Minutes MSc PC – 17 April 2025

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

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	(MBI)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	KV: Kristina Vereshchagina (MScBA AFM)
JV: Jelle de Vries (SCM)	SG: Shanifa Goelab (POC)
KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)	SP: Suus Pleyte (SM)
MAS: Maartje Schouten (POC)	SML: Sofia Murell Lema (PM)
EH: Evi Hommez (MScBA P-MIM)	NL: Niccolò Di Leo (SE)
MP: Mihail Pop (MScBA BAM)	PJ: Patryk Jarmakowicz (MI)
KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)	EB: Emanuel Ubert (SM)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS, P-MM)	SJ: Sarah Janders (MM)
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
AD: Andreas Distel (SE)	
RH: Reina Hamersak MScBA MiM)	
PS: Pravar Saran (BIM)	
LF: Luca Fanelli (SCM)	
LW: Lot van Westerveld (GBS)	
AR: Anna-Maria Radeva (FI)	
SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)	
DY: Dong Yan (FI)	Guests
	GH: Gabi Helfert (Cluster Lead/ Director of Educational Excellence)
	MB: Mirko Benischke (Acting Dean of Education)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Announcement:
1) MS: Mirko Benischke is the new Acting Dean of Education and he will introduce himself.
2) MB introduced himself. He is the new Acting Dean of Education at RSM.
3) In the future, MB would like to collaborate with the MSc PC and be invited when important topics should be discussed. In addition, when policies will be discussed, MB will be represented by Anna de Waard-Leung.
4) MB: The Executive Board decided to align the compensation of all programme committees with the EUR expectation, which means an upward increase in the amount of money for all staff and student members. Members will receive the compensation from 1 September 2024, meaning that current members will receive a retroactive portion.
5) MB: To inform the PC members about RSM changes every faculty member and student member will receive an invitation to a workshop about educational vision and educational quality definitions.

Comments of the Committee:
1) MS: It would be a good idea if the MSc PC will be involved in discussions about educational changes at RSM.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 27 March 2025—see attachment.
Not discussed.

3. Discussion on the TER 2025-2026- Gabi Helfert
GH updated the Committee on the changes in the TER 2025-2026.

1) This year, there no major changes in the TER because the school expects structural changes for the next academic year due to educational changes that the previous Dean of Education wanted to implement.

2) In the footnote on page 3, the information about the HRM programme has been deleted because RSM no longer offers the MSc HRM programme and the transition period between the old and new master has expired

3) An additional paragraph has been added to Article 1.3. specifying the difference between a resit and an improvement option.

4) In the footnote on page 7, there is a change to the Your Future Career course (YFC). The YFC course is the only course for which MSc students could request an exemption because there are students who do a second master and followed the YFC course during the first master.

5) In Article 4.1. the wording a) Re-examination has been changed to resit and improvement option, b) Extra opportunities has been changed to extra exam opportunities and c) The sentence *By way of derogation from paragraph 1 first sentence the resit shall be cancelled in case no students have registered during the regular registration period for the resit* has been changed to *By way of derogation from paragraph 1 second sentence, for any component of the assessment counting for a significant part (50% or more of the grade), a re-sit or a reasonable improvement option7 should be offered* because the resit won't be cancelled if no students registered because there is an option for students to come on the resit day itself and register for the resit.

6) Article 4.1.1. footnote 9 has been added to the document because students in the MSc MBI and MI programmes for example, no longer have a standard research method course in their curriculum but they do have a coaching document, workshop, assignments, thesis proposal and the final thesis. So, the students should be aware that they can't continue with the thesis until they have passed the coaching document and workshop.

7) Article 5.3.5. the rule that a paper copy may be changed at cost price would be eliminated as the paper copies are no longer used during the perusals.

8) The appendix hasn't yet been updated as not all programmes have yet submitted the changes

9) Changes have been made to Annex 2 regarding the premaster programmes

10) On page 33, there are now only 2 premaster programmes at RSM instead of 3.

11) There is no longer a separate online English premaster module for students with deficiencies in statistics and/or research methods".

12) The ECTS of the one-year pre-masters have been changed from 29 to 30 ECTS.

13) In Annex 2.3. the sentence *If not the grades and credits received up to that point will be cancelled* has been changed to *Whereby no extra exam opportunities will be offered in addition to the examination schedule, unless the Examination Board decides otherwise on the basis of article 4.1 paragraph 9. Further information is available on the RSM-website www.rsm.nl/pre-master*.

14) On page 33, the sentence, *Note, pre-master students must register themselves for the MSc programme according to the application deadlines* has been structed because it's also self-evident.

15) It has been aligned in the TER that the online English and Dutch pre-master programmes have the same 30 ECTS, intended Learning Outcomes and curriculum modules.

16) The curriculum drawing on page 34 will be adjusted.

17) Annex 3 is a new section in the TER about the Dual master Degree in Management. This master has already existed for a few years but has been added to the TER thus students are informed about the rules for example applying to this programme until the 31st of January to follow a second master at a partner school abroad (Bocconi University, ESADE or University of ST Gallen).

Comments of the Committee:
1) MAS: To make the TER more readable and searchable, it would be better to hyperlink the definitions in the document to the pages.
2) MS: It would be better to check whether table 2 and 3 on page 5 and 6 should be updated as the table is perhaps outdated due to changes in the programmes introduced this year.
3) MS: It would be better to check whether the curricula outlines are updated in the appendix, as they are different from those approved by the MSc PC.
4) MS: It would be better to add to the footnote on page 7 that the MSc BA MIM and MSc GBS students who followed the Building Your Career course and the Personal Narrative course during their first master could also request for an exemption, as these courses are similar to the YFC course.
5) MAS: It would be better to communicate very well to teachers that resits can't be cancelled and that students can register for a resit the day itself because they have the right to take a resit.
6) GB: For Article 4.1.1. footnote 9, it would be better to specify that it concerns the thesis trajectory components.
7) MS: From a formal perspective, the thesis trajectory consists of courses with multiple components where the requirements to pass these courses are determined by the teachers and thus it's no topic for the TER. Therefore, he wonders why this requirement has been added to the TER because teachers would then be constrained in what they do. Therefore, it would be better to make the wording more generic thus programmes can specify which courses must be passed to continue with the thesis trajectory.
8) JS: It isn't clear what the admission changes are in the new TER, which makes it difficult to vote on the document and therefore it would be better if MSc PC members could compare the TER 2024-2025 with the TER 2025-2026.
9) JS wonders whether changes to requirements in methods prerequisites for the thesis trajectory somehow influence the thesis manual.
10) JS wonders with the dual degree programme whether students defend the thesis in one institution and repeat the same defence at the other university and end up with two numeric grades or does one university act as a validator of the other or in a pass-fail perspective or is there a grade assign?

4. ILO 1 change in the MSc SM programme— Yu Liu

MS updated the Committee on the ILO 1 change in the MSc SM programme.
1) On the advice of the MSc PC the 'old' ILO 1: *Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of strategic management, founded upon and extends and/or enhances that typically associated with first cycle and provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas often in a research context.* Has been changed to the updated ILO 1: *Demonstrate advanced knowledge and understanding of strategic management, building on and extending what is typically learned in a bachelor's program, and apply this knowledge independently and originally, particularly in a research context.*

Comments of the Committee:
1) MS: The updated ILO 1 reads much clearer.

The Committee voted on the updated ILO 1 change in the MSc SM programme and in a vote, one member abstained and thirteen members were in favour of the proposal, so the proposal was accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

5. Improvements in PC proceedings

The PC members discussed how to improve the different PC proceedings.

a) Proposed amendment to PC Code of Order
1) MAS has heard signals in the school that some topics discussed in the PC created distrust at RSM so that

RSM Erasmus

people have been challenging the legitimacy of the PC decisions which is problematic for the Committee's legitimacy. Therefore, she proposes to change the PC procedure when the PC chair has a vested interest of appearance in how PC members make decisions. In that case, it would be better if the chair temporarily step aside and a collectively chosen temporarily different chair leads the discussion for that agenda topic, so that the 'normal' chair is able to participate in the discussion as a member and not have the appearance of influencing the decision making process.

Comments of the Committee:
1) MS: With the change, it would be good to define what constitutes vested interests, as members have vested interests in the discussed topics due to the members are teachers and students of the programmes discussed. The solution could be that when a PC member indicates that there is a vested interest of the chair in this topic, the procedure of choosing the temporary chair is initiated. In short, the PC members can decide whether there is an apparent conflict of interest of the chair in a specific topic that should be discussed.
2) DY: Each PC member is associated with a programme, so if, for example, the representative of the MSc FI programme speaks about the MSc FI thesis trajectory, it's clear to everyone in the committee that this representative has a vested interest. However, when specific courses are discussed, it isn't clear to each committee member whether other committee members have a vested interest in this topic. To resolve this ambiguity, it would be better if the member or chair who has a vested interest in this topic voluntarily discloses this thus in the case of the chair, the other members can assess whether another chair should be chosen for this topic.
3) JS: It would be better if PC members were better informed about the context of a topic that should be voted on, thus its clear to members what they should vote on.
   MS: To provide the PC members a better understanding of the context of a topic, it would be better to invite not only the decision maker (often the Academic Director) but also a domain expert on the topic to the MSc PC meeting.
4) MS: It would be a good idea if AL could share the Code of Order document with the PC members thus they could add their suggestions to the document which will be discussed during the next meeting.

b) Disambiguation of PC rights of consent and advice for key PC decision types
1) MS: To make the MSc PC more productive it would be better to be clear what advice and consent rights the MSc PC has. Therefore, it would be a good idea to get acquire services of an independent educational lawyer who could specify what the committee's advice and consent rights are.
2) MS will asks advice from the Faculty Council on how they proceed this from a formal and costs perspective.

c) Disambiguation of rightful applicant requesting specific PC decisions
1) MS: Due to a previous incident, it isn't clear who requests consent/advice from the PC for changes in the master programmes. Who is the legal entity? For instance the Dean or the Academic Director?

d) Format of requests directed to PC: specific decisions which are requested
1) MS: There is a format directed to the Committee but in practice, in the presentation, the context of the change and the change itself is often not very clear. Therefore, it would be better to ask the representative to be as specific as possible about why and what the PC members should vote on.
2) MS: To improve communication between the PC and the representative, for example, the Academic Director, it would be a good idea to include a template in the Code of Order on what a presentation of request should look like.

e) Ensuring information completeness about requests directed to PC: argumentation supporting requested changes, substantive topic expertise
1) MS: Besides the decision-maker (Academic Director), it would be better to also invite the domain expert about the topic that will be discussed thus the PC members will get a broader context about the change they should vote on.

RSM

2) MS: If after a committee vote, it appears that the PC hasn't received all the information about the topic voted on and the representatives disagree with the result of the vote a second vote is sometimes requested. MS wonders what the PC members think about this.

Comments of the Committee:
1) MS wouldn't want to have to re-vote every time the request representative disagrees with the vote result. Therefore, it would be better to add to the Code of Order that there is one appeal option for another consideration.

f)   Rights and the role of PC members (defining constituency, independence)
Not discussed.

g)   Other PC proceeding improvement areas
1)   MS: If PC members have suggestions to improve the Code of Order, they can propose them in the document.

6. Update on the subcommittees
1)   MS: Due to the busy MSc PC year, it would be better if the subcommittees submit a paper with only the goals and highlighting the problems on the topic.

7. Closing remarks
Not discussed.

8. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write a consent letters about the ILO 1 change in the MSc SM programme	By May	Maciej Szymanowski
AL will put the topic of comparing the TER documents on the MSc PC May agenda	By May	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will share the Code of Order document with the committee members and put the topic on the agenda for the next meeting	By May	Annelie van der Leelie
All PC members can add their suggestions about the Code of Order to the document	By May	All PC members
MS will ask advice from the Faculty Council on how they proceeded acquire services from an independent educational lawyer from a formal and costs perspective	By May	Maciej Szymanowski
All subcommittees will provide half a page of information about their topic	By May	All subcommittees

9. Next meetings:
22-May-25, 09.30h
19-Jun-25, 10.00h

RSM