Board of Studies MSc Programme Management of Technology
Annual report, course year 2016-2017

The Board of Studies (BS) is a formal board which has both staff and students involved in the MSc programme Management of Technology (MoT) as its members. The board advises the Director of Studies of the MoT programme and the Dean of the Faculty of TPM on subjects related to the quality, load and accessibility of the programme. (For a formal description of the tasks of the Board of Studies of a programme, see annex 1 below).

In this document the Board of Studies of MoT reports about the main subjects that were discussed during the course year 2016-2017. The report will be made available to the Director of Studies of the MoT programme, the Dean’s office, and to the Audit Committee. (More information about the annual report in annex 2 below).

During course year 2016-2017 the Board of Studies had four staff members and four student members. (The full list of members is given in annex 3 below). For two of the staff members (Hadi Asghari, Servaas Storm) it was their first year as member of the Board of Studies.

The educational advisor of the Department of Education and Study Affairs of the Faculty and the Commissioner Master & Career of the Students Association Curius are standardly invited to attend board meetings and were indeed present at all meetings. The Director of Studies of the MoT programme was present at the first and third Board meeting.

During the course year 2016-2017, the Board of Studies of MoT met three times, in November, February and June, and each meeting took about one-and-a-half hours. For each meeting minutes were made, which were available during the next meeting. The recommendations of the Board, plus its considerations, were shared directly with the Director of Studies when present. In other cases, the board’s opinion was communicated directly to the persons responsible for the subject at issue. Below the main subjects dealt with during course year 2016-2017 are summarized:

1. **The current curriculum of the MoT.**
   Students voiced as their concerns:
   - number of students whose mastery of English seems insufficient is much to high; this should not occur at all;
   - there are serious quality issues with the course on High-Tech Marketing and there is some dissatisfaction with the course on Financial Management;
   - through EVASYS some dissatisfaction with the course Technology Dynamics were noticed, esp. with respect to quality differences among and the connection between the separate parts of which the course consists, and also with some of the teaching in the Social and Scientific Values in MOT course;
   - students are not sufficiently informed about the options of doing an honours track or acquiring one of the annotations that the Faculty has on offer.

   With respect to the courses, the Board requested and received the programme director’s updates on how these problems would be tackled. It was generally satisfied that sufficient effort was put into solving them and that the proposed solutions would be effective. With respect to the Honours Track and the annotations, there appeared to be some difference of opinion between the Board and the programme director. The latter said he was not eager to have the options be advertised too openly, due to the risks of some students overreaching and then overrunning their programme schedules. The Board expressed as its opinion that these risk may be real but should be dealt with by other means than by hiding the options. It urged the programme director to facilitate these options more wholeheartedly.
2. **Thesis duration project**

The duration of the thesis project is a long-standing worry of the faculty and the programme directors of the three MSc programmes. According to the programme, work on the thesis should take 21 weeks, but on average MSc students take 36 weeks to finish their thesis. In the MoT programme, students take on average 32 weeks, so MoT does relatively well, but still 32 weeks exceeds the scheduled period by 50 percent.

During course year 2016-2017 O&S trainee Josephine Bergmans had as a special task to chart the reasons why students on average overrun their schedule by that much and to propose a new procedure for organizing and monitoring the thesis project so that overrunning will be significantly decreased.

In the first Board meeting, the project was presented and explained by Programme Director Robert Verburg and Josephine Bergmans. In the June Board meeting the final project report was discussed, in which Robert Verburg also participated. The board overall supported the approach taken.

3. **Arresting of the Teaching and Examination Regulation (TER) MSc Mot 2017-2018**

This year, only a limited number of changes in the TER/IR were up for review by the Boards of Studies, in anticipation of a major changes in the regulations for 2018-2019, scheduled for review in 2017-2018. The available time window for comments was small, and for that time window only the chair was available for the reviewing process. Provisional comments were communicated to the responsible Faculty employee (Lieneke Wardenaar). These comments were then discussed in the June meeting of the Board. The Board found the provisional comments adequate. In addition the Board agreed with proposed transition regulation for the High-Tech marketing course and also for the Preparation for the Master Thesis course, but pointed out a few remaining shortcomings in that regulation.

4. **Formal assessment of TPM’s degree programmes (December 2016)**

In December 2016 the assessment committee visited the faculty of TPM. On 13 December it had a discussion with representatives of the four TPM Boards of Studies. For MoT were present the chair, Maarten Franssen, and Tim Joosten as student member. Another student member of the Board, Pamela Núñez Araya, talked with the committee as a representative of the students in the programmes.

Participation in the audit did not lead to new insights apart from those already gained during the quality-assurance audit of April 2016. The final report of the audit committee, published at the end of the course year, assessed the programme as ‘good’ on two standards and as ‘satisfactory’ on two other standards. During the discussion of the report in its June meeting, the Board agreed with the programme director that was not very helpful in making clear how the programme could improve.

5. **Quality assurance**

As part of the implementation of a TUD-wide quality-assurance system, the faculty started the publication of an annual quality-assurance report. The Board discussed the first two reports, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, published simultaneously. The Board was dismayed by the lack of detailed quantitative knowledge concerning student numbers, and expressed as its opinion that this needed to be improved urgently. In the absence of accurate quantitative data, there is not much to e sort of detailed monitoring undertaken in the reports. Issues of accuracy also affect passing rates. here as well it is important to establish that universal registration procedures are adopted before undertaking this sort of detailed reporting. It was further pointed out that many problem originate.
6. **Stepping-up of contact among four Boards of Studies and with Board of Examiners and Education management Team**

   During the course year 2016-2017, steps were taken to increase the coordination of activities among the four Board of Studies of the faculty of TPM and with the Educational management Team. On 6 December the chairs of the Boards of Study met for the first time and discussed their approaches and in what way they could benefit from continued contact and exchange. An outcome of this was that on 26 January the four chairs met with Director of Education of the Faculty (Ernst ten Heuvelhof), where they urged for more clarity on how their advice and suggestions were taken up and also on ore access to those issues that were attended to at the level of the university as a whole, rather than the Faculty. On 27 March the four chairs met with Rolf Künneke and Robbert Kruiniger of the Board of Examiners. Further plans to continue and develop this were made obsolete, however, by the proposed merging of the three Boards for the MSc programmes (discussed in next paragraph).

7. **Intended reorganization of the Faculty’s Boards as result of Boards receiving legal right of approval**

   Shortly before the June meeting of the Board, the faculty, represented by its general secretary Martijn Blaauw and its head of O&S Jenny Brakels, met with the chairs of the four Boards of Study to discuss the Faculty’s intention to reduce the number of Boards to deal with the situation that from 1 September 2017 on, Boards of Study will have right of approval concerning changes in the content of degree programmes. In this meeting, the chairs expressed as their primary concern: (i) that reducing the four Boards to a single one would be too radical a reduction and that to maintain separate Boards for the BSc and MSc programmes would be minimally advisable, and (ii) that a single Board for the three MSc programmes could not be expected to continue to function as the main platform where student concerns would be discussed directly with programme staff and that measure would be necessary to safeguard the continuation of this function. The MoT Board of Studies, when informed about this development, did not express fundamental objections to the merging of three MSc Boards into a single one, and shared the worries concerning the potential loss of the more informal role of the old Boards. On the basis of this discussion, a letter was sent to the Faculty on behalf of the MoT Board in which both the Board’s understanding of the faculty’s position and the worries of the Board concerning the functioning of the new Board were expressed.

8. **Other points**

   - in February 2017, the Board received a request to comment on the Faculty’s draft response to a draft document presenting the university new vision on education. Due to time pressure, the chair (Maarten Franssen) sent a response on behalf of the MoT Board of Studies.
Annex 1: Formal tasks of the Board

The tasks of the Board of Studies are described in the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW, Article 9.18). These tasks are:
1. Advising on the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) of the programme.
2. Annual assessment of how the TER has been implemented.
3. Advising on all education-related subjects within the programme
(source: TU Delft Board of Studies Guide, April 2015)

Annex 2. Annual report

The Board of Studies draws up a short annual report describing last year’s recommendations and points for improvement. The report is made available to the Dean, the Director of Studies of the BSc or MSc programme, the Director of Education of the Faculty, and the Head of the Department of Education & Student Affairs. The programme makes the report available to the Audit Committee (source: TU Delft Educational Quality Plan).

Annex 3: List of members and attendees at meetings

Staff members: Maarten Franssen (chair), Geerten van de Kaa, Hadi Asghari, Servaas Storm.

Student members: Frank Ribbens (first-year student), Dusan Rajkov (first-year student), Pamela Núñez Araya (second-year student), Tim Joosten (second-year student).

Regular attendees: Wendela Louwerse-Houtzager (educational advisor from the department of Education and Study Affairs); Josephine Bergmans (trainee from the department of Education and Study Affairs); Mathijs Bijkerk (commissioner Master & Career of Curius).

Occasional attendee: Robert Verburg (Director of Studies of MoT);