

Minutes MSc PC – 19 March 2026

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

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	MJ: Mariel Jurriens (MI, MBI)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	AJ: Amber Jong (MI)
AT: Alfredo Trovato (PM)	LRS: Lisanne van Rijn-Szewczyk (SCM)
MAN: Maurice Annaars (MScBA AFM)	FB: Felix Boesch (MScBA BAM)
MA: Moritz Appels (POC)	
JB: Julia Botma (MBI)	
AD: Andreas Distel (SE)	
SZ: Solomon Zori (MSc BA AFM)	
RG: Robin Groen (MScBA P-MiM)	
TC: Tony Choi (GBS)	
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
AH: Anh Hoang (GBS)	
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)	
MC: Mert Cetin (MScBA MIM)	
RD: Robin Dottling (FI)	
IY: Irem Yildirim (MM)	Guests
IS: Isidora Sidorovska (SM)	MB: Mirko Benischke (Dean of Education)
LC: Luca Coban (SM)	AJB: Amy Janssen -Brennan (Cluster Lead/ Director of Students Affairs)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Announcement:

- 1) MB and MS discussed the MSc TER procedure of this year and it will start earlier because then there is time to rewrite the document. In addition, MS indicated that the BSc IBA TER is different than the MSc TER, as it is easier to find a topic in the IBA TER in terms of wording and individual provisions.
- 2) Probably, during the MSc PC April meeting, the Committee should give consent to the new MSc TER proposal.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the MSc PC on 12 February 2026 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved.

3. Q&A with the Dean of Education (including discussion about the information flow between PC and DoE)

The Dean of Education informed the Committee about RSM's financial situation and answered the committee members questions about the education portfolio.

- 1) In the past, there were main concerns about RSM's situation which indirectly influenced the MSc PC decisions for example regarding measures in the education portfolio.
- 2) Currently, RSM's financial situation has improved and is expected to remain stable next year. However, the school and the university will expect setbacks.
- 3) The Dean of Education would like to make RSM future proof in terms of its education portfolio and the Education Vision will allow the school to make choices on resource allocation.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) JS is concerned that if RSM is too much focused on the variable costs it might lose the structural costs out of sight.
- 2) JS is concerned that RSM will lose its academic scientific tradition if some master programmes will merge the method courses.
- 3) RD: It would be better if the school considered that there are many electives with the same prep course and content.

MB: It would be better to collaborate on the skills track, professional development and AI literacy track. However, the allocation model works against this.

- 4) LR: It would be better if the 12 Research Methods courses will be centralised in one course where it would be taught online or in a hybrid form.

MB: It would be a good idea, however, faculty of different masters could have different perspectives on the methods, so the department should consider what information could be shared across a group of programmes.

- 5) TM: Despite the changes in RSM, it would be better if RSM also would work on the reputation of the school.
- 6) MS: If master students of different programmes follow the same courses for the base principles, it would be better to include tailored modules within the course which are aligned with the specific master programmes the students are following.
- 7) MS: To ensure that the courses are aligned with the labour market, it would be better to demonstrate stakeholders what RSM students are learning.

4. Update on and request for advice on admission changes for the MSc MI programme

AJB updated the Committee on the changes of the admission requirements for the MSc MI and MBI masters.

- 1) The Admission Department would like to ask advice of the MSc PC to the proposal to change the admission requirements of the MSc MI and MBI programmes.
- 2) Currently, the programme goals are a) To learn how to effectively develop an innovation strategy, b) To create an innovation culture and c) How to manage the entire innovation process.
- 3) The programmes are focused on the tech industry and medical business innovation industry. However, there are a few applications for the master programmes due to the admission requirement: a Bachelor of Science degree from a research university in an engineering field combined with a minimum of 15 EC in business administration courses for non-business majors and it's difficult for students without a business background to get the credits. Therefore, the Academic Directors decided that the 15 ECTS of business administration aren't necessary to be successful in the programme. In addition, discontinuing the requirement won't change the quality of the students, as they will learn the business knowledge during the master programme.
- 4) The department asked advice to the proposal to change the current admission requirements a) A minimum total of 20 EC in qualitative and quantitative research methods and statistics as well as b) A minimum of 40 EC in advanced courses in business administration or c) A Bachelor of Science degree from a research university in an engineering field combined with a minimum of 15 EC in business administration courses to require to

have a research university bachelor degree containing a minimum total of 20 EC in qualitative and quantitative research methods and statistics as well.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) JS is concerned that if the business requirement would be discontinued, RSM will de-differentiate itself and lose students, as RSM would no longer be a business school but an innovation school. Therefore, JS advised if the business requirement will be removed, it would be better to replace it with for example a prerequisite course in which students learn about the theory of the firm and business theories, thus students with or without a business background have a chance to resolidify assumptions and theories that form the core of the business school model.
- 2) IS wonders how tailored the content of the programme is to make the background in business necessary? Because it could be an opportunity for RSM to deliver graduates from disciplines that could have an impact on society.
- 3) IS: In the masters, there are different background groups of students. Therefore, it would be better to design different content tracks that students could follow.
- 4) TM: It would be better to label the proposed changes as a three years pilot thus different parts could be measured and evaluated, for example, a) The quality of student inflow , b) Student performance and c) Student placement.
- 5) MA wonders how important the business background requirement is, as there are other RSM masters for which the business background isn't strictly necessarily.
- 6) MS is concerned that it's unclear what the impact of the requirements could have on current students who are admitted through the current requirements as the different levels of skills in a student group could constrain the study progress.
- 7) RG: For RSM, it would be better to know what is happening in the companies so that the school could align itself with that. This could also relate to changes within industries.
- 8) MA is in favour of adding some business content to the premaster, thus students with a non-business background should complete the premaster before they would be admitted to the MI/MBI master.

MS will write an advice letter.

5. Update on the PAC activity

AT informed the Committee about the PAC activity.

- 1) The Educational coordinators in the departments are the employees who support the Academic Directors in the organising and managing the PAC meetings during the academic year. Therefore, since the academic year 2024-2025, the coordinators will provide the PAC student training with topics about the a) PAC selection procedure, b) PAC visibility, c) PAC role and responsibility, d) Lack of references and e) Lack of knowledge transfer and knowledge sharing between PACs.
- 2) The training schedule is as follows: a) An onboarding meeting in October. During this meeting, students get an introduction about the role and responsibilities of the PAC and how to collect and process feedback from the Academic Directors, b) The sharing best practises meeting in February focuses on sharing best practises between PACs and c) In May or June would be the last meeting of the academic year where coordinators collect the final feedback from the PAC students regarding their PAC experience as a PAC student representative of their programmes.
- 3) During the meeting on 27 February 2026, the members discussed the following questions: a) How many times they met over the past few months?, b) What kind of deliverable did they prepare for the meeting with the Academic Director?, c) What topics did they consider when providing feedback on the courses? and d) What did they think worked very well during the PAC meetings? What could be improved? According to the students the following parts worked well: a) A key strength of the PAC meetings was the consistent set of

- questions”, b) “Specific issues highlighted by Academic Director before the start of the block, where PAC should focus”, c) “Asynchronous developing of the live document for the PAC, d) “High response rate for the WhatsApp Poll (60%) e) “Feedback survey questions vs. Group chats for electives’, f) “An active group chat keeps participation strong” and g) “Clear agenda and collaborative approach to identifying solutions. Parts that still could be improved, according to students are: a) “Increasing the visibility of the PAC, so that students better understand what the PAC is, what it does, and how it can support them”, b) “Finding New Members (Elective Blocks)”, c) “Feedback arrives too late and outcomes aren’t always visible”, d) “While feedback effectively enhances the curriculum for future cohorts, there is a gap in addressing real-time concerns for current students”, e) “Initial PAC onboarding left students with unanswered questions and responsibilities” and f) “Motivation within the PAC is somewhat lacking, likely due to the large group size”. In addition, during this academic year, a shared folder for PACs has been created in Teams where the PACs could share documents and collect information and have access to institutional documents the coordinators have prepared for them.
- 4) The conclusion is that a) High level of engagement and commitment, b) Standardised templates and procedures needed to streamline activities, c) Safe and compliant digital environment and d) Proper storage of documentation to facilitate knowledge transfer from one academic year to the next one (End of Year report).

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) RD: To improve the PACs, it would be better if students would be trained in how to gauge a representative opinion from the cohort, for example, how to create a good poll or questionnaire.
- 2) LR: In the PAC Teams environment, it would be better to add sample questions for questionnaires which the PAC member could use.
- 3) RG: To improve the PACs questionnaires, it would be useful if an AI tool will be added to the PAC Teams environment which compares all the survey documents on best practices and provides feedback about the information that students need regarding the questionnaire.
- 4) MS: For the last PAC meeting of this academic year, it would be better to summarise the current year and discuss which information should be forwarded to the new PAC members thus they could build on it and improve it.

6. Update on the progress of the subcommittees

The subcommittees updated the Committee on their process.

- 1) The Assessment Policy Advice Subcommittee had a meeting with the Assessment Policy Project project manager Yanick Kuper and the subcommittee received information about the extent and timeline of the project. However, not many details have been shared, as these haven’t yet been included but soon there will be a draft document which should be shared with the MSc PC for approval.
- 2) The Thesis Trajectory Subcommittee couldn’t find the top-data as it’s having challenges accessing the details. Therefore, the Subcommittee is currently focusing on student evaluations to identify the topics the Subcommittee could focus on.
- 3) The Quality of Education Subcommittee found a lot of theoretical research on this topic and is currently in the process of distilling this information, from a perspective of the Academic Directors to a practical best practice do’s and don’ts list.
- 4) The BAO Subcommittee is informed by the RSM Q&I Education Committee about how it’s going. In particular, the components concerning the quality of education are relevant, as this is the area the PCs deal with.
- 5) The PC Visibility Subcommittee would like to make a presentation about the PC’s visibility which will be presented to the Academic Directors and other stakeholders.
- 6) The PAC Subcommittee was discussed during this meeting in the topic *Update on the PAC Activity*.
- 7) 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 considering about potential suggestions, b) Is working

on goal 2: To inform PC/other departments about the legal and operational constraints and provide options for selection criteria and c) Goal 3: To assess effects of finance admission change on other programs' admission process (via students' strategic incentives when/how to apply).

- 8) The AI as a Competence in AI Learning Process Subcommittee would like to focus on a) How each department is approaching AI, including the use of available resources on campus which are provided by the university and b) From a students' perspective what the students AI literacy needs are. This will be measured by a student questionnaire.

Comments of the Committee:

Thesis Trajectory Subcommittee

- 1) MS: As there is no driven-data information accessible about the thesis trajectory, it would be better to establish coach evaluations to see how they experience the thesis trajectory process.
- 2) IS: The Subcommittee will suggests recommendations regarding coach experience. In addition, the subcommittee's approach is to identify gaps in knowledge and understanding in the thesis process and provide recommendations on how this could be improved in the future.
- 3) MS: To measure the value of the of thesis, it would be better to collect more data about the link between the thesis and careers.

MS: Executive Director Quality & Innovation Anna de Waard-Leung asked whether the subcommittees could approach her all at once otherwise it's difficult for her to keep up. Therefore, MS proposed if the subcommittees would like to approach Anna they should first contact MS, thus he could cluster the subcommittees.

7. Closing remarks

8. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write an advice letter about the admission requirements changes of the MI and MBI programmes	By April	Maciej Szymanowski

9. Next meetings:

16-Apr-26, 10.00h, 28-May-26, 10.00h18-Jun-26, 10.00h