

Minutes MSc PC – 27 November 2025

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)	
LRS: Lisanne van Rijn-Szewczyk (SCM)	
KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)	
MA Moritz Appels (POC)	
RG: Robin Groen (MScBA P-MiM)	
FB: Felix Boesch (MScBA BAM)	
AT: Alfredo Trovato (PM)	
NP: Nirmay Panchal (SE)	
AD: Andreas Distel (SE)	
MAN: Maurice Annaars (MScBA AFM)	
JS: Jeffrey Sweeney (BIM)	
RU: Roos Uijterwaal (POC)	
NN: Natalie Nieuwenhuizen (MScBA MiM)	
LR: Lora Raguz (BIM)	
TB: Toby Boontjes (SCM)	
AH: Anh Hoang (GBS)	
MJ: Mehek Jain (FI)	
TM: Tom Mom (MSc BA P-MiM)	
IY: Irem Yildirim (MM)	
MC: Mert Cetin (MScBA MiM)	
RD: Robin Dottling (FI)	
LC: Luca Coban (SM)	
TC: Tony Choi (GBS)	
IS: Isidora Sidorovska (SM)	
AJ: Amber Jong (MI)	
SZ: Solomon Zori (MSc BA AFM)	

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the MSc PC on 30 October 2025 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved. .

3. Information about the Annual report 2024-2025 being ready

MS informed the Committee about the MSc PC annual report 2024-2025 is ready.

- 1) The annual report has been uploaded in the folders Meeting 27 November 2025 and How the PC works in the MSc PC Teams environment.

- 2) The annual report is important to the committee members to find information about last year's subcommittees. In addition, the solicited and unsolicited topics, together with the appendices discussed by the committee last year, are also included in the report.
- 3) AL will upload the annual report 2024-2025 on the MSc PC website.

4. Information launch of the Dean of Education project on RSM Assessment Policy

MS updated the Committee on the launch of the project by the Dean of Education concerning RSM's Assessment Policy.

- 1) The chairs of the participatory bodies have been approached by the Dean of Education with information about the project Assessments Policy will be launched.
- 2) The project is about how to revise RSM's assessment policy (assessments refers to the way grades are generated),
- 3) The proposal is to use a closed list of allowed assessments instead of the current situation in which teachers are also the examiners and are allowed to design the type of assessments,
- 4) The reasons for the proposal are a) RSM has been approached by the Minister of Education and accreditation bodies to provide good argumentations that students graduate the students upon graduation own all the skills and knowledge they have learned during the study and aren't influenced by ChatGPT. With the listed exams and assessments RSM can indicate that graduates have completed all the types of exams and assessments on the list and therefore, it would be impossible to cheat using AI, b) With the different type of assessments in the current situation, before the courses (manual) is launched it's difficult for the Examination Board (EB) to assess whether an assessment is valid or not. If there is an assessment list, it would be easier for the EB to check the assessments and c) With a closed list of assessments, it would be easier to monitor the continuous improvement of Education as there are fewer types of assessments.
- 5) A taskforce has been created consisting of AI expert Dimitrios Tsekouras, the Learning Innovation Team, Academic Directors, teachers and students,
- 6) The idea is to launch the closed list as a pilot across some master programmes.
- 7) The Programme Committees have given the Dean of Education the following recommendations a) Communicate to faculty what administrative burden related to different forms of examinations exist because there is much diversity in exams, b) When formulating the list of allowable assessments, consider the impact both policy transition and the new policy itself on faculty workload. Increased workload can impact the quality of education negatively. Consider using as input examiner workload estimations created by FI department, c) Roll out the updated policy in stages to allow programme and teachers to adjust properly, d) Allow Academic Directors to choose which courses will use assessments from the list and which ones won't need to do it, e) Create a structural, permanent and transparent process of updating the assessment list in the future and f) Create and share a list of criteria applied in assessment method selection to create transparency in terms of why certain assessment methods are selected and not others. Among others, it's important to know if a given criterion is related to AI fraud or to facilitation of the administrative processes.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) MS: In the past, RSM wanted to use student course evaluations to identify problems and space for improvement but a dashboard has been created that uses assessment results to identify problems. According to MS, average grades which are dictated by the difficulty of exams and the quality of teaching would be used. However, for teachers, it would be easy to set easy exams that students don't complain about. In addition, MS indicated that this could be a topic for the Quality of Education subcommittee.
- 2) MA: The majority of departments allocate the fictitious money to courses. Therefore, it would be better to consider that RSM should use one of the official assessments methods, for example an oral exam that is more directly integrated into the allocation of the fictional money to the course. This is important because it probably influences teachers' decision to use an assessment method from the list.

- 3) LC: It would be a good idea to ask about the exemption procedure and how it will work.
- 4) LC: It would be good to ask whether the PC could receive the draft closest assessment method list thus it's visible what types of assessments are included and what the impact will be.
- 5) RG wonders who created the type of assessments list. The Dean of Education or the people who design the courses?
- 6) RD agrees that not every single assessment should be approved, as long as a sufficient number of assessments are approved. In addition, he indicated that students can't use AI during exams on campus
- 7) RG: It would be better if RSM took students AI literacy into account, as this is a requirement on the current labour market, and therefore an important skill for students to possess.
- 8) LRS wonders what the costs are of the administrative processes whether they are related to the work of the EB or whether they are also related to the exam organisations. Moreover, she wonders how do they balance AI exams, as on campus exams could increase the costs of assessments
- 9) TM: It would be important that the type of assessments corresponds with the learning goal. Therefore, it would be important that the MSc PC pays attention to the variation of different types of learning goals on the list
- 10) TM wonders whether this project isn't let by the EB because the topic concerns assessments and therefore relates to examination. Therefore, the MSc PC should ensure that the EB is involved in this project
- 11) TM: Because the assessment policy is a topic on the PC agenda, it would be better if the information about the topic should be shared with the members in advance thus they are prepared before the meeting.

5. Subcommittee formation

During the meeting, the following subcommittees have been established (see table). Members who don't yet have a subcommittee could indicate in the table which subcommittee they would like to join but they can only choose from the subcommittees whose status is listed as open.

Overview of the subcommittees and topics

Appendix 1. RSM MSc PC Subcommittees for 2025/26

	Subcommittee name	Goals	Members	Stakeholders	Status
1	Code of order	Consult lawyer Create guidance for stakeholders			
2	Assessment Policy Advice	Provide Dean of Education feedback on assessment policy project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AI fraud - Administrative burden in quality assurance 	Mert (MIM faculty) Lisanne (SCM faculty) Felix (BAM stud.) Anh (GBS stud.)		open
3	TER	Working with Faculty Council and Dean of Education on making the TER easier to process			

4	Thesis Trajectory		Irem Tom (P-MiM Faculty) Lora (BIM stud.) <i>Maciej (observer)</i> Isidora (SM faculty) Jeffrey		open
5	Quality of education	Goal: methodologically define what factors underlie quality of education and their impact on programme standards. - Course evaluations / quality measures - Programme quality standards - accreditation advice?	Roos Robin Groen (pMIM student) Moritz (POC Faculty) Maciej (observer) Jeffrey (observer)		open
6					
7	Programme design principles				
8	BAO funds/innovation		Maciej (observer) Amber Jong (MI stud)		open
9	PC visibility	Department visits AD meeting visits FC, Exam Board, other PCs meetings	Luca (SM Student)		open
10	PAC	Improving onboarding, procedures	Natalie (MIM stud) Mehek (FI student) Irem (student)	Alfredo Trovato	open
11	Prominence of ESG				
12	Admission process	Identify better yet actionable procedures for selective programs (to "server lottery")	Andreas (SE, Fac., x) Felix (BAM, Stud., x) Robin Döttling (FI, Fac., x) Toby Boontjes (SCM, Stud., x)	Admission office, program directors, dean of education	open
12	Examination and resit policies	- Striking a balance between student			

		goals and faculty workload - Exam quality and prep: repository, practice exams, rubrics (difficulty and topic representativeness)			
13	Data driven personalized education	AI role			
14	Graduation requirements check				
15	Alumni engagement (e.g. to fill FT questionnaire)				
16	Accreditation advice interpretation	Include as factor in education quality?			
17	AI as a competence; AI in learning process		Maurice (AFM stud) Nirmay (SE student) Tony Choi (GBS Faculty)		open

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) MA: it would better to have more information about the subcommittee topics before members should choose a subcommittee
- 2) RG: It would be a good idea to put the subcommittee proposals into the subcommittee folder of the MSc PC Teams environment.

6. Vote on the Code of Order

MS updated the Committee on the Code of Order.

- 1) The members didn't vote on the Code of Order because one of the members had made new suggestions to the document. The Committee will vote on the Code of Order during the December meeting.
- 2) MS would like to delete sentence that the PC should ask recommendations from the Dean about who should be elected as a chair, as the PC is an independent body.

After a short discussion, the MSc PC decided to delete the sentence about the Dean's recommendations about the elected chair.

7. Closing remarks

8. Action points

What	When	Who
AL will upload the annual report 2024-2025 on the MSc PC website.	By December	Annelie van der Leelie

9. Next meetings:

18-Dec-25, 10.00

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