

Minutes MSc PC – 21 February 2019

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

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)	AG: Anxhela Gore (OCC)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	AK: Alisa Knuutinen (MI)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	SH: Sarah Horn (BIM)
AS: Ad Scheepers (PM) (Left earlier)	GI: George-Stavros Isichos (SM)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM) (Left at 14:30)	VS: Verena Stuber (HRM)
KP: Kurdrat Kaur Paramjit (SE)	CK: Cynthia Kong (SCM)
YN: Yannick Niesen (SCM)	TL: Tsi Kwan Lam (GBS)
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE) (arrived later)	RH: Rebecca Hewett (HRM)
BK: Bas Koene (OCC)	JM: Juan Madiedo (MI)
LV: Lara in 't Veld (FI)	DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)
EG: Egemen Genc (FI)	YS: Yasemin Sezer (MM)
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)	
FP: Francesco Perniciaro (AFM)	Guests
SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)	n/a

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

GH makes two announcements:

1. Student participation in the National Student Survey (Nationale Studenten Enquete – NSE).

All EUR students have received a call to participate in the NSE, but response is lagging behind. Last year, the MSc PC members increased the response rate via the PACs. GH asks to repeat this this year.

The information from the survey will be used for quality improvement, not only about the programme but for example also about the facilities and policies. The survey will be open until mid-March.

MS asks what would be the best approach to reach students, whether surveys during the lectures would be an idea. GH replies that that is a possibility, or the instructors can call for students to participate. The students receive a couple of reminder e-mails about the survey and they can also win a prize.

LV notes that many students are annoyed by the calls for participation. GH is aware of that, but it's nevertheless important to receive feedback, in order to see what goes well and what needs improvement. The survey also has an open comments section.

2. New MSc in Medical Business and Innovation

RSM has been working on a new master in Medical Business and Innovation, together with the Erasmus Medical Centre. It is a master for graduates from medicine, medical technology, nanobiology, pharmaceutical science, and related disciplines, not for business graduates. It will be partly taught by RSM faculty and partly taught by faculty from the Erasmus Medical Centre. The focus is on innovation, entrepreneurship and legal components.

An application for the Macro Efficiency Test (Macrodoelmatigheidstoets) has been created and submitted to the EUR Executive Board (CvB), for submission to the Committee for Efficiency in Higher Education (CDHO). This is a required test to make sure that there is sufficient demand in the labour market for graduates of a new programme. The report is based on extensive market research with students, alumni, and industry representatives. The report got positive advice from the Faculty Councils from EMC and RSM, and was also received positively by the Education Committee of the University Council. (Right of Information). The evaluation

by the CDHO will take 3-4 months, and, if positive, request for accreditation will follow. The programme is scheduled to launch in September 2020 or 2021, depending on the feedback by the CDHO.

RSM and the Medical School are strong faculties at the university and they think that the collaboration is also better for the greater good because there is a lot of information in the medical sector going on like things of e-health, aging, society, artificial intelligence use in medicine or Nanotechnologies and a lot of the graduates from the medical programs actually lack the entrepreneurial skills so we think that this program can really help.

MS asks who within RSM is in charge of the programme. GH replies that so far, involved faculty at RSM are Professor Stefano Tasselli from the Innovation Management section, Luca Berchicci from Strategic Entrepreneurship, and Helen Gubby from Strategic Management, who is going to design the courses with legal content, like Patent Law and Clinical Trials, as well as the Learning Innovation Team and GH herself.

MS asks what the duration of the programme is. GH explains that it's a 90-credit 16-month programme, to ensure that the health science bachelors also acquire foundation knowledge about business.

BK asks how the programme relates to what BMG is doing. GH replies that ESHPM (Erasmus School for Health Policy and Management), the former BMG, educates mainly for functions in the public sector/ governmental agencies. Their programmes have a broader, socio-economic or national perspective on healthcare systems. RSM's programme will prepare students for a career in business, e.g. medical technology companies, genetics, or pharmaceutical companies.

2. Approval of minutes of the MSc PC meeting 22 January 2019 – see attachment.

The minutes were approved, with a comment on how many students with a master degree in consultancy will start working as a consultant. The minutes describe that the majority of the students will get a job in the consultancy, but this should be the minority of the students.

3. Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET)

AS presents the ongoing initiatives on improving the SET at RSM. These include:

- a) SET project research and practices inventory, a benchmarking study with 50 business schools, which produced a number of best practices regarding the process and the survey forms
- b) Review of the online evaluation system (EVASYS). The system has a lot of flaws in the way it is used now. It has technical issues and settings needs to be improved.
- c) Task Force "SET Optimization". This group consists of members from faculty, programme management, the Learning Innovation team, and students. It is running experiments with different surveys to improve/ safeguard validity and reliability. A pilot with shorter surveys showed that we can obtain the same information we get with a much longer survey. The Task force is also working on improving the response and response quality and is working on recommendations.
- d) In-class evaluation. The task force has been discussing the introduction of in-class surveys, specific to a course, in addition to a shorter, more general survey at the end of the course. The in-class surveys can be held more frequently, with questions about a specific content, teaching method, guest speaker, etc., so the teacher can receive immediate feedback and still has the opportunity to adjust during the running course.

BK points out that in a small class it might be easier to talk to students than let them fill in a survey. AS replies that the in-class evaluations can be used in smaller and larger courses. The current experiment runs with an app that makes it very easy and quick for teachers to ask questions and get answers.

FP suggests to run all surveys in the class to increase the response rate. AS replies that this is one of the options that is discussed in the task force, and one of the reasons why the in-class evaluations are being discussed.

MS asks the student members whether they use any online platforms to discuss course content the school could tap into. LV replies that Facebook groups sometimes discuss or survey about the content of core

courses, electives not so much. AS questions the representativeness of these discussions.

WH has good experience with in-class paper pencil surveys in his bachelor honours class (90% response), and with the Student Representatives who organize feedback rounds. GH mentions that in the master programmes the Programme Advisory Committees can take over this role.

SZ notes that if you do the survey in the last session it's not possible to evaluate the exam. AS replies that this is one of the reasons the task force experiments with splitting the course evaluations in an assessment part and in a more course-specific part.

SZ questions whether students recognize the importance and role of the surveys in teacher evaluations. AS replies that communication needs to be improved.

LV would like to know more about the purpose of the surveys. GH explains that the survey results are discussed with academic directors and teachers to improve the courses, but that the feedback of the results to the students is often lacking. Some teachers tell students in the first session which changes they have made to a course based on student feedback. This can help the students understand the importance of the survey and increase response rates. But not everyone does that on a systematic basis.

WH points out that there might be biased results due to some extreme answers. AS replies that there are methods to check and eliminate such bias, but they work best if the survey is not anonymous. WH adds that it's possible to disregard extreme answers.

MS asks how this process can be organized in the best possible way. He has concerns because the Task Force consists of people who have other jobs and are doing this on their side.

AS replies that there are a lot of levels you need to do something and that takes some time. The Task Force now tries a step-by-step approach, with recommendations and guidelines following each initiative.

MS suggests to involve more people and split the task force into two. AS replies that there will be a second task force that will focus on the use of the SET for HR purposes (teacher evaluations). GH warns of including too many people, as this will drag out the process and prevent from reaching a consensus on a solution.

FW asks how the recommendation of last year's MSc PC to drop the overall score question were considered, because teachers are often evaluated by only this one score, especially by the Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Committee. AS replies that it's one of the recommendations of the inventory and is looked into, and that the Task Force HR will be considering other sources of teacher evaluations too, e.g. expert observations.

SZ points out the options of video recordings which are then reviewed by experts or visits of the department chair. The department chair is also the member of the P&T Committee so he can make a strong case. AS acknowledges this and replies that all options are being considered. GH points out the possibility of using some of the HOKA funds because the project aims at improving teaching quality.

SZ asks the students why they use social media to discuss course quality, instead of completing the survey, LV thinks many students aren't aware of how the survey results are used. GH points out that social media bears the risk of group think, where students' opinions influence each other. SZ points out the US website Professor.com where students can evaluate their teachers. LV also mentions that a teacher in her bachelor programme collected feedback via anonymous google document. MS likes the idea of a platform that could be owned by the school and function like a social media. YN thinks the survey should happen before the exam to avoid exam bias. AS replies that a previous analysis of RSM surveys showed that there was no difference if a survey was held before or after the assessment. YN also suggests to make answering the survey count toward your grade. AS replies that research has shown that this can only increase the response rate by 5-10%

SZ asks whether there is a best practice example of another school. AS replies that there is no one best practice, all institutions are struggling with the same issues.

SZ doubts that students have the knowledge to really assess teaching quality. AS replies that students clearly cannot judge every aspect of teaching. GH adds that indicators like workload or how teaching material was organized can be judged by a student.

WH suggests the introduction of a chief officer for evaluations and the resulting improvements, to devote the necessary attention to the subject. AS reports that this is one of his recommendations.

LV would not appreciate de-anonymizing the surveys toward the teachers, as this makes students hold back information for fear of repercussions, even though response rates would then increase. GH replies that there might be an option to de-anonymize the survey only toward administrators, not teachers.

BK asks whether it's possible to receive an overview on the suggestions and concerns, so that comments and recommendations can be more targeted and less repetitive. AS will provide an overview.

MS suggests to increase the number of people who communicate, organize, and own the process of evaluations, and to increase transparency, considering the large number of persons affected by the SETs.

4. Discussion of the formation of subcommittees

Topics	Members
1. Thesis; pressure last block, selection process topic, plagiarism, transparency	Juan Madiedo Guido Berens Dimitrios Tsekouras Kurdrat Kaur Paramjit
2. Honours academy	Wim Hulsink Yannick Niesen
3. Teaching quality; sharing best practices, LIT, practitioners	Cynthia Kong Lara in 't Veld Maciej Szymanowski
4. Assignment of HOKA funds	Rebecca Hewett Bas Koene Solomon Zori Frank Wijen Egemen Genc
5. Recruitment of MSc PC student members	Francesco Perniciaro Verena Stuber
6. EQUIS Accreditation	George-Stavros Isichos Yasemin Sezer Tsi Kwan Lam
Presence PC members	

5. Closing remarks

There are no closing remarks

6. Action points

1. Each subcommittee must decide before the next meeting which main topic they want to concentrate on. The plans will be discussed in the next meeting.
2. AS will send the report from the SET Taskforce to the MSc PC when it is finished and will send an overview with all the recommendations that are already made in other studies.

Next Meetings:

21-Mar-19, 13:00h | 11-Apr-19, 10:00h | 21-May-19, 13:00h | 25-Jun-19, 13:00h