conventional paths and personal choices and considerations, and to make their own vision and distinctive contribution to research (e.g. open science) more visible (including impact in the short or longer term), thus presenting a richer and more unique personal profile. People perceive an advantage in the fact that the candidate can more clearly highlight and explain certain aspects of their CV (e.g. by including a limited number of key
publications). There are also advantages for the assessor, who gets a fuller picture of the person than just the dry facts from their CV, and of their vision of and unique contribution to one or more key areas. In a narrative CV, it is easier to distinguish main points from minor points, and it is expected that assessors outside the candidate’s field of expertise will also be able to make a better assessment of the candidate’s qualities.

However, people also see risks. After all, not everyone has the same talent or support to profile themselves as well as possible, and how can assessors see through the window dressing? Narrative CVs may be even more difficult to compare than traditional CVs that still include measurable (objective) output indicators. The solution may be found in a quantitative substantiation of the qualitative CV. Especially in internal appointment procedures, people see the importance of an assessment by an independent expert from the Netherlands or abroad who is knowledgeable about the field of the candidate to be assessed (inspired by international tenure procedures).

Quote from R&R poll:

‘Objective external evaluations will make the process less political.’

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Stimulating quality of research**
  - Recognise that additional research tasks (e.g. due to obtaining sizeable grants) require extra time, and this time should be gained through a reduction in other tasks (with a lower limit of at least 20% in both research and education, so that the intertwining of the two key areas remains intact) to maintain a manageable work package. On this point, ensure an unambiguous and uniform policy across the three research institutes and good coordination with the educational institution.
  - It is important that what FSS conveys (in communication) is in line with the ambition: ‘Our research is transparent, honest, and reproducible’. Provide an incentive structure that rewards ‘conducting high-quality research’ in accordance with Open Science (OS) principles. Consider OS principles that are valued across disciplines (making data and scripts public, replication research, open access publishing). The faculty can explicitly focus on and reward OS good/best practices (e.g. by making resources available for replication research and reusing of existing data; both types of activities have so far been difficult to fund from external resources) and set expectations for output like PhD dissertations and Master’s theses (emphasis on fewer publications, sharing data/scripts where possible, replication research). Also recognise that this way of doing research takes extra time. We have seen great examples of OS from several research institutes (e.g. in terms of data sharing: the Donders Repository). We should share these good/best practices more between institutes.
  - When evaluating research performance in annual appraisal interviews, explicitly discuss the use of OS practices.
  - Provide more R&R for researchers who conduct practice-oriented research and/or are partly employed outside the academic environment. This category of researchers can, for example, be consulted and involved more often in their colleagues’ research (teamwork), especially to strengthen the social impact of research and the composition of a consortium with social partners. The social impact of practice-oriented research can be more explicitly recognised by, for example, mentioning it in newsletters, on websites or on communication screens.
- **Assessing quality of research in terms of hiring & promotions**
  - In selection and appointment procedures, ask for a narrative CV and clearly indicate in advance which of the four key areas (research, education, impact, leadership) the candidate is expected to reflect on. Ask the candidate to supplement the qualitative CV with a quantitative substantiation (in an appendix), i.e. a complete overview of academic achievements (incl. mentioning grant applications submitted and valuable quantitative output indicators, such as an H-index for researchers and number of citations for key articles). Explicitly consider research achievements in relation to effective research time (e.g. how much time in FTE has been contractually available for research since the PhD defence date).
  - For internal appointment committees, arrange for an assessment by an independent external expert in the candidate’s field. This expert should be able to assess the quality of papers and the candidate’s impact within the discipline for value and disinterestedness. In principle, an external member already is part of many Advisory Appointments Committees that assess the promotion to associate professors or to full professors, but that is not the case for all such committees. Moreover, in practice the external member is not necessarily the one with substantive expertise in the candidate’s field. As an alternative to including an external expert as member of an Advisory Appointments Committee, one could consider requesting a written evaluation from an independent remote referent (following the North American model of tenure letters).

### 3.4. Quality in Education

**Scenario**

In education, too, quality is paramount. However, our question – What do we mean by good education? – generated a lot of discussion and very diverse answers. If we want to promote high-quality education with an appropriate incentive structure, we will first have to reach consensus on what we consider ‘good education’ to be. There are not yet any clear indicators that can be used to assess quality of education or of lecturer competences for the purpose of hiring and promotion decisions.

**Stimulating quality of education**

The FSS strategy emphasises the value of quality, attractiveness and flexibility in education ('Quality, commitment, and flexibility are at the heart of our education'). But before we can stimulate high-quality education, it is important to clarify what that means to us. The FSS strategy states that high-quality education is achieved via five routes: (i) the interconnection of education and research (strategic principle 1 in the strategy), (ii) an interaction between science and practice (strategic principle 4 in the strategy), (iii) a curriculum that pays attention to both knowledge acquisition and skill development as well as utilisation of skills, (iv) timely educational innovations, and (v) further professionalisation of lecturers.

Employees with teaching tasks indicate a strong need for more time to develop (or redevelop) courses/exams and their own competences as lecturers (iv and v). However, they perceive the allocation of hours in the task model as too tight, and they lack time for reflection and keeping up with the literature, both of which are necessary for educational innovation. They also indicate that coaching new and/or junior colleagues is important, but that this takes time that is currently not
recognised in the task models. Employees consider it undesirable that new and junior colleagues are often thrown in at the deep end. They deserve more time and coaching from senior lecturers (teamwork), for their own well-being and to ensure the quality of teaching.

Quote from R&R poll:

‘Teaching is a profession, not something you do on the side.’

The use of student evaluations is perceived as a sub-optimal tool for promoting the quality of education. This is partly because of the generally low rate of response from students and partly because evaluation scores are often linked to factors that have little to do with high-quality education (e.g. ‘difficult’ courses often receive a relatively low score). People see more benefit from using educational experts (e.g. employees from the Department of Educational Support) who periodically evaluate lectures, tutorials and courses, and work with lecturers to improve them.

There was discussion about the added value of panel discussions with students. On the one hand, input from such discussions can provide more and better opportunities for lecturers to gather feedback they can use to improve the quality of their teaching and further develop their teaching competences. On the other hand, there are concerns about the additional logistical or administrative pressure for the lecturer in terms of organising these additional sources of feedback.

Lecturers who work partly outside the academic environment are usually highly valued by students and are ideally placed to contribute to the interplay between science and practice (ii) and to skills education (iii). Nevertheless, this category of lecturers (many without a PhD) do not feel sufficiently valued at the university, partly because they can rarely contribute to socially relevant research and because they lack a long-term commitment from the university (also see section 3.5).

Assessing quality of education in terms of hiring & promotions

If we are not absolutely clear about what we mean by high-quality education, assessing it is difficult. We need a richer and more nuanced understanding of the quality of education and of teaching skills.

Lecturers who have extensive international teaching experience (including the required international certificates such as the Habilitation) find that their experience is not recognised by our educational institution. Instead, they are required to go through the entire University/Extended Teaching Qualification (UTQ/ETQ) procedure again, which causes frustration, extra workload and delays (e.g. in the transition from a temporary to a permanent appointment).
RECOMMENDATIONS

● **Stimulating quality of education**
  - Engage each other in a discussion about what we consider ‘high-quality education’ to be and provide an incentive structure that rewards it.
  - Allocate more teaching hours for (i) new and junior employees; (ii) developing (or redeveloping) courses/exams; and (iii) in-house lecturer professionalisation.
  - Use input from the experts in the Department of Educational Support to improve the quality of education. Panel discussions with students can also be considered, but avoid having these create extra work for the lecturer.
  - In light of periodic educational inspections, among other things, it is recommended to use some form of quantitative evaluation by students. To increase the response rate and avoid having the evaluation be influenced by the assessment, one could consider a set of questions in Mentimeter that students can answer anonymously during the last course meeting. There have been good experiences with this. This efficient Mentimeter option could replace the current form of quantitative student evaluations that involve questionnaires after the assessment.
  - Ensure greater appreciation of lecturers who contribute to skills education and the interplay between science and practice.

● **Assessing quality of education in terms of hiring & promotions**
  - To assess the quality of education and of lecturer competences for selection and appointment procedures, we need clear indicators (besides having or not having a UTQ or ETQ). Periodic evaluations by educational experts can be used in internal promotion procedures, especially when the teaching profile is the determining factor.
  - Ensure recognition of international teaching experience that is comparable to the UTQ or ETQ.
  - An innovative way to recognise educational contributions is also to make it clear for once where university finances come from. Is it sufficiently recognised that education is a major contributor to the university’s financial engine? There is generally a lot of appreciation for researchers who bring in money, but little regard for the fact that lecturers do this equally with their teaching. Without using this to see students primarily as a source of income, it could be refreshing to highlight this aspect in a newsletter, for example, which may contribute to greater appreciation and respect for lecturers.

3.5. TEAMWORK AND LEADERSHIP

SCENARIO

One strategic principle of the FSS strategy is: ‘Our education and research are committed to team science’. It is important that what FSS conveys (in communication) is in line with this ambition. This is still not always perceived as such because, until recently, when team achievements in research and education were mentioned on websites, newsletters and communication boards, for example, only the team leader (the main applicant) was mentioned. During the various R&R activities, it emerged that people feel more benefit could be gained from teamwork in many areas.
Quotes from R&R poll:

‘I have noticed that although everybody is talking about team efforts, the superstar model seems to be increasing, with massive grants (i.e. zwaartekracht) being connected to just one individual name.’
‘Rather that showering one or two persons with rewards, I would be much in favour of recognising collaborations, teamwork and so on.’

Shared leadership
Many employees, including some in supervisory and administrative positions, are in favour of ‘shared leadership’ in supervisory/administrative positions (e.g. shared director position). They see several advantages: (i) fewer burdensome supervisory/administrative tasks for one person (and thus more time for that person to focus on research and education); (ii) more diverse perspectives (two administrators working together have a broader perspective than one); (iii) more diversity in terms of personalities (shared leadership attracts different types of people); (iv) opportunities for associate/assistant professors with administrative ambitions at the department, institute or faculty level; and (v) more continuity in leadership/administration (e.g. in a structure where the appointment terms of the two administrators only partially overlap). The idea of shared leadership is also in line with findings from the Leadership Practice Pilot Study previously carried out at FSS, which highlighted the need for employees to have diversity in appointments and representation (‘fresh perspectives’ in leadership).

Leadership based on competences
There is strong support for assigning leadership positions/tasks based on competences rather than job level (professors). This applies to more structural positions such as directors and programme coordinators, but also to ad hoc tasks such as chairing Advisory Appointments Committees and manuscript committees. People agree that, for example, associate professors with a lot of experience in supervising PhD candidates are in an excellent position to chair manuscript committees. People also believe that the right to award a PhD (ius promovendi) could be more generously granted to associate professors, especially when the associate professor has been the daily supervisor and/or obtained the research grant themselves.

Using team input in evaluations
Various people also suggested that input from the team to which an employee belongs or which the employee supervises should be used more often in annual appraisal interviews. This is expected to produce a richer, fairer and more nuanced understanding of an employee/supervisor’s performance.

Collaboration
It emerged in the discussions that people felt more could be gained from teamwork in several ways. First, in the form of a shared course coordinator position, preferably a combination of a more senior lecturer (experience) and a more junior lecturer (fresh perspective) who could divide tasks among themselves. Second, people pointed out the added value of colleagues who conduct practice-oriented research and/or are partly employed outside the academic environment for the quality of research (incl. social impact) and education. People felt that the value of this group of colleagues is not fully made the most of within their teams. Third, employees often do not experience collaboration with educational support staff as teamwork. The support provided is not always perceived as facilitating, but rather as controlling, and adding administrative pressure. Lecturers would also like to leave certain ICT-driven administrative tasks that do not suit their job level.
(entering grades into Osiris was often mentioned as an example) to support staff, also with a view to reducing workload and maintaining job satisfaction. The earlier workload analysis – see the document *FSS reduces workload in education* (June 2019, Appendix C) – already identified that suboptimal collaboration leads to unnecessary stress and misunderstanding for lecturers and educational support staff.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- **It is important that what FSS conveys (in communication) is in line with the ambition: ‘Our education and research are committed to team science’.** When highlighting team achievements in research and education on websites, newsletters and communication boards, highlight the entire team, not just the team leader (the main applicant). The recently presented team science awards are a positive example.

- **Shared leadership**
  - Create more opportunities for ‘shared leadership’ in supervisory/administrative positions (e.g. shared director position).

- **Leadership based on competences**
  - Assign leadership positions/tasks based on competences rather than job level (professors). This applies to more structural positions such as directors and programme coordinators, but also to ad hoc tasks such as chairing Advisory Appointments Committees and manuscript committees.
  - More generously grant the right to award a PhD (*ius promovendi*) to associate professors. The current criteria – established in 2016 by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) and currently used by Radboud University’s Doctorate Board – could be re-examined. This should mainly focus on successful experience with PhD supervision. Incidentally, in the international context, it is much more common for the primary supervisor to also be the PhD supervisor (or to make no distinction at all between the two roles). Dutch universities deal with the *ius promovendi* in various ways; Maastricht University, the University of Amsterdam and the Science Faculty at the University of Groningen grant the *ius promovendi* to all associate professors by default. More generously granting the *ius promovendi* to associate professors would prevent situations in which the promotor is the formal PhD supervisor but is not involved as co-author in the PhD candidate’s publications.

- **Using team input in evaluations**
  - Consider using input from the team to which an employee belongs or which an employee supervises more often in, for example, evaluations in annual appraisal interviews. This input could, for example, be obtained via a short survey that can be completed individually (anonymously) or with the entire team. The responses could then be included in an annual appraisal interview in an open and constructive way. There have been good experiences with team members making one joint evaluation, but there are certainly several conceivable ways of obtaining input from colleagues (e.g. 360-degree feedback).

- **Collaboration**
  - Benefit from teamwork in education in the form of a shared programme coordinator position, preferably a combination of a more senior lecturer (experience) and a more junior lecturer (fresh perspective) who could divide tasks among themselves.
  - Use the knowledge and expertise of colleagues who conduct practice-oriented research and/or are partly employed outside academia to increase the quality of research (incl. social impact) and education.
  - Lecturers can only perform their tasks well if they have good educational support. To relieve lecturers of the burden of some (administrative) tasks, we can refer back to the document...
3.6. Diversity and flexibility in career paths

Scenario

Clear promotion criteria and procedure
The need for more diversity and flexibility in career paths was strongly expressed in the various R&R activities. Participants agreed that academics who excel in teaching should also be able to qualify for associate professor or professor, provided their research meets certain (minimum) requirements. The 2019 RU-wide Teaching Cultures Survey also found that two-thirds of respondents, and three-quarters of supervisors, would like to see a more significant role for ‘education’ in promotion pathways. Our R&R respondents would also like to see the possibility of deviating from the strict (usually 50%-50%) division between research and education during the career, depending on career stage, private circumstances, ongoing research grants, or administrative duties. In this, they see the importance of a lower limit of 20% in both the research and education domains.

Quotes from R&R poll:

‘Still, I notice that researchers who have chosen the traditional career path are rewarded much faster than researchers who take a more dynamic path. I hope this will stop with the new vision on Recognition and Rewards of Academics. It is precisely those researchers who take a special path who often also have something special to contribute.’

‘Recently, one of my colleagues was promoted to associate prof, mainly based on excellent teaching (in combination with good, but not exceptional research). I think this is important for the university, because it helps to retain good teachers.’

The assessment system at FSS currently uses ‘stars’ (*= more than sufficient; **= good; ***= excellent); a scholar must obtain at least five stars from the combination of research and education to be eligible for promotion. In theory, therefore, this system offers the possibility of promoting employees who earn three stars for education (and two for research). However, in practice, that mainly happens when the candidate not only has excellent achievements in education but also outstanding achievements in one of the other key areas (i.e. impact or supervisory competences). When a candidate earns a rating of excellent for research, people seem to consider achievements in the other key areas less necessary (bearing in mind that professors and associate professors were overrepresented in the R&R response group).

Many employees feel very dependent on their immediate supervisor in terms of whether they qualify for the next step in their career. The usual procedure is that an employee who believes they qualify for a promotion makes this desire known to their supervisor at some point. If the supervisor supports this request for promotion, they will discuss it, with a statement explaining the reasons, with the relevant directors (usually the ‘triangle’: supervisor, Director of Research, Director of Education) and provide feedback based on this to the employee concerned. People generally agree with this process (keeping in mind that professors were overrepresented in our R&R response group). However, if the
supervisor does not support the employee’s request, the rest of the ‘triangle’ is essentially left out of the decision and the process stalls. This leads to employee frustration and work arounds (in which the employee directly approaches the Director of Research or Director of Education about their request for promotion). Employees need a fair and transparent procedure, a more independent assessment of their request for promotion (less dependent on their direct supervisor), and clear criteria (at least regarding research and education) that their performance and achievements must meet. For example, it is not always clear to what extent funding (or the lack thereof) plays a role in whether an appointment procedure is begun. The institutes and study programmes communicate differently to employees about this. In addition, for many employees it is unclear when they can submit their request for promotion to their supervisor. The annual appraisal interview is frequently used for this although, in principle, this is not an assessment setting. However, there are no regular assessment interviews either.

Quotes from R&R poll:

‘Recognitions often seem to depend on the assertiveness of candidates or their supervisor(s). Modest people are underappreciated.’

‘Because there is never any money, there can be no real prospective personnel development plan, something like: We like your work, we would like to work towards your promotion in about X years.’

‘Now, I mostly see that the traditional path is PhD, postdoc, assistant professor, associate professor and perhaps full professor. Any researcher who has not focused on research from the beginning or cannot meet the publication pressure thus gets stranded. Hopefully, ‘Recognition and Rewards of Academics’ will make it possible to follow alternative paths and still create a career.’

Flexibility in focus areas
There is also considerable interest in greater individual flexibility in focus areas (i.e. emphasis on teaching and research) over time. Employees, in consultation with their supervisors, would like to be able to choose to temporarily place a greater emphasis on either research (e.g. due to secured research grants, writing grant applications, or additional administrative tasks) or education (e.g. due to secured teaching grants, additional administrative tasks, or the need for time away from ‘grant pressure’). This is in line with the FSS strategy, which states: ‘Academic staff can temporarily (e.g. on the basis of acquired funding) opt for a different distribution in teaching/research.’ However, we note that some research institutes still do not offer this possibility. The principle of spending at least 20% of contract time on research and teaching is widely endorsed.

In the R&R discussions, sometimes the term ‘buying-out’ was dropped, suggesting that employees would deliberately want to get rid of a particular task (e.g. teaching). It is important to stress that employees generally do not want to get rid of a specific task at all, but are looking for a manageable range of tasks and thus a manageable workload. If changed circumstances temporarily demand more attention and time in a certain area (e.g. research or administration, but this could also be teaching), then some energy would have to be temporarily pulled from one or more other areas.

There is strong support at all levels, including Research and Programme Directors, for the structural use of the associate professor level 2 position (UHD2). The step from UD1 to UHD1 is usually a big one. Many assistant professors (UDs) approaching associate professor (UHD) status, fall just short of meeting the criteria for UHD1. They do meet the criteria for UHD2, but this is not used as a structural
position at FSS (only as a temporary run-up to UHD1). When a person wants to be promoted to associate professor, ‘recognition of associate professor qualities’ generally plays a bigger role than salary increase.

Quote from R&R poll:

‘I hope that career paths in education will become more supported and rewarded in the future. Education is what drives our university to a large extent and makes research possible, but to me still feels undervalued.’

Career paths
Among employees as well as Research and Programme Directors, there is great interest in a teaching career path with a division of education and research tasks that is not 50%-50% (instead, perhaps 70%-30%). Even with such a 70%-30% division, people should still be able to follow the career path from assistant professor → associate professor → full professor. We could call this career path the ‘principal lecturer’ route. Radboudumc has good experience with such a career path. Utrecht University has also had ‘teaching professors’ for quite some time.

Although the University Job Classification profiles already allow for an educational career path (lecturer 4 → lecturer 3 → lecturer 2 → lecturer 1) with increasing seniority and responsibilities, we noticed in the discussions that this was not very familiar to many employees and supervisors. Therefore, in practice, the opportunities offered by this educational career path are rarely used. And supervisors rarely encourage (and sometimes even discourage) their employees to obtain an Extended Teaching Qualification (ETQ).

It is generally agreed that lecturers with extensive practical experience but not necessarily a PhD are of great value to education, especially skills education. But Radboud University/FSS currently has an ambivalent relationship with this category of lecturers: although they are desperately needed, they are generally given no long-term commitment.

Education-related research
In line with the FSS ambition to ‘intertwine education and research’, some lecturers – thanks in part to NPO funds – have been able to exchange 20% of their teaching time for research time. However, this does not apply to all lecturers. In particular, lecturers with relatively small teaching appointments are not eligible for research time (from NPO funds). There are differences in this respect between the study programmes at FSS.
Quotes from R&R poll:

‘I think it’s important that lecturers without a research appointment/membership in a research group still have opportunities to conduct or contribute to academic research.’

‘PWO has now created the possibility for lecturers to also get research time. That is a first step in appreciation.’

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Clear promotion criteria and procedure**
  - If we value research and education equally, there cannot be double standards. In other words, excellence in research cannot be sufficient for a promotion, while additional criteria apply in the case of excellence in education. Consideration will have to be given to ‘whether’ and, if so, ‘what’ one expects in the case of which promotion as supplementary to the other key areas (with equal value for education and research). To this end, it would be desirable to align the current assessment system at FSS (based on 5 domains: research, education, societal impact, leadership and recognition) with the key areas at the core of balanced R&R for academics: research, education, impact and leadership.
  - Employees need a fair and transparent procedure, a more independent assessment of their request for promotion, and clear criteria (at least regarding research and education) that their performance and achievements must meet. For the past year, the Behavioural Science Institute (BSI) has been using a new BSI promotion procedure in which an internal evaluation committee advises the Director of Research about promotion requests. This procedure only evaluates research performance and assesses whether it meets the minimum requirements for promotion. A request for promotion can be submitted to the Director of Research and evaluation committee via the supervisor or directly by the employee. Experiences with this new procedure have been generally positive. Employees strongly appreciate the independent evaluation, supervisors like not having to judge themselves whether an employee already qualifies for the next career step, and directors like being advised by an independent committee. Perhaps the promotion procedure at BSI can serve as an example for the other research institutes and the educational institution.
  - It is not always clear to what extent funding (or the lack thereof) plays a role in whether an appointment procedure is begun. This is communicated differently to employees across institutes and study programmes. The same goes for whether a group is ‘top-heavy’. It is important to communicate clearly and unambiguously about the role of funding and ‘top-heaviness’. Promotions are not usually included in a multi-year budget (unless they are already known a priori). Nevertheless, it could be anticipated that an X number of promotions from assistant professor to associate professor, or from associate professor to professor, will take place in a period of, say, 5 years. This would prevent ‘lack of funding’ = cited (arbitrarily) as a reason not to honour a promotion request (from an employee who in principle qualifies).
  - In addition, many employees are unclear about when they can submit their request for promotion to their supervisor. The annual appraisal interview is frequently used for this although, in principle, this is not an assessment setting. However, there are no regular assessment interviews either. Make clear agreements about this: for example, the employee can indicate a need for a discussion about promotion and/or salary during an annual appraisal.
appraisal interview (or at another time), but a separate time will have to be set aside for that discussion.

- **Flexibility in focus areas**
  - When circumstances warrant it (e.g. someone obtains a research grant or takes on extra administrative tasks), it should be possible to deviate from the standard 50%-50% split of education-research time (while still working at least 20% of the time on both education and research) on a case-by-case basis and by mutual agreement. It is important that all our research institutes and study programmes offer this possibility. We suggest to stop using the term ‘buy-out’ because it inaccurately suggests that employees would deliberately want to get rid of a particular task. Instead, the issue is about having a manageable total set of tasks (that align with the employee’s qualities) and therefore a manageable workload.

- **Career paths**
  - Use the UHD2 position not only as a temporary run-up to UHD1, but also as a structural position. This meets a need among both employees and directors.
  - Create a career path with, for example, 70% education and 30% research (principal lecturer). This career path may enable us to retain colleagues with teaching ambitions instead of them leaving the university.
  - Publicise and use the already available opportunities for an educational career path (lecturer 4-3-2-1). Encourage people to obtain an Extended Teaching Qualification (ETQ) as part of lecturer professionalisation.
  - Offer lecturers with extensive practical experience but without PhD – people with great value to education – prospects for a future (permanent appointment) at the educational institution.

- **Education-related research**
  - Study programmes at FSS have different criteria for allocating research time to lecturers. Aim to achieve an unambiguous policy within the educational institution (or clearly explain why there are differences between study programmes). Not only is it advisable to offer the possibility of doing research to as many lecturers as possible within the educational institution, but it is also advisable to support them as well as possible in making that research time fruitful. A great option is to embed the lecturer’s research time in the research institute (e.g. as an associate member). Lecturers can also be involved more often in research projects in general (team science). This would benefit the lecturer’s professionalisation, the quality of education, and the bonding between researchers and lecturers.
### 3.7. Matrix of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human dimension</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realistic allocation of hours</strong></td>
<td>Create a distribution of hours that does justice to daily practice that is characterised by a variety of tasks (research, education, leadership, impact, academic citizenship). In doing so, also take a close look at the perceived shortage of hours allocated to education.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilise the document <em>FSS reduces workload in education</em> (June 2019, see Appendix C) and concretely implement the action points listed therein.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the differences in educational task models between the various study programmes and try to use the same basic principles as much as possible. In doing so, evaluate existing overarching educational task models.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify where supervisors want support in fulfilling their supervisory role. For instance, they would like support in conducting annual appraisal interviews.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust</strong></td>
<td>Reduce control of low-risk operations (e.g. conference expense declarations in BASS), give employees more flexibility as to when they can spend acquired funds for external services, and give supervisors more opportunities to delegate authority.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a safe academic culture. Follow the guide to <em>Social Safety in Dutch Academia: From paper to practice</em> (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2022).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offer more support from FSS (HRM) in creating a safe setting during the annual appraisal interviews. Support supervisors in conducting these interviews. Make the four key areas (research, education, impact and leadership/teamwork/academic citizenship) an explicit part of the annual appraisal interview and adjust the annual appraisal interview form accordingly.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation</strong></td>
<td>Organise away days for all job groups: for example, invite associate professors to the away day for professors and organise another away day for assistant professors, lecturers and researchers.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality of research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulating quality of research</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognise that additional research tasks (e.g., obtaining sizeable grants) require extra time and thus should be paired with a reduction in other tasks (with a lower limit of at least 20% in research and education). On this point, ensure an unambiguous and uniform policy across the three research institutes and good coordination with the educational institution.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that what FSS conveys (in communication) is in line with the ambition: 'Our research is transparent, honest, and reproducible'. Create an incentive structure that rewards good research (Open Science). For example, make additional resources available for OS research (e.g., for replication research and reusing existing data) and set expectations for output like PhD dissertations and Master’s theses (emphasis on fewer publications, sharing data/scripts, replication research). Share good/best practices in OS.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give OS practices a more central role in annual appraisal interviews.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more R&amp;R for researchers who conduct practice-oriented research and colleagues who are partly employed outside academia. The social impact of practice-oriented research can be more explicitly appreciated (in newsletters, on websites or on communication screens).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessing quality of research in terms of hiring & promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing quality of research in terms of hiring &amp; promotions</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In selection and appointment procedures, ask for a narrative CV that supplements the qualitative CV (in an appendix) with a quantitative substantiation, i.e., a complete overview of academic achievements (incl. mentioning grant efforts and valuable quantitative output indicators, such as an H-index for researchers and number of citations for key articles). Explicitly consider research achievements in relation to effective research time.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For internal appointment committees, arrange for an assessment by an independent external expert in the candidate’s field. This expert should be able to assess the quality of papers and the candidate’s impact within the discipline for value and disinterestedness. This expert could be the external member on an Advisory Appointments Committee or someone like an independent remote referent (tenure letter).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stimulating quality of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate what we consider ‘high-quality education’ to be and provide an incentive structure that rewards it.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate more teaching hours for (i) new and junior employees; (ii) developing (or redeveloping) courses/exams; and (iii) in-house lecturer professionalisation.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use input from an expert in the Department of Educational Support to improve the quality of education. If you use panel discussions with students, avoid having these create extra work for the lecturer.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In light of periodic educational inspections, the continued use of some form of quantitative student evaluations is recommended. There have been good experiences with using Mentimeter in a final instructional session.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure greater appreciation of lecturers who contribute to skills education and the interplay between science and practice.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessing quality of education in terms of hiring &amp; promotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess teaching competencies in selection and appointment procedures, we need clear indicators (besides having or not having a UTQ or ETQ). Periodic evaluations by educational experts can be used in internal promotion procedures, especially if the teaching profile is the determining factor.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure recognition of international teaching experience that is comparable to the UTQ or ETQ in the Netherlands.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An innovative way to recognise educational contributions is to make clear (in a one-off communication) that education is a major contributor to the university’s financial engine. Without reducing students to a source of income, highlighting this aspect in a newsletter, for example, could contribute to greater appreciation of lecturers.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Teamwork and leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensure that what FSS conveys (in communication) is in line with the ambition: ‘Our education and research are committed to team science’. When highlighting team achievements in research and education on websites, newsletters and communication boards, highlight the entire team, not just the team leader. The recently presented team science awards is a positive example.</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shared leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create opportunities for ‘shared leadership’ in supervisory/administrative positions (e.g. shared director position).</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership based on competences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assign leadership positions/tasks based on competences rather than job level (professors). This applies to more structural positions such as directors and programme coordinators, but also to ad hoc tasks such as chairing Advisory Appointments Committees and manuscript committees.</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More generously grant the right to award a PhD (<em>ius promovendi</em>) to associate professors. The current criteria could be re-examined with a focus on successful experience with PhD supervision. In the international context, it is quite common for the primary supervisor to also be the PhD supervisor, and Dutch universities deal with this in various ways.</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Using team input in evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider using input from the team to which an employee belongs or which an employee supervises more often in, for example, evaluations in annual appraisal interviews. There have been good experiences with team members making one joint evaluation, but there are certainly several conceivable ways of obtaining input from colleagues (e.g. 360-degree feedback).</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit from teamwork in education, for example, in the form of a shared coordinator position (preferably a combination of a more senior lecturer (experience) and a more junior lecturer (fresh perspective)).</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use the knowledge and expertise of colleagues who conduct practice-oriented research and/or are partly employed outside academia, to increase the quality of research (incl. social impact) and education.</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers can only perform their tasks well if they have good educational support. To relieve lecturers of the burden of some (administrative) tasks, use the recommendations in the document <em>FSS reduces workload in education</em> (June 2019, see Appendix C).</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diversity and flexibility in career paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear promotion criteria and procedure</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If we value research and education equally, there cannot be double standards. Consideration will have to be given to whether and, if so, what one expects in the case of which promotion as supplementary to the other key areas (with equal value for education and research). To this end, it would be desirable to align the current assessment system at FSS with the key areas at the core of more balanced R&amp;R: research, education, impact and leadership.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure a fair and transparent procedure and clear criteria for promoting employees. Experience with the revised Promotion Procedure at BSI has been generally positive. Perhaps that procedure can serve as an example for the other research institutes and the educational institution.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to communicate clearly and unambiguously about the role of funding (or lack thereof) and ‘top-heaviness’ of the group when responding to requests for promotion. Potential promotions can be included in a multi-year budget. This would prevent ‘lack of funding’ being cited (arbitrarily) as a reason not to honour a promotion request.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make clear agreements about when and how an employee can make a request for promotion or salary increase. This could be announced in an annual appraisal interview, but that is not the setting for a comprehensive discussion about it.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flexibility in focus areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility in focus areas</th>
<th>Part A (low-hanging fruit)</th>
<th>Part B (develop further)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When circumstances warrant it (e.g. someone obtains a research grant or takes on extra administrative tasks), make it possible to deviate from the standard 50%-50% split of education-research time (while still working at least 20% of the time on both education and research) on a case-by-case basis. Avoid using the term ‘buyout’ because it inaccurately suggests that employees would deliberately want to get rid of a particular task. Instead, the issue is about having a manageable set of tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career paths</td>
<td>Part A</td>
<td>Part B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the UHD2 position not only as a temporary run-up to UHD1, but also as a structural position. This meets a need among both employees and directors.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an ‘educational’ career path with, for example, 70% education and 30% research (principal lecturer) to retain employees whose ambitions at the university mainly involve education.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicise and use the already available opportunities for an educational career path (lecturer 4-3-2-1). Make that path attractive and encourage people to obtain an Extended Teaching Qualification (ETQ).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer lecturers with extensive practical experience outside academia, but without PhD – people with great value to education – prospects for a future (permanent appointment) at the educational institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education-related research</th>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Part B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When allocating research time to lecturers, aim for an unambiguous policy within the educational institution (or thoroughly explain why there are differences between study programmes). Support lecturers as well as possible in making their available research time fruitful. Consider embedding lecturers with research time in a research institute (e.g. as an associate member). Involve lecturers in research projects more often (team science). This would benefit the lecturer’s professionalisation, the quality of education, and the bonding between researchers and lecturers.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

With this report, we have taken a first step in a longer ongoing process of Recognition and Rewards at FSS. Recognition and rewards at Dutch universities will remain high on the agenda in coming years. Not only is R&R receiving a lot of attention across Radboud University and nationally, but it was also mentioned as a priority in the recent collective labour agreement for universities. At the opening of the 2022-2023 academic year, the rector emphasised: “We have great plans for our campus, the Recognition and Rewards programme. The cultural shift wrought by the Recognition and Rewards programme is something that we must, and can, realise together: last year we formulated a wonderful vision for it, our plan of action is nearly ready, and we expect to make important progress this year. A diverse, equitable and safe campus is also something by and for all of us.”

4.1. RU VISION AND 2022-2026 RECOGNITION & REWARDS PROGRAMME PLAN

This report is consistent with the RU-wide committee’s preliminary programme plan ‘Towards a new method for Recognition and Rewards’ (August 2022) and their vision document (June 2022). The programme plan describes the structure of the R&R programme at Radboud University and Radboudumc for the period from 2022 to 2026. Radboud University is working in the context of a national R&R programme in partnership with other universities, public knowledge institutions and grant providers (VSNU, NFU, KNAW, NWO and ZonMw). Formulating and establishing a clear vision on recognition and rewards at Radboud University is a crucial milestone.

4.2. NEXT STEPS FOR RECOGNITION & REWARDS AT FSS: 2022-2026

With the R&R project at FSS and this report as an initial result, our faculty is leading the way at Radboud University. The RU-wide programme plan has used ‘lessons from, among others, the R&R project at the Faculty of Social Sciences’. It is now envisaged that similar R&R projects will begin in other faculties in the period from 2022 to 2026, and that Radboud University will make a financial contribution to that process. Based on our experiences from and work during the past year, we advise the faculty’s Executive Board to free up about 0.4-0.5 FTE for the faculty R&R project management. We also recommend a tandem construction for the R&R project management with a project leader and a co-project leader who differ in terms of profile, institute and job level. In our experience, this tandem construction worked very well: there is always one point of contact, it maintains the momentum of the process, and sparring and keeping each other focused contributes to the quality of the approach, the recommendations and their implementation.

We recommend forming another steering committee alongside the project management, which can support the project leaders in terms of both content and practicality. Participation in the steering committee could span a two-year period, with half of the members being replaced each year. This ensures both continuity and fresh perspectives.

At FSS, we can now start working on the recommendations from this first report. In this process, the recommendations in Part A can be made more concrete and implemented relatively easily. The recommendations in Part B require more discussion, elaboration and concrete details before they can be implemented. It is up to the faculty’s Executive Board and the yet-to-be-appointed R&R project
management to elaborate on and give concrete form to the recommendations from this report in an R&R programme plan.

In this first phase (2021-2022), the R&R project focused on this target group: full professors, associate professors, assistant professors and lecturers with permanent appointments. Repeatedly, and rightly, we were asked why vulnerable groups of employees, such as lecturers with temporary appointments, PhD candidates and Postdocs, were not included. We recommend that follow-up projects for recognising and rewarding members of these target groups be launched in the near future, and that these follow-up projects also be included in the R&R programme plan. This also applies to the Educational Support Personnel. Fostering close collaboration and mutual respect and trust between academic staff and Educational Support Personnel is crucial for efficient work processes and a pleasant working atmosphere.

We would like to present this report in person to the Faculty’s Executive Board. We trust that the board will share this report widely within the faculty. Of course, that also applies to the board’s substantive response to this report.
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APPENDIX A.

APPETISERS FOR THE WORKSHOP AT THE AWAY DAY FOR FSS PROFESSORS AND ADMINISTRATORS

A narrative CV: A good development, or are we throwing the baby out with the bath water?
The Dutch Research Council (NWO) and several universities are increasingly asking for a relatively compact narrative CV rather than an exhaustive CV for use in evaluation and assessment procedures. In a narrative CV, candidates use a narrative approach to describe their career, their views on (and contributions to) research and, depending on which areas are being assessed, also their views on the other key areas (education, impact, leadership). Candidates are asked to provide a limited number of core publications with an explanation of why they consider this to be their most significant output. Using certain quantitative performance indicators (e.g. journal impact factors and H-index) is discouraged (also see the recommendations in the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)). The added value of a narrative CV should lie in a stronger emphasis on the quality of academic achievements, and less on quantity and prestige. According to the NWO, a narrative CV would also better fit with a new method for recognition and rewards, ensure equal opportunities for scholars and a dynamic career path, and eliminate the differences between the domains.

What do we think about narrative CVs? Are they a good development, or are we throwing the baby out with the bath water? Does a narrative CV create equal opportunities or does it give an advantage to certain (groups of) scholars with strong self-presentation skills? Do male and female scholars have equal opportunities with a narrative CV? Might a narrative CV have undesired side effects such as conflicting interests between scholars with a track record and young novice scholars? Does it elicit calculating behaviour?

Teamwork, or the “five-legged sheep”?
The word ‘teams’ recurs repeatedly in the national debate on more balanced recognition and rewards for academic achievements. There is a growing realisation that individual scholars cannot be asked to excel in every key area (research, education, impact, leadership). Scholars have certain core competences that fit one area better than another, and they also have to make choices between areas when it comes to time commitment, depending on where their ambitions lie at that point in their career. In addition, the complex scientific and social issues of our time also require (multidisciplinary) collaboration. Working in teams enables tasks to be divided in such a way that individuals can make unique and valuable contributions to common goals based on their own competences. The FSS strategy also emphasises ‘team science’ in both research and education (strategic principle 6). ‘Team science combines the different qualities of different employees and enables each team member to make a unique and valuable contribution to the whole. We (FSS) encourage collaboration between disciplines and encourage our academic staff to engage in cross-disciplinary research and education.’ Since the phrase ‘team science’ has strong connotations with research, we prefer to speak of ‘teamwork’ here. What do we actually mean by ‘teamwork’ in research and education? Why would we want to encourage ‘teamwork’ in research and education, and do we also see risks in doing so? How would we want to encourage ‘teamwork’ in research and education?
Recognising & rewarding teaching: a paradox?
There is a paradox involved in recognising and rewarding teaching. On the one hand, teaching achievements are still undervalued compared to research achievements when it comes to career opportunities. In recruiting and promoting processes at the level of assistant professor, associate professor and full professor, research achievements in practice outweigh teaching achievements. This is partly due to the greater visibility of research achievements (including international publications) and the incentive structure (grant opportunities). On the other hand, in practice, many scholars spend considerably more time on teaching than on research, often more than what is ‘fixed’ contractually/percentage-wise. Thus, in terms of time, research seems to be the ‘poor relation’. This is (partly) because academics spend a relatively large amount of time on non-substantive matters (e.g. administrative, technical, logistical tasks). The FSS strategy refers to the ‘equal importance’ of education and research (strategic principle 1), but how do we actually put this into practice? How can excellent educational achievements be made visible, and how can we create incentives that make it attractive to invest in education? And how do we ensure that academics again devote their attention and time primarily to the content of education (design, innovation, assessment) and to their own professionalisation as lecturers?

Recognising & rewarding leadership and academic citizenship
‘Academic leadership’ is needed at all academic levels. This can vary from supervision of students and PhD candidates to managing a team or department and performing administrative tasks at the highest level (directors, deans). Academic leadership is crucial to creating an open, transparent, stimulating and inclusive study and work environment. For example, how do we realise strategic principle 8 from the FSS strategy (‘a pleasant study and work environment’) without good academic leadership? The concept of ‘academic citizenship’ also fits in this context. We expect academics to do their part on matters beyond their own teaching and research, such as contributing to the interests of the team, institute, faculty, university or wider university community. Some of these tasks are visible (e.g. organising conferences, opposing at PhD defence ceremonies, giving lectures at other faculties/institutions, participating in research- or education-related committees), but others also partly take place ‘behind the scenes’ (e.g. review work, participating in/chairing confidential committees like appointment advisory committees). How important do we think ‘academic citizenship’ is, and where is that reflected? Is the importance of ‘leadership’ adequately recognised and rewarded in terms of time and development opportunities? If we want to value ‘academic citizenship’ and ‘leadership’ more/better, how could we do that?

Which key areas do we want to recognise and reward, and how are they weighted against each other?
In the paper Room for everyone’s talent in autumn 2019, universities and grant providers (VSNU, NFU, KNAW, NWO and ZonMw) made a plea for modernising the system of recognising and rewarding academics with an eye for and appreciation of the key areas: research, education, impact (academic and social), and leadership. The paper states: ‘Many academics feel there is a one-sided emphasis on research performance, frequently leading to the undervaluation of the other key areas such as education, impact and leadership’. It then calls for the assessment system to be modified: ‘It is unrealistic as well as unnecessary for each academic to excel in each of the key areas.’ The paper notes that we need a system of recognition and rewards for academics that allows greater ‘diversity in career paths with a clear profile in one or more key areas, in combinations that may change in the course of a career (i.e. flexibilisation)’. In addition, the intertwining of education and research requires academics to have ‘sufficient competences’ in at least these two key areas. The assessment system at FSS currently uses ‘stars’ (* = more than sufficient; ** = good; *** = excellent). How heavily do we want each of the four key areas to weigh in a selection and promotion path from assistant professor → associate professor → full professor? And should diversity in career paths also affect the contractual division of research and education? Finally, some universities (e.g. Utrecht University) are already quite advanced in their changes to the system of recognition and rewards. Utrecht University uses the TRIPLE model (Team spirit, Research, Impact, Professional Performance (=patient care), Leadership & Education) where the goals and needs of the team are the starting point in organising and evaluating scientific work. How much do we value ‘team spirit’ and should this be a fifth key area?
APPENDIX B.

STATEMENTS FOR GROUP DISCUSSIONS ABOUT RECOGNITION & REWARDS AT FSS

The following statements were presented to participants via Mentimeter in the various group sessions. The responses to the statements formed the basis for a group discussion.

Hirings & Promotions
1. In hiring and promotion procedures, research performance should weigh more heavily than education.
2. Academics with modest research performance, but who excel in e.g. education and valorization, should also qualify for promotion.
3. ‘Academic citizenship’ (e.g. participating in committees, reviewing journal articles) is not our core business, and should not weigh in hiring and promotion procedures.

Vitalisation of career paths
4. There would be a lack of interest in a career path for academics with an teaching profile (e.g. 75% education and 25% research).
5. Universities and academics are too much focused on promotions ('vertical development') rather than on development within the same job level ('horizontal development'), e.g. fulfilling more managerial roles within the same job level.
6. The division of tasks between research and education should be more flexible than 50%/50% on an individual level (with the focus alternating dependent on personal preferences, life or career stages).

Recognising & rewarding teaching
7. It is easy to show excellence as a lecturer in education.
8. Many teaching-related tasks required from academics do not suit their job level (in Dutch: functioneringsniveau).
9. Teaching should be rewarded more realistically in terms actual hours required (e.g., development and updating of lectures, exam materials; taking over a new course etc).
10. Within the teaching appointment, academics should have (more) opportunity for personal/professional development and reflection.
11. In education, junior/unexperienced academics should be allocated more hours for the same tasks than more senior/experienced academics.
12. In education, more hours should be allocated for teaching new courses.
13. In education, more hours should be allocated for impact/valorisation activities.

Recognising & rewarding teamwork
14. We should have a proper discussion on what we consider ‘team science’.
15. Team contributions in research should be valued more.
16. Education could profit more from co-coordinating teams consisting of a senior and a junior academic.

Recognising & rewarding leadership/academic citizenship
17. Leadership and academic citizenship should be valued more realistically, e.g. by a 40%/40%/20% division for research/education/management.
18. It is logical that administrative tasks and academic citizenship are not at all or hardly rewarded in hours allocated, it is just part of the job.
19. The faculty could profit from managerial positions shared by more than one person (e.g. heading a department, shared labs, directorships, associate directors), for example because of increased diversity in perspectives and personalities.
20. More UHDs should be awarded the ius promovendi.
21. UDs and UHDs should be given more opportunities for management and administrative tasks/positions.
Appendix C.

Workload Action Plan for FSS
established on 26 June 2019

‘FSS reduces workload in education’

Introduction
This is the draft version of the Workload Action Plan for FSS in which the faculty’s steering committee for workload (the ‘workload stewards’, see Appendix 1) propose concrete measures in five areas (‘the big five’). Factoring in the perceived urgency among the lecturers and educational support staff, these five areas are:

1. Teaching tasks
2. ICT systems
3. Testing and assessment
4. Educational support
5. Accountability and quality assurance

What came before
The faculty’s steering committee developed this draft action plan between February and May 2019 based on discussions and inventories in each of the seven FSS study programmes and the faculty office. Guided by the university’s workload plan, the stewards focused on ‘scrapping’ and on ‘organising differently (more simply)’ within education.

The action plan focuses on education. It tries to strike a balance between ‘harmonising’ to achieve a more efficient use of resources and providing space for staff and study programme autonomy. Less attention is paid here to workload that might be related to accountability and performance pressure in research. More generally, perceived workload can also be reduced by contributing to the job satisfaction of lecturers and support staff. The points mentioned by the study programmes that have to do with research and job satisfaction (i.e. additional points of attention), have been collected in a separate document and will be presented separately to the faculty’s Executive Board.

The way forward
This draft was discussed in the steering committee meeting on 15 April and, after revision, again on 20 May 2019. The draft plan was then fed back to the constituencies (study programmes) in weeks 22, 23 and 24, and to the faculty’s Executive Board on 5 June. Based on the feedback, the steering committee prepared this final version in week 25. It will now be presented to the faculty’s Executive Board and the Directors of Education / training heads in meetings on 25 June and 26 June, respectively. The faculty’s Executive Board will be asked to adopt this plan on 3 July 2019. Then the study programmes will start working on the proposed measures and carry out the plan. The study programmes will be asked periodically to give feedback about the progress of reducing workloads. The steering committee workload stewards will therefore be followed up with respect to monitoring the progress and exchanging good/best practices.

Appendix 3 lists the concrete actions collected by the steering committee for which there is sufficient support. The steering committee believes that these measures can reduce workload, but at the same time realises that workload remains a many-headed monster that will need our continued attention. Some of the actions involve measures whose impact is likely to be more direct, but others aim for a culture change, which will depend on everyone’s cooperation.

While not every action listed will necessarily require additional funding, some will. A significant portion of the required funding can be covered from the resources obtained for the implementation of the Quality Agreements Plan for Education in 2020-2023. These resources are directed at more intensive and small-scale education, more and better guidance of students, and further professionalisation of lecturers, and touch on the proposals formulated in this document in several areas. The study programmes can also use the ‘workload stewards’ budget available in 2019 and 2020.
Five Problem Areas (The Big Five)

1. Teaching tasks

At the top of many lecturers’ wish list is ‘more time’. More time for certain teaching tasks, more time for innovation or, on the contrary, for unforeseen jobs that are not included in the formal task package but that must nevertheless be done. We can create more time for teaching in several ways:

1. Redefine our idea about available teaching time: ‘good and enough’. Do not spend more time than is available.
2. Make more money available for a) contingencies, b) innovation, and c) a familiarisation period for new lecturers.

1. Towards a new balance: good and enough

Educational task model should be based on ensuring that experienced lecturers can provide high-quality education within the number of hours allocated to a task. Staff should be informed about how hours per course are calculated and which calculation models are used in the faculty.

The latter should be known in advance: in June prior to the new academic year, every lecturer should receive an overview of how many hours they are assigned in the study programme and the maximum number of hours they are allowed per course. This will require lecturers to make a more conscious estimate of time spent on teaching tasks, especially when setting up courses. Lecturers should personally ensure that they do not exceed those estimates, and teams of lecturers should support each other in this. Colleagues can also caution each other against ‘pampering’ students too much and encourage each other to shift more responsibility to students. Supervisors can support and facilitate lecturers in terms of awareness and planning of the hours. Thus, focusing on ‘good and enough’ can contribute to creating a balanced standard for good education that fits within the allotted hours.

2a. Time for contingencies

Some basic ‘contingency’ time has been made available for each lecturer: a full-time appointment with a 50-50 education-research split includes 800 hours for teaching tasks and 800 hours for research tasks every year. On top of that, 80 hours are included by default for work-related meetings and contingencies. Time is also made available for the two training days (in accordance with the Collective Labour Agreement). The calculation of available working hours is attached as Appendix 2.

Within the study programmes, the way in which consultation hours are spent will be carefully examined and, if necessary, adjusted to increase the effectiveness of the consultation. The study programmes will also provide solutions where needed so that unforeseen circumstances can be dealt with appropriately.

2b. Time for innovation

Study programmes need to innovate regularly, but we often hear complaints that lecturers mostly have to develop such innovations in their spare time. This has to change. The Director of Education needs to set aside a bank of innovation hours to be used for larger innovations. These innovation hours could then be distributed separately from the regular task load. Innovations will have to be better planned and worked out in consultation with lecturers well before they are launched. Not every good idea can or must be immediately implemented. Every study programme will consider the medium and long term and thus examine whether (intended) innovations and/or changes in the curriculum can lead to a revised distribution of tasks to reduce the current workload.

2c. Time for novice lecturers or new courses

Teaching a course for the first time or being new to the classroom yourself requires extra hours. Temporary and novice staff in particular have to deal with this. This aspect should be included in the teaching tasks for novice lecturers.


2. ICT systems

Many new ICT systems were introduced in recent years (e.g. BASS declarations, BASS leave, Brightspace, Osiris-lecturer, Cirrus, repository, METIS, Hora Est). While self-service systems are part of modern life, the perceived lack of user-friendliness of RU systems is a source of irritation for many lecturers and support staff. There is a feeling that the systems rarely deliver on the lofty promises made about them, and that the systems are leading the education instead of the education leading the systems (as should be the case). Moreover, because lecturers do not work with all these systems every day, they do not build any routine with them.

FSS promotes the idea that user-friendliness of ICT systems and autonomy on primary systems should be core values for the ICT systems at Radboud University. New ICT systems are there for education (and research); not the other way around. The way in which they are introduced, communicated about and implemented must improve, and FSS will consider this recommendation in future ICT projects. Every lecturer at FSS is expected to eventually master the use of Brightspace, and lecturers will be supported in this effort. After all, Brightspace is a system that is substantively important for teaching. The situation is different with business management systems: lecturers should easily be able to call on support staff for help with them.

Principles of ICT systems

- Research & education are the bottom line
  ‘That’s not possible in [system name]’ cannot be a default answer.
- More rights
  Employees who wish to do so should easily and directly be given more rights and freedom where possible in systems that facilitate teaching and communication (e.g. CMS, Brightspace).
- Fewer people
  Where possible, delegate data entry into systems with which lecturers do not regularly work (e.g. Osiris, leave) to a central person in each department (e.g. the secretarial office).
- Fewer systems
  Critically review whether a new system is needed, and ensure that education and research staff have to work in as few systems as possible or that systems are easily linked.
- Less information
  Assume trust and do not add ‘useful’ but (for education & research staff) unnecessary fields to systems.
- Less paper
  Avoid duplicating administration by scanning forms.
- Fewer systems changes
  Implement system improvements or changes less often, and do not implement several at once (e.g. Brightspace, CMS, Osiris).

When implementing most principles, the authority for decisions is not at the study programme or faculty level but at the central Radboud level. The faculty commits to making the principles negotiable and having them implemented at the appropriate levels.

3. Testing and assessment

In recent years, we have invested heavily in a variety of assessment methods and in improving the quality of testing and assessment. That was necessary, but it has created a situation where too many different things are happening at once. It is time to determine at the study programme level which system of testing, assessment and assurance is feasible and appropriate (really necessary). The basic principles are to make good use of partial tests and to simply quality assurance.

3a. Testing

To make good use of partial tests, every study programme should review the number and types of assessment opportunities and forms within a curriculum or total educational programme and adjust or scrap them where
necessary. In doing so, the study programme must make firmer choices as to which courses will be assessed (primarily) in summative form and where more in-class assignments can be used.

3b. Assessment
Numerous checks and forms have been developed to satisfy assessment committees and to ensure uniform assessment when several lecturers are involved in a course. At present, we usually work with six-fold assurance: 1) we provide clear assessment schedules in advance; 2) we apply a four-eye principle for thesis assessment; 3) we evaluate inter-assessor reliability; 4) the Examining Boards reassess a sample of assessed theses; 5) the assessment committees assess; and 6) during the Institutional Audit on Quality (ITK), quality assurance is reassessed. It is time to re-examine this process as a whole and focus on where simplified (‘lighter’) assurance is justified (good is good enough).

4. Educational support

Lecturers and educational support staff both benefit from good collaboration. However, lecturers sometimes feel overwhelmed by unexpected deadlines and are not adequately informed about why educational processes are scheduled as they are. Lecturers who routinely miss deadlines create difficulties for educational support staff. This leads to unnecessary stress and misunderstanding on both sides. That is why it is important that lecturers and educational support staff understand each other’s partly ‘different’ perspectives, and this requires collegiality, empathy and questioning from both sides. Ultimately, although they play different roles, they are both faced with the same task: providing good education to our students.

In addition, lecturers can only perform their tasks well if they have good support in educational processes. One ‘best practice’ here is the Education and Examination Regulations (EER) timetable.

4a. Student communication and support
The Student Information Point (STIP) has been active in the faculty since February 2019. It is the front office for students and a first point of contact for all (current) students at the Faculty of Social Sciences. Students can find all sorts of information there about regulations, diploma applications, studying abroad, careers advice and student advisors. The STIP will be further expanded until the move to the new building and administrative processes will be digitised as much as possible. Lecturers can refer students to the STIP for non-educational questions.

4b. Lecturer communication and support
The Teaching Information Point (TIP) has long been available to help lecturers with practical problems related to using ICT in education, questions about using ICT resources, and questions about the design of education and blended learning. Over time, the aim is for TIP to become the front office that, in cooperation with the relevant central departments or teams (such as the Brightspace team), provides all the desired hands-on support to lecturers and answers all the lecturers’ education-related questions.

To relieve lecturers of the burden of their (administrative) tasks, this proposal makes several recommendations for deploying Educational Support for this purpose. However, we should take a critical look at the possible impact of this on the Educational Support workload. Where necessary, we must provide the necessary resources for additional deployment by the Educational Support staff.

5. Accountability and quality assurance
Teaching staff are faced with many accountability obligations on top of the primary task of teaching. The usefulness and necessity of these are not always clear.

We should limit administrative obligations to educational institutions/study programmes to those that are necessary/obligatory and desirable for the quality of education. For mandatory components, we should take a critical look at the scope, the frequency of reporting ('If it is necessary and desirable, should it be with this frequency/size?') and the use of reports for policy- and decision-making purposes. We should also look closely at how business operations and support are currently organised. What could be better and easier in the workplace?
Finally, and to create more mutual understanding, we should pay more attention to communication within FSS about (changes in) procedures, such as why procedures are the way they are.

Appendix 1  Members of the faculty’s steering committee for workload

Artificial Intelligence  Cristel Claas-Hofman
Communication Science  Paul Hendriks Vettehen
Cultural Anthropology & Developmental Sociology  Luuk van Kempen
Sociology  Niels Spierings
PWO  Nora Loretan
Psychology  Jose van Alst
RCSW  Jan-Wilm Delicat
Faculty Office  Robin Kayser
Dean (chair)  Michiel Kompier
Head of HR (secretary)  Angelique van der Voort

Appendix 2  Calculating workable hours at FSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FT in plusvariant</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 x 40</td>
<td>2080 bruto uren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verlofrechten</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plusuren</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 feestdagen op werkdagen</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totaal verlof</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384 verlof minus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totaal</td>
<td>1696 netto uren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 studiedagen CAO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bijeenkomsten (werkoverleg, recepties, opening academisch jaar etc)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totaal</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96 minus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totaal</td>
<td>1600 werkbare uren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>