

# Minutes MSc PC – 28 May 2026

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

## 1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

*Announcement:*

- MS: The new draft TER is available in the Mc PC Teams environment.
- MS: It's a draft document but the final proposal to be submitted for approval will be shared with the PC before the next MSc PC meeting.

## 2. Approval of the Minutes from the MSc PC on 16 April 2026 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved.

## 3. Course evaluations redesign project

JC and IF updated the committee members on the course evaluations redesign project.

- The Dean of Education has established a working group to restructure the student course evaluations.
- The working group consists of representatives from Programme Management, faculty, IT and Qualitative Assurance.
- The working group is investigating what the current state of the course evaluations is, what has been done in the past with the course evaluations and decide how RSM should proceed with the course evaluations.
- A questionnaire conducted among Academic Directors and teachers has shown that the current course

evaluations should be changed. However, there are many different opinions on how to improve the course evaluations.

- 5) The Faculty Council and the Dean of Education decided that the student course evaluations won't be used for promotion and tenure decisions due to a) Student course evaluations are biased and b) Students don't have the expertise to assess the teacher's pedagogical progress.
- 6) To motivate students to fill in the course evaluations, the working group would like to provide a presentation with information about the improvements made to the courses based on previous year's course evaluations, thus students can see why they should complete the questionnaire.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) TM: The working group sent a recommendation document to the PC members but for the presentation it would have been better if the working group had indicated what the conflicting recommendations (according to the working group) are thus the MSc PC could help the working group to make better decisions.
- 2) TC: The Faculty Council and the Dean of Education decided not to use the student course evaluations for promotion and tenure decisions; however, once the questionnaire has been improved, it could also be used for those decisions.
- 3) According to JS, there is a discussion about different aspects of the course evaluations, namely the use or validity of the instrument. Therefore, it would be better to separate the two in unit of analyses of what RSM is concerned about. Is the focus on the students, the courses or the instructors? However, the course evaluations have a low sample size, a low response rate, a self-selection bias and unobservable variable bias which are problems that are difficult to overcome but it would be better if the school makes a distinction between evaluating the course and the quality of education versus evaluating the career paths of the teachers versus evaluating the future potential of the students.
- 4) TM: It would be better for teachers if the new course evaluations format will be communicated to them clearly and in a timely manner thus teachers could better tailor the course to the results and expectations raised by students through the student course evaluations.
- 5) TC: It would be better if teachers only improve the courses when the course evaluations response-rate is high enough, as it would be problematic if teachers should change course components based on every single recommendation.
- 6) AT is concerned that no issues will be resolved if the school focuses only on high response-rate, as student response-rates are constantly low.
- 7) TC: To increase the response-rate, it would be better to change the course evaluation time, as students don't want to fill in the course evaluations during the exam period.
- 8) MS: Teachers who have been teaching a course for some time aren't open to changing the course based on student course evaluations whereas teachers who teaching a newly designed course are willing to do so.
- 9) MS: Regarding student feedback, RSM should think more outside the box and it would be better to collaborate with the PACs, as they provide better and more nuanced feedback. Additionally, teachers could also hold discussions with the PACs.
- 10) TC: It would be better to add a question to the questionnaire asking which classes students attended during a course, to understand how much value teachers can add to the course evaluations recommendations.
- 11) RG: To increase the response-rate, it would be better to involve the students in the process of what is done with the feedback from the course evaluations. In addition, it would be better if teachers share the course evaluations results of the previous year and ask the students during the last lecture whether these course components are improved.
- 12) AD: To increase the response-rate, it would be better to make completing the course evaluations mandatory, for example by requiring students to fill in the questionnaire in order to receive their final grades. However, some grades are released late resulting in students don't remember the course well enough to provide an accurate assessment.

- TC doesn't know whether this would work in practice, as for some courses the response-rate is so low that the course evaluations results would be based solely on the course material and not on how teachers teach.
- 13) NP is concerned that if the student course evaluations will be mandatory that the questionnaire will be completed too quickly, without providing meaningful answers.
  - 14) AD: If the course evaluations aren't mandatory there will arise a selection bias because the questionnaire will be completed only by motivated or dissatisfied students and if there will be a 100% response-rate these overly positive and or negative responses will be balance each other out.
  - 15) MS: It would be better to create a spreadsheet for teachers which clearly indicates what the course evaluations comments mean because a comment can come across as negative when students mean the opposite. In addition, it would be useful to add an attendance question to the questionnaire thus teachers could see the connection between students attendance and the score teachers receive in the course evaluations. This would help them better to understand the course evaluations results.
  - 16) JS: RSM should consider that not only the course quality is important but also that the school generate income from the courses by enabling students to graduate. He concerns that, as a result of student course evaluations, good courses are marked as failing and less good courses maybe rated highly, which means that teaching standards could deteriorate following any adjustments.
  - 17) TC, FB: To increase the response-rate, it would be an idea to offer students incentives for completing the course evaluations, for example extra points or a voucher.

#### 4. Update on the progress of the subcommittees

The subcommittees updated the Committee on their process.

- 1) There is currently no update from the Assessment Policy Advice Subcommittee but it will continue its work in the next academic year.
- 2) The Thesis Trajectory Subcommittee received quantitative top-data about the grades and the level of the rubric and qualitative data from the thesis trajectory student course evaluations results. In addition, the subcommittee members implemented a first quantitative and qualitative analyses and is currently formulating its recommendations.
- 3) The Quality of Education Subcommittee finished the draft version output. This is based on theory and best practices from other universities and researchers. The final document could be used by the PC to evaluate the Dean of Education's definition of the quality of education and to assess whether it meets certain requirements which would be a consistent and pragmatcal definition of the quality.
- 4) The BAO Subcommittee collaborates with the Dean of Education and the Quality and Assurance Team. The subcommittee's final output will be a document containing detailed feedback on the documents shared by the team, specifically on the following topics a) Profiles of he graduates and what qualities RSM graduates should possess and b) How the education should be designed.
- 5) The PC Visibility Subcommittee completed the presentation which should be shared with the Academic Directors.
- 6) The PAC Subcommittee is redefining the PAC playbook and will upload it to the Teams folder.
- 7) The Admission Process Subcommittee finalised the draft document.. A goal of the subcommittee was Inform PC and other departments about the legal and operational constraints and provide options for selection criteria; the subcommittee members concluded that, despite the constraints, there is no scope for an admission procedure other than that currently used by the MSc FI programme. In addition, the subcommittee would like to focus on mitigating the negative spillover effects that may arise due to the admission change in the MSc FI master. The spillover effects are a) Possible pre-application substitution where the demands shift and there could be potential mismatches. Students may avoid applying or withdraw the application to the MSC FI master opting instead for programmes with earlier and more predictable outcomes. This leads to applicants switching to other programmes and demand increasing elsewhere and may also lead to more mismatches or lower commitment within the other programmes, b) Post-application

limits, whereby reallocation after the outcomes are published is limited, as some alternative programmes are already closed by the time the results are published which reduces flexibility for students and may lead to the loss of strong candidates to other institutions and c) A spillover effect may occur at other universities as demand shift potential leading to late changes because applicants can only apply for one RSM master at a time. Part of the adjustment occurs externally. As a risk hatching strategy Students may switch to other universities and changes to the MSc FI admission process may also lead to increased competition between institutions, higher and more last-minute changes elsewhere due to the late communication of results and a potential loss of strong candidates. The subcommittee investigated which programmes were closed before the deadline, these are the MSc BA BAM, MSc SM and MSc SCM programmes, which means that these programmes won't probably be available for the MSc FI applicants who haven't been selected for the FI programme. Therefore, the subcommittee would like to advice the admission results will be published as soon as possible (within operational constraints) as a delay of few day may lead that some MSc FI applicants applying for different programme. Moreover, regard the general communication the subcommittee's advice is as follows a) Provide centralised information on when programmes have filled up in previous years and when the MSc FI results will be announced, thus it's clear for every student that applies b) Communicate transparently about the new MSc FI process, the time frame, and the two-step procedure with results to be announced by 8 January the latest, c) Provide information on the number of applicants progressing to the second round in relation to the available slots. This enables applicants to deduce that there is a good chance they will be admitted once in the second round and d) Inform the applicants as soon as possible that they have made it to the second round and consider whether preliminary aggregate information could be provided in early December thus applicants have an idea of whether they have a good chance of securing a spot on the programme.

- 8) The AI as a Competence in AI Learning Process Subcommittee has changed the to AI Education Subcommittee, as the original name was too long. The subcommittee created a questionnaire on topics about the current AI use, AI literacy and demands. The subcommittee would like to send the questionnaire to students via STAR, as this could increase the response-rate, however if that's not possible, the subcommittee would like to send the survey to students via the Dean of Education or the Academic Directors. In addition, the subcommittee asked the department for financial support to offer incentives alongside the questionnaire to increase the response-rate.

## 5. Closing remarks

## 6. Action points

What	When	Who
AL will send an email to the PC member to inform the PC members about the final subcommittee output deadline	By May	Annelie van der Leelie
All subcommittees will put the draft outputs in the MSc PC Teams environments and send it to AL eight days before the next meeting.	By May	All subcommittees

## 8. Next meetings:

28-May-26, 10.00h

18-Jun-26, 10.00h