

MINUTES MSc PC – 27 MARCH 2018

Mandeville, T03-42, 13.00 – 15.00 hours

Present

MS: Maciej Szymanowski (chair, MM)
SB: Sigrid Batenburg-Mudde (PM, minutes)
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)
BT: Ben Tims (FI)
DD: Dirk Deichmann (MI)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)
FD: Felix Dressel (MM)
DA: Denise Althaus (HRM)
MSp: Marijke Speelberg (GBS)
GN: Gerald Nuha (FI)
ML: Marc Liebermeister (OCC)
CK: Chyntia Kong (SCM)

Absent

FW: Frank Wijen (SM)
MSh: Meir Shemla (HRM)
AC: Ata Choudhry (AFM)
DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)
LS: Lisa Schulze Egberding (SCM)
RE: Reinoud van Eerden (SM)
IB: Isabel Bienert (BIM)
SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)
AS: Ad Scheepers
BK: Bas Koene (OCC)
MK: Myles Kuhns (MI)
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE)
AR: Anatole Reboul (SE)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomed everybody present and especially CK who was present for the first time. MS will send email about attendance to those who were not present without notice.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC Meeting 27 February 2018

There were a few questions about the minutes. What was meant with:

- Best practice from Research Clinic teacher
 - a. TOP system? Careful as it should be more specific for department rather than school-wide

GH explained that this referred to the discussion. During the yearly evaluation meetings with the Academic Directors one of the Research Clinics got a very good rating and therefore it seems to be a good idea to have a best practice workshop given by this lecturer.

SB will make the necessary changes in the minutes. There were no further comments on the minutes and herewith the minutes were approved.

3. Monthly update on progress subcommittees

Thesis trajectory

Two interviews took place, one with Lucas Meijs and one with GH and Anna de Waard.

According to Lucas it would be nice to have separate learning outcomes for the thesis. Other issues are the number of cum laudes and the standard couples of coaches and co-readers.

GH explained that the high number of cum laudes is not a problem by definition, as our bar for acceptance in the master is already very high. FD mentioned that the number of cum laudes is high in MM. According to ML this can be explained by the fact that argumentation is important for MM and OCC. When you do AFM or FI there is a good or false.

More coordination between thesis coordinators would be feasible. Perhaps a MOOC can be made for teaching staff to support them.

Quality of education

1) measurements of teaching quality

The response rate for teaching evaluations is not high. It is not clear how the insights are used. A recommendation would be to make the evaluation mandatory and make it possible for the Examination Board to reach out to a student that gives inappropriate feedback. Another recommendation would be to shorten the survey so it will not take longer than three minutes to fill out. Timing of sending these evaluations is also important, although GH tells that a pilot has shown that there is no significant difference. GH does read all the evaluations and students can distinguish the quality of the course and the exam.

A suggestion would be that you receive your grade as soon as you filled in the evaluation. If not, you have to wait for (an extra) three weeks.

Most important thing in this is to increase the response rate.

2) Periodical ILO (intended learning outcomes) review

A recommendation would be to facilitate the system in which periodic reviews can take place. For example a round table with the lecturer, dean's office, alumni and industrial company and discuss what is missing in curriculum. How often is not yet defined. Perhaps it is an idea to link it to the accreditation cycle, although it should be a continuous process.

3) Teaching advice system

At the moment there is no system that facilitates continuous development on teachers. A recommendation would be to have a pedagogue working for RSM. This person would visit all courses and give constructive feedback so lecturers know how they can improve. This would not be meant to be a teaching quality assessment tool.

Peer review could also be helpful, but some people feel not comfortable with colleagues and therefore do not ask.

Of course there have to be thought about who will see the report of the pedagogue.

Communication

1) During the monthly meeting it would be nice to have an insight on top 5 things that are going on campus. GH explained that it is hard to get the relevant information and it is also hard to separate relevant from irrelevant. And do we really need to repeat everything?

2) Internal communication: how do we interact in meetings? How do we implement this? Perhaps UN style. Democratic approach is important, ask for opinions. And also timing of emails is important.

3) External; keep website up to date

4) How do we recruit new student members? How do we point out what we established, what we have been doing?

5) Add thank you to recommendation letter that is written by Dean.

New mission statement

How do people accept it?

The proposal would be to distribute teacher survey and add mission related questions to course evaluation survey and program evaluation survey. Teachers would report if and how they integrate school's mission in their course.

The outcomes of the surveys would be used to share information between teachers on how schools mission can be implemented in teaching.

MS and FD would like to be invited for the next Academic Directors meeting so they can talk about the idea of the survey. SB will send invitation to them.

Improvement of PAC

The various structures in PAC's are very different. It might be a good idea to streamline this. It would also be nice to have an organogram that makes all different bodies in which students can participate visible. Formation of the PAC is random. STAR study board is formed already before the start of the academic year, so there is no one in the board that did his/her bachelor at another university. It is suggested to discuss this with STAR and do a suggestion.

MS advised to have the recommendation for the April meeting. Your recommendation can be for the Dean or for the Programme Committee. Use a constructive way of bringing your recommendation and also indicate timing.

4. Action points and closing

MS thanked everybody for being present. GH wanted to express her appreciation about the work that is done so far on recommendations.

Next meetings:

26-04-2018, 14.00 hrs

22-05-2018, 13.00 hrs

21-06-2018, 10.00 hrs