improvement and adaptations thus in 2020 the standardised short Evasys Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) questionnaire and the In-class tool were designed and in 2021 a pilot (HOKA) project expert observation with peer and stakeholder reviews has started.

2) The new Evasys questionnaire a) Is standardised and condensed, and it is used to assess the quality of teaching. b) The validity has increased compared to the original questionnaire, c) The response rate and reliability are sufficient in the master programmes (approximately 30%), d) The non-response bias is always a problem with questionnaires because often only very dissatisfied and very satisfied students fill in the survey. In order to improve the response rate, faith and professionalisation of the respondents of the questionnaire RSM works with the CLI sponsored research. Thereby, informing respondents that something will be done with the evaluations.
3) The in-class tool is used for the course improvement. It a) Has course specific feedback questions, b) Isn't mandatory and c) Isn't meant for ratings or assessment of teaching.

Comments of the committee:

1) BES: Students are especially willing to fill in questionnaires if they have had a negative experience, for instance in an exam. Therefore, it's difficult to assess the quality of a course.
2) BES: If the exam and course evaluations will be done separately, it would be better to do the course evaluation before the exam.
3) BES: In order to increase the response rate. It would be better to incentivize the students to fill in the questionnaire, for example with a 0,1-bonus point.
4) SZ wonders what RSM is capturing with the student evaluations: quality of teaching or experience of the students. Student opinion is often not a reflection of the quality of the course because students don't have the expertise to judge this. It's more about the experience during the course.
5) GH: Students can't assess the quality content of a course. However, they can give their opinion about, for example the organisation, material and workload of the course and this information combined with the information from peer- and stakeholder observations gives a good overview about the quality content of a course.
6) SZ: Incentivizing students to fill in a questionnaire could lead to students not answering the survey sincerely, leading to unreliable results. However, filling in the questionnaire could become mandatory before the students receive their grades.
7) SZ: It would be better to do pre- and midterm course evaluations.
8) SZ: It would be better to innovate in tools to make it easy for students to participate in a questionnaire, for instance, a barcode on Canvas which can be scanned with a cell phone.
9) CS: University wide the course evaluations are very important because they are the main tool for steering teaching in different directions.
10) CS: It would be better if RSM knows which aspects it would like to capture. What would it like to teach, and which data should be collected?
11) MS: Course evaluations are a huge topic. Therefore, it would be better if it's clear on which dimensions of quality of teaching and course evaluations RSM will focus on.
12) MLP: To decrease the questionnaire response-bias, it would be better to work with a random sample and incentivize it with, for example monetary benefit.
13) GB wonders whether the thesis evaluations could be revised because the questions should be improved, and insufficient feedback is given.
14) MIP: The thesis evaluation questionnaire isn't applicable to every master programme because some programmes the thesis trajectory has a different timeframe.

4. Formation of subcommittees

During the meeting almost all MSc PC members decided who will be part of which subcommittee. However, this is probably not yet the final overview.

Overview of the subcommittees and topics they intend to work on

Topics	Members
HOKA	Han Pei Wu Michal Pilch Jorrit Alkema
Programmatic Practice Relevant Assessment subcommittee - Change of resit policy in assignment-based courses - Problems with group assignments during the course because there aren't sufficient study spots - Due to programmatic assessment education, teachers shouldn't be overwhelmed by the new way of assessing (broader across courses)	Morteza Pourakbar Rob Geurts Sam Oor Alla Molibog Philipp Cornelius
Thesis subcommittee - Alternative thesis projects - Investigate the progress of previous changes in the thesis project and how they were implemented	Yu Liu Malgorzata Iwanczuk – Prost Romee Servant Volquin Korcan Kavusan Emanuel Ubert
Course Evaluation subcommittee - Low response rate - Positive approach to course evaluation by teachers - Improve course evaluation design e.g. More aspects of a course should be measured	Claus Schmitt Solomon Zori Nico Eymael
Diversity subcommittee - Gender diversity at university - Besides the European/ American market, RSM should make more use of markets in other continents such as Africa, Asia and Latin America for case studies and companies	Pedro Barbosa Tinnemans
MSc BSc PC Collaboration subcommittee - To get more inside across the committees	
Sustainability School Mission subcommittee - What does the mission mean? - How is the mission visible at RSM?	
Onboarding Faculty subcommittee - Making the practice onboarding information more user-friendly for new staff members - Providing information on RSM culture to new teaching staff	Guido Berens
Open Education subcommittee - Improving collaboration between stakeholders (e.g., alumni, companies) and RSM for courses projects	Wim van Vliet Nico Eymael Baris Eren Sezer Stefan Vuksa

5. Closing remarks

6. Action points

Next meetings:

20-Dec-22, 10.00h
26-Jan-23, 10.00h
21-Feb-23, 10.00h
21-Mar-23, 10.00h
18-Apr-23, 10.00h
30-May-23, 10.00h
27-Jun-23, 10.00h