Minutes MSc PC – 21 December 2023

Online meeting via Teams and T3-42; 13:30–15:30 hours

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

1. Opening and announcements
The chair welcomes everybody present.

Opening announcements
1) MS: During the first AI thesis coach training, participants learned a) How to use AI properly, b) How people can cheat with AI and c) How to evaluate in the AI programme. One of the findings was that cheating with AI doesn't work very well. In the second session, attendees learned about prompting. For example, how to give different specify tones and other requirements. The result was a) The user should have the skills to indicate to AI what he/she wants and b) AI is only worthwhile for specific aspects in the thesis process. In addition, the group focused on authorship issues such as plagiarism and people signing for papers they haven't worked on. However, these are no AI issues but ghost writing is. Therefore, they are redefining the definition of authorship regarding ghost writing. Furthermore, the group is investigating whether students could work with AI generated preliminary feedback in the thesis process like basic criteria comprehensiveness and completeness thus coaches could focus on the content of the thesis. According to MS, the strongest conclusion is that students are overconfident about their thesis research skills and procrastinate in developing the skills causing them run into trouble at the end. With the use of AI, this problem will increase because students might think that if they get trouble at the end of the thesis process, they can use AI. However, students forget that they should have the skills to use AI to do so.
2) GH: For the academic year 2025-2026, the FC received a proposal to set two additional caps: a) A cap of 150

students for the MSc SCM programme and b) A cap of 100 students for the MSc POC master. The reason for the caps is capacity limits in the teaching department and due to the financial savings, it's impossible to recruit more teachers. In addition. If the FC gives consent to proposal, this means that (with the exception of the MSc MI and MSc MBI programmes) that all RSM masters have a cap in their admission process.

Comments of the Committee:
1) CS: Admission caps are important because too many students mean problems such as a) Faculty should work more without compensation, b) Insufficient room capacity, c) The quality of education and d) Financial problems because it takes two years for RSM to receive the reimbursement for additional students. To improve the admission policy, it would be better to change the fairness argument of who clicked first in the programme to selective criteria which the school would like to have. This change will improve the education experience.
2) MS: It would be a good idea to invite the Executive Director of Recruitment Amy Janssen – Brennan to a MSc PC meeting to discuss the admission policy. MS is interested in how the algorithm is adjusted and whether staff who work more because of the number of students will be compensated.
3) KR wonders whether putting caps on master programmes is the long-term solution because the real problem has to do with teaching and facility limits. Therefore, it would be better to change something in the capacity.
4) FM: To get the best motivated students in the master programmes, it would be better to use the motivation letter as an admission criterion.
5) GH: The motivation criterion isn't useful in the admission process as it's a bad predictor of study success and the increasing use of AI tools for written applications will further decrease the predictive value. To make the motivation criterion valid, an assessment should be added to the admission process but that's not feasible due to the high numbers of applications.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 30 November 2023—see attachment.
1) GB: The word *budget* should be changed to *Carbon budget.*
2) GB: The sentence *So that it has an indirect impact on channels and efforts in certain directions* should be changed to *So that it has an indirect impact and channels our effort in certain direction.*

3. Questions from the MSc PC about scheduling of lectures and exams
The PC members discuss which questions they would like to ask to ES Management Consultant Dr Annemarie Kersten and Julia Roos about the scheduling of lectures and exams.
1) MS: Some people are negative about the quality of scheduling at RSM but it would be better to keep in mind that other universities have the same problems or even worse. There are universities where the course day, time and room can change every week. However, at RSM the course timeslots stay the same and there is less changing of rooms.
2) MAS: Would it be possible to give students a free week in the Spring which could be used for e.g., a) A study trip because currently, in the MSc POC programme a study trip is being organised and therefore is asked whether the course attendance policy can be changed and b) To improve student well-being because there is no break for students between January and July.
3) KR has three questions a) What are the basic variables or constraints that should be considered when scheduling a session, b) To what extent are teachers' preferences about when they are available to teach considered and c) Could the university use off-campus facilities?
4) SZ: When scheduling, it would be better to consider the quality of the room, because some rooms have air and sound equipment problems and if facilities aren't working, it costs teachers time.
5) MS: Is it possible to schedule courses twice per academic year instead of once? Because scheduling the entire year in advance leads to problems when teachers would like to change the setup of a course later in the academic year.

Comments of the Committee:
1) GH: In the past, the EUR had an Erasmus-wide *Witte Week.* During this week, no classes were scheduled and study trips could be organised. However, in practice, the trips were organised at other times of the year and in

RSM Erasmus

addition, the Witte Week created capacity issues in terms of facilities, which is why it was discontinued If students would like to reintroduce a free week, the University Council should be contacted as this issue would be a university-wide decision.
2) FM: If the free week for students will be reintroduced, it would be better to introduce it RSM-wide, since the electives are master cross-curricular, where without a school-wide break no study trip can be organised.
3) MK: It would be nice if students are given some time to decompress between January and July as these months are stressful.
4) MAS: Scheduling once per academic year also creates problems for new faculty, because they can't schedule their own course that year.

4. Update from the PC subcommittees
1) The AI in Education Subcommittee: During the last subcommittee meeting, the Committee created an agenda with the following topics: a) Starting with the status quo, looking into what is the current state of AI and sharing some best practices from other universities and industry, b) Looking at implications of AI what are the challenges and chances for faculty and students and c) The idea with the looking forward topic is which recommendations does the subcommittee want to give and this are three main topics a) Educating teachers on AI use. This relates to how teachers are educated from the university to have an equal level of understanding of AI and how they should use the tool in the class, b) Educating students on AI use and c) The assessments and general adaptations.
2) The Course Evaluation Subcommittee would like to focus on two topics: a) The subcommittee would like to help the PAC members to gather the best feedback, for example, by providing suggestions and improving the PAC manual and b) How to improve the feedback that teachers receive? More specifically how teachers collect feedback during a course and indicate the importance of building a personal working relationship between teachers and students and ultimately not using the course evaluation form as the only feedback tool. The challenge is to think could RSM provide guidance and show what teachers personally gain from the feedback.
3) The Diversity & Social Safety Subcommittee is figuring out which topic they would like to focus on. There is much movement in inclusion and diversity at RSM and the university. In the new year, the subcommittee is meeting the IDEA project leader to discuss a) What they would like to see where the Committee could focus on, b) What the IDEA is doing and c) Whether the subcommittee and IDEA could collaborate to have the most impact at the school. In addition, the Committee would like to know the university strategy regarding the definition of diversity and inclusion as a part of the university policy and future direction on this topic. This information should reveal how the university is doing in terms of diversity and inclusion.
4) The Open Education Subcommittee members know what topic they would like to focus on. They interviewed the Academic Directors and the Executive Director about open education. From this it emerged that a) Faculty check the educational strategy because it's useful to see whether the topic they are focussing on is relevant to the school and b) The subcommittee will keep a questionnaire for teachers about open education, asking if and how they use open education for example, guest lectures, company visits and or real-life cases in their course. Based on the results of the questionnaire, the Committee would like to create an open education best practices list, making it easier for teachers to use open education tools in their courses.
5) The Career Preparation Subcommittee has noticed that students get insufficient information a) From the industry about their possibilities and b) About what will happen after graduation. In addition, the Future Career platform isn't clear to every student. Therefore, the subcommittee would like to form a problem statement and focus, for example, on improving the Mentor Me platform. Moreover, the Committee would also like to investigate the connection between RSM and the industries.

Comments of the Committee:
Course Evaluation Subcommittee
1) MS: It would be good if the feedback is filtered before the teacher receives it because the very negative impolite feedback could damage a teacher.
2) FM noted that some course evaluations are more about the entire master programme than the course. In the

MSc SE programme, there is nothing in place to evaluate every course on an individual basis.

Diversity & Social Safety Subcommittee

3) MS: Currently, admission and diversity is a prominent topic. It's difficult because on one hand RSM isn't allowed to collect data on diversity but on the other hand the school should be diverse.

4) CS: It's important for the university to be diverse and include minorities. Therefore, it would be better to investigate what the diversity composition of students is, because then it becomes clear how the diversity of society is reflected in the university. In addition, it would be a good idea to encourage and support minorities to apply to certain master programme at RSM.

5) MS: Students aren't sufficiently aware about what happens at RSM and what the school stands for. Therefore, it would be useful to inform them about topics related that, for example, sustainability and diversity.

5. Closing remarks

6. Action points

What	When	Who
All members will send their questions about RSM's admission policy to AL	By January	All members
AL will invite Executive Director of Recruitment Amy Janssen – Brennan to a MSc PC meeting to discuss the admission policy	By January	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will add the course manual discussion to a future MSc PC meeting	By January	Annelie van der Leelie
Al will invite the head of the alumni office to discuss the alumni topic	By January	Annelie van der Leelie

Next meetings:

25- Jan-24, 09.30h   18-Apr-24, 09.30h
29- Feb- 24, 09.30h   16-May-24, 09.30h
21-Mar-24, 10.00h   13-Jun-24, 09.30h