

Annual Report

Programme Committee Economics & Business Economics
Academic year 2024-2025

Dear reader,

This is the annual report of the Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics. This annual report describes, and provides details, of the membership, working methods and activities of the Programme Committee in the 2024-2025 academic year.

The Programme Committee advises the Erasmus School of Economics' Programme Management on issues concerning the education in the following programmes:

- Bachelor Economics and Business Economics (both the Dutch track (Economie & Bedrijfseconomie) and the English track (International Bachelor in Economics and Business Economics))
- Master programme Economics and Business

In 2024-2025, approval from the Programme Committee was requested on the:

- Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026
- Service Level Agreement 2025-2026
- Proposal for Savings on tutorial education

The Programme Committee was asked for feedback on the:

- Quality and Innovation Education Agenda ESE 2025-2028
- Request for termination of the Fiscale Economie programme
- Project Proposal strengthening participatory bodies
- Rules of Procedure Programme Committees
- Thesis Management System

The minutes of all meetings that were held in 2024-2025, as well the approval and advice letters are attached as appendices to this report.

October 2025

Prof. dr. Michael Erkens, chair
Suzanne Leentvaar MA, secretary ESE participatory bodies

Table of contents

Foreword	i
1. Structure of the Programme Committee.....	3
1.1 Teacher echelon and student echelon	3
1.2 Recruitment of commissioners	3
1.3 Way of working	3
2. Tasks, communication and reporting.....	4
2.1 Tasks and activities.....	4
2.2 Communication and reporting.....	4
3. Overview of activities	4
3.1 Activities within the legal framework (WHW)	4
3.1.1 Teaching and Exam Regulations (TER).....	4
3.2 Activities on new (parts of) educational programmes	5
3.2.1 Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028.....	5
3.2.2 Service Level Agreement	5
3.2.3 Thesis Management System	5
3.2.4 Proposal Savings on tutorial education	6
3.2.5 Numerus-fixus for IBEB	6
3.3 Other activities	6
3.3.1 Code of conduct students	6
3.3.2 Rules of Procedure Programme Committees.....	7
3.3.3 Project Strengthening the participatory bodies	8
4. Points of interest for the next academic year	8
4.1 Professional development of the programme committees.....	8

Appendices

- Minutes Meetings Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics
- Feedback on Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2024-2028
- Approval/advice on Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026
- Advice on Service Level Agreement 2025-2026
- Advice on Proposal Savings tutorial education
- Approval on Proposal Savings tutorial education

1. Structure of the Programme Committee

1.1 Teacher echelon and student echelon

The Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics consists of ten members: five staff members and five students. In 2024-2025, the members are:

Faculty:	Students:
Prof. Dr. Michael Erkens (chair)	Artyom Kanshin (vice-chair)
Dr. Michiel Gerritse	Erroll van Dijk
Dr. Daniel Urban	Daniël Spierings
Dr. Carlos Riumallo Herl	Lili Kovacs
Dr. Dana Sisak	Evelina Kaushik

The Programme Committee is supported by Suzanne Leentvaar, secretary for the ESE participatory bodies.

1.2 Recruitment of commissioners

To recruit new student members for the academic year, an advertisement is placed on Sin-online, on Canvas, and in the student newsletters. The current student members are requested to recruit and select new student members. They inform the chair and secretary about their selection such that the members can be officially presented to the programme director and the Dean. After approval by the School Council, the new members are appointed by the Dean.

An important task of the Programme Committee is to organize the process of the student representatives. Student Representatives gather feedback from students during the course and discuss this half-way with the course coordinator; suggestions for improvement can be implemented during the course. The recruitment of the student representatives is coordinated amongst student members. Advertisements are placed on Sin-online, on Canvas, and in the student newsletters. The student representatives were offered a training, which was attended by 10 students.

1.3 Way of working

The members of the Programme Committee meet at least six times per academic year. Depending on the documents that need to be reviewed, it is possible to schedule additional meetings. The general meetings are scheduled in the middle of each educational block. Tentative dates are scheduled for the whole academic year. Documents for the members are distributed via MS Teams.

During the academic year 2024-2025 the Programme Committee convened six times:

- Meeting 1 – 10 October 2024
- Meeting 2 – 21 November 2024
- Meeting 3 – 6 February 2025
- Meeting 4 – 3 April 2025
- Meeting 5 – 19 May 2025
- Meeting 6 – 30 June 2025

In most cases, the meetings were attended by one of the senior policy officers, representing Programme Management. In 2024-2025, programme director Josse Delfgaauw was invited to join the meeting of 3 April 2025.

As of this year, the students are asked to appoint a vice-chair from their midst. The vice-chair will be the first contact when it comes to student members and is requested to take over the tasks of the chair when the chair is absent.

Furthermore, members of the Programme Committee were invited to the joint meetings that are organized five times a year, at the start of each educational block, to discuss questions and remarks on the education at ESE that concern the whole school. Ideally, one staff member and one student member are present at these meetings.

2. Tasks, communication and reporting

2.1 Tasks and activities

The main task of the Programme Committee is to advise the board on all matters regarding (quality of) education. Annually, the Programme Committee is requested to review and approve of the bachelor and master TER. Other topics that were discussed this year were:

- Code of conduct students
- Numerus-fixus for IBEB
- Crafting the international classroom
- Ranking of the programme in the Keuzegids

Last year, a focal point for the Programme Committees was the Bachelor curriculum redesign. In December 2024 Programme Management decided to put his project on hold until further notice.

2.2. Communication and reporting

In line with School Regulations, the programme committee submits their advice and proposals to the School Council for information. For every meeting minutes are made, that are distributed among members. The minutes are included in this Annual report.

3. Overview of activities

3.1 Activities within the legal framework (WHW)

3.1. Teaching and Examination Regulations

Except for the implementation of the numerus-fixus for IBEB as of September 2025, no major changes were made to the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) for the academic year 2025-2026. Comments of the Programme Committee on the TER:

- concerns were raised about the reliability of the current grading process in Osiris;
- it is requested to revise Article 4.2 to more explicitly reflect its purpose;
- clarification is requested regarding the timeline for confirming whether a numerus-fixus will be applied;
- the Programme Committee questioned the rationale for having different ILOs under the same CROHO code;
- the Programme Committee requested an update on the pilot concerning the integration of a specific internship with the thesis.

The Programme Committee approved of the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026 for the articles for which they have right of consent and advised positively on the articles on which the Programme Committee has right of advice.

3.2 Activities on new (parts of) educational programmes

3.2.1 Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028

The Programme Committee was informed that HOKA funding is going to be structural as of 2025 and will be renamed to BAO (Bestuursakkoord Onderwijskwaliteit); funds remain available and a planning for the budget was proposed in the Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2025-2028. Comments of the members were regarding:

- the structure of the plans, as the learning and innovation theme seems an umbrella of other themes;
- one-on-one coaching for students: three individual coaching sessions for students seem a lot and it is offered next to study advice and thesis coaching; furthermore, it is expected to be quite expensive.

3.2.2 Service Level Agreement

The Programme Committee advised positively on the Service Level agreement 2025-2026. Although students are pleased that a logbook is no longer necessary, the Programme Committee wondered about the expected content of the initial discussion between student and supervisor regarding the use of AI tools. Furthermore, the members commented on the composition of course grades, which is kept at 30% rather than 40%.

3.2.3 Thesis Management System

As of this academic year, TMS was introduced as the system for handling theses, to replace the thesis workflow in SIN-Online. Programme Management is planning to further develop TMS, as improvements are possible. The staff members of the Programme Committee provided Programme management with the following feedback:

- maintaining oversight is challenging;
- the interface is not intuitive (the use of the "play" button is unclear) and could be improved;
- communication disappears after thesis submission;
- no deadlines are visible in the system;
- lecturers could only attach one file when contacting all students;

- it is suggested to include a brief explanation of the supervisor and second assessor roles in the students' manual;
- it is recommended to include a question about the experience with TMS in the questionnaire for students upon submission of their thesis.

3.2.4 Proposal on savings on tutorial education

Because of governmental decisions, universities are facing budget cuts. ESE raised a taskforce to explore possibilities to gain funds, but also to see where savings can be made. One of the proposals is for savings on tutorial education. The proposal, consisting of five options, was presented to the Programme Committee for approval. Comments of the Programme Committee were:

- reducing tutorials is not favored due to high dropout rates, especially in the first two blocks. Reducing TAs for the most difficult courses is seen as counterproductive. It is suggested to offer alternatives to lecturers if tutorials are reduced.
- Integrating academic skills: student members suggest removing career skills and enhancing academic skills to improve student engagement.
- PhDs teaching tutorials: concerns are with increased workload and higher costs.

The Programme Committee approved of the proposal to initiate discussions and further explore the different measures as presented in the proposal, but withheld her approval on the use of PhDs as TA's, pending further discussion.

3.2.5 Numerus-fixus for IBEB

A large concern that was raised this year were the consequences of the proposed Wet Internationalisering in Balans. This proposal, initiated by the new government, could have resulted in the discontinuation of IBEB. Due to further governmental changes, a numerus-fixus for IBEB became a possibility that Programme Management would like to explore, as a way to ensure keeping the English track of the programme.

The members of the Programme Committee shared the following remarks on the proposal:

- both the amount of 700 students as well as the bandwidth is quite high; a concern would be that there could be too many students enrolling;
- the conversion rate/students that enroll is quite low (50%) compared to other programmes;
- be aware that a numerus-fixus could also have the effect that students are not able to shift anymore after the 1st of February.

3.3 Other activities

3.3.1 Code of conduct students

As several incidents have happened involving students - for example students threatening teachers, or improper communication in using mentimeter, but also between students themselves – a work group was formed to investigate this some more. The work group started by gathering information on the status of the code of conduct and collect information on what actions are already taken.

First findings were:

- the code of conduct can be found on the EUR website and is quite comprehensive; there is a definition of inappropriate behavior and who to contact.
- many staff are unaware of this code of conduct and/or do not know what it entails.
- the student evaluations seem to be an outlet for aggressiveness.
- a lot of staff members encounter one or two incidents per year.
- staff members deal with it differently; many dismiss it, as no one seems to know what the appropriate channels are.
- incidents happen between students in group assignments as well. Students report it to the coordinator but do not know what to do next.
- some TAs, mainly women, experience less authority when the class consists of mostly male students.

Further investigation brought to light that evaluations among both staff and students regarding wellbeing are held on a regular basis. The results of the student well-being survey were shared with the Programme Committee for informational purposes.

- while lecturers are not expected to resolve student issues directly, it is essential that they are aware of students' needs and can refer them to the appropriate support.
- group assignments: the survey proposed assigning students to groups to reduce racial and gender-based discrimination. The committee noted that group work encompasses more than cultural and gender factors. While random group assignment may benefit first-year students, it is not seen as appropriate in later academic years.
- sharing anecdotes: while not mandatory, sharing personal stories could enhance student wellbeing if the lecturer is comfortable doing so.
- student-lecturer activities: It is preferred to maintain professionalism, which means not meeting students outside formal academic activities.
- discrimination toward international students: although this is not a central theme in the report, it relates to students' sense of belonging, which could be a focus area for further investigation next year, if data is available.
- survey follow-up: the PC is interested in how the survey findings are followed up.

The Programme Committee decided not to pursue further investigation on the topic. Despite efforts to gather information and engage with stakeholders, the committee is of the opinion that other parties may be better equipped to conduct further investigations.

3.3.2 Rules of Procedure Programme Committees

According to Dutch Educational law, Programme Committees need to have their own Rules of Procedure. In this document, the way of working of the committees is explained. The Programme Committees were presented a draft of the Rules of Procedure for feedback. The remarks and comments of the Programme Committee will be taken up in the final draft.

3.3.3 Project Strengthening the participatory bodies

In March 2025, the participatory bodies of EUR were informed that EUR budget will be made available for the strengthening of the participatory bodies. A proposal was drafted up by programme management consisting of the input from the Programme Committees as well as the School Council. From the Programme Committee, a request was made to provide for a substantial database and archive.

4. Points of interest for the next academic year

Looking forward to the academic year 2025-2026, the Programme Committee will continue its recurring annual tasks, but will also look at:

- The futureproof bachelor curricula
- Quality of education in the light of budget cuts
- Students' sense of belonging

4.1 Professional development of the Programme Committees

This year, the members of the Programme Committee were offered a basic training on the tasks of participation in general and more specifically the activities of the Programme Committee. Two student members followed the training.

Next year, a similar training will be organized via EUR Central as part of a project in which the EUR aims to strengthen the participation and encourage collaboration between participatory bodies EUR wide. As well as last year, an introduction day will be organized for the (new) members, where they will be able to meet the other members of the Programme Committees as well as the members of the School Council. New members will be provided with some general and background information on the activities and tasks of the Programme Committees.

Other steps that will be taken towards the professionalization of the Programme Committees for academic year 2025-2026 are:

- Finalize and approve of the Rules of Procedure of the Programme Committees.
- Enhance collaboration between participatory bodies across ESE and EUR-wide.

Appendices

- Minutes Meetings Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics
- Feedback on Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2024-2028
- Approval/advice on Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026
- Advice on Service Level Agreement 2025-2026
- Advice on Proposal Savings tutorial education
- Approval on Proposal Savings tutorial education

Minutes Meeting 1. 2024-2025, Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Date: 10 October 2024, 09.00-11.00 hrs

Room: Theil CT-2

Present:

Staff members: Michael Erkens (ME, chair), Dana Sisak (DS), Carlos Riumallo Herl (CRH), Daniel Urban (DU)

Student members: Lili Kovacs (LK), Artyom Kanshin (AK, online), Erroll van Dijk (ED, online), Evelina Kaushik (EK, online), Daniel Spierings (DSp)

Other participants: Iris Versluis (IV, Policy officer education), Suzanne Leentvaar, SL, Secretary, minutes).

Absent: Michiel Gerritse

ESE = Erasmus School of Economics

SC = School Council

PM = Programme Management

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

ME opened the meeting; the agenda was approved. All members shortly introduced themselves. It is preferred that members join the meetings on campus as it facilitates the discussion. If this is not possible, members are requested to inform the secretary as soon as possible.

- a vice-chair will be appointed from the student body who will coordinate the student affairs and will chair the meeting if ME is absent. The vice-chair will also be the first contact when it comes to student members. The students are asked to let the other members know by Monday who the vice-chair will be. To facilitate communication, a Whatsapp group will be formed with the students and ME.
- A task of the student members is to recruit the student representatives (SRs). The SRs represent their student cohort and are the contact between students and teachers. As there are more seats that applications for the Dutch track, all applicants will be asked as SR. For the other tracks, SRs still need to be appointed. The student members are asked to have a list of SRs ready by Monday so they can get started.
- An introduction day is organized for (new) members of the PC's. The day starts with a training session for the (new) members of the PC's and after that, a meeting is scheduled with the other members of the participatory bodies of ESE.
- SL made a schedule for the PC meetings for 2024-2025. The schedule was approved.

2. Draft Minutes meeting 6 (01.07.2024)

The minutes were approved. CRH suggested to avoid too much discussion on the course evaluations, until the evaluation of the current ways of working is available.

3. Draft Annual Report 2023-2024

DS pointed out a mistake in the spelling of a name. With this change, the Annual Report was approved.

4. Action point list

- Curriculum redesign: the project is still in its conceptual phase. MG is part of the expert group: they prepare a report that is shared with the stakeholder group, of which DU, ME, AD and ED are part. ME will share the document with the other members; feedback needs to be given before 16 October. IV: a separate project is started to make IBEB more international and unique, to better

fit the law re new language requirements. This project runs simultaneously with the curriculum redesign, but should be implemented before. LK is involved from the student body.

- Report Keuzegids: the topic will be on the agenda of the February meeting.

5. Code of conduct students

There is a concern re the conduct of students. Several incidents have happened: examples are rude communication, but also threatening situations, for example students coming into the office space threatening teachers, or improper communication in using mentimeter. DU wondered if others share the experience and if the PC needs to take action. CRH acknowledged that communication has become more aggressive, but colleagues sometimes seem to trivialize the problem. CRH would like to know what steps can be taken if incidents like this happen; he once shared it with the ombudsman, but never got a response and the Examination Board says they cannot do anything. It is not only about aggressiveness towards staff, but also between students: a lot of people experience social unsafety. DS feels that juniors possibly ignore it rather than see it as a problem. DSp acknowledges that there is a problem and agrees something should be done; there is a Code of conduct on the internet, but only publishing such a document on the internet is not enough.

The PC took the initiative to establish a working committee on this topic consisting of DU, CRH, LK and DSp. The working committee will gather more information on the status of the code of conduct and collect information on what actions are already taken. The working committee will also prepare suggestions to handle the topic.

6. N=N/BSA

IV: this topic has been up for discussion for some time; the current government now says it is up to the faculties. On university level there is a preference to lower the EC. ESE is not in favor and would like to keep N=N, while at the same time helping students more. Would it be better to keep the 60EC with compensation or 40EC without. Implicitly it is a part of the curriculum redesign. The N=N has a bad connotation as it seems strict; it could be presented better.

7. Numerus fixus IBEB

IV explained that, as the current government is now allowing following this route, ESE want to take the momentum to make arrangements to enable a numerus fixus if needed; not so long ago there were problems with managing a huge amount of student members. Also, if the government decides on restrictions, it might help keeping the programme.

8. HOKA progress report

The document is shared for information. Comments were:

- The dashboard to monitor evaluations is only available to programme directors. As it is not sure the programme directors know about this, IV will bring it up again. The PC members will get access as well.
- DS noticed that the evaluations of the career skill courses were not that great. IV explained that it is a package; the mandatory online course is not very popular, the elective course on the other hand is evaluated very good.
- Regarding the social atmosphere survey, it is suggested to ask the student wellbeing officers (Pilar Garcia Gomez and Teresa Bago d'Uva) about their experience.

9. HOKA plans 2025-2028

The HOKA plans will run from January 2025. Comments were:

- on the structure of the plans, as the learning and innovation theme seems an umbrella of other themes and how the numbers came about, as career skills is a lot, compared to others and teacher support is not that big. IV: the numbers are accurate estimates.
- one-on-one coaching for students. Three individual coaching sessions for students is a lot and it is offered next to study advice and thesis coaching. What would happen if all students would like to make use of the coaching. IV: the one-on-on coaching it is for students that are having difficulties with studying. It is not mandatory although it reads this way. This could be clearer. Student wellbeing is an important theme, and it is good that the issue is addressed but is not sure what is the best way. One-on-one coaching will be quite expensive and there is a EUR wellbeing platform as well. The ESE platform is an addition to the EUR platform to align with the EUR.

Study advisors are there to help with the study, whereas the wellbeing coach is there for problems related to wellbeing. The focus of the pilot is on balance life and avoiding procrastination. The work of the study advisor and coach cannot be completely separated, there is a fine line between these two. Procrastination can be a result of depression for example, coaches need to be able to distinguish. It should be clear what the objective is of these coaches: academic support or wellbeing. The PC wondered if there is also coaching available for staff as a lot of people have stress related problems.

10. Incoming mail and decisions Management Team (MT)

MT informed the participation on the proposed termination of the programme Fiscale Economie. The termination will have a small impact on EBE as well. The participation bodies are asked for advice. The reason that MT decided to terminate the programme is because of a decrease in student numbers; furthermore, the programme does not fit the strategic objectives of ESE in terms of international education. Following this decision, the programme will be phased out, until it stops in 2029. This is the last year students can start their bachelor; students have two years to start the master. There is a small impact on Economics students that also do Fiscale Economie.

The documents are shared after the meeting and the members are requested to give a reaction on the proposed plans before Monday.

Any other business

Programme Management is planning a session on the HOKA plans where students will be involved. The plan is to organize this in January.

Minutes Meeting 3. 2024-2025, Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Date: 6 February 2025, 13.30-15.30

Room: Mandeville – T18-25b

=====

Staff members: Dana Sisak (DS), Carlos Riumallo Herl (CRH), Daniel Urban (DU)

Student members: Artyom Kanshin (AK, vice-chair) Lili Kovacs (LK), Daniel Spierings (DSp), Evelina Kaushik (EK)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

PM: Iris Versluis (IV, Policy officer education)

Absent: Michael Erkens (with notice), Michiel Gerritse, Erroll van Dijk (due to online problems)

ESE = Erasmus School of Economics

SC = School Council

PM = Programme Management

=====

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

Because of illness, ME asked AK to chair the meeting. The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Draft Minutes meeting 2 (21-10-2024)

The minutes were approved as presented.

3. Announcements

- Through the dashboard, all course evaluations will be made available for the staff members of the Programme Committees. In other PCs (a summary of) the evaluations are shared with the student members when course evaluations are discussed.
- There is a small increase in the response rate of the evaluations, mostly when lecturers provide time during the lectures to fill in the evaluation.
- The course evaluation forms stay open until a day before the exam, some students possibly do not know about this. It would be good if students could be reminded of the expiration date for filling in the evaluation.

4. Action point list

- Inviting the programme director: postponed.
- Requirements Bachelor and Master thesis: the investigation was part of the project Curriculum redesign, which is now put on hold. More information on the differences is in the supervisor manual and Service level agreement, and there is a small overview in the master thesis manual. The information in the supervisor manual could be used to share with the students. Currently, a pilot runs for the bachelor thesis: more deadlines are given, which works well as it provides more structure.
- Code of conduct: on the agenda.
- Change projects taken up re governmental decisions: Discussed?

Monitoring:

- Process recruitment student representative (SR) recruitment: for Econometrics, a plan is drafted for the recruitment of SRs, which could be shared with the PC EBE and in the joint meeting of the participation bodies as well. AK: at RSM the recruitment of SRs is less informal, and it would be good to do the same at ESE, to make students more aware and form a community. A first step is to map the current process, which channels could be used, and see where improvements can be made. The most difficult is to find SRs for the Dutch programmes as well as for the first year. Once someone is SR for the first year, he/she is asked for the second year as well.
- Changes in theses process: 'Bachelor' should be 'Master'

5. Numerus fixus

The PC EBE was requested to comment on the documents regarding the decision on the numbers for the Numerus fixus.

- DU: both the amount of 700 students as well as the bandwidth is quite high. IV: the MT decided on this number as they do not want to lose too many students; the figure can be always altered, if the conversion rate turns out low.
- The conversion rate/students that enroll is quite low (50%) compared to other programmes. There are a lot of uncertainties; as it is mostly about international students, they have a choice. LK, being an international student herself, knows that most students choose a bunch and then decide. The effect of installing the numerus fixus on the applications is unknown. Both DU and CRH would like to see more data from other universities and their experience.
- CRH: some schools call after the applicants if they rejected a place, to ask for the reason why.
- AK wondered about the 15% conversion rate; seemingly, the MT is quite conservative.
- AK: a numerus fixus could also have the effect that students are not able to shift anymore after the 1st of February.
- There is no penalty if students accept, but in the end do not enroll. They could hold a place from someone who would have wanted to enroll.
- The biggest risk of the current number is that there would be too many students enrolling. IV: the MT would rather have too many than too few students.

Next week, the decision of the selection criteria will be shared with the PC members. All members are asked to give feedback by mail, after which the feedback is shared with the SC, so they can take the feedback into account drafting up their own feedback.

6. Ranking of the programme

The rankings in the 'keuzegids' are based on the 'Nationale studenten enquête'. The ratings are converted in a point system. Overall, given the number of students, the school is not doing that bad. PM is keeping an eye on items on which the school has a bad score and, where possible, PM will look where improvements can be made. For example, when the rating on career preparation was low, career skills were introduced. and try to fix it. At the moment, there are no red flags.

7. Rules of procedure

A draft document with regulations for the programme committees is drafted up. All members are asked to review the document and send any comments by mail to the secretary. DSp agreed on the fact that the minutes and letters of the PC should be publicized.

8. Code of conduct students

DU: the committee met twice. One of the topics was the Enablement & Engagement (E&E) scan and the well-being figures therein. In 2023, 16% experienced undesirable behavior, in 2024 it was 21%. There was increase however of people who knew where to turn to in case anything happened. It was discussed if the committee should follow-up on the survey some more. The E&E scan is for staff only; possibly TAs could be added, as they are in a vulnerable position. As the scan is discussed in small break-ups per team, people might be hesitant to share information. The PC decided it will be good to try to follow-up on the scan at least. The committee will contact the team that prepares the survey, to ask them for more data and to ask whether more questions could be added to the survey, such as when if someone says he/she encountered a problem, if they have asked for help with it.

9. Attachments for information

A letter was send by the MT with an explanation how the compensation for staff members works.

10. Any other business

The chair closed the meeting at 13.40.

Minutes Meeting 2. 2024-2025, Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Date: 21 November 2024, 13.30-15.30

Room: Mandeville – T18-25b

=====

Staff members: Michael Erkens (ME, chair), Dana Sisak (DS), Carlos Riumallo Herl (CRH), Daniel Urban (DU), Michiel Gerritse (MG)

Student members: Lili Kovacs (LK)

Other: Iris Versluis (IV, Policy officer education, online), Suzanne Leentvaar, SL, Secretary, minutes).

Guest: Janine Smit (JS, from 13.30-14.00)

Absent: Artyom Kanshin, Erroll van Dijk, Evelina Kaushik, Daniel Spierings

ESE = Erasmus School of Economics

SC = School Council

PM = Programme Management

=====

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Introduction to Crafting the International Classroom (Janine Smit)

Regarding the 'Wet internationalisering in Balans', ESE has started several projects. Janine Smit (JS) is the coordinator of the International Classroom for IBEB. The project started as a solution to pass the TAO (Toets Anderstalig Onderwijs). JS explained:

- The project entails writing a narrative on IBEB; data from alumni research is included.
- Further developments are a numerus fixus for IBEB and a Dutch language course; this course is for first year students.
- The housing of international students is not accounted for in these plans.
- The introduction of the International Classroom is piloted in six Economics courses. During tutorials, students get to compare both Dutch and other nationalities and share their knowledge; in that way, students learn about the Netherlands and other countries as well.
- The project started in September; the kick-off was in October.
- What happens in the tutorials should come back in the lectures.

The PC members wondered why none of the courses the pilot were from Business Economics. PM decided on these courses. Although the six courses are a good enough basis for the narrative, JS can look into the possibilities of adding courses from BE; more courses make the narrative broader and stronger. Adding classes and motivating lecturers might be challenging because an additional workload is expected. When asked which course would be good, the PC suggested Organizational Strategy.

ESE wants to do everything possible to keep IBEB and pass the TAO. But even if IBEB does not pass the TAO, Dutch students can benefit from the proposed changes.

Regarding the number of students, in his speech, the dean seemed quite pessimistic, the number decreasing from 600 to 200 students; this is unrelated to the development of the numerus fixus. JS will keep the PC updated on the development of the pilot. In general, the PC members were worried about the numbers and what other faculties do in this regard.

3. Draft Minutes meeting 1 (10.10.2024)

The minutes were approved as presented.

4. Action point list

- Inviting the programme director: postponed.
- Keuzegids: no further action for now.
- Requirements Bachelor and Master thesis: not discussed now.
- Code of conduct: on the agenda.

5. Code of conduct students

The workgroup has started. LK and DSp were asked to see whether students know a code of conduct exists; staff members are collecting information from lecturers if they experienced problems with students and if they know a code of conduct exists.

Findings up till now:

- Many staff are unaware of this code of conduct and/or do not know what it entails.
- The student evaluations seem to be an outlet for aggressiveness.
- A lot of staff members encounter one or two incidents per year.
- Staff members deal with it differently; many dismiss it; no one seems to know what the appropriate channels are.
- Incidents happen between students in group assignments as well. Students report it to the coordinator but do not know what to do next.
- The code of conduct can be found on the EUR website and is quite comprehensive; there is a definition of inappropriate behavior and who to contact.
- Some TAs, mainly women, experience less authority when the class consists of mostly male students.
-

The suggestion is to prepare a survey for both staff and students, asking if incidents occur and, if so, how often they occur and if people are aware of the existence or content of the code of conduct. Another idea is to speak to Teresa Bago d'Uva, diversity officer, as she will have data on discrimination.

The code of conduct does not need reviewing, but the process does. Bachelor students get information on the code of conduct in year one; master students may not. Students could be helped with guidance sessions. Staff with temporary contracts should know that it will not affect their evaluation if they speak up. After collecting information, the following steps need to be decided.

6. Concerns Bachelor and Master theses

DS: several supervisors received final theses from students they had hardly seen that year. Most of the theses were of very poor quality. CHR was asked as a second reader for a student the supervisor had not seen. Students can start on their thesis only after their proposal is approved, but after that, students can submit their thesis without seeing the supervisor; a student who hands in a thesis is entitled to a formal assessment.

IV: PM is looking for changes. At Econometrics, a pilot has started for the bachelor thesis, with a different structure and assignments leading up to the proposal. Furthermore, in Econometrics, the thesis is separated from the graduation; if there is a problem, the student cannot graduate. Then, there is more emphasis on the defense and discussion than on the report; even if AI writes the report, students need to understand and be able to discuss the subject. IV will give an update on the pilot in Econometrics.

DU wondered how many students failed their thesis because of AI. IV will see if the Examination Board has information on this. Turnitin is not a good tool to discover the use of AI. A possibility

would be to have formal calibration sessions in the departments, to see if supervisors reach the same outcome.

7. Attachments for information

No attachments.

8. Any other business

- The student members asked if it was possible to create a dedicated email account for the committee. Such an e-mail account already exists and will be forwarded by the secretary.
- The PC wondered what their role is in all the changes/projects that have started regarding the decisions of the government. IV: any changes on intended learning outcomes (ILOs) will be shared with the PCs to comment/advice/approve on. There is no need for different CROHO tracks, as it turns out that changes may be made up to 40% of a track. IV is asked to present an overview of all the change projects that are on the agenda of ESE.

Minutes Meeting 4. 2024-2025, Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Date: 3 April 2025, 13.30-15.30

Room: Mandeville – T18-25b

=====

Staff members: Michael Erkens (ME, chair), Michiel Gerritse (MG)

Student members: Artyom Kanshin (AK, vice-chair), Lili Kovacs (LK), Daniel Spierings (DSp), Evelina Kaushik (EK), Erroll van Dijk (EvD, online)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

PM: Iris Versluis (IV, policy officer education)

Guests: Josse Delfgaauw (JD, programme director, from 13.30-14.00)

Absent: Dana Sisak (with notice), Carlos Riumallo Herl (with notice), Daniel Urban (with notice)

ESE = Erasmus School of Economics

SC = School Council

PM = Programme Management

=====

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Introduction Josse Delfgaauw

ME welcomed Josse Delfgaauw as guest to the meeting. JD is programme director since 1 April. JD addressed two main topics, namely the law on internationalization and the subsequent 'Toets Anderstaling onderwijs' (TAO), and the smarter academic year.

- Although the criteria of the new law on internationalization are not confirmed yet, a committee was installed to investigate arguments for keeping the English programme. The biggest change for the bachelor 1 courses for next year is to use the international classroom project to a larger extend. Students are encouraged to actively engage in the courses, in which countries are compared, data collected, and discussions take place. The idea is to do something similar for Dutch students. It is one pillar of the whole narrative towards the TAO/test. The ability to learn from each other is an argument for keeping the international programme.
- Another pillar is the investigation of the stay-rates of both Dutch and non-Dutch students. ESE is actively trying to increase the stay-rate by offering Dutch language courses. Several other initiatives are being investigated for enhancing the stay-rate. The municipal politics in almost all cities do not back up the plans for keeping the English programmes, as lack of housing plays a prominent role. The lobby is coming from the universities and some tech companies at this moment. MG would like to see the school try to get support from big multinationals from the existing network.
- There are several discussions within universities how to approach the issue, within the boundaries of keeping 'zelf-regie'/or self-management. Several scenarios are being looked at, to see if the universities can come up with a good plan that achieves the set goals, so there will be no need for the test anymore.
- JD is hesitant regarding investigating a cooperation with RSM; it is not known what steps RSM is taking. Although it was viable to have two English programmes before, it might become a liability now. There is not much information on how other faculties are facing the problems.

Smarter academic year

- It is preferred to combine the smarter academic year with the curriculum redesign, which PM hopes can be implemented in 2027-2028. As the curriculum needs to be ready a year prior to implementation, it means that preparations need to start this moment.
- The smarter academic year is a nationwide initiative, in which the EUR is frontrunner. Compared to other countries, the academic year at Dutch universities is long with hardly any breaks. The

number of teaching weeks will be reduced, giving more room to breathe. This should reduce the workload and enhance wellbeing of both staff as well as students. The curriculum needs to be made more relevant for the upcoming years.

- The discussion on whether the smarter academic year will lead to a decrease of workload, or if there will be less time for the same workload is fundamental. The learning outcomes need to be met, but in fewer teaching weeks. Teachers themselves need time to redesign their courses. Existing courses need to be reshaped, and a proper redesign of courses is also needed. Staff/student wellbeing and quality of education need to be balanced.
- The government wants to have a Dutch language course as part of curriculum; offering Dutch language courses could lead to even more workload, which could mean that possibly less students want to follow the programme.
- The next phase is to determine what courses are needed based on what you students need to know. The expertise of the individual lecturers is needed and vital for the process.
- As it is all about improving the quality of education, JD welcomes the involvement of the participation. As former chair of the PC Economics and Business Economics, he knows participation from the inside. JD hopes to set-up a system in which the participation can give their feedback on the plans in an early stage, before the plans are set and not after.

It was agreed that it would be good to meet with JD at least once a year.

3. Announcements

There were no announcements.

4. Draft Minutes meeting 3 (06 Feb 2025)

The minutes were approved as presented.

5. Action point list

23-24 PC1. 1 Development curriculum redesign: discussed with JD.

24-25 PC 1.1 Process recruitment student representatives/student members:

- LK, EK, AK and EvD will continue for another year. One other bachelor student is required.
- The recruitment of the SRs can already be started, except for the SRs for Bachelor 1.
- Involve the study associations: most members are committed and wish to contribute and already have contacts within the school.
- Ask professors to contact the most engaged students directly, during breaks for example, to recruit proactive students that will show up in all courses/blocks
- Ask the TA to address it during the presentation of Academic skills. Contact prof. Arjan Non, who is involved with the Tutor Academy.
- The Dutch programmes need more attention, as in general, there are less applications.

6. Code of conduct students: update working group

DU shared the latest update from the working group via e-mail. The working group needs to gather again to discuss the next steps. It would be good to have something on paper for the upcoming meeting. It is suggested to contact diversity officer Teresa Bago d'Uva on the subject, from the student perspective.

From EUR central the vice-deans recently received a document with more information on what lecturers can do if students behave improperly, to give lecturers more guidance. IV will share the document when it is available.

7. Any other business

The next meeting is scheduled on 19 May in the morning, in which the TER will be discussed. Input on the TER needs to be send to IV by 26 May at the latest.

The chair closed the meeting at 14.40

Minutes Meeting 5. 2024-2025, Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Date: 19 May 2025, 10.00-12.00

Room: EB-01

=====

Staff members: Michael Erkens (ME, chair), Michiel Gerritse (MG), Daniel Urban (DU, online), Carlos Riumallo Herl (CRH)

Student members: Daniel Spierings (DSp), Erroll van Dijk (EvD, online)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Absent: Dana Sisak (with notice), Artyom Kanshin (without notice), Lili Kovacs (without notice), Eveline Kaushik (without notice)

ESE = Erasmus School of Economics

SC = School Council

PM = Programme Management

MT = Management Team

UC = University council

=====

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Announcements

There were no announcements.

3. Draft Minutes meeting 4 (3 April 2025)

The minutes were approved as presented.

4. Action point list

24-25 PC 1.1 Code of conduct: on the agenda.

24-25 PC 2.1 Change projects taken up re governmental decisions: for next meeting.

5. TER

Bachelor TER

- Page 3 – Exam Results in Osiris: Concerns were raised about the reliability of the current grading process in Osiris. Instances have occurred where grades were entered incorrectly, resulting in students passing courses they should not have passed. These errors remained undetected for several months. Questions were raised about who is responsible for verifying the grades if not the lecturer, and at what point the grades become definitive.
- Article 4.2: The article is insufficiently clear. If the intent is to state that the programme is full-time and delivered in person, referencing a specific location may be unnecessary. It is recommended to revise the article to more explicitly reflect its purpose.
- Article 28 – Numerus Fixus: Clarification is requested regarding the timeline for confirming whether a numerus fixus will be applied.
- Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs): The Programme Committee questioned the rationale for having different ILOs under the same CROHO code. It is recommended to prepare a document outlining these differences and explaining the justification. The Committee expressed concern that the Dutch-language programme may lack the quality and international orientation of the IBEB programme. It was noted that working in an

international classroom and with international data is equally important for Dutch students as it is for international students.

Master TER

- Article 13.5 – Internship Component of the Thesis: The Programme Committee requests an update on the pilot concerning the integration of a specific internship with the thesis. There is concern that students may be able to extend their thesis deadlines too easily by participating in an internship.

SLA 2025–2026

- Supervisor–Student Discussion on AI Use: Members requested clarification on the expected content of the initial discussion between student and supervisor regarding the use of AI tools. It is advised to include a reference or link to the institutional AI policy for guidance and alignment.
The students are happy that keeping a logbook is no longer required, as it was very time-consuming.
- An important note is that the composition of course grades is kept at 30% rather than 40%.

Education offer

- No comments.

A separate meeting will be scheduled with Iris Versluis at the beginning of June to discuss the TER and ILO's some more.

6. Saving costs on tutorial education

A proposal outlining various cost-saving measures related to tutorial education was presented to the Programme Committee. The following comments were made:

- Measure 1 – Reducing the Number of TAs/Tutorials: Reducing tutorials and teaching assistants would increase workload for lecturers, who would need to restructure their courses accordingly. Such reductions are not preferred, as they significantly affect the student learning experience. For more challenging courses, maintaining more than one tutorial per week is strongly recommended, given the importance of contact hours with TAs in exam preparation. Reductions could be considered for courses with consistently low tutorial attendance, not only for cost-saving purposes but also due to limited student engagement.
- Measure 3 – Integration of Academic Skills: The proposed integration of academic skills into existing courses can only be meaningfully evaluated within the broader context of curriculum redesign. While students generally value the academic skills course is generally valued by students, the career skills course is less well received. Therefore, reductions in the career skills course are preferred over cuts in tutorial hours.
- Measure 4 – Student-led Tutorials: The Committee is open to exploring the possibility of students conducting tutorials under supervision, as this measure seems relatively easy to implement and is preferable to reducing the number of tutorials. However, the overarching principle remains that cost savings must not compromise the quality of education.

- Measure 5 – Tutorials as a PhD Duty: Committee members expressed concerns about requiring PhD students to take on mandatory tutorial responsibilities, particularly given that many PhD candidates are externally funded. The Committee does not support this measure.
- General Remark: The introduction of the proposal mentions the need for cost reduction, but lacks specific information regarding the scale or target of the intended savings. The Committee finds it difficult to assess the proposed measures without a clear understanding of the financial goals. The Programme Management is asked to provide further clarification.

7. Code of conduct students: update working group

CRH met with Teresa Bago d’Uva to discuss concerns related to student conduct. The educational department shares similar concerns; however, no comprehensive actions have been taken to date, and statistical data is not yet available.

- Preliminary data may become available through the Enablement and Engagement (E&E) scan and one other evaluation. It is suggested that this information be collected centrally and accompanied by practical tools for reporting incidents. Although a guideline exists, it is unclear how many lecturers are aware of its existence.
- It is advised to explore how other faculties and universities are addressing similar issues, in order to identify best practices.
- According to DU, a study adviser reported that many incidents stem from unclear communication and unmet expectations. It is recommended to increase transparency regarding rules and expectations and to move away from strictly top-down decision-making. For example, providing a rationale for denying an extra exam, rather than a flat denial, may foster greater understanding among students.
- The results of the current E&E scan are not yet available. DU would like to explore the possibility of adding one or two questions to the E&E scan or to the evaluation coordinated by Teresa. Once the results are available, DU will consult with Iris Versluis or Josse Delfgaauw for support with the analysis, ideally comparing them to prior scans. The Programme Committee prefers that the Programme Management conduct the analysis rather than doing so itself.

The objective of further inquiry would be to provide recommendations based on the E&E scan results, thereby increasing awareness and clarifying reporting procedures. If the underlying issues are found to exist at a university-wide level, the University Council (UC) could be involved in addressing them.

DU also noted that the Code of Conduct is currently under revision. The Programme Committee expressed interest in reviewing the proposed changes before implementation, if this falls within its remit. DU will consult Marc Gabarro Bonet regarding developments at the university level and will keep the Committee informed. A decision on whether and how to proceed will be made at the next meeting.

8. Attachments for information

A final HOKA report is presented for information. The PC has no comments.

9. Any other business

The next meeting will be scheduled Monday 30 June.

The chair closed the meeting at 11.50.

Minutes Meeting 6. 2024-2025, Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Date: 30 June 2025, 13.30-15.30

Room: Mandeville – T18-25b

=====

Staff members: Michael Erkens (ME, chair), Michiel Gerritse (MG, online), Daniel Urban (DU, online)

Student members: Daniel Spierings (DSp), Evelina Kaushik (EK), Artyom Kanshin (AK)

Secretary: Suzanne Leentvaar (SL, minutes)

Absent: Lili Kovacs (with notice), Carlos Riumallo Herl (with notice)

ESE = Erasmus School of Economics

SC = School Council

PM = Programme Management

MT = Management Team

UC = University council

1. Opening and approval of the agenda

Sharing questions in the Teachers chat was added as topic. The agenda was approved as presented.

2. Announcements

There were no announcements.

3. Draft Minutes meeting 4 (3 April 2025)

The minutes were approved as presented.

4. Code of conduct students: update working group

DU noted that the topic of the Code of Conduct has been discontinued. It is uncertain whether the working group should continue its investigation. The results of the student well-being survey were shared with the PC for informational purposes. Feedback on the survey:

- The survey is well-constructed and contains valuable insights; however, the reports reflect different periods.
- While lecturers are not expected to resolve student issues directly, it is essential that they are aware of students' needs and can refer them to the appropriate support.
- Group assignments: The survey proposed assigning students to groups to reduce racial and gender-based discrimination. The committee notes that group work encompasses more than cultural and gender factors. While random group assignment may benefit first-year students, it is not seen as appropriate in later academic years.
- Sharing anecdotes: while not mandatory, sharing personal stories could enhance student wellbeing if the lecturer is comfortable doing so.
- Student-lecturer activities: It is preferred to maintain professionalism, which means not meeting students outside formal academic activities.
- Discrimination toward international students: Although this is not a central theme in the report, it relates to students' sense of belonging. It could be a focus area for further investigation next year, if data is available. The investigation could be supported by money coming from the budget to strengthen participatory bodies.
- Survey follow-up: The PC is interested in how the survey findings are followed up.

The PC decided not to pursue further investigation on the topic. Despite efforts to gather information and engage with stakeholders, the PC believes that other parties may be better equipped to conduct further investigations.

5. Thesis management system (TMS)

Student members of the committee are very positive about TMS; it is easy to use, centralized, and responsive, with instant notifications when action is needed. The issue of the thesis disappearing upon entry was not a major concern. He heard no complaints from other students. The members also received positive student feedback, although some continued to use email out of habit or reluctance to learn a new system for a short period. This dual usage risks losing information. Integration into Canvas is recommended, with a TMS link and manuals placed there, as Canvas is the primary learning platform.

Comments from lecturers:

- A broader pilot would have been helpful, though Accounting did pilot it, and some departments had walkthroughs.
- It is challenging to maintain oversight; student names aren't always visible, unread messages aren't highlighted, and it is unclear where action is needed without checking each thesis individually.
- The interface is not intuitive (the use of the "play" button is unclear) and could be improved.
- Communication disappears after thesis submission. The second assessor loses access to prior communication and feedback, unlike in Sin-Online. In this case, objectivity is of more importance than the second assessor being able to see the process.
- No deadlines are visible in the system.
- Lecturers could only attach one file when contacting all students.
- It is suggested to include a brief explanation of the supervisor and second assessor roles in the students' manual.
- It is recommended to include a question about the experience with TMS in the questionnaire for students upon submission of their thesis.

6. Savings on tutorial education

Following feedback from the PCs, minor adjustments were made to the proposal. Furthermore, a clarification was shared with the PCs. Comments on the response of PM:

- Measure 5 (PhDs teaching tutorials): all questions were addressed except this one. Departments also raised objections. Concerns remain, including increased workload and higher costs.
- Measure 3 (Integrating academic skills): Course evaluations provide limited insight. Many first-year students don't yet value academic skills, whereas career skills are often seen as easier and less relevant to core educational goals. Student members suggest removing career skills and enhancing academic skills to improve student engagement. Integration could improve relevance, as is already done in ESL. Academic skills could also be practiced more in existing first-year courses.
- Measure 1 (Reducing tutorials): Not favoured due to high dropout rates, especially in the first two blocks. Reducing TAs for the most difficult courses is seen as counterproductive. It is suggested to offer alternatives to lecturers if tutorials are reduced.

The PC is asked to approve the proposal to initiate discussions and further explore the measures.
Indicated per measure:

1. Engage in discussions with lecturers – Approved
2. Explore alternative formats – Approved
3. Integrate academic skills into curriculum redesign – **Approved**
4. Limit TA hiring to one tutorial – Approved
5. Use of PhDs as TAs – Approval withheld, pending further discussion

7. Attachments for information

The Proposal Strengthening the participatory bodies is shared with the PC for information; the SC approved the proposal. It will be sent to the EUR for approval. Funds are available to the PCs, SL will coordinate the requests.

8. Any other business

- The teacher chat can be used to contact all lecturers, for questions such as the one about TMS evaluation. For more targeted communication, using a department chat can be considered.
- Most staff and student members will remain, except CRH and DSp. A meeting with potential new members is planned; DSp may refer candidates from his study association.
- Two SRs have been recruited for IBEB2. Other cohorts still need representatives. A vacancy has been posted in the newsletter.

The chair closed the meeting at 15.00.

To Brigitte Hoogendoorn
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
08 November 2024

Subject
Advice on Quality and Innovation Agenda
Education ESE 2054-2028

Our reference
ESE/PC EBE

Page
1/1

Appendix
-

Department
Programme Committee Economics and
Business Economics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
3062 PA Rotterdam

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E erkens@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Hoogendoorn, dear Brigitte,

Upon your request, the Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics reviewed the Quality and Innovation Agenda Education ESE 2054-2028, that was send to us for feedback.

We would like to share some feedback and suggestions with you.

- The learning and innovation theme seems like an umbrella scheme that serves all other themes.
- The PC was wondering how the budgeted costs were determined. For example, teacher support gets assigned 50,000 EUR for two years while career skills get 300,000 EUR allocated.
- The PC discussed a lot on the one-on-one coaching for students. We think that three individual coaching sessions per student is a lot, as students can also make use of study advice and thesis coaching. We were also wondering how many students you expect to make use of this one-on-one coaching and what would happen if all students would enroll. Furthermore, it reads as if the one-on-one coaching is mandatory; if it is not, this should be clarified. Finally, it should be clear what the objective is of the coaching. Is it more on providing academic support or psychological wellbeing? If it is the latter, then the PC recommends leaving this to professional therapists and psychologists.

The Programme Committee kindly requests to take the above-mentioned feedback into consideration.

With kind regards,

Prof. Dr. Michael Erkens
Chair Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Cc: Iris Versluis, School Council

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
27 May 2025

Subject
Advice on Proposal Savings on tutorial
education

Our reference
ESE/PC E&BE

Page
1/2

Appendix
none

Department
PC Economics & Business Economics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E erkens@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

A proposal outlining various cost-saving measures related to tutorial education was presented to the Programme Committee. The following comments and concerns were raised:

Measures 1 and 2: Reducing the Number of TAs/Tutorials

- Committee members reiterated that reducing the number of tutorials and teaching assistants would substantially increase the workload for lecturers, who would need to redesign their courses such that still enough exercise moments are integrated into the course.
- This measure is not favored, as it significantly affects the quality of student learning. Tutorials are critical for exam preparation, particularly in more demanding courses.
- The Committee recommends exploring possible reductions only in courses where tutorial attendance is consistently low, and engagement is minimal.

Measure 3: Integration of Academic Skills

- The Committee believes that integrating academic skills into existing courses should be evaluated within the broader context of the curriculum redesign.
- Students generally value the academic skills course, while the career skills component receives less positive feedback.
- The Committee recommends prioritizing reductions in the career skills component rather than in tutorial hours that support core academic learning.

Measure 4: TA Contracts and Group Sizes

- The PC takes note of the Tutor Academy's initiative to revise TA contracts and consider assigning TAs to more than one tutorial group. This seems a relatively easy-to-implement measure and gets support from the PC.

Our reference
Error! No text of specified style in document.

Your reference
Error! No text of specified style in document.

Measure 5: Tutorials as a PhD Duty

- The Committee opposes making tutorial responsibilities mandatory for PhD candidates, particularly because many are externally funded and may not have teaching obligations.
- Concerns were raised regarding capacity limitations and the potential negative impact on both PhD research and tutorial quality.

General Remarks

- The proposal references a need for budgetary cuts but lacks specificity regarding the targeted savings.
- As tutorial education is part of the core educational offering, any proposed changes must be approached with caution.

The Programme Committee was asked to approve the implementation of the proposed measures. The Committee emphasizes the importance of clarifying the financial goals to facilitate a proper evaluation of the proposal.

Additionally, the Programme Committee urges Programme Management to consider alternative solutions that preserve educational quality and avoid disproportionate reductions for minor financial gains.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Michael Erkens
Chair PC Economics & Business Economics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information.

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
16 June 2025

Subject
Approval on Teaching and Examination
Regulations 2025-2026

Our reference
ESE/PC E&BE

Page
1/1

Appendix
none

Department
PC Economics & Business Economics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E erkens@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

Upon your request, the Programme Committee Economics & Business Economics discussed the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026.

The PC Economics & Business Economics approves of the Teaching and Examination Regulations 2025-2026 for the articles for which we have right of consent and advises positively on the articles on which the PC has right of advice.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Michael Erkens
Chair PC Economics & Business Economics

cc. Iris Versluis
PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information.

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
16 June 2025

Subject
Advice on Service Level Agreement 25-26

Our reference
ESE/PC EBE

Page
1/1

Appendix
-

Department
Programme Committee Economics and
Business Economics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
3062 PA Rotterdam

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E erkens@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

Upon your request, the Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics reviewed the Service Level Agreement (SLA) 2025-2026.

The Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics advises positively on the Service Level Agreement 2025-2026.

With kind regards,



Prof. Dr. Michael Erkens
Chair Programme Committee Economics and Business Economics

Cc: Iris Versluis
PS. This letter will be sent to the School Council for information

To Josse Delfgaauw
Programme Director
of Erasmus School of Economics

Date
30 June 2025

Subject
Advice on Proposal Savings on tutorial
education

Our reference
ESE/PC E&BE

Page
1/2

Appendix
none

Department
PC Economics & Business Economics

Visiting address
Erasmus School of Economics
Burgemeester Oudlaan 50
E Building

Postal address
PO Box 1738
3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands

E erkens@ese.eur.nl
W www.eur.nl/ese/english

Dear dr Delfgaauw, dear Josse,

In its letter dated 27 May, the Programme Committee provided feedback on the proposal outlining various cost-saving measures related to tutorial education. The Committee appreciates that the feedback was taken into account and that a revised proposal has been submitted for consideration.

After reviewing the revised proposal, the Programme Committee gives its approval on initiating discussions and further exploring the following measures:

- **Measures 1 and 2:** Reduction in the number of TAs and tutorials
- **Measure 3:** Integration of academic skills into the curriculum
- **Measure 4:** Adjustments to TA contracts and tutorial group sizes

The Committee acknowledges that **Measure 5—assigning tutorials as a PhD duty**—is still under development. As such, the Programme Committee withholds approval of this measure at this time.

Yours sincerely,



Prof Dr Michael Erkens
Chair PC Economics & Business Economics

cc. Iris Versluis

PS. this letter will be sent to the School Council for information.

Our reference

Error! No text of specified style in document.

Your reference

Error! No text of specified style in document.