

# Minutes MSc PC – 30 May 2023

Hybrid meeting via Teams and in T3-42 10:00–12:00 hours

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	MLP: Michal Pilch (BIM)
RG: Rob Geurts (MScBA BAM)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
PBT: Pedro Barbosa Tinnemans (MBI)	KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)
SO: Sam Oor (MI)	EB: Emanuel Ubert (SM)
CS: Claus Schmitt (FI)	JA: Jorrit Alkema (HRM)
MIP: Malgorzata Iwanczuk – Prost (MI, MBI)	GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)
JS: Jonas Schmidt (GBS)	YL: Yu Liu (SE)
EV: Eric Vaupel (MScBA AFM)	AM: Alla Molibog (HRM)
	AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)
	BES: Baris Eren Sezer (MM)
	PBC: Philipp Cornelius (BIM)
	JU: Jule Ulrych (MScBA MIM)
	RSV: Romee Servant Volquin (SE)
	NE: Nico Eymael (SM)
	MP: Morteza Pourakbar (SCM)
	WV: Wim van Vliet (MScBA P-MIM)
	SV: Stefan Vuksa (FI)
	HPW: Han Pei Wu (SCM)
	(MScBA P-MIM)
	<b>Guests</b>
	AK: Annemarie Kersten (Senior Education Service Officer)

## 1. Opening and announcements

- 1) The chair welcomes everybody present.
- 2) GB was the chair during the meeting because MS was absent.

### Announcement 1:

PBT informed the Committee about the MSc MBI programme application process.

- 1) During the current MSc MBI application process students who don't have a 7 average are rejected. However, it's more difficult for medical students to get a 7 than for IBA/ BA students with the result that medical students are barely admitted to the master programme. Therefore, PBT wonders whether adjustments can be made to admission process/ TER for medical students.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) AL: It would be better to discuss this topic in the next academic year as the application process for 2023-2024 is already running. The possible changes to the TER would be for the academic year 2024-2025. AL will make a note to discuss this topic during the next academic year.

### Announcement 2:

MIP updated the Committee on a request from the EB.

- 1) The EB would like to propose RSM that to hold all thesis defences on campus from this year on to reduce ChatGPT fraud.

- 2) From the EB perspective it would be better a) To hold the defences on campus thus the EB could better monitor the process, making the use of AI already easier to find for the defence and b) To have an option that students can fail their defence, if there AI software is involved in the thesis.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) GB: The thesis manual already indicates that the defences should take place on campus but there are exceptions to do it online.
- 2) CS: It would be better to keep the option to online thesis defences because there will always be students who can't come to campus for physical reasons.
- 3) According to CS, the use of ChatGPT during live online thesis defence is low because of the specific questions and it's visible what the student does on the screen. The ChatGPT risk is higher during the thesis writing process.
- 4) CS: It would be better to have a fail option during the thesis defence for students who fraud.
- 5) According to RG, the current ChatGPT software can't write an entire thesis. Students use the programme to formulate.
- 6) RG: It's difficult to suspect students of fraud based on a feeling. Therefore, it would be better to suspect students if they can't answer questions during the defence.
- 7) CS: If students can't answer question during the defence. It should be investigated whether students used ChatGPT while writing their thesis or other reasons, for example students being too nervous for their defence.
- 8) RG wonders whether using ChatGPT is fraud because the student puts the information in the programme. However, ChatGPT generates the information.
- 9) GB: It's too late to discover the use of ChatGPT in a thesis during a thesis defence. Therefore, it would be better to meet the student in person during the thesis process thus the coach could monitor what is happening.
- 10) MIP: It would be better to use the bottom-top button on the thesis online platform where teachers could indicate whether students have used ChatGPT software.
- 11) CS: Changing the rules for this academic year is no longer feasible. However, the EB could explain in which cases teachers should indicate plagiarism.

GB will ask GH to organise a session with thesis coordinators and student representatives to discuss how teachers should deal with ChatGPT during the thesis process and thesis defence.

## **2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 18 April 2023—see attachment.**

The minutes were approved.

## **3. Updates in TER for the upcoming year – Annemarie Kersten**

AK informed the Committee about the changes in the TER 2023-2024.

- 1) After the MSc PC April meeting the TER is updated with some small changes.
- 2) AK wrote a letter to the PC to answer their questions about the TER.
- 3) The definitions of assessments are aligned with the assessment framework (written test, oral test, assignment, and practical exercise). The change doesn't mean teachers are limited in their choice of test types. It's just the same description.
- 4) The term 'Explanatory feedback' has been replaced by the term 'debriefing' because 'explanatory' suggests more interactive feedback rather than standardised feedback. During debriefing, information is shared regarding the correct answers to the exam questions. it's not an interactive session.
- 5) The final transition rule to the MSc PMB programme has been updated.
- 6) The FC proposal to stipulate the minimal duration of digital perusal opportunities at 24 hours has been changed to 8 hours (working day) as the BSc PC recommended a perusal duration of 3 hours. In an effort to facilitate students while finding reasonable middle ground to agree to the proposal is to set the minimum timeframe of digital perusal opportunities at 8 hours.

- 7) Article 4.1.3 about improvement options and resits has been specified. This was done on request of the BSc PC and it clarifies when an improvement option or resit is reasonable and what the rules are in that case,

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) RG is in favour of the improvement option because if the improvement option isn't there and students have to wait until the next academic year, it feels like these students will have more time for the assessment.
- 2) CS: With the improvement option rule it would be better to consider the faculty workload because their workload will increase.

The proposed changes to the TER were unanimously accepted by the Committee. MS will send a letter of consent.

#### 4. Discussing the progress of the PC subcommittees

GB asks MSc PC members to send their final subcommittee output document to AL by 20 June. The documents could then be discussed during the next MSc PC meeting.

- 1) There is no update from the HOKA Subcommittee.
- 2) The Programmatic Practice Relevant Assessment Subcommittee had a meeting six weeks ago but they will create an output document.
- 3) The Thesis Subcommittee conducted interviews with faculty and students and as an output they will write a recommendation letter.
- 4) The Course Evaluation Subcommittee would like to come up with suggestions on how to improve the course evaluations.
- 5) The Diversity & Inclusion Subcommittee is working on their final output document.
- 6) The Onboarding Subcommittee is working on the final output document which will be send to the department heads.
- 7) There is no update from the Open Education Subcommittee.

#### 5. Closing remarks

#### 6. Action points

What	When	Who
GB will asks GH to organise a session with the thesis coordinators and student representatives to discuss how teachers should deal with ChatGPT during the thesis process and thesis defence.	By June	Guido Berends
AL will put the MSc MBI application requirements on the MSc PC agenda for next academic year	By June	Annelie van der Leelie
MS will write a letter of consent about the changes in the TER	By June	Maciej Szymanowski
All MSc PC subcommittees will send their final output to AL	By June	All subcommittees

#### Next meetings:

27-Jun-23, 10.00h