

MINUTES MSc PC – 16 FEBRUARY 2017

Mandeville, T3-42, 14.00 – 16.00 hours

Present

GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)
SB: Sigrid Batenburg-Mudde (PM, minutes)
AS: Ad Scheepers
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (chair, MM)
BT: Ben Tims (FI)
DD: Dirk Deichmann (MI)
AT: Anna Tillmann (HRM)
JQ: Judith Quist (SCM) (left at 15.00 hrs)
KR: Karl-Ander Reismann (AFM)
JE: Juup Essers (OCC)
VB: Vivian Burcescu (GBS)
WS: Ward Seeger (MM)
GA: Gustaf Ågren (SM)
SK: Stephan Kramer (AFM)

FW: Frank Wijen (SM)
EG: Emilia Giniatulina (FI)
ML: Maxime Lejeune (BIM)
SBo: Sander Boeije (OCC)

Absent

SKA: Sophie Kamuf (AFM)
RK: Roelof Kuik (SCM)
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE)
CK: Cindy van Kerkhof (MI)
ANP: Anne Nederveen Pieterse (HRM)
DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

FW (faculty SM) introduces himself as representative for the Strategic Management programme.

GH (PM) announces that Monica Reulink will leave the MSc team. Her successor's name is Anna de Waard-Leung. Anna becomes the new Programme Manager of MSc Finance & Investments and MScBA Master in Management.

The draft on the 'Program Advisory Committee' that was sent earlier today has been discussed with MS (faculty MM) and AS (Policy Advisor). It has to be fine-tuned a bit more. This will be done in the coming month.

SB (PM) coordinates the student workshop that is organised by RISBO. For Thursday only five student members have registered. In case there are less than six registrations the workshop will be cancelled. JQ (student SCM) will ask her lecturer whether she can skip her lecture. She will inform SB (PM) as soon as possible.

Merger HRM and OCC: based on the discussion in the January meeting the proposal is back to the drawing board.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 13 December 2016

The overview provided by GH (PM) was not forwarded. SB (PM) will forward this after the meeting.

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

3. Discussing ideas for how to define education quality

MS (faculty MM) would like to define what the MSc PC members think is quality. GH (PM) suggests to take the 'Quality of business education according to AACSB' as starting point. There are four sections mentioned in the document that is handed out.

- A. Strategic Management and Innovation
- B. Participants – Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff
- C. Learning and Teaching
- D. Academic and Professional Engagement

The institution is evaluated according to these quality dimensions every five/six years by AACSB and NVAO. The next re-accreditation by both bodies is coming up in June 2018.

MS (faculty MM) thinks this document is a guideline to meet the standard and not to rise above.

KR (Student AFM) says that students select their master based on ranking. A ranking is not based on quality. Rankings are also important but we do not have much influence on them. Many of the big rankings consulted by students place a high proportion on the rank on alumni salary, which is a variable the school has little influence on, and which also doesn't reflect the quality of the education. .

FW (faculty SM) thinks an important thing is missing and that is the primary process. Do we have systematic checks on what is going on in the classroom? We should have peer reviews and class visits. We need a serious grip on the primary process. Students cannot judge if they learn what they are supposed to learn. According to AS this is a role that the accreditation bodies take on, as they examine the learning outcomes.

SK (faculty AFM) agrees with FW (faculty SM) that lecturers have to cater and entertain students more and more instead of teaching them what they should learn. The tenure criteria should be revised as well. GH (PM) says that the tenure track regulations don't fall under the PC's area of responsibility. If the PC thinks the tenure track regulations should be changed, it should bring this to the attention of the Faculty Council.

Everybody is talking about teaching the right things. Who decides what this is? This is decided all together, so Academic Directors, lecturers, alumni and professional networks. When we establish new programmes we do market research. Is this new programme relevant for the job market? Structural changes in programmes are also made under consideration of the opinion of the labour market.

MS (faculty MM) suggests to split the members of the Programme Committee into four subcommittees. The subcommittees will look into their section and describe what they miss. The first question is whether we can live with this document. Is that what is taught the right thing? The four subcommittees will make a list of questions which perhaps can already be answered by AS.

Those who were not present during this meeting and therefore are not in a subcommittee yet should pick a committee and contact the other subcommittee members.

Section	Participants
A	Maciej Szymanowski
B	Juup Essers, Ward Seeger, Anna Tilmann, Vivian Burcescu and Karl-Ander Reismann
C	Frank Wijen, Ad Scheepers, Sander Boeije, Emilia Giniatulina
D	Ben Tims, Dirk Deichmann, Stephan Kramer

GH (PM) thinks this is a very good exercise. All the feedback we can get on how to improve our quality is appreciated.

SK would like to discuss the teaching evaluations. Some of the evaluations were not send, some had a bug and he thinks it is not good that a student assistant is responsible for sending out the questionnaires. GH (PM) will have a look at this.

KR (student AFM) suggests that you get a pop up when you log-in on SIN-online. This pop up mentions that you did not fill in the evaluation yet. If we want this the evaluation can no longer be anonymous.

The mentality amongst a group of students is that they are the customers and if they are not catered in the way they think they should be catered, they have the right to say what they want. This has led to an increasing number of abusive remarks about teachers in the anonymous student evaluations. We have a [Code of Conduct](#) that everybody within RSM should honour. The student members say they don't know this Code of Conduct, but it has been communicated during the Master Kick-off and is also linked on the [Current Students website](#).

GA (student SM) suggests that you have to tick a box that states that you have read the code of conduct. When you keep this in mind your evaluation will be anonymous, and otherwise it will be no longer anonymous.

This is an issue that needs to be addressed under section B.

4. Update on discussion how to implement the new rights of the Programme Committee

The subcommittee is working on this item. The draft will probably be discussed in the next meeting.

5. Action points and closing

- SB will forward the promised document and also the links to the documents mentioned above.
- Every 'section' will summarize the problems that they encounter in three minutes. Solutions are not necessary yet.

EG (student FI) would like to put 'Internships' on the agenda. She is asked to send a short description of her issue to MS (faculty MM) and SB (PM).

There is no other business.

Next meetings:

14 March 2017

11 April 2017

18 May 2017

13 June 2017