

Minutes MSc PC – 22 March 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)
PC: Philipp Cornelius (BIM)	AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)
FM: Florian Madertoner (FI)	MP: Morteza Pourakbar (SCM)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)	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)	
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)	

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 22 February 2022 – see attachment

- 1) AS: The sentence *The response rate and reliability are sufficient on a high level* in the topic update on the course evaluation project should be changed to *The response rate and reliability are on a sufficiently high level*
- 2) AS: The sentence *The HR-related quality rating is no longer biased by related information* in the topic update on the course evaluation project should be changed to *The HR-related quality rating is no longer biased by course-specific information*
- 3) GB: The sentence *while on the other hand the dimensions are supposed to be measured separately* in the topic update on the course evaluation project should be changed to *while on the other hand the items are supposed to be measured separately*
- 4) GB: The abbreviation *LS* in the topic Curriculum change in the MScBA AFM programme should be changed to *SL*

3. Process of student selection of exchange programme – Simon Lang

SL explained that the GBS PAC members had received complaints about the selection process of the exchange programme and that the process could be improved in the following ways:

- 1) Grading system: a) The grading system of the selection process is very unclear. It would be better if applicants know how many points they would receive per criteria and in total. This would allow the students to better

- compare their position in the selection process, b) There should be a better differentiation of criteria whereby in the extracurricular engagement for example a direct RSM engagement should have more value than an engagement in sports initiative. In addition, students with more practical experience should also receive a better spot in the selection process than students with less practical experience.
- 2) Comparison with other applicants: In order to obtain more transparency, it would be better to have an anonymous comparison system so that it's clearer to students why they didn't get a spot
 - 3) The definition of academic motivation should be clarified as it's very unclear to applicants what is meant by the definition
 - 4) Applicants should receive more explicit information regarding the update of the grades as it's unclear which grades students need for the application.
 - 5) There is differentiation within the process between the top three priorities of applicants and the alternatives. To improve this, it would be better to introduce a bonus point system for priorities to benefit those who clearly set their priorities rather than aiming for prestige because if there is a better distribution of applicants the process would be better for students who know where they want to do their exchange programme
 - 6) It would be better to create an overview of the number of applicants per university in the previous years, thus current applicants know which competition they can expect which a) Allow students to better assess their chances of being admitted to the desired exchange spot, b) Improves the distribution of applicants and c) It reduces frustration
 - 7) The expectation regarding motivation letter should be clarified as creativity isn't encouraged

Comments of the committee:

- 1) HD is in favour of improving the selection process. However, in her opinion the criteria for the motivation letter are clear because applicants receive an email prior to the interview outlining the important components that will be considered
- 2) HD: Applicants in the bachelor programme often have unrealistic expectations about the selection process because they expect to get a spot anyway
- 3) EJ: Many suggestions aren't feasible because for example, the point systems will rigidify the process.
- 4) EJ: It would be better to improve the transparency of the process and the communication to the applicants thus students know what their chances are
- 5) GH: In the bachelor programmes the exchange is a credited part of the curriculum, and in the master programmes it is offered as an add-on that is not subsidized by the government. Therefore, the process in the master programmes can differ from the bachelor programmes
- 6) FM: More transparency and explanation of the selection criteria won't solve the frustration problem of applicants as students can't assess their suitability for the exchange programme
- 7) FM: Nowadays, for students, the extracurricular activities aren't about expanding their knowledge but about CV building.
- 8) JMP: The main goal is to improve the transparency in the selection exchange process as students should know in advance what the criteria of the process are and this should be properly communicated to students
- 9) MS: The next step should be that SL will discuss the input from the MSc PC with the head of the International Office Linda de Vries. In addition, the MSc PC could establish a selection process exchange programme subcommittee in the upcoming academic year to improve the process

4. Discussion plans of the PC subcommittees

An overview of what the subcommittees have done until now:

- 1) Competency Framework/ Transition to Programmatic subcommittee: During a meeting with the Competency Framework Group in March the subcommittee will learn more about the competency framework and the learning goals
- 2) The Impact subcommittee asked MS whether he would like to reply to the email that the subcommittee sent him

- 3) The Diversity and Inclusion subcommittee has sent a questionnaire about diversity and inclusion to all RSM students. The survey focuses on diversity in the group formation process, as main question does the group formation (when students are assigned a group or when students can choose the group) influence the diversity of the group? In addition, the questionnaire contains open questions about experience of inclusion/ exclusion of students. When analysing the results, the subcommittee will research whether there is a difference between student groups and / or master programmes
- 4) The HOKA subcommittee: The onboarding process for students is one of the HOKA projects. In addition, during the HOKA Working Group meeting, the following new projects for 2022 were created: a) Implementing a game so that students will become positive change agents. According to the subcommittee, the game could be a part of the Future Career module thus it isn't enforced on every student, b) Creating a competency framework. This is about which competences RSM students have when they graduate, c) The MSc MM programme would like to have feedback from the HOKA Working Group on their new research platform and d) The course evaluation. The concern of the HOKA Working Group was that it isn't clear who the experts in the peer-review would be
- 5) The PAC SR collaboration subcommittee has almost completed the PAC and MSc PC manuals
- 6) There is no update on the Online Education Social interaction subcommittee

5. Discussion to switch from online to hybrid meetings

MS asked the committee members whether they would like to switch from online MSc PC meetings to offline or hybrid MSc PC meetings

Comments of the committee:

- 1) MS is in favour of hybrid meetings
- 2) FW has bad experiences with hybrid education
- 3) GH, GB: Meeting room T3-42 frequently has technology problems, so hybrid meetings are difficult
- 4) GH is in favour of online meetings, also because the attendance of members in online meetings is higher than in offline meetings
- 5) RG is in favour of online meetings because she doesn't know whether the quality of the meetings would be better offline
- 6) FM would like to give hybrid meetings a chance
- 7) AB prefers to keep the online meetings. However, she can be flexible

After the discussion, the committee decided to keep the MSc PC meetings online

6. Closing remarks

7. Action points

What	When	Who
SL will schedule a meeting with Linda de Vries about the selection process of the exchange programme	Before 26 April	Simon Lang
MS will reply to the email of the Impact Subcommittee	Before 26 April	Maciej Szymanowski

Next meetings:

26-Apr-22, 10.00h
 24-May-22, 10.00h
 28-Jun-22, 10.00h