

Minutes MSc PC – 25 January 2024

Online meeting via Teams and T3-42; 09:30–11:30 hours

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	SET: Shinouk Ettema (MScBA P-MIM)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	NZ: Nadine Ziegengeist (FI)
PBC: Philipp Cornelius (BIM)	YL: Yu Liu (SE)
NN: Nargiz Najaf (BIM)	MC: Marta Cazzamalli (POC)
EB: Emanuel Ubert (SM)	KR: Kristupas Radzvila (SCM)
MK: Michelle Kossoi (MM)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
TC: Teodora Comanescu (GBS)	IH: Ian Hermes (MScBA MiM)
BS: Bianca Stoiciu (MI)	AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)
LL: Larissa de Liedekerke (MSc MBI)	CS: Claus Schmitt (FI)
BB: Bas Bogers (MScBA BAM)	GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)
FM: Felix Mayer (SE)	(MScBA pMiM)
DB: Daiana Botezatu (MScBA AFM)	
MAS: Maartje Schouten (POC)	
FH: Felicitas Huffer (SM)	
KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)	Guests
AN: Anna Nikulina (SCM)	JM: Juan Madiedo (Academic Director MSc MI)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Opening announcements

- 1) MS: The Dean has responded to the MSc PC letter but the Dean of Education is still working on the Document. Probably the PC could discuss the letter during the next meeting.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 21 December 2023 – see attachment.

- 1) The minutes were approved.

3. A credit change in the MSc MI programme – Juan Madiedo

JM presented the credit structure adjustment: 2024-2025 academic year, in the MSc MI programme.

- 1) The changes are a) Allocate 1 EC from a core course to the new Positive Impact Agent Trajectory (PIA) and b) To merge the Research Fundamental course (4ECs) with the Thesis Trajectory (16 ECs).
- 2) Change 1: The Positive Impact Agent Trajectory is related to the positive impact agent role in the Competency Framework. The trajectory consists of activities in Block 1 and 2, a) Block 1 consists of four motivational sessions in which topics on positive impact are discussed, for example the organisation Erasmus X's topic on accessible education for everyone. These sessions should create motivation and incentive students to think about how they can have positive impact on society and b) In Block 2, students should follow two core courses, the Design Thinking course and the Implementing Innovation course. During the Design Thinking course, students devise a project that will have an impact on society and in the Implementing Innovation course, the project idea will be further developed. All this will lead to the final submission of the project to the

Hummingbird Fund (The fund is a body of RSM in which members of the RSM community could submit ideas for projects that have a positive impact on education at the school and applicants could receive 2.000 euros to fund the projects) Submitting the project to the Hummingbird Fund is mandatory for the students because these projects are a lot of work and it would be nice if something is actually done with them.

- 3) Currently, the Design Thinking course has 6 ECs and the Implementing Innovation course has 5 ECs. The department would like to reduce ECs of the Design Thinking course from 6 to 5 ECs. The free credit will be allocated to the activities in Block 1. By allocating the extra credit to the activities, students will receive assignments during the sessions that will go towards the project in the core courses of Block 2. It isn't a big change but it's a different sequence from the current academic year.
- 4) Change 2: The Thesis Trajectory will be part the Competency Framework, activities will be developed for this track thus students will develop competencies as critical thinker and communicator through lectures and workshops. The portfolio will be eventually used for the thesis proposal.
- 5) The thesis time frame will be a) October – December: Students will build a thesis competency framework portfolio, b) In January, students learn about the research methods and c) With the competences developed and research method devised, the thesis proposal will be submitted in February. After that, students will work individually on the thesis in collaboration with coaches. The first deadline of the entire thesis is in the second week of June.
- 6) The department would like to merge the Research Fundamental course with the Thesis Trajectory due to students work on the thesis from the beginning of the academic year. Merging the credits has the following advantages a) The big assignments of the Research Fundamental course removes and the thesis proposal will be used as a summative assignment with a pass-fail system. In addition, the quantitative assignment will become the final thesis submission, b) Students will have a jumpstart with their thesis project which prevents the thesis from being shelved and spreads the work on the thesis better over the academic year and c) The feedback process will be improved as it's more effective and easier to give feedback on smaller pieces of the thesis because if students receive feedback faster they are back on track with the thesis more quickly.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) GB: To work on the thesis from the beginning of the academic year could create two challenges a) Students don't know the thesis topic yet which makes it more difficult for them to work on the thesis and b) Since the thesis topic isn't yet known to students, it also becomes difficult for them to apply the correct research method in the course.

JM: In the October-December period, students will use the motivational sessions, workshops and coach assistant to decide on the thesis topic. This topic should be known in January thus they can work with it during the methodology course.

- 2) MS: If the Research Fundamental course is combined with the Thesis Trajectory, students might be assessed at the final thesis submission for mistakes made during the Research Fundamental course. MS wonders whether this is fair because the Research Fundamental course is meant to learn how to implement research. In addition, the two course have different learning goals.

JM: The Research fundamental course won't affect the final grade because it's a pass/fail course.

- 3) MS: If the Research Fundamental course is merged with the Thesis Trajectory, students would only be interested in their own thesis from the beginning of the academic year, which may lose students motivation to want to explore the other research methods.

- 4) AN is positive about merging the courses. However, there could be problems with the final grading system because the final thesis of all the master programmes should be assessed using the same rubric. This rubric focuses too much on the final product than on all the steps that led to the thesis. She wonders how the department will solve this issue.

JM: For the competences students should learn in the workshops, there are rubrics aligned with the final thesis rubrics.

- 5) AN: It would be better if the department defines how the new thesis process relates to the final thesis rubric because otherwise a) Flexibility in grading could occur and b) The explanation will make it clear to students how the process is works and that it's fair.
- 6) MS: It would be better to spread the allocated 1 EC over Block 1 and 2, otherwise students who follow the course for the second time could expect a grade two weeks after the Block 1.
- 7) According to MS, it will be unclear to students that the motivational sessions of Block 1 are an introduction to an assignment in the larger Design Thinking course of Block 2. In addition, because of the different courses, students might want to change groups and/or topics which might increase the workload of teachers.
JM: It's mandatory for students to stay in the same group. However, to keep students motivated, the project initiative should come from the students themselves.
- 8) DB is concerned that working on the thesis from the beginning of the academic year a) Could increase the workload for students because they have other courses alongside it and b) That students in the exam period will choose to pass the exam with a grade and intentionally fail the Research Fundamental course because it works with the pass -fail system.

The proposed changes in the MSc MI programme were unanimously accepted by the Committee. MS will write a letter of consent.

4. Update from the PC subcommittees

- 1) The AI in Education Subcommittee is working on the following topics a) Insights into AI at other universities and consultancy, b) Sub-tools used in AI and c) Implications of AI for education, teachers and students. During the next subcommittee meeting they would like to discuss what the form of the output will be, for example, one page with the main topics. Moreover, the members would like to finalise the draft document thus the MSc PC members could provide feedback on it during the MSc PC in meeting in February.
- 2) The Course Evaluation Subcommittee: During the previous subcommittee meeting the members discussed two topics, a) The PAC manual isn't much used and is very unfamiliar to students and b) The way formative feedback tools are used by teachers. Soon, the subcommittee will have a meeting with someone from the Learning Innovation Team to discuss which formative feedback tools are available.
- 3) Soon, the Diversity & Social Safety Subcommittee will have a meeting with the RSM's D&I initiatives project leader to discuss what is going on regarding diversity and inclusion within the school, thus the subcommittee can align the topics it wants to work on. Possible topics include sexual safety for students and international student inclusion.
- 4) The Open Education Subcommittee members are interviewing the Academic Directors about the best practices in open education topics, for example stakeholder connections, guests lecturers, and internships. After that, the subcommittee would like to create an overview of how each master programme deals with open education and if necessary, the subcommittee would like to expand their research to include a questionnaire for the teachers about education in the programme but this depends on the response from the Academic Directors. In addition, the committee would like to submit their draft report in March.
- 5) The Career Preparation Subcommittee: During the previous subcommittee meeting, the members discussed a) The gap in career preparation offerings and b) How the subcommittee's solutions could have a longer-term impact. The next step is to create a holistic overview for all master programmes. The final report will consist of an overview with information about the current gaps in the career preparation, the best practices and the general solution for the future.

Comments of the Committee:

Course Evaluation Subcommittee

- 1) MS: It would be better if the MSc PC could provide a starter pack in the Teams environment for the new student PC members, including the PAC manual.

- 2) MAS: Other tools to get formative feedback are a) The Plus Delta method and b) The behavioural anger skills in performance evaluation research. This method specifically measures what should change about the teacher's action to improve themselves.

Open Education Subcommittee

- 3) MS: It would be better to establish checkboxes for stakeholder involvement so that its visible which activities take place, for example, guests' lecturers, workshops or getting feedback.

Career Preparation Subcommittee

- 4) MS: To expand RSM's alumni network it would be better if the programmes encourage current students to become an active member of the alumni network.

5. Closing remarks

6. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write a letter about the changes in the MSc MI programme	By February	Maciej Szymanowski
AL will add the course manual discussion to a future MSc PC meeting	By February	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will invite the head of the alumni office to discuss the alumni topic	By February	Annelie van der Leelie

Next meetings:

29- Feb- 24, 09.30h

21-Mar-24, 10.00h

18-Apr-24, 09.30h

16-May-24, 09.30h

13-Jun-24, 09.30h