

Minutes MSc PC – 16 April 2026

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

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	JB: Julia Botma (MBI)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	AJ: Amber Jong (MI)
AT: Alfredo Trovato (PM)	IS: Isidora Sidorovska (SM)
MJ: Mariel Jurriens (MI, MBI)	MC: Mert Cetin (MScBA MIM)
MA: Moritz Appels (POC)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MSc BA AFM)
MAN: Maurice Annaars (MScBA AFM)	RG: Robin Groen (MScBA P-MiM)
AD: Andreas Distel (SE)	TC: Tony Choi (GBS)
LRS: Lisanne van Rijn-Szewczyk (SCM)	AH: Anh Hoang (GBS)
FB: Felix Boesch (MScBA BAM)	
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
NN: Natalie Nieuwenhuizen (MScBA MiM)	
TM: Tom Mom (MSc BA P-MIM)	
NP: Nirmay Panchal (SE)	
RU: Roos Uijterwaal (POC)	
LR: Lora Raguz (BIM)	
TB: Toby Boontjes (SCM)	
MJ: Mehek Jain (FI)	
RD: Robin Döttling (FI)	Guests
IY: Irem Yildirim (MM)	EY: Esra Yedekci (Learning Innovation consultant)
LC: Luca Coban (SM)	AB: Alexander Baanen (Project Manager Quality & Innovation)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Announcement:

- 1) MS shared the early version of the new TER document with the committee members.
- 2) The new TER document is easier to read

2. Approval of the Minutes from the MSc PC on 19 March 2026 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved.

3. RSM Education Vision Graduate qualities

EY discussed the RSM Education Vision Graduate Quality document with the Committee:

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) MS: All profiles in the figure consist of four quality elements except the Change Agent profile which contains of three quality elements in the quality description part of the document. He wonders whether the elements change capacity and lifelong learning have been combined. The change capacity quality consists of an internal

component (Being reflective about your own values and beliefs) and an external aspect (Influencing people, dynamics and systems). MS understands why the change capacity internal part could be combined with the life-long learning element but doesn't understand how the change capacity external aspect is combined with the life-long learning quality and he believes the definition of the change capacity external aspect someone who could impact the world around them should be specified separately from the life-long learning quality which is the internal focus of a graduate.

EY: The idea is to make the change capacity quality the core element of the profile. In addition, the Change Agent profile is difficult to evaluate and describe in concrete terms because it's abstract and fits more in the 'quality attitude' than the other profiles. However, RSM could empower students that they have the capacity for a change. Moreover, the change capacity quality isn't connected to the life-long learning capacity in general. However, the internal aspect is connected to the life-long learning quality.

- 2) MS: A Change Agent is a professional with an ethical attitude, for example, the stakeholder engagement, implementation and delivery are the equivalence are missing in the Change Agent profile. Therefore, it would be better to shorten the *Change Agent* profile to professional plus the system, ethical and life-long learning qualities and skip the change capacity quality as the stakeholder engagement, implementation and delivery elements are already covered by the professional quality.
- 3) TM is concerned that the Education Vision Graduate Quality document won't be used as it indicates that the framework is inspirational and high-level and programmes aren't expected to explicitly assess elements or to redesign the curriculum. The aim of the document is to ensure meaningful alignment. Therefore, it would be better if the team reconsiders how the document could make an impact in the school.
- 4) MS: RSM would like to improve the education quality without increasing the workload for people and the framework could help to reduce the effort on employees. An implementation goal of the document could be to facilitate redesign programmes.
- 5) TM suggested that it would be better if the team considers that in practice some master programmes are more specialised to a specific profile than other programmes. Therefore, it would be better if the team considers that not all master programmes should meet all the profile elements.

4. RSM Education Vision Guiding Principles document

AB discussed the RSM Education Vision Guiding Principles document with the Committee.

- 1) The Education Vision Guiding Principles document is an operationalised version of the Education Vision document and this initiative was launched by the Dean of Education.
- 2) The topics in the Education Vision document could be implemented. Currently, they are making agreements and mandating with different stakeholder groups. The next step will be to set short-, mid- and long-term goals with the different stakeholders who are responsible for shaping these goals.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) MS: In projects such as the Education Vision Guiding Principles, it is often assumed that the changes will be implemented by faculty which could increase their workload. Therefore, it would be better to consider that the new implementations may not be easy for teachers to conduct for example due to the system.

AB: The Education Vision Guidelines Principles document content reflects on how RSM currently operates. The goals provide an inspiring vision of where the school aims to be in five years' time, but these goals should fit within the context of RSM's current work. However, the goals should be set explicitly otherwise the resources won't be allocated.

- 2) JS is concerned that in the operational process the general population of students that matters will be forgotten.
- 3) TM is positive about the document but the document presents a closed internal looking view of the RSM ecosystem. However, for developments of this ecosystem the school should collaborate with external stakeholders as well. Therefore, it would be better to include external stakeholders in the stakeholder overview in order to maintain the connection with the outside world.

- 4) MS: It would be better if the team considers not using the research for marketing of this project, as this isn't in line with the research integrity.
 - 5) LR: It would be better if the goal *thoughtful technology integration and institutional digital capability* were more specified in the document, as the current description is very general.
- AB: During the next phase of the project, the goals will be further specified.
- 6) MS supports the specific directions of the project, for example the technology and cross-domain components. However, he is concerned about the mechanisms that enable the right decisions to be made in those domains, for instance, which technologies should RSM invest in or how those involved should be remunerated? Therefore, it would be better to make these decisions on programme level to create a comprehensive portfolio. However, it should be considered who should be involved in this process e.g., external stakeholders.

5. Update on the progress of the subcommittees

The subcommittees updated the Committee on their process.

- 1) The AI as a Competence in AI Learning Process Subcommittee has held meetings with stakeholders is currently working to define what students would like to learn from AI with a view to bridging the gap between students AI needs and what the university has to offer.
- 2) The Admission Process Subcommittee a) Has finished goal 1: To Inform the PC about the consent vote on the finance admission process change to come, and to consider any suggestions, b) Is working on goal 2: To inform PC/other departments about the legal and operational constraints and to provide options for selection criteria. The subcommittee has created a draft document and discussed it with Amy Janssen-Brennan from the Admission Office. The draft document consists of a legal and operational requirements part and an institutional part. From the legal perspective, the admission policy should include two assessments criteria; in the case of the MSc FI programme these are the GPA and the interview questions. For the institutional content there are no strict EUR- guidelines but the most valuable criteria are the GPA and the interview questions, as no additional infrastructure is required and this procedure is already applied in the CEMS programmes. In addition, resources indicate that other assessment criteria don't work for the admission procedure. However, in the future, it might be possible to work with an admission lottery procedure and c) Goal 3 To assess effects of finance admission change on other programmes' admission process. The three spillover effects are: a) (Pre-)application substitution: Demand shift & potential mismatches: students may avoid applying to MSc FI master or withdraw applications due to uncertainty and instead choose programmes with earlier and more predictable outcomes, b) Post-application limits: Limited reallocation after FI outcomes . By the time FI outcomes are released, many alternative programmes are already full. This reduces flexibility and may lead to the loss of strong candidates to other institutions and c) Spillovers for other universities: Demand shift & late changes. Given that applicants can only apply to one RSM MSc at a time, part of the adjustment occurs externally. Students may substitute towards other universities as a risk-hedging strategy. The FI changes may lead to increased cross-institutional competition, higher (late) change rates elsewhere and potential loss of strong candidates from RSM. The subcommittee advises the Admission Office to a) Communicate the outcomes as early as possible thus that students have the flexibility to choose another programme, b) When students are searching about the admission process they should already be informed of the application deadline thus they understand the timeline and decide whether they would like to apply for the master or not and c) if students reach the second round of process, this should be clearly indicated, as students then have a huge chance of being admitted to the programme without making false promises.
- 3) The PAC Subcommittee created a PAC Playbook. This contains information about onboarding, best practises and notes from the individual PACs. The PAC Playbook will be distributed to the PACs of next year.
- 4) The PC Visibility Subcommittee created a presentation about the PC's visibility which will be presented to the Academic Directors and other stakeholders.
- 5) The BAO Subcommittee was involved in the meetings regarding the BAO funds and provided feedback to

the Dean of Education.

- 6) The Quality of Education Subcommittee is working on the final output document. The document contains recommendations about what the quality of education is, how it could be measured it and so on.
- 7) The Thesis Trajectory Subcommittee idea was to research through data how the thesis trajectory process is progressing. It took some time because it's not common that the thesis trajectory student course evaluations and top-data would be shared but the subcommittee analysed the data and was able to design a new regression model based on this year's results. The idea of the subcommittee was to create a strength and weakness document about the thesis trajectory process based on the student course evaluations comments but it's uncertain whether creating such a document is feasible for this year.
- 8) The Assessment Policy Advice Subcommittee is in contact with Policy Project Project Manager Yanick Kuper and the subcommittee would like to share a draft policy document on which the other PC members could provide feedback on.

6. Closing remarks

7. Action points

What	When	Who
All subcommittees will put the draft outputs in the MSc PC Teams environments	By May	All subcommittees

8. Next meetings:

28-May-26, 10.00h

18-Jun-26, 10.00h