Minutes MSc PC – 22 June 2021

Online meeting via Zoom 10:00–12:00 hours

Present	Absent
MS: Maciej Szymanowski (Chair, MM)	SM: Susana Mendes (HRM)
AL: Annelie van der Leelie (Minutes)	BS: Benjamin Schubert (SCM)
FW: Frank Wijen (SM)	YL: Yu Liu (SE)
GB: Guido Berens (GBS)	TH: Ties Hitzert (SE)
JA: Jens Angele (SM)	AB: Anne Burmeister (HRM)
MM: Marlies Mons (MM)	AS: Ad Scheepers (PM)
PC: Philipp Cornelius (BIM)	SZ: Solomon Zori (MScBA AFM)
FM: Florian Madertoner (FI)	
MAM: Mersad Arab Maghsoodi (MScBA MIM)	
RB: Rajae Bolghiran (MScBA BAM)	
KK: Korcan Kavusan (MscBA MIM)	
GH: Gabi Helfert (PM)	
TL: Tim van der Linden (MScBA AFM)	
MH: Magnus van Haaren (MI)	
SC: Seleyna Celik (FI)	
MP: Morteza Pourakbar (SCM)	
CH: Claudia Heese (OCC)	
SK: Sofia Klingelhoefer (GBS)	
MW: Mike de Witte (BIM)	
ASE: Anastasia Sergeeva (OCC)	
JN: Jurriaan Nijholt (MScBA P-MIM)	
MB: Marietje Bosma (MScBA P-MIM)	

1. Opening and announcements
The chair welcomes everybody present.

2. Approval of minutes from MSc PC meeting 25 May 2021 – see attachment
The minutes were approved.

3. Discussing plans of PC subcommittees
An overview of the outputs of the subcommittees
1) The HOKA subcommittee: The HOKA programme is so complex that it is difficult for the HOKA Working Group to fulfil their role of overseeing the projects/ initiatives. Therefore, a meeting will be organised between the HOKA Steering Committee and the HOKA Working Group. Hence, JN asked the PC members whether they had input for this meeting. The MSc PC a) Wonders why a lot of money is going to the project mission, because the project has little to do with the impact on the quality of education, b) Suggests making the application for HOKA money more user-friendly, due to teachers spend too much time explaining in detail why they need HOKA support for the course. Therefore, the MSc PC proposes a fast-track procedure for projects under €2000 and c) Would like to review the HOKA projects and the money allocated to them. Therefore, the PC suggests developing a system whereby the participatory bodies can periodically review the budget allocations for the HOKA projects.
2) The Impact subcommittee dealt with the a) Summary of the TER. This document has been updated with the help of Carla Dirks from the EB, b) The study books project. This project is still ongoing and

RSM Erasmus

the university library is designing an online study book platform for students and c) Guidelines for learning analytics and adaptive education topic. MS already discussed this topic with EUR Central but it is still theoretical. However, the discussion with the Dean could already start on what to do with the rules once the analytics are open, because this could cause some problems such as where is RSM going to invest in terms of marketing to the standards of bringing weaker students up to speed or invest more in the more talented students. The subcommittee incorporated the information on these topics in a final report which will be send to the Academic Directors

3.) There is no update by the Online Education Best Practises subcommittee

4) There is no update by the Online Education Social Practice subcommittee

5) The Thesis Trajectory subcommittee created a report on the information collected on best practises for thesis trajectory. In addition, ten initiatives have been added to the report. These initiatives provide guidelines to certain topics, for example group work or a buddy system that each master programme can benefit from its own way. Moreover, a discussion group has been established to discuss how the ideas from the thesis trajectory could be implemented.

6) The SR MSc PC Collaboration subcommittee a) Schedules a meeting for September between the current and future PAC/PC student members to exchange information about the Programme Committee, b) Has created a proposal on the set-up of the Master Professor Award election and c) The SR has prepared a training for the new student PC/ PAC members where they will receive information about the individual master programmes in the MSc PC.

4.Discussion about the master thesis

MS explained to the committee that during the MSc PC meeting on 20 April it was discussed whether and how the current thesis should be changed in the future. He asked the committee members whether they had any additions to this discussion.

Comments of the committee:

1) FW: A thesis should be academically solid and he is concerned that another form of a final piece, such as an internship, doesn't do justice to the academic added value of the master programme. Thus, if the thesis changes it should be ensured that the final piece proofs that the student is capable of independently managing a research project based on a solid academic insight. In addition, RSM should be careful that the new thesis doesn't converge with the Higher Vocational Educational thesis because then the academic character of the master thesis is lost.

2) ASE: A master of science seems to imply a proficiency in academic writing and research. If students aren't interested in this, they shouldn't enrol in the programme. Often a bachelor's degree is sufficient for a job and the employees are trained further within the company

3) JN: There is a distinction between a solid research that is aimed at application in practice or solid research that is aimed at a contribution to the academic world and the school should make a choice for which approach to take. However, in his opinion JN indicates that RSM should go for the academic approach because the Dutch master's degree is already more practice-oriented than, for example, a master's degree from the United States. Thus, if the Dutch master's thesis becomes even more practice-oriented, the international value of a Dutch master's degree will decrease

4) MH: RSM should take the individual interests of students into account. Therefore, it would be better if students could choose between an academic-based or practical-based thesis

5) KK: The value of the master thesis is scientific research skills which students develop during their master and these are independent of the content of the thesis

6) CH: Instead of changing the final piece, it would be better to better inform the students about the learning goals of a thesis. JN and FW added that this could be done through a course manual, Canvas or a research clinic

7) MP: The MSc SCM programme students combine the practice and academic approach in the thesis trajectory because the students do research in a company but write their thesis based on a

RSM

solid and rigorous methodology which meets the needs of both aspects
8) JM: The thesis shouldn't only have value for RSM and the students but also for society
9) MS: It would be better to have a multidisciplinary team thesis where each student has its own project, but the projects together raise or solve a bigger issue which has an impact on society
10) JA: Many international students find the Dutch master thesis already very practice-oriented which reduces the chance of a PhD position abroad because foreign universities ask for a more academic approach of the master thesis

MS will write an advice letter about a course manual for the master thesis.

5. Closing remarks
MS would like to thank all the committee members for their contribution to the committee over the past year. GH joins in.

6. Action points

What	When	Who
AL will invite the Dean for a MSc PC meeting to discuss the Guidelines for learning analytics adaptive education topic	September	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will write the annual report	From July to September	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will send the subcommittees final output to the academic directors	September	Annelie van der Leelie
AL will send the information package to the new MSc PC student members	September	Annelie van der Leelie
MS will write an advice letter about course manual for the thesis	July	Maciej Szymanowski

Next Meetings:
Will be scheduled and published in late August.