

# Minutes MSc PC – 11 April 2019

Mandeville, T3-42, 10:00 – 12:00 hours

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)	YN: Yannick Niesen (SCM)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (minutes)	Ad Scheepers (PM)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM) (arrived after 11.00)	JM: Juan Madiedo (MI)
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)	KP: Kurdrat Kaur Paramjit (SE)
TL: Tsi Kwan Lam (GBS) (arrived at 11. 00)	SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)
RH: Rebecca Hewett (HRM)	BK: Bas Koene (OCC)
AK: Alisa Knuutinen (MI)	GB: Guido Berens (GBS)
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE) (left at 11.40)	LV: Lara in 't Veld (FI)
CK: Cynthia Kong (SCM) (left at 11.08)	AG: Anxhela Gore (OCC)
GI: George-Stavros Isichos (SM)	VS: Verena Stuber (HRM)
EG: Egemen Genc (FI) (left at 11.30)	SH: Sarah Horn (BIM)
	FP: Francesco Perniciaro (AFM)
	YS: Yasemin Sezer (MM)
	DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)
	Guests
	Carla Dirks – van den Broek L.L.M (Managing Director Examination Board (CD))

## 1. Opening and announcements

The Chair welcomes everybody present. MS announces that CD is attending the meeting because a discussion about the proposed changes in the TER was added to the agenda. The second announcement is about the Code of Order. MS updated most of the document, but the Code of Order is still missing information about who can be a member of the Programme Committee, how members are selected, and what their duties are.

## 2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 21 March 2019 –see attachment

The minutes were approved with a comment that Rebecca's acronym is RH and not RB.

## 3. Proposed changes in the TER

CD explains that the overview of the proposed changes of the Examination Board is meant to inform the PC. The discussed items are:

- 1) A curriculum change in the premaster programmes. This is necessary because of the new bachelor curriculum. The exact changes in the premaster are still unknown. The PC will receive a detailed overview in May.
- 2) From AY 2019-2020 on, master students who are selected for international exchange after their regular programme need to keep 1 free elective open. MS explains that the idea is that students do an exchange instead of an elective and asks if it is possible for students to graduate with more credits than required. CD confirms. She also mentions that some students receive 6 credits for their exchange, but it should be 20 credits. This might be because some students don't finish their exchange. AK is wondering what happens when students don't complete their exchange. CD notes that they need to attend another elective, but they can enter immediately and they don't have to wait for another year.
- 3) Several academic directors want to abolish the resit possibilities for passed courses, but the Examination Board explains that students have the legal right to redo an exam even if they passed the course. MS clarifies that students may want to do a resit because by law the highest result counts. FW mentions that there was a rule in the past that the lowest grade counts. CD indicates that the rule was changed because students can't fail a course that they already passed. MS wonders whether it is possible that the lowest grades counts unless the

- student will fail the course. CK notes that the teachers can give the students a 5.5. AK indicates that some students do resits because they need a certain grade for a job by a certain company.
- 4) MS mentions that the personal development course is missing in the TER and requests to change this.
  - 5) CD explains that students who didn't complete their first year and still need to do a free elective in their second year can currently pick what they want, but the Examination Board wants a cap on how many additional programme components they can choose from to avoid cherry-picking. MS notes that in the current situation there are students who will not finish their master and find an easier core course to get a higher grade and use it as a replacement for an elective for their first MSc programme. WH adds that students also use it for their CV. MS indicates that according to the TER students who enrol for an elective have to finish it and the problem is that students who drop out of a course that is fully booked block the spot for another interested students. CD also mentions the negative effect on other group members regarding the group assignments. EG has a lot of drop-outs in his course and that is problematic because he works with group assignments, so he suggests to introduce a drop-off period of 2 weeks at the beginning of the course, when students can decide if they want to take the class or not and if they do, they have to show up in class and at the exam otherwise they fail. According to CD it is possible to apply mandatory participation as part of the grading. MS recommends that teachers explore what is possible according to the regulations if students don't show up in class. Only participation in class can't be graded, active participation in class can be graded. WH reports from CEMS programme that when the groups are formed, the students sign a charter and if they drop-out there are consequences. CD adds that the Examination Board supports this system. MS asks whether EG wants to send an e-mail to the PC and CD about his suggestions to solve the drop-out problem. EG is wondering whether he can require students to have followed a particular core course if they want to follow a certain elective. GH mentions that some students follow an elective before the core courses, e.g. due to personal circumstances. MS adds that there is no regulation about it. There is also a group who fails the core course and participates in the electives. EG indicates that he has to balance between students with advanced knowledge before enrolment and those without. TL suggests that teachers offer a quiz at the beginning of the course; students who fail would have to retrain themselves. MS is critical because of the additional workload on students and teachers; students might also wonder why they have to retrain themselves even though they were enrolled. RH suggests lecturers can mention in the course guide which prior knowledge is required. MS notes that master free electives have to be open to students from other programmes. RH suggests that teachers can indicate what students should have read before the start of the elective and then are tested before the registration; if they fail the test the students might still be allowed to follow the elective but should be aware that it will be harder to catch up. GH suggests to provide an additional reading list for students who fail the pre-course test.
  - 6) CD notes that the appendix of the MSc programme-specific regulations hasn't been updated because the Examination Board didn't receive any updates from the programmes yet.
  - 7) CD mentions that some academic directors asked whether the 4-week period to publish and peruse the grades can be extended, because the timeframe can be too tight to grade open-question exams in large courses. RH believes that 4 weeks to publish the grades is reasonable, but suggests to allow 2 more weeks for the perusal. EG suggests to publish grades initially only via SIN-Online, but not on Osiris, until all claims have been cleared, to avoid having to correct them. AK mentions that sometimes the time between the publication of the grades and the resit date is too short. CD replies that there is no regulation for that. CK indicates that the teachers need to consider this. MS notes that the TER doesn't provide rules for courses without exams. CD replies that there is no need for a resit if a course doesn't have an exam. MS summarizes that if a student fails an assignment it is up to the teacher to decide if they can redo their assignment. He is wondering whether this is fair to students because they might have to wait a year if the teacher refuses to provide this possibility.
  - 8) CD mentions that while exam questions are currently published on Canvas right after the exam, in future the students will only see the questions during the feedback sessions.

#### 4. EQUIS Student Report Presentation

*Comment AL: Please refer to the PowerPoint presentation attached to the minutes for the contents of the presentation. The minutes only include additional information.*

GI presents the EQUIS Student Report. The EQUIS subcommittee was asked for feedback about all the aspects of the faculty, programmes and to identify some issues. This report is the final version and the subcommittee will discuss this report with the EQUIS peer reviewers during their visit in June. The record is also aligned with the Faculty Council. They have identified some issues that were almost the same as those of the subcommittee but the Faculty Council will give more details about the topics. The selection of students for the subcommittee was

voluntary, and there are students of all programme levels in the subcommittee, because the reviewers want to get a good overview of the student views as a whole.

For this report there were 8 key focus areas; slide 5 contains further information. The key areas are

#### 1. The school and it's governance (slide 6)

GI notes that students indicate that admission at RSM is perceived to be easier than at other international business schools, which might explain the large classes. FW asks whether the students are overwhelmed by the size of the classes at RSM. GI replies that most of the students can't compare the sizes of the classes to something else. They didn't bring it up specifically, but class size is reflected in topics like feedback. FW is surprised because he read that RSM dropped in terms of appreciation by students. GH replies that class size is more relevant in the BA programme, which is one of the reasons that the Boost-the-Bachelor initiative was started. RSM is not allowed by law to put a cap on the admission to the Dutch bachelor programme. In the MSc programmes it's less of a problem; average class size per programme is announced in the master brochure, students know what to expect. Also, large class size generally only applies to some core courses; the electives have maximum group sizes.

#### 2. Programmes (slide 6)

#### 3. Selection of students (Slide 7)

According to GI there were comments on the GMAT because the GMAT is not relevant for every programme. GH replies that RSM doesn't have a GMAT requirement for students with a bachelor degree obtained in the Netherlands. The GMAT is only mandatory for students with a bachelor degree from outside the Netherlands because the grading systems are too different to compare to the Dutch grading system. Students with a Dutch bachelor degree can, however, provide a GMAT test result on a voluntary basis if their bachelor GPA isn't sufficient for admission.

#### 4. Faculty (slide 7)

GI indicates that students have a high perception of the teaching quality at RSM. MS wonders if the effect of using digital tools in class has been analysed. GH replies that the use of digital tools in the class room is not systematically tracked. The course evaluations indicate that quiz or voting tools are well received by students, but it is more seen as a nice thing to have than that it has an impact on the course evaluations.

#### 5. Recourses and administrations (slide 8)

#### 6. Internationalisation (slide 8)

#### 7. Ethics, responsibility and sustainability (slide 9)

GI mentioned that students are impressed by how much extra-curricular activities they can do, but students also feel that these possibilities are not university-wide. RH replies that this is a surprise because of the school's mission. GH notes that the possibilities also depend on the programme and the course.

#### 8. Corporate connections (slide 9)

GI notes that cooperation with companies mostly targets Dutch students. GI wonders whether the university can help to improve company access to non-Dutch speakers. GH replies that these events are organised by STAR, and STAR focuses on Dutch students. She suggests that PC students encourage students to contact the STAR Board or even join the board. She also recommends students who want to work in a Dutch company, especially as a consultant with Dutch clients, to take Dutch classes. GI believes that the communication of the university about companies that don't have Dutch language requirements can still be improved.

### 5. Closing remarks

MS congratulates the subcommittee EQUIS accreditation on the good report.

### 6. Action points

1. Every subcommittee has to send in their (draft) final proposal from their committee.

### Next Meetings:

25-Jun-19, 13:00h