Minutes MSc PC – 22 May 2025

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

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

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Announcement:

1) The chair asked whether any volunteer could write the minutes of the meeting, due to AL's absence the following week.
2) MB introduced the development of an "Educational Vision Document," which outlined the desired state of RSM education by 2030. He clarified that this document did not concern RSM's future strategy but rather aimed to capture the faculty's educational position in the future. The vision should be tied to a quality framework to help define and assess the educational quality of RSM. The document will be shared with the Programme Committee (PC) in the following weeks. A subsequent document, expected after summer, will explain how the vision should be achieved. MB stressed the importance of reviewing the first document by the next month, as ongoing conversations were taking place about the future delivery of professional services and educational programmes. Feedback was also expected from the PC (MSc, BSc, CEMS) and the Faculty Council around the same time, so the document could be approved before summer, when the planning for the second stage of the project would begin. MB further emphasised that the document could not go through multiple iterations, as it would need to be reapproved by the other parties involved. He stated that the document would

be provided to PC members around the end of the following two weeks.

3) The TER commission approached the chair to inform him that none of its members would be able to attend the final PC meeting in June, when the PC was scheduled to vote on the final version of the TER. However, they stated that they would provide a written explanation of how they had responded to the PC's comments on the proposed TER changes.

Comments of the Committee:

1) MS commented that a request for consent would not be made from the PC, as this typically relates to matters such as the TER or curriculum changes. The chair then asked whether a request for advice should be made regarding the educational vision document.

MB clarified that while no formal advice was required for a high-level vision document, the bottom-up development process meant that additional input might still be needed to refine and finalise the content. Furthermore, depending on the final form of the document, a formal request for consent could be submitted.

MS asked MB whether a clear stipulation of what the PC was expected to do with the document would be provided. MB confirmed that.

MS also questioned whether the document would be ready within a week, to allow the PC approximately three weeks for review.

MB responded that he could not confirm this but assured that he would meet the formal requirement by sending the document to the PC at least two weeks before the next meeting.

JS asked whether the relationship between the vision, quality standards, and assessment requirements could be made more explicit, especially considering the timing and possible misalignment with broader objectives.

MS stressed the importance of MB's team clearly formulating what the PC was expected to advise or give consent on and mentioned that MB's team was open to meeting with students to gather feedback. However, no students volunteered for the task.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meetings 27 March 2025 and 17 April — see attachment.

The minutes are approved.

GB proposed that in section 3, point 11, "There is no longer an online English premaster module for students with a bachelor degree in statics and/ or research methods" should be changed to "There is no longer a separate online English premaster module for students with deficiencies in statistics and/or research methods".

3. Comparison of the TERs 2024-2025 and 2025-2026 on the admission requirements

The chair mentioned some of the main changes in the TER. These included changes in the required minimum GPA for admission (which in exceptional cases could be lowered to 6.8 instead of 7.0) and an increase in the number of EC for research methods in the Premaster programmes.

Comments of the Committee:

1) JS pointed out the ambiguities that arose with changes in dual hybrid master's theses due to the involvement of external organisations and different coaches and co-readers. He noted that the TER contained an ambiguous section on this matter, which complicated decision-making for stakeholders.

MS responded that it would be helpful if JS could highlight this issue for the TER revision process, so it could be addressed in the next meeting.

4. Update on the PC Code of Order

The chair mentioned that no further comments or updates had been addressed in the new version of the Code of Order, meaning that there was no need for discussion in this meeting. He suggested and encouraged everyone to share their ideas on the document before the next meeting, particularly those with concrete ideas or specific proposals.

RSM Erasmus

Comments of the Committee:
1) GB proposed that it would be better to divide the labour and ask specific people to take the lead, as otherwise nobody might take the initiative.
2) MS requested that someone volunteer to lead the revision of the Code of Order. No one volunteered, but the chair proposed to get in touch with MAS.

5. Update on the subcommittees

MS opened the discussion, asking committees to present the conclusions of their work, if there were any, in order to compile the yearly report.

- Career Preparation, Engagement with Companies and Alumni: The team is compiling a final report, and a summary has been provided to the PC. More work is needed in the coming years due to the fast-paced changes in the job market.
- Course Evaluations: A final work has been provided to the PC with the related findings and identified issues. Conclusions will be discussed in the following meeting.
  There is one link to a video that still needs to be added.
- AI Assessment: Nothing concrete is ready yet; a document will be shared to open a discussion in the following meeting. PJ mentioned that the problem was difficult to tackle due to the multiple dimensions AI assessment touched, with many stakeholders involved. MS proposed creating a task force with different stakeholders to align policies on AI assessment. PJ supported the idea, as this could produce more productive insights than a sole subcommittee.
- Thesis Assessment: A document will be provided with an overview of the input from various stakeholders, past years' assessments, and conclusions. JV mentioned that the weighting of the different parts of the rubric is quite different between the programs and questioned whether this was a desirable and transparent objective. JV concluded that the observations of the subcommittee should be delivered to relevant decision makers to assess their relevance.
- TER: MP noted that the TER is structured in a non-linear manner, making it difficult for readers without a legal background to fully understand certain sections. He further explained that the Faculty Council informed him that the TER for the upcoming academic year can no longer be revised. Additionally, making even small changes is challenging due to the legal implications they may entail. MP proposed that the current subcommittee could formulate conclusions and suggest potential improvements, which could serve as a reference for the next subcommittee. This subcommittee, however, should include multiple stakeholders, also outside of the PC.
- PAC: LF explained that a document was being worked on and would be shared in a few weeks with the PC for revision. The objective of the subcommittee was to standardise some PAC procedures, as suggested by the Dean. Afterwards, the document would also be shared with Anna de Waard to determine whether the formalisation of these changes would be possible. MS suggested that the document could be shared as a draft with both Anna de Waard and the PC at the same time, so that changes could be revised before the next meeting.
  SJ mentioned that the document would also provide guidelines, which currently did not exist. GB suggested taking a look at the manual from SR, but LF replied that SR did not have a full overview of how MSc processes were handled, being a Bachelor student association. Furthermore, the manual was more focused on following a single-lead approach, without mentioning guidelines and standards for the PAC as a whole.
  SJ mentioned that the programme coordinator should have a proactive approach in guiding the PAC, as that was not always internalised. MS proposed that extra training and meetings could be provided by the faculty to PAC members, similar to those offered to PC representatives, to stimulate collaboration.
  LF mentioned some of the issues that student representatives experienced in processes such as PAC

RSM Erasmus

formation, which could result in not finding the most suitable person for these tasks. SJ suggested that guidance on roles would be included in the document, and that PAC meetings should be structured from the beginning of the academic year.

Closing remarks

- The revised TER, Educational Vision Document, and Subcommittees reports will soon be shared with the PC for revision and/or further voting.
- GB and LF volunteers to write the minutes.

6. Action points

What	When	Who
All subcommittees will draft a document about their work or draw conclusions.	By June	All subcommittees
Join a meeting with other bodies, such as the Faculty Council, to share views on the Educational Vision Document.	By June	Maciej Szymanowski
Check the revision of the Code of Order	By June	Maciej Szymanowski Martje Schouten
Send an email to EB for a conversation about YFC	By June	Annelie van der Leelie Maciej Szymanowski

7. Next meetings:
19-Jun-25, 10.00h