

Minutes MSc PC – 30 October 2025

Online meeting via Teams and T5-117 10:00–12:00 hours

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	AT: Alfredo Trovato (PM)
LRS: Lisanne van Rijn-Szewczyk (SCM)	TC: Tony Choi (GBS)
KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)	AJ: Amber Jong (MI)
MA Moritz Appels (POC)	IS: Isidora Sidorovska (SM)
RG: Robin Groen (MScBA P-MiM)	
FB: Felix Boesch (MScBA BAM)	
JB: Julia Botma (MBI)	
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)	
MM: Mert Cetin (MScBA MIM)	
RD: Robin Dottling (FI)	
LC: Luca Coban (SM)	

1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

Announcement 1:

- 1) Three new members introduced themselves to the other members
 - Tom Mom is a professor at the department of Strategy and Entrepreneurship and teaches in the Strategy Entrepreneurship master, full- and parttime MIM master. He was the Academic Director of the Executive MBA programme at RSM. In the past, he was also a member of the Faculty Council.
 - Toby Boontjes is the new student representative for the MSc SCM master programme
 - Mert Cetin is the new faculty member of the MScBA P-MIM master programme. He is an Assistant Professor at the SCM department and teaches in the MIM, BAM and executive programmes.

Announcement 2:

MS informed the members about a meeting between the Dean of Education, the chairs of the BSc, MSc PCs and the Faculty Council. They discussed what they considered to be the Committees' priorities.

- 1) EUR Central would like that all faculties consider the following EUR strategic priorities: a) Student well-being (Smarter Academic Year BSc), b) Impact Education (Minor policy (BSc), Sustainability education, reporting), c) Student selection (selection vision → toward selection based on “potential”), d) Assessment vision (Assessment of learning assessment for learning, assessment as learning) and e) AI @ EUR (student AI literacy, translation of AI Pact)
- 2) The RSM priorities are: a) The Future Proof Project (which means cost savings and improving RSM quality for the future), b) RSM education priorities (high-level thinking about education) and c) Running changing ‘the Business’ (the things that happen in the classroom and during the courses).
- 3) The RSM Education strategy priorities more specific are: a) 1. Defining programme-level standards (based on graduate profiles. The idea is to revisit how to measure the quality of the programmes as there are always changes and developments. The PCs safeguard the quality of education but there are no definitions about quality of education and b) Defining design principles (based on educational principles) the idea is to professionalise RSM in terms of how well lectures teach and costs. There should be more alignment in design of the courses and programmes to reduce the costs.
- 4) The Running/ Changing ‘the business’ more specific are: a) Renewal of RSM’s assessment policies (starting point adapt to the reality of AI in education) which means that due to the costs RSM would like to work with portfolios containing different types of assessments in which teachers can use instead of the current system in which teachers are allowed to use any assessment they would like to use, b) The TER. The PCs and the Faculty Council would like to change the document to make it more user-friendly, c) Review of the thesis trajectory. From different perspectives at RSM (including the MSc PC) people are looking at whether the thesis trajectory costs are being spent wisely or how it could be improved and d) Quality of education “measure” including the course evaluations. In the academic year 2024-2025, the MSc PC advised the Dean of Education to send out the course evaluations before the exam to improve the evaluations and this will be implemented. In addition, there are other different aspects of quality measurements for example student experience, peer feedback, didactic expert and/ or alumni feedback.
- 5) The main topics for the committees are TER and the assessment portfolios but MS would like to see that the MSc PC is also involved with the defining programme-level standards and defining design principles.

Comments of the Committee

- 1) JS MA: Prioritizing of the topics is useful but due to the overlap between the topics the results will lead to the same path.
- 2) LB wonders how much power the MSc PC has to change the TER, as it’s a legal document. However, the PC could create a simple overview of the TER which would be readable for everyone.
- 3) According to TM, topics raised by the Dean of Education are motivated by cost reductions and there will always be tension between cost savings and improving the quality of education. Therefore, it would be better if the Dean of Education should be transparent when the proposals relate to cost reductions.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the MSc PC on 26 September 2025 – see attachment

The Minutes were approved. .

3. Subcommittee formation

During the meeting, the MSc PC members mentioned the following priority issues and topics they would like to work on:

- 1) High priority issues from last year: Lawyer / disambiguation a) Disambiguation of PC rights of consent and advice for key PC decisions, b) Disambiguation of rightful applicant requesting specific PC decisions, c) Format of request directed to PC specific decisions which are requested, d) Ensuring information completeness about requests directed to PC argumentation supporting requested changes substantive topic expertise and e) Rights and the role of PC members (defining constituency independence

- 2) Dean of Education topics, a) PC visibility (department visits, AD meeting visits FC, Exam Board, other PC meetings), b) Assessments portfolio c) TER, (clarity information flow about TER), d)Thesis trajectory revision, e) Course evaluations/ quality measures, f) Programme quality standards and H) Programme design principles
- 3) PAC: a) PAC onboarding process, b) ESG or AI (too much) prominence c) Admission process (not server lottery), d) Resit (limit "free resits"), e) AI in learning assessments, thesis, policies f) Data-driven personalised education, g) Graduation requirement check, h) Alumni engagement (e.g. to fill in the evaluations), I) Exam quality and prep: repository, practice exam, rubrics (difficulty and topic representativeness) and j) Accreditation advice interpretation

During the meeting, the Committee decided that members would choose their subcommittee topic in the MSc PC November meeting.

4. Advice to the Dean of Education about the timing that the draft TER will be shared

MS informed the Committee about the TER procedure of the previous years.

- 1) There were years when the PC received the TER changes very late making it difficult for members to make suggestions because there was no time left to discuss and evaluate suggestions with other committees.
- 2) To improve the process, the committee chairs propose that the committees receive the TER in February thus the committees' suggestions can be discussed, evaluated and, if necessary, incorporated into the document in the coming months.

The Committee voted on the timing that the draft TER will be shared proposal and in a vote thirteen people were in favour and one person voted against the proposal. MS will write an Advice letter.

5. Code of Order updates and approval

MS explained the Code of Order document to the members.

- 1) The Code of Order is the PC's internal document containing information about how the Committee will operate.
- 2) MS updates the document and discussed the changes with the PC members.
- 3) The proposals for changes are: a) The Dean of Education indicated that the faculty term in the committee is unlimited and he wonders whether this is desirable, b) There are faculty members who represent two programmes because one of the programmes doesn't have a faculty member. The faculty members representing two programmes has one vote which isn't ideal. Therefore, it would be better to reconsider that each programme has a vote. The best way to do this is that each programme should have a faculty member. Therefore, MS proposed to add the following line in the Code of Order *Each programme is represented by a different student and faculty member and in case of problems with appointing the faculty representative a PC faculty member can represent at most two programmes*, c) The two innovation masters MSc MI and MSc MBI are mentioned more explicitly in the document, d) The word Vice Dean has been replaced to Dean of Education, e) Information about the hybrid meetings has been added to the Code of Order and f) The subcommittee system has been added to the document.

Comments of the Committee:

- 1) MS is in favour of an unlimited term for faculty because people grow in the role as faculty member. However, it would also be possible for faculty members to be re-elected after a few years.
- 2) RG: It would be good to have a reflection moment on the constitution of the group to see which issues there are and whether something should be adjusted.

The MSc PC will vote on the Code of Order during the November meeting.

6. MSc chair election

The members who had volunteered for the PC chair position presented themselves but MS was the only one who applied for the position.

- 1) MS would like to see a culture development within RSM in which the Committee has an important voice in the school. Within the MSc PC, there is already a collaborative and productive process. However, there are parts of the Committee that could be improved, namely a) The MSc PC should be little quicker in making decisions about the school and b) More work should be done with the MSc PC outputs from the previous years and make the Committee more visible within RSM. In addition, MS would like see each committee member to develop a sense of ownership for the Committee. where they also have the chance to discuss topics that are important to them.

The Committee voted on the chair position and in a vote thirteen people were in favour and one person voted against the proposal.

7. Closing remarks

8. Action points

What	When	Who
MS will write a advice letter about the draft TER will be shared proposal	By November	Maciej Szymanowoski

12. Next meetings:

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