Minutes MSc PC – 26 September 2025

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

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	AD: Andreas Distel (SE)
LRS: Lisanne van Rijn-Szewczyk (SCM)	GB: Guido Berens (GBS, P-MM)
KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)	
MA Moritz Appels (POC)	
RG: Robin Groen (MScBA P-MIM)	
FB: Felix Boesch (MScBA BAM)	
JB: Julia Botma (MBI)	
NP: Nirmay Panchal (SE)	
AJ: Amber Jong (MI)	
MAN: Maurice Annaars (MScBA AFM)	
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
RU: Roos Uijterwaal (POC)	
NN: Natalie Nieuwenhuizen (MScBA MiM)	
LR: Lora Raguz (BIM)	
MM: Mariano Malaga (SCM)	
AH: Anh Hoang (GBS)	
MJ: Mehek Jain (FI)	
IS: Isidora Sidorovska (SM)	
IY: Irem Yildirim (MM)	
SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)	
AT: Alfredo Trovato (PM)	
RD: Robin Dottling (FI)	Guests
LC: Luca Coban (SM)	MB: Mirko Benischke (Acting Dean of Education)

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Introduction of the MSC PC members

All MSc PC members introduced themselves during the first meeting of the academic year.

1) Maciej Szymanowski is the current chair of the Committee and represents the MSc MM and MScBA BAM programmes,
2) Maurice Annaars is representing the MScBA AFM programme,
3) Roos Uijterwaal studied International Studies in Leiden, specialising in economics and followed a few business management minors. She represents the MSc POC programme,
4) Mehek Jain is from India. She studied Business Economics at the Erasmus University Rotterdam and she represents the MSc FI programme,
5) Amber Jong studied at the University in Eindhoven and she represents the MSc MI master,

6) Natalie Nieuwenhuizen studied Cognitive Science and Computer Science at the Toronto University in Canada and now she represents the MSCBA MIM programme in the Committee,
7) Julia Botma obtained her bachelor's in communication and media and followed a management education. She represents the MSc MBI programme,
8) Felix Boesch studied Psychology at the University of Maastricht and represents the MScBA BAM programme in the Committee,
9) Lora Raguz studied IBA at RSM and she represents the MSc BIM programme,
10) Irem Yildirim is from Turkey she studied Communication and Media at the Erasmus University and she represents the MSc MM master,
11) Lisanne van Rijn-Szewcyk obtained her PHD at the Erasmus School of Economics and she is the faculty representative for the MSc SCM programme,
12) Isidora Sidorovska obtained her PHD in Canada and she is the faculty representative of the MSc SM programme,
13) Moritz Appels is from the Organisational Behaviour Division Department and he represents the MSc POC programme,
14) Robin Dottling is from the Finance Department and represents the MSc FI & Investments programme,
15) Mariano Malaga is from Peru and obtained his bachelor Business Engineering at the university of Maastricht. He is representing the MSc SCM master,
16) Luca Coban did his bachelor Hospitality Management in Den Haag and he is representing the MSc SM programme,
17) Jeffrey Sweeney obtained his PHD at the University of Colorado Boulder and he is the faculty representative for the MSc BIM programme,
18) Robin Groen studied psychology at the Leiden University and he is representing the MScBA P-MIM master,
19) Solomon Zori has been in this Committee for approximately eight years and he represents the MScBA AFM programme,
20) Kathrin Borner is an Assistant Professor at RSM and she is representing the MSc MI and MSc MBI programmes,
21) Anh Hoang did his bachelor's in Environmental Science at the UC College Utrecht. He represents the MSc GBS programme,
22) Nirmay Panchal is from India. He studied Econometrics Operation and Research at the University of Maastricht. He is representing the MSc SE programme,
23) Alfredo Trovato is the Team Leader Educational Coordinator of RSM. He studied Classics and obtained his PHD in Historical Linguistics. He is a guest of the Committee,
24) Mirko Benischke is the Dean of Executive Education and the interim Dean of Education.

3. Request for approval of changes in course evaluations – Mirko Benischke

MB requested approval for the change in the course evaluations.

1) No changes can be made to the educational component from the quality perspective of the course evaluations as more evaluation of the content of the course evaluations is required and the academic year has already started.
2) The reason for the proposal is that there are concerns about the timing of the course evaluations, as the course evaluations were sent out after the examinations, which means that the difficulty of the examination could influence the course evaluations results.
3) The proposal is to send the course evaluations on the last day of class (from Block 2 onwards) instead of after the exams. However, this would have consequences a) The exam related questions should be removed from the course evaluations and b) There won't be formal evaluations of the exam because the school can't send two questionnaires.
4) The perusal process won't change. Students can view their examinations and have the opportunity to ask

questions about the exams. In addition, the PACs have the chance to discuss the examinations with the Academic Directors.

Comments of the Committee:
1) KB: To increase the course evaluations response rate, it would be better to integrate the course evaluations into the last session of the course
2) JS concerns that valuable information about, for example, how the course aligns with the exam will be lost. Therefore, it would be better to add a bonus question to the exam in which students reflect on their learning.

The proposed change to the course evaluations was unanimously accepted by the Committee. MS will write a consent letter.

4. Information about changes in the thesis trajectory – Mirko Benischke

MB informed the Committee about changes to the thesis trajectory.
1) The change to the thesis trajectory is for information purposes only, as it doesn't require any changes to the TER or the Rules & Guidelines 'document.
2) There was a request from Academic Directors and Department Heads to reconsider the thesis from a validity perspective because the proliferation of AI compromises the quality of the thesis, as it's uncertain which faculty grade is the intellectual ownership of the students.
3) The changes are a) The thesis will be separate into two components. The first part will be the written component and the second one is the defence component. 70% of the thesis grade will be determined by the written component and 30% of the thesis grade will be determined by the defence component. The defence component will be transformed into a formal oral exam which has the same purpose as the defence but ensures that the student has intellectual ownership of the thesis. Therefore, the defence will be given a prescribed weighting in the grading rubric. If students fail the defence, they can only resit the defence and don't have to redo the entire thesis and b) The oral exam will once again be an in-person defence which means that one examiner will be present together with the student.

5. Introduction regarding the rights and responsibilities of the MSc PC - Alfredo Trovato

AT informed the committee members about the rights and responsibilities.
The PC is all about quality of education but there are different sources of feedback on the quality of education.
1) SET (course level employer & alumni feedback (CAR)
2) Annual performance reviews of faculty and annual feedback interviews with academic directors
3) Examination Board and Examination monitor
4) Accreditation reports, (NVAO, AACSB, EFMD)
5) Programme Committees
6) Faculty Council / University Council
7) International rankings (student, alumni and school surveys).

Explanation about the different Committees:
1) The University Council operates EUR-wide and represents EUR students and staff members on a central level. The University Council meets with the Executive Board to discuss the university's central policy om matters such as education, research and finance.
2) On school level, there is the Faculty Council which represents the interest of the RSM community and advises the Dean on topics relating to educational and research activities with the focus on the quality of educational programmes and exams. Another task of the Faculty Council is to approve the TER and evaluate the implementation of these changes
3) The Programme Committees consist of students and faculty members. The tasks of the PCs is to approve

the TER and to evaluate the implementation of these changes, to monitor the educational programmes and provide advice on education.

4) The Programme Advisory Committees (PACs) are informal committees for individual RSM MSc(BA) programmes. In these PACs the Academic Director and/or instructors, education coordinators and students discuss suggestions and changes for the programme itself. One of the students is usually also a member of the MSc PC and acts as a link between the committees.

The Regulatory framework:

1) The Dutch Higher Education Act (WHW) stipulates that the state funded Dutch higher education institutions must have a Programme Committee and TER. This is also described in the RSM faculty regulation in Articles 5.8., 5.9, and 5.10.
2) Article 5.8. about the Programme Committee indicates that the Dean shall establish a programme committee for each programme or group of programmes, as required by the Dutch law.
3) The Programme Committee is giving the opportunity to consult with the Academic Director or the Dean of Education before renders advice, and the Dean shall inform the Programme Committee in writing as soon as possible about the way the advice has been followed.

Recommendations by the Education Inspectorate:

1) The tasks and demarcations should be clear in the Committee.
2) The distribution of roles within the MSc PC and with other committees should be clear.
3) The committee members will be trained about the Programme Committee.
4) The Code of Order document describes the house rules. The Code of Order is published on the MSc PC website.
5) Formulate your priorities. Which topics do the PC members consider important to work on this academic year?
6) Be visible: Students in the programme should know who the MSc PC representatives are of their programme and students should be able to contact the representative.
7) The PC should have a balanced composition: one student and faculty representative of each master programme, thus all MSc (BA) programmes are equally represented.
8) The MSc PC should collaborate with other participatory bodies.

Comments of the Committee:

1) MS: The programme committee members have the right to consent and right to advice. The consent right is a pseudo veto right because the PC can't stop things ever happening but if the PC doesn't give consent for something, this means that the Dean should start an appeal procedure consisting of two phases. There is a university body. Handles all type of conflicts within the university, and if it doesn't work, there's a court in Utrecht. In addition, the PC has the right to give advice which means that the Dean must follow the advice unless there are very strong reasons preventing the Dean from following this advice, and the Dean should respond to the Committee within certain timeframe and before the Dean replies to the Committee negatively, he/she can't formally proceed with the project. Only if the PC has a couple of weeks to appeal against the decision not to follow the committee's advice and if the PC doesn't use the appeal possibility, the Dean can move on with disregarding the committee's advice.

6. PC proceedings and yearly agenda – Maciej Szymanowoski

MS explained different aspects of the Committee.

Summary:

1) The composition: The Committee consists of a) A secretary, b) A chair, c) One faculty and one student member from each programme (but sometimes a faculty member represents two programmes) and d)

Different kind of guests such as the Team Leader Educational Coordinator and guests related to specific agenda topics. The contact person of the Committee is the secretary.

2) Other bodies are a) The Bachelor Programme Committee (BSc PC), b) CEMS, the MSc 1,5-year PC, c) The Faculty Council (FC) which deals with topics relating to the budget and recruitment policy and d) The Examination Board (EB) which is appointed by the Dean but the body is independent and has the task of ensuring that exams are conducted fairly. The topics discussed between the EB and PC mainly concern how education can be made effective and to improved,
3) The work of the MSc PC members consists of two main components a) The PC meetings. During the meeting the PC members represent their programme by reading the shared documents, attending the meetings and talking to the PAC, faculty, Academic Director and the students of their own programme. The main challenges are to maintain contact with the students and b) The subcommittee work. The subcommittee members role is to contribute to the improvement of a specific aspect of RSM by holding subcommittee meetings once a month, taking initiative on what and how to do and helping to draft the subcommittee's output. The biggest challenge is do little but well.
4) The Programme Committee focuses on affecting multiple one-year RSM MSc programmes and the quality of education. Outside the scope of the PC are a) Topics relating to issues concerning a single programme (these topics will be discussed in the PACs), b) Campus facilities topics (which will be discussed in the University Council) and c) Facility employment issues (These topics will be discussed n the Faculty Council)
5) Logistics: a) The MSc PC meetings are held once a month in a hybrid form. However, the chair prefers everyone to be present in the meeting room, as this makes the meeting more productive. Yearly Agenda: a) On response topics, the MSc PC will be approached by the school for consent or advice. The important topics each year are the TER and curricula changes, and b) The are two types of MSc PC initiatives: Programme Committee priority Issues and ad-hoc issues. The Programme Committee priority Issues are committee-defined focal points of action for the entire year. In October/ November, members scout for important issues in their own programme. Importantly, that those topics should be related to the quality of education and should be relevant to the entire master portfolio. In November, the PC selects the topics and forms subcommittees to work on them. In December/ February, the subcommittees present a draft proposal about their topic and in March/ April the subcommittees have their final outputs. Those outputs can take on different forms, e.g., a report, a presentation, an overview, or a recommendation letter. Examples of subcommittee topics are PAC coordination, improving RSM's communication between programme management and teachers, and improving the PC visibility. In addition, the Committee could also bring up ad-hoc issues. These topics should be submitted to the agenda a week before the meeting, b) All documents discussed in these meetings are available in the MSc PC Teams /.environment, c) If a member would like to contact the chair, it would be useful to contact the secretary or put the secretaries' email in the cc and d) If absent, a) Notify the secretary and b) Share your input into on agenda topics with the secretary. For faculty: if you are absent more than twice in a row, please find someone to cover for you. If you are more than 1/3 absent, your Head of Department will be approached.

7. Overview of last year subcommittees – Maciej Szymanowoski

MS informed the MSc members about last year's subcommittees topics. The topics were a) Career Preparation Engagement with Companies & Alumni, b) Course Evaluations, c) AI Assessments, d) Thesis Assessments, e) TER and f) The PACs.

8. Legal TAQT training of the participate bodies – Maciej Szymanowoski

MS recommend the new MSc PC members to follow the Legal TAQT training of the participate bodies this year to get an inside how the PC works.

9. Approval of Minutes from the MSc PC meeting on 19 June 2025 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved.

10. Closing remarks

11. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write a consent letter on the course evaluations changes	By October	Maciej Szymanowski
AL will ask whether the TER could already be discussed in January this year.	By October	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will add the chair election topic on the October meeting agenda	By October	Annelie van der Leelie

12. Next meetings:

30-Oct-2025, 10.00h
27-Nov -25, 10.00h
18-Dec-25, 10.00h
15-Jan-26, 10.00h
12-Feb 26, 10.00h
19-Mar-26, 10.00h
16-Apr-26, 10.00h
28-May-26, 10.00h
18-Jun-26, 10.00