

# Minutes MSc PC – 13 June 2024

Online meeting via Teams; 09:30–11:30 hours

Present	Absent
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM, BAM)	AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)
KR: Kristupas Radzvila (SCM)	TC: Teodora Comanescu (GBS)
KB: Kathrin Borner (MI, MBI)	MC: Marta Cazzamalli (POC)
AN: Anna Nikulina (SCM)	LL: Larissa de Liedekerke (MSc MBI)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	MAS: Maartje Schouten (POC)
PBC: Philipp Cornelius (BIM)	YL: Yu Liu (SE)
SET: Shinouk Ettema (MScBA P-MiM)	BS: Bianca Stoiciu (MI)
MK: Michelle Kossoi (MM)	EB: Emanuel Ubert (SM)
BB: Bas Bogers (MScBA BAM)	NN: Nargiz Najaf (BIM)
FM: Felix Mayer (SE)	KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MiM)
SML: Sofia Murell Lema	NZ: Nadine Ziegengeist (FI)
	CS: Claus Schmitt (FI)
	DB: Daiana Botezatu (MScBA AFM)
	IH: Ian Hermes (MScBA MiM)
	FH: Felicitas Huffer (SM)
	(MScBA pMiM)

## 1. Opening and announcements

The chair welcomes everybody present.

### Announcement

- 1) MS: Kathrin Borner is the new faculty representative for the MSc MI programme.
- 2) MS updated the Committee on the MScBA AFM curriculum change issue.
  - 1) After the presentation during the MSc PC on 21 March 2024, the PC decided not to vote on the proposed changes. The Committee ask the programme to update the changes and come back to discuss the topic again to get the Committee's approval.
  - 2) The Dean of Education contacted the MSc PC chair to inform him that according to RSM's lawyers, the MScBA AFM programme can make the changes because the PC only gives consent to the ILOs and the ILOs haven't been changed. Therefore, the Dean of Education decided to approve the AFM changes.
  - 3) Currently, the Committee is awaiting the Dean of Education letter explaining why he approved the changes and why nothing was done with the MSc PC's advice.
  - 4) In the future, it would be better for the PC if the ILOs of a course also change, as the Committee can then give consent.

## 2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 16 May 2024– see attachment.

GB: The sentence *In addition, the subcommittee suggests to (...) b) Stop basing the teacher performance on the course evaluations (...)*. Should be changed to *In addition, the subcommittee suggests to (...) b) Stop basing the teacher performance assessment on the course evaluations (...)*.

### 3. PC Subcommittees Presentations

The subcommittees presented their final documents to each other.

- 1) As the final document, the AI in Education Subcommittee wrote a letter discussing the following topics: a) A general introduction of AI in education and a SWOT analysis, b) Opinions on AI from different universities and organisations, for example McKinsey, c) Relevant tools, d) Fulfilling the issue of education for teachers on AI use, regarding their technical, didactic, operational and administrative levels, e) AI education for students. The important topic is to interact with the bachelor programmes thus the educations are aligned with the AI rules, f) What role AI could play in learning and course tasks, g) How AI could be used to bridge the gap between the students' heterogeneous skills. However, to prevent the heterogeneous skills gap between students, they should be properly trained in how to deal with AI, h) AI on assessments. AI could be used as second vents for testing methods and l) References. The plan is to send the document to the Dean of Education and Learning Innovation Consultant Ella AKIN from LIT.
- 2) The Course Evaluation Subcommittee researched materials on course evaluations and spoke with RSM IDEA Project Leader Julia Cselotei and Learning Innovation Consultant Ella AKIN from LIT. This revealed that student course evaluation feedback isn't optimal because a) Students don't take the evaluations seriously, b) Response rates are low and c) Course evaluations are important for faculty HR evaluations but this doesn't work well due to low response rates. According to the subcommittee, solutions could be a) Peer-reviews, b) Assessment of teaching by external experts and c) To improve feedback between students and teachers, it would be better if PAC members choose two student representatives per course who would collect feedback and discuss this feedback with the teacher. To ensure that process runs smoothly, the subcommittee suggested appointing one central owner of PACs at RSM to ensure the reliability of the internal administration (standardisation, stakeholder communication, continuity through the year). The Bachelor Student Representatives have created templates for good PAC processes, specifically for the master programmes.
- 3) The Diversity and Social Safety Subcommittee created a checklist that could empower faculty to make the classes more inclusive. The next steps are a) To add the checklist to the online teachers' manual, b) To visit department meetings to provide information about the checklist, c) To create a video showing elements of the checklist and examples of action and d) Align with ongoing inclusive education initiatives developed through LIT. Besides implementation, the subcommittee also recommends monitoring the use and effectiveness of the checklist by measuring a) Adoption rate and utility of the checklist for instructors and b) Perceptions of inclusion among students.
- 4) The Open Education Subcommittee. The subcommittee's recommendations are a) Organising industry days, b) Creating a programme specific (alumni) stakeholders database because then it's clear which stakeholders could be invited to the right topic, and c) Improving collaboration with Career Centre on consultancy projects. The Open Education subcommittee added to the final document that the Alumni Office would like to start a an Alumni Advisory Board project. However, the subcommittee indicated that the advisory board isn't popular by Academic Directors because they don't want another committee telling them what to do. Therefore, the subcommittee suggests holding industry days where stakeholders and the school could discuss which topics the programmes should or shouldn't be in the programmes.
- 5) The Career Preparation Subcommittee. Would like to create a Your Future Career 2.0 course which extends the current Your Future Career course. The subcommittee would like to implement the following ideas a) Integrate more guests lectures and industry representatives into the regular courses to bridge the gap between career considerations and knowledge, b) To establish a alumni community which connects with current students, for example through Facebook interaction groups and improving access to and visibility of the MentorMe programme and ,c) To involve more alumni on campus for instance by having alumni organise their own events for students.

Comments of the Committee

#### Course Evaluation Subcommittee

- 1) MS is in favour of a PAC coordinator.
- 2) MS: To improve PAC members' knowledge about the PAC process, it would be better if they attend the SR training.
- 3) MS: For next academic year, it would be better if the MSc PC establishes a PAC Coordinator subcommittee consisting of two student members and a faculty member. This subcommittee could design and deliver PAC trainings to PAC members and remain the contact point throughout the year.

#### Diversity and Social Safety Subcommittee

- 4) MS is in favour of showing the inclusion checklist during department meetings because teachers will know that there are existing tools to make classes inclusive.
- 5) SML: It would be a good idea to add the inclusion checklist to the teacher's' manual, as this would make it easier for teachers to find the document.

#### Career Preparation Subcommittee

- 6) MS: The Your Future Career course is important to prepare students well for the labour market. Therefore, it would be better if ILOs will be added to the course.

### 4. Update to PC introduction presentation

MS asked the MSc PC members whether they had any suggestions to improve the MSc PC onboarding process.

- 1) MS would like to find a solution that the subcommittees output is finished earlier, e.g., in March.

Comments of the Committee

- 1) AN: To improve the subcommittee process, it would be better if PC members receive an overview of what the previous subcommittees have done before the new subcommittee topics are selected. In addition, it would also be better if during the topic selection process, consideration is given to who within the school is relevant to approach for the specific topic. This procedure would prevent miscommunication and it becomes visible what has already been done within RSM on the topic.
- 2) AN: To get a better idea of what initiatives are being worked on in RSM, it would be useful to invite the Dean of Education to the MSc PC October meeting. Moreover, this information will also help in selecting the right subcommittee topics.
- 3) AN: To receive feedback on the subcommittee's outputs, it would be better to change the feedback process to one subcommittee provides feedback to two other subcommittees, as everyone would the same workload, and it would give clarity on what to read.
- 4) BB, KR: In the beginning of the academic year, new MSc PC student members receive too much general information about how the PC works which makes it very unclear. Therefore, it would be better to develop a one- or two-pages document with information about how the MSc PC works (meetings, unsolicited and solicited topics) and legal perspectives.

### 5. Closing remarks

### 6. Action points

What	When	Who
AL will contact the SR to ask whether the new PAC members could attend the SR training in September.	By July	Annelie van der Leelie

### 7. Next meetings: