

## MINUTES MSc PC – 26 OCTOBER 2017

Mandeville, T03-42, 14.00 – 16.00 hours

### Present

MS: Maciej Szymanowski (chair, MM)  
SB: Sigrid Batenburg-Mudde (PM, minutes)  
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)  
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)  
DD: Dirk Deichmann (MI)  
IB: Isabel Bienert (BIM)  
LS: Lisa Schulze Egberding (SCM)  
RE: Reinoud van Eerden (SM)  
GN: Gerald Nuha (FI)  
FD: Felix Dressel (MM)  
JE: Juup Essers (OCC)  
MSh: Meir Shemla (HRM)  
MK: Myles Kuhns (MI)  
DA: Denise Althaus (HRM)  
CB: Caolán Broderick (OCC)

### Absent

RK: Roelof Kuik (SCM)  
DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)  
SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)  
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE)  
AS: Ad Scheepers  
MSp: Marijke Speelberg (GBS)  
BT: Ben Tims (FI)  
AC: Ata Choudhry (AFM)

### 1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Meir Shemla replaced Anne Nederveen Pieterse in this body. Also three new students introduce themselves: Myles Kuhns for MI, Denise Althaus for HRM and Caolán Broderick for OCC.

RE has joined a VSNU conference focussed on degree programme committees. He took some learning goals back:

- Training & handover from previous year (how to participate)
- Connection with Faculty Council as comparable documents are used
- Timetable for a whole year

He participated in a workshop from Maastricht University. In Maastricht they have a lot of attention for quality of each of the courses. FD says that they publish evaluations on the web. GH will not share the outcomes of the evaluation with the world, as some comments are very impolite. Of course they can be hand over in bulk to the members of the PC.

In Maastricht they also have subgroups, only big things are discussed in the plenary meeting.

### 2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 21 September 2017

RE mentions that his name is Van Eerden and not van Eerde. SB will adjust this in the minutes before they will be published on the web.

There are no further comments on the minutes and herewith the minutes are approved.

### 3. Review of how visible are PC members to their constituency

Agenda item 3, 4 and 5 are combined.

**All members present inform the body whether they are visible or not.**

**MS (faculty MM):** He made PC visible at his department. The department is working hard on the accreditation. Academic Director is working hard on how we can implement the new mission statement in the curriculum.

**RE (student SM):** He is not visible yet as the student members are defining their goals. Next week he will give a presentation for his cohort. PAC is in progress, at the moment there is a discussion on how to envision this. Key MSc related topic could be development of certain skills.

**FW (faculty SM):** FW is visible. Key MSc-related topic is how do we assess the quality of teaching? He wants to make sure that this is taken care of.

**MSh (faculty HRM):** MSh made himself visible. The programme is in the middle of revising it. They have lost some teachers and gained some. At the moment it is too early to raise anything.

**GN (student FI):** GN did not make himself visible yet for the same reason as RE. Key MSc-related topic is the numbers of lecturers on one day. And he wants to raise the issue of study places now Polak is temporary closed.

**JE (faculty OCC):** He is visible within his programme. There is a pressing need for innovation and improvement. Two colleagues are retiring this year and a number of colleagues is retiring in the upcoming five to six years. Staff capacity is a FC issue.

**DD (faculty MI):** DD is visible and shares the minutes, although he thinks that they are not read. The programme is working on a redesign. At the moment there are no overarching issues that need to be addressed.

**MK (student MI):** MK is not visible yet. He will introduce himself next week. At the moment there is no PAC and he will recruit two more students for this.

**IB (student BIM):** IB is not visible yet, as the student members have a meeting to see what they are going to do. She did not have a meeting with the Academic Director. She will meet with her and the programme coordinator (Yannick Kuper) next week. BIM does not have a PAC.

**FD (student MM):** FD is half visible. He spoke to the Academic Director and confirms that mission alignment is very important. MM does not have a PAC, the Master Study Club is taking care of this. FD met with Miguel and will have another meeting next week.

**LS (student SCM):** LS is also not visible yet. This will happen probably next week when the two groups have a joint lecture. SCM has a PAC and they have a meeting in the middle of the block so they can correct when necessary. There is one issue and that is mandatory lectures. The consistency and checking of this is lacking.

**DA (student HRM):** DA will make herself visible next week. HRM does not have a PAC yet, for now it is part of the STAR board.

**CB (student OCC):** CB made himself visible already. OCC has a PAC and he works closely with the PAC representative. He and JE already had a meeting. Next week he will give a proper presentation.

A summary of improvement points:

- 1) Communication within the different bodies
- 2) Extend discussion on TER throughout the year
- 3) Topic of recruitment
- 4) School mission alignment

- 5) Quality of teaching assessment
- 6) Study spaces (GH: contact the University Council for this)
- 7) Scheduling (GH: university would like to have two dedicated schedulers in the future, then Programme Management does no longer has anything to do with this)
- 8) PAC organization; improve current document
- 9) Mandatory attendance; why make a master course mandatory?

These improvement points will be added to last years improvement points. The MSc PC will have a look at them point they want to improve this year. Subcommittees will be formed.

#### **4. Review of PAC formation across programmes**

See above.

#### **5. Overview of key MSc-related issues reported by students and faculty members**

See above.

#### **6. Update on MSc accreditation process**

There are three important aspects:

- 1) What is the process? How does it work?
- 2) Impact on the school
- 3) What can we, as MSc PC, do?

We will be accredited by the AACSB and NVAO. AACSB focuses on school accreditation. How is our mission implemented? Do our students achieve certain skill? NVAO focuses on programmes and course levels.

All processes need to be described. Academic Directors, Policy Advisors and Programme Management will write this documents. In December the draft should be ready. The document will then go first to the Executive Board, followed by the University Board. When ready then it will come to the MSc PC.

In June 2018 we will be visited by a peer review team with three representatives per body. They decide who they want to talk to. Also members of the MSc PC can be asked to answer questions. The NVAO is a Dutch organ and they most likely have questions such as do you have regular meetings, can you contact the management and so on.

Members wonder whether this is cooked up. GH says it is not.

For AACSB it is more important what we do to improve. What did/do we do with learning opportunities?

A Q&A session with the Dean would be a good idea. GH suggests to ask him in February or March.

#### **7. Discussion on the role of PC should play in connection to the accreditation process**

Next meeting we will have a presentation by Karolina van der Werf about the accreditation process and what the role of the MSc PC should be.

#### **8. Action points and closing**

1. Merge improvement points last year with this year's improvement points.

There is no other business.

**Next meetings:**

20-11-2017, 10.30 hrs

19-12-2017, 13.00 hrs

25-01-2018, 13.00 hrs

27-02-2018, 13.00 hrs

27-03-2018, 13.00 hrs

26-04-2018, 14.00 hrs

22-05-2018, 13.00 hrs

21-06-2018, 10.00 hrs