MSM MBA & MM Academic Course Coordination

Version June 2023

Contents

1. Introduction

To ensure the consistency and quality of the academic content and rigor of all courses within the MSM-MBA and MSM-MM programme, regardless of the variant of delivery, MSM applies a quality assurance process on course level.

For each course an Academic Course Coordinator (ACC), is appointed. Per expertise track one Academic Coordinator Expertise Track is appointed who acts as the ACC for all courses within the expertise track.

Each ACC must be appointed as examiner by the Board of Examiners of the School of Business and Economics (SBE) of Maastricht University (UM).

The ACC is fully responsible for the complete quality assurance cycle of the course(s) for which he/she is appointed, including the development of the content and examination component(s), assessment of students, and continuous improvement of the specific course.

2. Peer review

Peer review is an important aspect within academic quality enhancement. In the Netherlands a four-eye-principle is required by the Dutch Higher Education Law for all parts of a course including content of the course, setting and grading examinations.

In order to secure peer review, the ACC has regular contact with his/her colleagues within the respective field to stimulate discussions and receive feedback on the course.

Additionally, the ACC is responsible for carrying out a pre- and post-course peer reviews when the course is taught by other lecturers.

3. Process

The process for academic course coordination within MSM consists of four steps:

1. Course development/adjustment
2. Pre-course peer review
3. Post-course peer review
4. Evaluation

3.1 Course development/adjustment

Before the new academic year starts, the ACC reviews the syllabus, in terms of learning objectives, content, literature, examinations, assessment rubrics etc., meets with his/her peer-colleagues for discussion and feedback, and adjusts the course template in the LMS accordingly. This template will be used by all faculty throughout the year teaching that specific subject. During this phase, comments and suggestions from the evaluations of the previous year will be taken into account.

In case of required updates of learning objectives, the Academic Coordinator of the MBA / MM programme will be involved in the discussion to ensure that learning objectives are in line with the general learning goals of the programme.

3.2   Pre-course peer review

- *The MSM pre-course peer review applies to all courses (except OMBA) that are NOT taught by the ACC him-/herself.*
- *Peer review for courses taught by the ACC is taken care of by the assessment committee of SBE in a separate process.*

Meeting between ACC and lecturer (approx. 8 weeks before the course)

After the course is created in Moodle and the lecturer is informed about the next steps, the ACC will receive the link to the course, the contact details of the lecturer, and a pre-course peer review form from the Education Officer (EO).

It is the responsibility of the ACC to plan a meeting with the lecturer as soon as possible.

During this meeting the following points should be discussed/agreed upon:

1. General course content: Lecturer should follow the syllabus template for his/her course.
2. Learning goals: Should not be changed but stay as they are listed in the syllabus template.
3. Literature/material: Core literature should stay the same, additional literature/cases can be added. Important not to overload the participants.
4. Examination components:
   a. In case of a final individual assignment, preferable the assignment and assessment rubric from the syllabus template should be used. But if the lecturer has plausible reasons to change it, the ACC might accept this. Please indicate changes in the pre-course peer review form so the education officer knows that the rubric(s) need to be changed in Moodle.
   b. In case of a final exam (especially at MSMKW) the lecturer needs to provide the full exam and model answers to the ACC before the course can be approved. The exam questions must be connected to the Dublin Descriptors. If an exam has been taken in a previous intake as well, it should be proven that it is a new exam.
   c. Other assignment(s) can be changed but grading always should be done based on a rubric or model answers. Please indicate changes in the pre-course peer review form.
5. Grading: The ACC should explain the Dutch standards for grading. The average of the grades must not be too high (average around 7), and grades should clearly discriminate the level of students. For assignments individual feedback should be given to each student, either per criterion within the assessment rubric, or in general for the complete assignment.

Course review (approx. 4 weeks before the course)

After the meeting with the lecturer and after receiving the final syllabus (and in case of an exam the exam questions and model answers), the ACC makes the final review. If the review is positive, the ACC completes the pre-course peer review form and sends it to the EO and Johanna.

In case the lecturer is not reacting, not cooperative or there are disagreements that cannot be solved, the ACC should contact Amy Wang and Stuart Dixon who will follow up with the lecturer and/or partner.

3.3 Post-course peer review (after grading is done by the lecturer)

- *The MSM post-course peer review applies to all courses taught by lecturers who are NOT appointed as examiners.*
- *Peer review for grading done by examiners is taken care of by the assessment committee of SBE in a separate process.*

The ACC receives the link to the grades in Moodle from the EO and is asked to review the grades. For all examination components (also group assignments) a sampling should be taken and checked for the points described above under "3.2: 5. Grading".

If the grading is not done according to MSM standard, the ACC should contact the lecturer and ask to regrade the examination component(s). In this case the lecturer should be clearly instructed (again) how to carry out a proper grading. It is also the right of the ACC to regrade him/her-self.

Once the ACC is satisfied with the grades, (s)he should complete the post-course peer review form and return it to the EO and Johanna.

In case of disagreements, the ACC should contact Amy Wang and Stuart Dixon who will follow up with the lecturer and/or partner.

3.4 Evaluation

Course evaluations and the experience gathered during the pre- and post-course reviews, the ACC should take into account when contacting the respective lecturer for future assignments.

In case of a negative evaluation of a lecturer or problems occurring during the process, the ACC should inform the Director of Academics and the Director Education. In case of severe issues with a lecturer, it might be decided that the lecturer will not teach in the future anymore.

Feedback from peer faculty regarding course content, literature, examinations, etc. will be taken into account for improvement/adjustment of the course for the next academic year as part of the quality assurance cycle.