

Minutes MSc PC – 18 December 2018

Mandeville, T3-42, 13:00 – 15:00 hours

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)	EG: Egemen Genc (FI)
SB: Sigrid Batenburg-Mudde (minutes)	YS: Yasemin Sezer (MM)
CK: Cynthia Kong (SCM)	JM: Juan Maldiedo (MI)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	KP: Kurdrat Kaur Paramjit (SE)
TL: Tsi Kwan Lam (GBS)	AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)
RH: Rebecca Hewett (HRM)	GI: George-Stavros Isichos (SM)
SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)	FP: Francesco Perniciaro (AFM)
SH: Sarah Horn (BIM)	BK: Bas Koene (OCC)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)	AG: Anxhela Gore (OCC)
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)	LV: Lara in t Veld (FI)
YN: Yannick Niesen (SCM)	VS: Verena Stuber (HRM)
DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)	
AK: Alisa Knuutinen (MI)	Guests
Wim Hulsink (SE)	Eric Waarts, Dean of Education
	Adri Meijdam, Executive Director BA/IBA

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present and introduces Annelie van der Leelie who is a possible candidate for the Programme Committee assistant role. Annelie introduces herself: Gabi gave her the opportunity to participate in this body. She did her master in History and worked at Erasmus MC. She likes to travel which she organises herself.

Gabi invited Annelie to this meeting to get to know the group. Annelie will take over from Sigrid, who will move to a new role within RSM. Annelie will take minutes, work herself into legal law, arrange training and so on.

No other opening announcements.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 20 November 2018 – see attachement

The sparse minutes of last meeting are approved.

3. Introduction applicant for the role of PC assistant

This is done under agenda item 1, Opening and announcements.

4. Reflect on last year and perspective for upcoming year – guest Eric Waarts

Eric is present in our meeting to talk about what he expects from the MSc Programme Committee and in which direction he sees the PC go. What are the key things according to Eric? Eric says he need to know a bit more to reflect on this. He thinks the MSc PC is a little quiet. He would like to know what the main concerns of the MSc PC are.

MS: Main concerns are thesis trajectory, student evaluations, how is mission implemented in teaching, support of the MSc PC, and inclusiveness is a concern. The PC is in the middle of the procedure how to structure the work. Subcommittees will work on certain topics and pass it on in June. Unfortunately everybody is very busy

at that moment with either grading or thesis. So also the supporting role is a topic. We as MSc PC try to have a compromising view and try to address some tough issues to avoid frustration.

Eric tells that the MSc market is one of the most important parts of the school. Our portfolio is a big one, has quality and is still growing. For the Executive Board is it important to get ideas on how to balance this growing numbers as we are not allowed to select, and we do not have enough faculty to deliver. We see that this is important for our programmes to grow further. Especially in the area of coaching we are missing staff. This should be evaluated every year. Quality is what drives us. To guarantee this a master core team could be implemented around every master, something like a PAC. This did not happen yet. The vision can also be discussed here.

MS: The MSc PC is an overarching body where overarching topics are discussed (such as thesis and so on). Not relevant topics on course level should not be discussed here. PAC is a good idea but there are two issues. It is a one-year programme and students who join are completely fresh. At this moment we do not have an onboarding programme for them yet, they are struggling in the beginning. This is also related to PAC as well, they experience the same problem. Teachers say that this is a job for the Academic Directors (AD). AD often have a clear view on what needs to happen and they do not have time to onboard students. Students need to advise them, a PAC is supposed to help the AD. Some MSc's have a PAC and they are happy with it, others do not feel they need it.

Eric says that the MSc PC somehow needs to monitor how the new mission is implemented in all our programmes. If it does not work then you need to flag that it is not going fast enough. It is not the concern of the MSc PC how it is done per programme, but the result should be monitored.

MS: The MSc PC's view is that we do not want to put pressure on teachers. We want to hand them best practices instead of being a stick.

Eric explains that HOKA could be helpful in this. Every programme will go into a redesign and come up with a plan to change, including the mission and a more modern way of teaching, Each of the programmes will come up with a plan and the MSc PC could be a mirror for this plans. The MSc PC can have a look at all these plans and give advice on it and check if it is consistent.

Frank wants to ask a question about the issued recommendations, for example about the quality of teaching. He wonders what Eric is going to do with these recommendations. Eric does not receive many formal recommendations.

GH: Concerning student evaluations a pilot is running now. A short questionnaire is used and is tested on five core courses. They are now finishing this test and the first results are expected mid-January. This data can be brought back to the MSc PC. In the next meeting there will be a presentation of the results of this pilot. Dimitrios is part of the pilot commission.

Eric thinks that the MSc PC should have a look at what we can do with the extra money we receive from the government. The Your Future Career course is running in six of the master programmes. The MSc PC should evaluate this; is this really added value, is it good enough, should we invest further for the other masters. Here we can spend the money easily and visibly

According to Frank there is an urgent topic and that is quality of teaching. You cannot get a full picture of teaching quality by only asking students. If we want to take measuring teaching quality serious we really need additional sources to gather information on what is going on in the class room.

SZ: At AFM the department chair sits in during one of your classes and he will give feedback on that. The purpose to align teaching quality of what students say but also to give faculty the opportunity to reflect on their own performance. Can I improve what I did last year? How can we implement this in a more systemic

way?

Coming back to the money from the government, Maciej refers to the meetings with Department Chairs that have to place in the near past. How is RSM going to involve the MSc PC in these plans? Eric explains that he was referring to these plans. There are already a number of plans, such as personal development, more flexible learning. The MSc PC can reflect on these or come up with their own view on those.

Eric summarizes the dimensions set by the minister: small scale, better guidance, feedback, educational facilities (on-line), flexible routes, faculty development and quality of teaching. This is important to keep in the back of your mind when discussing issues that involve government funding.

Frank would like to have a proper session on the recommendations. Eric does not need an advice to start a project as we did that already, what he does need is a letter from the MSc PC which says okay we saw the results, but we have an idea to improve it, or say that you miss something.

Eric would like to thank everybody for their energy, ideas and effort.

5. Advice on Pre-master – guest Adri Meijdam

A proposal was sent well in advance and Adri would like to know how the MSc PC thinks about the proposal. The bachelor programme will be redesigned with a focus on research. With the new BtB programme most of the courses will change and the Bachelor Thesis will get a strong link with the modules of the track to which the Thesis belongs. It is unlikely that the thesis can be written as a stand-alone, without taking the track modules at the same time.

The new BtB programme will be rolled out year by year. However, the premaster programme is a one-year programme. This requires us to cater for additional transition arrangements, in which parts of the current premaster programme need to be increasingly combined with parts of the new premaster programme.

Members ask why the programme is rolled out in phases. Are there no alternatives? Adri explains that there need to be a lot of transition rules (like was the case with the first BtB-project) and therefore this is not chosen.

There are some general concerns about premaster students participating in the master. Do they have sufficient background knowledge? Are they performing well?

Frank teaches in PMB and if you compare students with HBO and with BA background, HBO students have different mathematical skills and the research mindset is lacking in HBO. Gabi explains that PMB do not do a premaster.

Gabi explains that premaster students in the master have very good grades. Those who did premaster are doing well, very well.

Adri is thanked for his presence and he will receive a formal advice from the MSc PC as soon as possible.

After Adri has left the meeting a vote takes place and everybody present votes in favour of this proposal. There are no additional remarks.

6. Discussion on PC priorities for 2019

The Dutch government wants participating bodies to be very active. Every member that is present gets the opportunity to suggest some priorities for the MSc PC in 2019.

WH: the combination of thesis and teaching in block 5. (GH explains that this is discussed in the Academic

Directors meeting and this will not be changed. It is impossible to find a way that is good for all)

WH: In BSc there is an honours programme that is part of Honours Academy. Some MSc's have an honours programme but these are not part of the Academy.

GB: Thesis trajectory; coherence and grading

CK: Thesis trajectory

CK: How to increase teaching quality → introduce best practice

AK: MI is investigating electives, they have made it a business project

FW: Teaching quality; sit in to see what actually is happening

FW: Recent drop of popularity; scale is a problem, even electives are too big. Ratio teacher→students should be improved.

DT: Thesis and plagiarism. Not clear what rules on plagiarism are.

SH: Give students more voice. When students have an idea they do not know where to go to. An entrepreneurial hub would be a good initiative on campus. (WH explains that ECE is in place for this)

RH:

MS: Tutor academy; have a reputation system in it.

TL: Resit; consistency between courses. Now some courses have a resit and some don't.

TL: Offer research skills at the beginning of the year (according to Gabi this is more a question for the Academic Directors)

YN: Process of selecting students; this should be done in a standardised way.

YN: Core Course in January is weird; SCM is getting an extra semester

Suggested topics are:

- Thesis; pressure last block, selection process topic, plagiarism, transparency
- PAC; improve, involve on development
- Honours academy
- Teaching quality; sharing best practices, LIT, practitioners
- How to use funding?
- Resit: standardise, make available for everyone
- Law: how to communicate
- Prep courses; how to do this?
- Recruitment student members
- Equis
- Presence PC members

Next meeting these items will be discussed and members can volunteer in at least one of the subcommittees that will be formed. Every subcommittee should write a simple recommendation.

7. Update of the PC Code of Order

This agenda item is postponed to next meeting as there is no time left.

8. Closing remarks

FW would really like to see the recommendations to be send to the Dean (of Education). MS will work on this in the coming days and then they can be send.

9. Action points

- Presentation pilot results Student Evaluation (Ad and Dimitrios)
- MS will work on recommendations previous year
- MS will write advice on premaster

Next Meetings:

22-Jan-19, 13:00h

21-Feb-19, 13:00h

21-Mar-19, 13:00h

11-Apr-19, 10:00h

21-May-19, 13:00h

25-Jun-19, 13:00h