

iPSRS Quality Assurance Board Meeting

Online, 2026-04-27

Participants of the meeting

1. Dovydas Benevicius (VU, chair of the iPSRS QAB)
2. Alain Tremeau (UJM)
3. Pasi Vahimaa (UEF)
4. Régis Fournier (UPEC)
5. Teagan Kilian (M2 student iPSRS)
6. Holly Lewis (M1 student iPSRS)

Agenda

1. Review of the Student satisfaction questionnaires from the UJM, UPEC and VU study semester.
2. Review of the selection process numbers for the 2026 cohort.
3. Discussion on the appeal process.

1. Review of the Student satisfaction questionnaires from the UJM, UPEC and VU study semester.

QAB members, presented the results of questionnaires completed by iPSRS students during their time at **UJM, UPEC and VU**.

A very small number of questionnaires from the first-year students. Good numbers from second-year students.

Students note that the **grade transcripts** are coming slowly and that they need them to start employment procedures.

Students note that the guidelines and evaluation rules for the **COIL projects** should be more detailed.

QAB concludes that the program and study material have a lot of potential, but the organizational part of the program needs improvement. For example, the **holiday period** should be workload-free, and the **assessment criteria** should be very transparent.

2. Review of the selection process numbers for the 2026 cohort

Dovydas Banevičius, the Chair of the Board, presented key figures for the new cohort that will enroll in September 2026.

The total number of applications was nearly 300.

The QAB board members were pleased to see that the number of applications is increasing.

The QAB is requesting information from the AMB:

What is the procedure when letters from the Selection Committee have already been sent out, but the ranking of students changes after the appeal process? Are students who have already been invited to the program losing their spots?

3. Discussion on the appeal process.

The QAB board discussed the appeals received after the selection process results were sent out. In the board's opinion, the selection process was carried out with the required equality among the applicants. The **Board reviewed and analyzed the received appeals** before the meeting. During the meeting, it was concluded that the applications of those appealing were judged adequately. The **Board decided not to ask** the Academic and Management Board to reassess and reconsider those applications.

Chair of the Quality and Assurance Board

Dr. Dovydas Banevičius