Minutes MSc PC – 22 February 2022

Online meeting via Zoom 10:00–12:00 hours

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, MScBA BAM)	ANV: Antje Nikkels van der Veen (FI)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	EMT: El Mehdi Trifaia (SM)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)	PC: Philipp Cornelius (BIM)
FM: Florian Madertoner (FI)	FW: Frank Wijen (SM)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM – from 11:00)	AF: Andrea Da Fre (MI)
YL: Yu Liu (SE)	(MScBA BAM)
LB: Laurens Boeren (MM)	(MScBA P-MIM)
JMP: Jan Müller-Popkes (MScBA MIM)	
MB: Marietje Bosma (MScBA P-MIM)	
JM: Juan Madiedo (MI)	
AB: Anne Burmeister (HRM)	
HD: Hilde Dales (SCM)	
RG: Rabia Guney (BIM)	
CD: Carmen Damen (MScBA AFM)	
EJ: Elianne de Jong (HRM)	
VM: Viviana Mercuri (SE)	
KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)	
SL: Simon Lang (GBS)	Guests
MP: Morteza Pourakbar (SCM)	ER: Evelien Reusen (Academic Director MScBA AFM)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 25 January 2022 — see attachment

1) GB: The word *test* in the topic SR Draft PAC manual should be changed to *task*
2) GB: The name of the *Transition to Pragmatic assessments Subcommittee* should be changed to *Transition to Programmatic Assessment Subcommittee*

3. Review on how PACs performance across programmes

An overview on how PACs performances across programmes:

1) MS: According to the MSc MM Academic Director Bram van den Bergh, the PAC is more about the atmosphere in the programme and the emotions of students (the vibe) in a programme than about the course evaluations.
2) LB: The MSc MM PAC and Academic Director Bram van den Bergh use a bottom-up approach. They focus on how students experience the course and whether changes in the programme have improved it or not. The PAC gathers feedback from students via WhatsApp groups or thesis groups. In addition, if there are students who have problems with a course, the PAC directly contacts the teacher.
3) EJ: The MSc HRM PAC consists of three students who collaborate with the coordinator and professors. The PAC collects feedback through surveys.
4) MB: The MScBA P-MIM PAC consists of three students from the first year and three students from the second. All the PAC communication goes through the Academic Director Raymond van Wijk

5) HD: The MSc SCM PAC gathers the feedback via surveys and has received good results. This is probably because the PAC collaborates with STAR for the surveys. However, the PAC is currently the contact point for students when there are problems.
6) JMP: The MScBA MIM PAC collects feedback through conservations with students and questionnaires. Moreover, students who have problems with a course can always contact the PAC individually.
7) VM: For the MSc SE PAC it is difficult to gather feedback because students are divided over many electives.
8) The timing of PAC surveys varies per programme (in the middle of a course or after an exam) due to the different length of the courses

Comments of the committee:
1) FM: The evaluation immediately after an exam doesn't give an accurate picture of the reality of a course

4. Curriculum Change in the MScBA AFM programme – Evelien Reusen
ER presented the planned changes in the MScBA AFM programme.
1) The overall goal of the programme is to better reflect the latest developments in the field i.e., to adapt and innovate the curriculum to remain relevant timely and most effective in preparing students for a career in AFM
2) One of these developments is the increasing importance of analytics. Therefore, the academic director wants to introduce the new core course Analytics in Accounting and Financial Management and simultaneously ensure integration by explicitly focusing the new core course on applications related to the other three core courses.
3) The consequences of the curriculum change are a) Repositioning of Management Control; currently included as a core course, this course will become an elective, b) Moving small portions of content of the core courses 'Financial Information and Decision Making' and 'Business Analysis and Valuation' to the new core course. In addition, the programme creates space for new topics in both courses. This helps cover some core issues in management control in 'Financial Information and Decision Making', which will be relabelled as 'Financial Decision Making and Control' and further integrate and align the core courses 'International Financial Reporting' and 'Business Analysis and Valuation'. The latter change leads to repositioning and renaming 'Business Analysis and Valuation' to 'Reporting Analysis and Valuation' and c) Adjust the current 'Accounting Analytics' elective to become a more advanced data analytics course focusing on 'Algorithms in Accounting and Control'
4) The additional plan is to offer an elective course 'Integrated Measurement and Reporting' because the importance of sustainability has also increased, and it ties with the school's mission.

Comments of the Committee:
1) SL: It would be better to offer a specific course on sustainability as students would be more aware of the topic than if it was integrated into other courses.
2) AB: Students should also learn about business ethics and ethical decision making in relation to data analytics
3) FM is concerned that the topics budgeting and cost accounting will only be taught in the Management Control elective while each MScBA AFM student needs this basic knowledge.
4) MS: The programme should decide which level of knowledge (basic or expert-based data analytics knowledge) students should possess after following the new core course Analytics in Accounting and Financial Management. He suggests teaching expert-based knowledge in an elective.

The proposed curriculum change in the MScBA AFM programme was unanimously accepted by the committee. MS will write a letter of consent.

5. Update on the course evaluation project – Ad Scheepers
AS updated the committee on the course evaluation project.
1) Timeline: In 2019, a report on general guidelines to optimise the course evaluation was created. Based on this

report, the Taskforce Optimisation RSM SET was established to improve the course evaluations in terms of a) Implementing the validated and standardised short version questionnaire for the BSc and MSc course evaluations, b) Improving the reliability and response rate and c) A pilot with an in-class tool evaluation. During the December 2019 MSc PC meeting, the committee approved the proposed changes and in spring 2020 the questionnaire and the pilot were implemented. In the February 2022 meeting, AS answered questions from the committee on the various topics which are described below.

2) Question 1: Is it still possible to add questions to the questionnaire to evaluate each teacher? AS: The current questionnaire is shorter than the previous questionnaire, but each instructor is evaluated separately.

3) Question 2: Does the questionnaire also ask to what extent the students achieve the learning outcomes? AS: It is a standard questionnaire mainly intended for HR purposes and focusing on the quality of teaching and courses. The learning outcomes are more about course improvement which can be evaluated using the in-class tool or measurements such as exams and assignments.

4) Validity of the questionnaire question 3: Does the questionnaire measure what RSM wants to measure? AS: It was the intention of the RSM task force to develop a new, valid, short and standardised questionnaire that would focus on the quality of teaching and the courses. In developing the questionnaire, the Taskforce used a) The experience and expertise of the RSM Taskforce, b) Research on SET, c) Best practices with validated SET items and d) Expert views on which question to ask students and which not.

Question 4: What concepts does the questionnaire measure?
AS: After performing a factor analysis, it turned out that the old questionnaire measured different concepts and dimensions which made it unclear what was being represented. Hence, what was being measured differed per course. In the current questionnaire, the concepts, and dimensions *course and teacher quality* and *student attendance and study intensity* were measured, making this questionnaire more valid.

Question 5: Does the abridged questionnaire provide the same information as the old questionnaire?
AS: The old questionnaire measured different (per course) underlying concepts, whereas the current questionnaire is more uniform because it focuses on the same concepts in each course.

5) Question 6: Is the overall opinion question still included in the current questionnaire?
AS: The overall opinion question is still included in the current questionnaire because a) It can be compared to the previous questionnaire and b) It functions as one of the KPI's for the HOKA project evaluations. However, the individual scores of the current questionnaire are also considered.

6) AS: The response rates of the old and current questionnaire for the core courses are similar and the response rates in the elective course evaluation are low but have increased with the current questionnaire

7) AS concluded that a) The validity of the questionnaire meets the standards for measuring course and teaching quality, b) The reliability of the questionnaire has increased due to increased validity, c) The response rate and reliability are on a sufficiently high level, d) The HR-related quality rating is no longer biased by course-specific information and e) The information on improvement-related aspects can independently be acquired by teachers.

8) AS: In addition to the questionnaire, courses are also evaluated by the in-class tool (for improvement purposes only, course-specific questions, for lecturer only, to be used during or at completion lecture period) and MSc5 HOKA project Alternative Assessment of Teaching Quality (expert observations of teaching, peer-review of teaching, stakeholder feedback)

Comments of the committee
1) FM: The response rate on the course evaluation doesn't have to be proportionality lower for the electives than for the core courses. The result also has to do with fewer students in the electives.
2) FM: The term *student attendance* should be changed to *student participation*, because in online/hybrid education is no longer about how many students were present during the course but about how many students saw the lecture/recording.
3) FM: Educational experts are more focused on theory than on teaching in practice. From the teacher's

RSM

perspective the educational quality feedback from peer evaluation is more important.
4) GB wonders what the non-bias response rate is in the course evaluations. To get a good overview of this, it's useful to compare the PAC questionnaires about the same course with the course evaluations, because the PAC questionnaires give a different perspective
5) GB wonders whether the in-class tool is useful because the PAC questionnaires also contain course-specific questions and students shouldn't receive too many questionnaires
6) JM wonders whether RSM ensures the data quality of the course evaluations
7) JM: Information about the non-bias response rate could also be investigated by looking at the final grades. Who responds to the questionnaires, students with low or high grades or is it equal?
8) JM wonders whether it's known how students interpret the questions on the course evaluations
9) JM wonders whether the dimension *course and teacher quality* really measure the teaching quality
10) JM doubts the results of the factor analysis because on the one hand, the two dimensions are good for the analysis, while on the other hand the items are supposed to be measured separately
11) MS: In order to have the quality of the teacher assessed by experts or peer-reviews, it should be clear which criteria a teacher should meet
12) MS: The validity of the course evaluation is more important than the reliability of the response rate. However, the reliability of the response rate could be improved by excluding the extreme scores. In addition, the confidence interval can be based on the size of the sample.
13) For the course quality improvement MS wonders how many classes work with the in-class tool and how it is integrated into the workflow. He suggests integrating the in-class tool at the programme level as it is difficult to assess courses without knowing the programme context.

MS will write a letter so that AS can respond to all the comments.

6. Discussing plans of PC subcommittees
Not discussed

7. Closing remarks

8. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write a letter of consent about the curriculum change in the MScBA AFM programme	Before 22 March	Maciej Szymanowski
MS will write a letter about the course evaluations	Before 22 March	Maciej Szymanowski

Next meetings:
22-Mar-22, 10.00h
26-Apr-22, 10.00h
24-May-22, 10.00h
28-Jun-22, 10.00h