

Minutes MSc PC – 22 October 2019

Mandeville, T3-42, 12:00 – 14:00 hours

Present	Absent
GB: Guido Berens (Chair, GBS)	MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)
AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)	BK: Bas Koene (OCC)
EV: Elisa Vandesteene (BIM)	WH: Wim Hulsink (SE)
AD: Annelore Doeze (SE)	JF: Jan-Philipp Fuhrmann (FI)
FM: Florian Madertoner (FI)	JME: Julija Mell (HRM)
NG: Niccolò Ghiggia (HRM)	GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)
TM: Tom van Mierlo (GBS)	EC: Elena Corsiglia (MM)
AG: André van Gorp (MI)	CK: Cynthia Kong (SCM)
JM: Juan Madiedo (MI)	SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)
MC: Marcell Csomor (OCC)	AST: Adam Stożek (AFM)
FW: Frank Wijen (SM) arrived at 13,00 hrs	
HF: Heleen Francoys (SM)	
MA: Munther Alahmad (SCM)	
	Guests
	MD: Mathijs van Dijk (Academic Director of the MSc FI)
	WM: Wilfred Mijnhardt (Policy Director of RSM)
	AWL: Anna de Waard –Leung (Programme Manager of the PQI-Hoka Project)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 26 September 2019 – see attachment

The minutes were approved.

3. MSc FI Redesign 2020-2021 – Mathijs van Dijk

MD explains the changes in the MSc FI programme.

1) The programme will include an introduction week with social activities and kick-off sessions by teachers and companies. MA notes that if the introduction week is held in the first week of the academic year, students will have problems with their deadlines. Maybe FI can consider to do the introduction week in the week before the start of the academic year.

2) Redesigned core courses. In block 1 and 2 there will be an academic course paired with an applied course where students can practice their software skills. MS is concerned that pairing theory- and practice-oriented courses may be unpopular with the students, therefore a careful coupling is important. MD replies that the courses are not only practical or theoretical, but the instructors will monitor it. FM adds that the combination of the courses isn't a danger if the teacher adds value to the course.

3) Thesis trajectory. The research methods course will be swapped with one of the core courses so that students can start writing their thesis earlier. MS asks why the students can't choose their thesis topics earlier than January. MD is concerned that students will miss too much information if they choose their thesis topics too early. However FI tries to bring the moment of choice to December.

4) Allowing an internship as a replacement of one of the electives. EV asks if they thought about a research company project so that the students can combine an internship with the thesis. According to MD FI doesn't have the possibility. GB is concerned that an internship will hamper the thesis process. MD replies, therefore is firstly the internship in block 5, secondly there should be a very good communication system about this issue and thirdly the deadline of the internship report is in August. TM wonders how much content is left in the master if students do an internship and a thesis in the same year. MD notes that the sacrifice is going to be 1 elective. AD asks if there are guidelines for the internship and MD confirms. AD wonders if there is a cap on the internship because it will change the composition of the elective classes. MD indicates that it is unknown because they can't estimate how popular the internship will be. HF wonders if there is a possibility to write the thesis before the internship. MD replies yes but it is a challenging option. JM asks why the internship can't be held in block 3 or 4. MD explains that they don't want to give up more electives.

5) The honours programme has started this year and there will be a different application procedure next year. The 50 seats will be given to students based on their average grades of the 2 core courses and a motivation letter.

The main goals of the changes are

1) To update the learning objectives and connect them to the RSM mission statement. TM asks how FI wants to integrate the RSM mission in their programme. MD replies that all the core courses incorporate an element of the RSM statement in their programme, for example a stakeholder's game of a mining company in Alaska where students do a roleplay with different viewpoints to see what happens in practice.

2) To introduce more practical applications into the programme.

3) Improve the thesis trajectory.

4) Boost "cohort feel" among students. FI wants to boost that cohort feel by an introduction week and small-scale classes with the same composition.

During the voting process everyone agreed with the implementation of the changes in the MScFI. MS will write a letter of consent.

4. Information about spending the HOKA Funds –Wilfred Mijnhardt-Anna de Waard –Leung

WM mentions that the Programme Quality Innovation programme (PQI) is a result of the previous AACSB and NVO accreditation that happened in 2018. The goal of this programme is to improve quality and education. Secondly he clarifies that between 2019-2024, RSM will receive 2 million euros each year from the Dutch government for the improvement of education. This money comes from the old Basisbeurs and is now called HOKA (Hoger Onderwijs Kwaliteits Agenda – Higher Education Quality Agenda). At RSM 70% of the money is allocated to the bachelor and 30% to the master programmes. This division is based on the higher percentage of Dutch students in the bachelor programmes.

5. Formation of HOKA subcommittee.

WM explains that for the implementation of the PQI –HOKA programme, the government has defined themes that will be used. In addition the HOKA project group has defined projects that fits in the themes. In order to implement the PQI –HOKA programme very well, the HOKA project group wants to form a workgroup with representatives of the different committees to exchange information between the PC's and the HOKA project group.

The representatives of the MSc PC are Guido Berens, Florian Madertoner, Heleen Francoys and Niccolò Ghiggia.

6. Proposal for changes in the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) –Ad Scheepers

AS explains that RSM wanted to improve course evaluations because there are problems with the current questionnaire, such as, too many items, it is unclear what the questionnaire measured and the questionnaires are not comparable between courses. Therefore, the Taskforce has developed a new short questionnaire which is more standardised and has fewer questions.

AS responds to questions of the PC from the previous meeting

- Why is the perceived learning goal missing in the short questionnaire? AS: this topic is not usually used in

the student evaluations. Moreover this information has already been tested during the exams.

- Are there any differences between the answers given in the questionnaires before or after the written exams? AS: there are no differences but the best timing to do the questionnaire is after the exams and before the grading.
- Can RSM forfeit the anonymity of students in case of abusive language? AS: that is only possible in special cases.

JM wonders if the shortened questionnaire provides the same information as the current questionnaire. AS assumes that both of the questionnaires measure the same information. AG remarks that the question about the teacher can be interpreted in different ways. AS replies that the management wants to know the general information about a course. MA mentions that the survey question about the teacher is difficult to answer because students have more teachers in one course. Is there a possibility to add an option where students can indicate about which teacher it is? AS is going to consider this. TM wonders why the 5% significant level is used for the research instead of the 10 or 15%. AS replies that 5% is a common and reliable measure. EV adds that it is very difficult to increase the response rates because the answers of the students are positive or negative and usually not in between. The most valuable feedback comes from the open questions. Therefore the significant level is less important. FM thinks that the assessment representative for the course content is a difficult question. If a teacher gives more time on the difficult content in a course and tests this in exam, then the students will comment that it isn't representative with the syllabus. However if the teacher makes an exam on the syllabus then students will say the exam isn't representative because they spend more time on the difficult topics in class. AS indicates that if the exams fits in the learning goals from the course manual then it is representative. MS mentions that new questionnaire must be evaluated by the PC next year.

AS asks the PC to vote on the proposal to implement the shorter version of the questionnaire instead of the current questionnaire. 1 member voted against, another one abstained and 12 members voted in favour of the proposal.

7. Closing remarks

None.

8. Action points

What	When	Who
Form PACs	By October 2019	Each student rep for their programme
Scouting for focal issues to build sub-committees	By November 2019	All MSc PC members
Decision on SET surveys	PC Meeting October 2019	MSc PC plenary

Next Meetings:

19-Nov-19, 12.00h

19-Dec-19, 12.00h

23-Jan-20, 12.00h

20-Feb-20, 12.00h

24-Mar-20, 12.00h

23-Apr-20, 12.00h

26-May-20, 12:00h

25-Jun-20, 12:00h