

Minutes MSc PC – 18 June 2026

Online meeting via Teams and T09-67 10:00–12:00 hours

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	MJ: Mariel Jurriens (MI, MBI)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	LRS: Lisanne van Rijn-Szewczyk (SCM)
AT: Alfredo Trovato (PM)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MSc BA AFM)
JB: Julia Botma (MBI)	MC: Mert Cetin (MScBA MIM)
MA: Moritz Appels (POC)	
AJ: Amber Jong (MI)	
AD: Andreas Distel (SE)	
IS: Isidora Sidorovska (SM)	
FB: Felix Boesch (MScBA BAM)	
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
RG: Robin Groen (MScBA P-MiM)	
TM: Tom Mom (MSc BA P-MIM)	
NP: Nirmay Panchal (SE)	
NN: Natalie Nieuwenhuizen (MScBA MiM)	
RU: Roos Uijterwaal (POC)	
RD: Robin Dottling (FI)	
MAN: Maurice Annaars (MScBA AFM)	
LR: Lora Raguz (BIM)	
IY: Irem Yildirim (MM)	
MJ: Mehek Jain (FI)	
TB: Toby Boontjes (SCM)	Guests
TC: Tony Choi (GBS)	BG: Brenda Grashoff (Secretary General/ Teamlead EB RSM)
AH: Anh Hoang (GBS)	AR: Arthee Ramsamy (Project Manager)
LC: Luca Coban (SM)	JC: Julia Cselotei (Inclusion Diversity Equity and Accessibility Project Lead)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the MSc PC on 28 May 2026 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved.

3. Approval of final output of the subcommittees

The subcommittees presented the final documents to each other and voted on it.

- 1) The Assessment Policy Advice Subcommittee indicated that this project has been delayed.
- 2) The Thesis Trajectory Subcommittee analysed the top data of the previous years and summarised the previous year's qualitative comments of the student evaluations about the thesis trajectory. The results of the student evaluations as follows: a) There is a timing discrepancy, as students had to assess the thesis defence experience before it happened because the evaluation took place after the thesis had been submitted but before the thesis

defence, b) There were concerns about the level of preparation offered by the research clinic and research methods courses. Probably, there is a mismatch between expectations regarding level of preparations courses offers and the faculty expectations regarding the level of skills that student should possess prior starting the research course in quantitative research, c) There were problems with data accesses, d) There were comments on the thesis timeline, e) With regards to the coach heterogeneity, there were concerns about the availability of coaches, the number of contact moments during the process and the quality and type of feedback students received, and f) There were concerns about the lack of expectation management. According to students there was a lack of practical information (in the course manual) regarding how the thesis trajectory will run. The subcommittee's key recommendations are: a) To focus on improving the expectations by strengthening and updating the thesis manual, b) To expand the guidance on the thesis layout by including a sample thesis, identifying contact points or student support and to set expectations regarding the availability of coaches should be, response time and a minimum standard for feedback. This standard information package could be added to the thesis manual, c) Establish and enforce minimum coaching standards, d) Reconsider the research methods preparations. According to the subcommittee, it would be better to provide a standardise research clinic covering these aspects and make a difference between the introductory and more advanced courses for some of the method based on the coaches requirements and e) To split the evaluations in two parts to address the technical problem that the evaluations had to be completed before students met their coaches. In addition, the subcommittee's general recommendation is that the coach experience has been neglected during the process. Therefore, it would be better to consider how the coach experience could be included into the subcommittee's research when revising the aspects of the trajectory.

The top-data of the lasts three years shows patterns that suggests differences between programmes in grading and the importance of the rubric categories. This is to be expected as there could be slight differences between programmes due to programmes are being more quantitative and theoretical focused than others. Therefore, the subcommittee would like to monitor the patterns to see whether there are signs of grade inflation, grade deflation or expectations management differences.

- 3) The purpose of the Quality of Education Subcommittee document is to ensure that when the Dean of Education defines the quality of education that the Programme Committee has a framework to assess the quality of the definitions. Key elements in the document are that the quality definitions should be/ have a) Defined with involvement of stakeholders, b) Compatible measurements and c) Created for a long-time period perspective.
- 4) The BAO Funds Subcommittee hasn't yet been able to produce a report, as it first has to wait for input from the Dean.
- 5) The PC Visibility Subcommittee would like to make the MSc PC more visible within RSM through a presentation providing information about what the Committee does,, how it operates and how the PC could be approached. The presentation is ready and the subcommittee would like to ask next year's subcommittee members to distribute the presentation within RSM by visiting the departments attending the Academic Directors meeting and by sending an email to students. However, the presentation should be adapted for students.
- 6) The PAC Subcommittee created a playbook which is a transitional document guide for the next PAC Subcommittee to update this information. Topics in the document are: a) Definitions, for example What is he PAC? How does the PAC relate to the MSc PC?, b) The onboarding process, c) Meeting structure frequency, d) The do's and don'ts for receiving feedback, e) The deliverables for the Academic Directors meetings and how the PAC should forward the meeting results to the students and f) A framework to standardise the PACs as much as possible.
- 7) The results of the Admission Process Subcommittee were discussed during the MSc PC meeting on 28 May. However, the subcommittee members indicated that the final output consists of two documents. One document is intended for the Academic Directors and contains information about how to introduce an admission process and what the legal and operational restraints are. The second document is intended for the

Admission Office and it contains information about the spillover effects of the new admission policy in the MSc FI master.

- 8) The AI for Education Subcommittee created a questionnaire with the following topics: a) AI use frequency, b) Which AI tools students use, c) For purposes which students use AI, d) AI literacy, e) The extent to which students are familiar with AI tools, f) AI learning effectiveness, g) How AI helps students during their study, for example, whether AI could identify students' knowledge gaps, h) Whether AI is effective for students, i) What the students concerns are about AI and j) What students need on educational support related to AI. The subcommittee has still the following questions: a) Is the questionnaire content comprehensive enough to be insightful, b) The subcommittee would like to compensate students for the participation in the questionnaire but how much should the voucher be?, c) What would be the best timing to implement the questionnaire and d) What would be the best way to distribute the questionnaire to the students. The subcommittee's idea is that the next year subcommittee could implement the questionnaire and collect and analyse the data.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) TM: To the quality of education framework document, it would be better to add a few lines at the beginning of the document about the importance of the recommendations. In addition, it would be better to prioritise the importance of the recommendations throughout the document.
- 2) LR: It would be better if the PC Visibility Subcommittee presentation will be showed to students during the master introduction day, thus students are aware that the MSc PC exist and what it entails.
- 3) IS is in favour of the PC Visibility Subcommittee presentation but it would be better if the subcommittee considers to distribute the presentation to faculty as well, by keeping a presentation or by posting it on the MSc PC website thus the faculty can better retain the information.
- 4) MS is in favour of the PAC playbook document but he is concerned that it's too comprehensive to use due to information overload.
- 5) LC: To make the PAC playbook document more useful, it would be better to include a summary of the key information in the document.
- 6) MA: For the AI for Education Subcommittee, it would be better to distribute through STAR as this would increase the response rates due to STAR has many active members.

Vote on the subcommittees outputs:

- 1) The proposed final output of the Thesis Trajectory Subcommittee was unanimously accepted by the Committee.
- 2) The proposed final document of the Quality of Education Subcommittee was unanimously accepted by the Committee.
- 3) The Committee voted on the PC Visibility Subcommittee presentation and in a vote, one member abstained and fifteen members were in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee.
- 4) The proposed playbook document of the PAC Subcommittee was unanimously accepted by the Committee.
- 5) The proposed admission policy documents of the Admission Process Subcommittee was unanimously accepted by the Committee.
- 6) The Committee voted on the AI for Education Subcommittee questionnaire and in a vote, three members abstained and fourteen members were in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee.

MS will write a subcommittee letter.

4. TER 2026-2027

BG informed the committee members about the TER 2026-2027.

- 1) For this year the main goal was to align the current TER with the EUR Central TER as much as possible.

- Therefore, only a few content-wise changes have been to the TER.
- 2) BG would like to know what the PC members think of the new TER.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) JS: It would better to highlight in the TER that as there are different types of students how they should be treated differently within the framework of general procedures. This will help thesis coaches to understand that some students have different timelines than other students which could impact the coach quality delivery which could lead to resentment amongst other students.

According to BG, this topic should be included in the course or thesis manual as it's programme specific.

- 2) LC: It would be better to include the cum laude distinction in the TER instead of the Rules & Regulations document as the procedure is unclear to many students, yet the topic applies to all students.

BG: The cum laude distinction rule is set out in the Rules & Regulations document because the decision should be made by the Examination Board and not by the Dean. However, BG could include a remark in the TER explaining why this topic is covered in the Rules & Regulations document and how to find it.

- 3) RG: It would be useful for the TER to include guidelines in the document on how faculty should deal with exceptions.
- 4) TM: Giving the hardship clause, it would be better to be careful regarding the number of exceptions set out in the TER, given the hardship clause. The more exceptions that are set out in the TER, the less flexible the document will become, as a solution should be devised for each exception.
- 5) MS: The TER indicates that in addition to MSC curriculum, a student may extend the programme with one additional programme component up to 15 EC in total and MS wonders where those ECs points come from.

BG is waiting on a response from Programme Management to this question.

The proposed TER 2026-2027 was unanimously accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

5. Consent on the recommendations regarding course evaluations redesign

JC updated the Committee on the recommendations regarding course evaluations.

- 1) The team proposes for the course evaluation revamp that the PACs and SR would get a larger role of providing feedback from students to faculty because the questionnaire results come too late.
- 2) The team proposes to change the name of the course evaluations from Student Evaluations of Teaching to Student Experience Survey to change the focus of what this instrument measures.
- 3) The team proposes to implement 20% of the new content in the questionnaire from September onwards and from the next academic year to focus on reviewing the rest of the questionnaire in collaboration with experts.
- 4) The team would like to know how the PC members think about striking a balance between including the QR code in the last lecture versus having identifying responses in case of abusive comments.
- 5) The team would like to know the Committee's view about 4.2. complementary mechanism outside of SES. With the PACs and SR feedback teachers will be encouraged to write a better self-reflection.
- 6) The Team would like to encourage the school to invest in expert and peer to peer reviews.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) IS is in favour of removing the focus of the instructor from the questionnaire and more focus on the learning experience and achievements of the learning objectives. However, she is concerned that switching the question the teacher is engaging to my interest in the course is now lower or higher may lead to expectation mismatch. Therefore, it would be better to change the question to the course intensified my interests in this topic.
- 2) IS disagrees with introducing a statement in the document that the questionnaire is anonymous until the school decides that is no longer anonymous, as students assume that there is confidentiality to the answers

they provide, therefore, students provide genuine and constructive feedback who won't be comfortable being personally connected to the feedback, for example for fear of retaliation. However, IS understands that anonymity stops with offensive comments.

- 3) TM: The risk of only receive feedback from small groups of students is that no information has been gathered from a larger group of students and that people are speaking from their own experience. This results in teachers receiving biased information. Therefore, it would be better to implement a pilot for the PAC and SR feedback.
- 4) TM: if the questionnaire content and the implementation methods will change at the same time the results are no longer comparable.
- 5) RG: Students aren't filling out the questionnaires, so they won't see the new questions either.
- 6) RG: The question in the questionnaire asking are you more interested in the course after you completed it is an improvement, as it students allows students to reflect on what they have learned and to indicate this. In addition, the response-rate will increase if students see what RSM has done with the feedback from the previous students and why, students will then understand that their feedback will be used.
- 7) MS: The results of the QR code questionnaire aren't useful as teachers don't know whether one student is driving the discussion or whether many students have similar points.

6. Closing remarks

MS thanked everyone for the good collaboration over the past academic year.

7. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write a subcommittee letter	By June	Maciej Szymanowski
MS will write a consent letter about the TER	By June	Maciej Szymanowski

8. Next meetings:

TBD