

# Minutes MSc PC – 25 June 2019

Mandeville, T3-42, 13:00 – 15:00 hours

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)	TL: Tsi Kwan Lam (GBS)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	YS: Yasemin Sezer (MM)
AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)	JM: Juan Madiedo (MI)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	KP: Kurdrat Kaur Paramjit (SE)
DT: Dimitrios Tsekouras (BIM)	BK: Bas Koene (OCC)
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)	CK: Cynthia Kong (SCM)
SH: Sarah Horn (BIM)	GI: George-Stavros Isichos (SM)
RH: Rebecca Hewett (HRM)	AG: Anxhela Gore (OCC)
WH: Wim Hulsink (SE)	YN: Yannick Niesen (SCM)
VS: Verena Stuber (HRM)	SZ: Solomon Zori (AFM)
	FP: Francesco Perniciaro (AFM)
	EG: Egemen Genc (FI)
	AK: Alisa Knuutinen (MI)
<b>Guests</b>	LV: Lara in 't Veld (FI)
CD: Carla Dirks (Examination Board)	GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)

## 1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

MS mentions that the automatic reminders to the course coordinators have been implemented by programme management. The first reminder is about when the exams need to be published, the second is about when the hardcopy needs to be submitted and the last reminder is about when the final grades need to be posted. The reminders, however, only work for courses with written exams.

## 2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 21 May 2019 – see attachment

The minutes were approved.

## 3. Examination Regulations 2019-2020

CD explains the last changes that are made in the TER since the previous meeting.

1. Change in the complaint procedure. The part about student complaints by the SR has been removed from the TER because master students aren't represented by the SR. Students with complaints need to go to the Examination Board.
2. The pre-master programmes have been slightly changed because of the Boost-the-Bachelor (BtB) changes in the first year. The methodology course has been removed of the pre-master programme. AS adds that the pre-master has to change because it runs alongside the bachelor programme.
3. The most important changes for the PC are the changes in the FI-A and MIM programmes.

MS thinks that the highest result counts rule is not ideal, that the last grade should count, and in cases that students fail their resit they should get a 5.5. CD replies that the Examination Board considered it but they stayed with highest grade counts rule because it is about the knowledge of the students. In practice there are very few resits because students want to improve their grade. MS and AS agree to the proposal, but FW favours a different solution. MS suggests to re-discuss this topic with some statistics during in January or February of the following year.

WH brings up the topic of thesis resits. Some students only submit 1 page of the thesis at the June deadline and the rest in August, at the resit deadline. CD replies that if the students passed the proposal they have the

right to a resit. RH comments that these cases are often related to personal circumstances and then there can be an agreement made between the coach and the student.

MS concludes that the PC will do an online voting about the TER.

#### 4. Draft proposals from the subcommittees

MS didn't receive anything from the subcommittees. The output of this academic year is:

1. A proposal on how to spend the HOKA funds,
2. A student report for the EQUIS accreditation,
3. A presentation about the Honours Academy,
4. An overview of the thesis procedure,
5. The sub-committee on teaching quality talked about the issue and the proposal of the funding subcommittee supports it.
6. The sub-committee on student recruitment for participation in the PC and/ or PAC has not produced a document, but VS explains their intention. The students had to complete a survey about how they organised PAC recruitment. Furthermore, a folder was created with suggestions how the information about the PC can be shared in a course so that the students know about the PC faster and that every programme works similar. MS notes that is hard to standardize the procedure and wonders if this is necessary. VS replies to avoid confusion with the PAC.

MS wonders how the PC members can create more impact with as little effort as possible. WH suggests to define themes and establish committees like accreditation and thesis where new members can be added. MS believes deadlines could help. DT suggests that the subcommittees should present their outcomes in one of the meetings. MS agrees, because then the information is also easier to share with the Dean. The presentation can be sent with recommendations. AS indicates that they can use the annual report and send the report to the Dean. WH asks if the PC can invite the Dean to discuss emerging and current issues. RH comments that the PC needs to come up with its priorities earlier so that if the Dean comes the PC can show what it wants to focus on and provide structure at the end of the year. MS points out time constraints of the Dean and suggests to include a summary, questions and recommendations in the annual report. That also makes it easier for the next PC to see what the previous PC has produced and to get direction for the next year. FW agrees because there is a lack of continuity. It would be an idea if the PC members receive the annual report (prior) for the first meeting. MS mentions that AL was asked to produce a starting point with all the issues in it and then spread the document so that everyone can give suggestions. AS adds there can be different sections in the report like reactions to requests from the Dean, but also specific recommendations/ initiatives to be made to the Dean. MS indicates that maybe the meetings need another layout to get a better impact with the results of the PC. The PC agrees that the new layout for the meetings is as follows. The meetings will be held on a Tuesday or a Thursday between 12.00-14.00 hrs and during the meetings there will be breakaways from the subcommittees so that they can work together on their topics. If members can't come to the meeting they can send their comments for the subcommittees by e-mail.

FW wonders what happened to the advice of boosting the teaching quality. MS replies that the letter has been sent to the Dean but MS didn't receive any feedback yet. The PC can schedule a meeting with AS about it in October so they know the facts. In November the Dean will be invited and discuss the priorities for the new academic year and he can respond to the proposals of the previous academic year.

#### Honours Academy overview presentation

WH reports that the Honours Academy subcommittee has looked into the honours programmes at the master level how they are hosted, organised and coordinated by the different departments.

1. The Master honours programmes don't have a duty of responsibility to the Examination Board and the PC. This is in contrast to the honours programmes in the bachelor. They have a special Dean for the Honours Academy and 2 kinds of honours programmes: university-wide and at a department level.
2. Positive aspects are a) Very committed teachers, coordinators and students, b) Interest from companies

to collaborate with the honours programmes and departments c) The programmes are financed via the teaching allowance to the departments; the SCM honours programme also receives some company contributions. d) Most of the programmes have the same output requirement: pass /fail. Two programmes issue grades.

3. Negative aspects are: a) Not every master has an honours programme. The bigger ones have the smaller ones not. The reasons vary: Small groups, no staff, no priority b) Not all the teachers and coordinator are supported by the departments c) All instructor levels are represented in the honours programme but it is almost run by junior (assistant) professors d) The motivation for coordinators to organise honours programmes varies from scheduling fun events for the happy few, challenges or curricular activities not offered in the regular programme e) There are no regular meetings involving the different coordinators and there is a demand on wanting to know what the other programmes are doing. f) More standardization needed concerning selection, class size, content (there is no link to a research master), workload (varies from 6-10 EC and there is no justification on paper) and the certificates.

4. What do students want? There is no input or evaluation from them.

GB asks whether there is no evaluation. WH replies that there is an evaluation but only by the teachers themselves. MS mentions that in his opinion the system looks good. All honours programmes apply similar selection criteria and use a motivation letter for the admission. WH notes that every department must use the 10% rule for the admission criteria because it is a nationwide criteria for the honours programme.

## 5. Closing remarks

The chair thanked all members of the committee for their efforts over the past academic year.

## 6. Action points

AL: Prepare draft annual report by mid-August and share with MS.

## Next Meeting:

26 September 2019