Minutes MSc PC – 21 March 2019

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

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)	FW: Frank Wijen (SM)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (minutes)	Ad Scheepers (PM)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM) arrived after 14.hrs	CK: Cynthia Kong (SCM)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	KP: Kurdrat Kaur Paramjit (SE)
TL: Tsi Kwan Lam (GBS) left at 14.30	GI: George-Stavros Isichos (SM)
RH: Rebecca Hewett (HRM)	BK: Bas Koene (OCC)
YN: Yannick Niesen (SCM)	
JM: Juan Madiedo (MI)	Guests
DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)	n/a
YS: Yasemin Sezer (MM)	
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE)	
LV: Lara in 't Veld (FI)	
VS: Verena Stuber (HRM)	
EG: Egemen Genc (FI) left at 14.30	
AG: Anxhela Gore (OCC)	
AK: Alisa Knuutinen (MI)	
SH: Sarah Horn (BIM)	
FP: Francesco Perniciaro (AFM)	
SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)	

1. Opening and announcements
The Chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 21 February 2019 — see attachment
The minutes were approved with a comment that the minutes are printed in a way that searching, copying and pasting is not possible. AL will look whether she can change it.

3. Discussion on the plans and ideas from the subcommittees
All the subcommittees are discussed separately
1.   Assignment of HOKA Funds (RH, SZ, BK, FW, EG)
RH notes that the purpose of this subcommittee is how they can be involved in the process of allocating the money from HOKA. The subcommittee had a meeting about this topic with Gabi, Wilfred and Jaqueline. In talks with the Faculty Council and with academic directors of the MSc programmes, 4 main areas of activity were defined for the MSc programmes regarding appropriation of the HOKA Funds.
1). To improve the students on-boarding experience
2). To improve the small-scale experience
3). To improve the research skills and academic writing skills of students.
4). To intensify the representation of the RSM mission within the programmes
The subcommittee has been asked to comment on the 3 following questions.
  -    Do these 4 goals cover everything?
  -    How does the subcommittee thinks about the contribution of the funding towards this goals might be valued? What might be the PQI?
  -    How funds might be allocated? To make sure that all of the master programmes can equally benefit from the money.

The subcommittee agrees with the 4 goals, but is missing a goal on teaching quality. The final one is how these funds might be allocated. 1. Introducing a research resource centre which would be RSM wide and benefit students to support their thesis process. 2. Some of the new HOKA money goes to new staff. In the past the money was subdivided amongst various departments but it never contributed the 4 goals, so a solution for this can be a centralised pool of tutors and teachers to help on small-scale teaching.

EG is critical about value of hiring experts to observe teachers because the experts cannot judge a course.

RH replies that the observation focuses on didactics (for instance, teaching style) and not the content of the course. The subcommittee suggests to cooperate with the Learning Innovation Team or peers. The expert observations are primarily intended to identify problems of teaching, and not every teacher will be observed.

SZ and JM mentioned that there is almost no money for case studies in class, excursions and the professors are not allowed to let the students pay for such things. RH replies that Gabi suggested that some of the HOKA funds should be spent on pay-per-student teaching material. The subcommittee hopes that there will come a central fund available. SZ is concerned that in a central system the money will not be divided equally.

YS is wondering whether the HOKA money is only meant for Dutch students. RH indicates that the purpose of the Dutch government is to support Dutch students and therefore a larger proportion is going to the bachelor programmes compared to the master programmes. That doesn't mean that the Dutch students will benefit more from it than their international classmates in the same programme, but that programmes with more Dutch students will benefit more.

MS asks where the 4 goals originate. RH replies that this stems from the attempt to align the RSM PQI goals with the 7 HOKA goals on university level. GH adds that the 4 general goals came together by talking to faculty members and students and comments from students about the lack of representation of RSM's mission in the curricula. MS thinks that the goals on-boarding students and research and academic writings skills are too specific. According to GH these goals are actually very broad, because most master students don't possess practical knowledge required at the beginning of their studies, for example how to use Canvas, how to register for electives, or what a programme committee is and how to apply for it. Furthermore, the funds for the on-boarding project will come from the Community for Learning and Innovation HOKA funds, and not from the RSM HOKA funds. A lack of research skills and academic writing skills is prevalent in many programmes and could be addressed by creating a pool of resources shared between programmes.

WH asks whether it is an idea to spend some of the HOKA funds on streamlining the honours programmes in order to get more funding for small-scale teaching. RH replies that if you want to increase small-scale teaching a lot of money will be spend on new staff and that is not the intension of it.

SZ indicates that there is nothing said about on-boarding new employees. MS adds that there could be a larger BKO course or that the Tutor Academy can help with that.

JM notes that instead of a research resource centre the students already can use a programme by Sage. RH replies that there are different tools which the student can use but the intention of a centre is to create a central platform where the students can find all the general support during their thesis process.

MS is wondering what the status is of the proposal. GH indicates that Jacqueline is working on an integrated version including the bachelor and master plans. Once the document is finished it will be presented to the Executive Board. Eric Waarts already signalled that the input from the Programme Committee sub-committee do concur with the 7 themes described in the PQI and in the HOKA strategy charter but there is still a discussion going on about how to organize and manage it, for instance the Tutor Academy.

2.   Thesis subcommittee (JM GB DT KP)

According to DT the subcommittee wants to create an overview of all the different approaches in the departments about the thesis preparation courses and thesis process. When the overview is complete they can come up with ideas and solutions.

MS suggests whether it is an idea to arrange a meeting with the thesis coordinators to share the output of the research and send them to the Dean, because then the coordinators can see which different approaches there are and which one can apply to their own programme. DT thinks that such a meeting is only relevant if someone wants to change something.

MS asks the students why unification of the thesis process is so important for them. YN replies that all students

want to have the same amount of time to work on their thesis and currently that is not the case. LV adds that there are also differences between the supports of students in the same programme. SZ notes that there is a maximum of 6 feedback moments of 30 minutes. WH replies that 3 hours is very little time to supervise a student. EG and MS indicate that there is no more time to supervise the students because the classes are too large for personal support. LV says that efficiency is also important; when the coach can give the student feedback ahead of the meeting, the appointment will be much better spent than when the student hears about the feedback during the meeting itself. SZ adds that there is also a balance because a part of the grade for the thesis is how independent the student has been.

MS suggests that making the factsheet is enough for the subcommittee this year. The committee can make an overview with three items: 1) what is the approach of the master programme 2) What are their problems 3) and how can stages be tackled?

3. Honours Academy (WH YN)

WH indicates that there is a large variety of honour programmes in the master programmes. The subcommittee already talked to students and academic directors about their experiences with honour programmes. With all the collected data the subcommittee wants to research what the similarities and the differences are between the master programmes. They research amongst other things topics like availability, content and how important the honour programme is for the master. At the end they want to make an overview of what is going on with the honour programmes in the master programmes.

GH will provide an overview of indicators that the subcommittee wants to use for their research. WH asks whether the Examination Board is involved in the honour programmes. GH replies that the Examination Board is involved to the level that the honours classes are courses and students get credits for them. The credits are, however, registered as extracurricular activities on the grade list, so the honours classes are not mandatory parts of the programme.

MS wonders what the focus is of the Bachelor Honour Programme. WH replies that the honours programme features a whole variety on different educational approaches. In his class, for instance, content is delivered about the best practices in Silicon Valley, including a study trip to Silicon Valley. The unintended outcome is that the bachelor students are more career-oriented.

WH asks how popular it is to extend the one year programme because he can imagine that an internship can be more popular for students than an honours programme. According to GH it is hard to say how popular an honours programme in the masters would be, because different factors play a role, like which programme does the student follow and is the student already doing an internship or an exchange? LV notes that it can be hard for non-EU students to follow an honours programme after the regular 12 months because then they have to extend their visa.

4. Teaching Quality (CK MS LV)

This subcommittee wants to cooperate with the HOKA subcommittee to write recommendations about teaching quality and the Tutor Academy.

5. Recruitment (FP VS TL AG SH)

FP suggests that the subcommittee wants to make the process of recruitment more uniform because there are too many differences between the master programmes. They want to make a small informative PowerPoint presentation where they explain
- What happens in the PC
- What the benefits are for the PC members
- What kind of responsibility every member has towards the PC

MS mentioned that the explanation about the different councils and PACs are very important because students can be confused about which council is doing what. He also notes that the students can show their presentation to all the academic directors at the Kick Off day in September. GH indicates that this more a task for the faculty members of the PC because most of the students are gone at the beginning of the new study year. MS replies that Annelie can send the presentation by e-mail to the academic directors and faculty members in July.

MS asks the members to write a letter to their successors, because it always hard to remember what you missed at the beginning of a year as a PC member.

6. EQUIS Accreditation (YS GI)

In January the subcommittee had a deadline where they had to write a student report and they finished it. In a next step they will be invited for discussion by the EQUIS peer review team during their visit in June.

4. Closing remarks

MS mentioned that the subcommittees EQUIS and HOKA Funds did a lot of work already and other subcommittees are lagging behind but the majority is moving forward.

GH indicates that the Code of Order needs an update. MS will work on the adjustments of the document together with GH.

5. Action points

1. Every subcommittee has to write a draft proposal about their topic.

Next Meetings:

21-May-19, 13:00h

25-Jun-19, 13:00h