Report on Development Dialogue

Programme details	
School	Rotterdam School of Management
Programme	BSc Bedrijfskunde (ISAT 50645)

Accreditation details		
NVAO Framework	2024	
Date site visit	22 – 24 January 2025	
Panel	*Member*	Prof. dr. M.H.P. Kleijnen
	Member	Dr. F.J. Prins
	Secretary	R. Ligthart
	Standard 1	Meets the standard
	Standard 2	Meets the standard
	Standard 3	Meets the standard
	Standard 4	Meets the standard
Panel conclusion	*Final conclusion*	Positive
NVAO decision	AV-3369 of 20 June 2025	
The most recent results of the programme accreditation can be consulted at https://www.nvao.net/en/decisions/educations		

Development dialogue details	
Date	6 May 2026
Participants	Academic Directors of the programme and RSM's Executive Director Quality and Innovation

Context development dialogue
In line with the NVAO assessment framework, each programme or cluster of programmes conducts a 'development dialogue' (ontwikkelgesprek) with the assessment panel following the assessment visit. During this development dialogue, future developments and potential improvements are discussed from a development perspective. The agenda is drawn up by the study programme. Although the development dialogue is part of the programme review, outcomes are not part of the accreditation assessment. Pursuant to the Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (WHW), Article 5.13 paragraph 6, we publish the report of these discussions with this document.

Discussion points

Assessment design and validity in the AI-enabled environment.

- Enabling students to learn how to effectively work with AI tools.
- Impact of the use of AI by students in (written) assessments.
- Finding balance between formative and summative assessments. Further development towards capstone assessments.

Discussion takeaways

The school placed these AI-related themes on the development dialog agenda for two connected reasons: RSM is currently updating its assessment policy to safeguard and enhance assessment validity in an AI-enabled landscape and AI is a strategic theme for the programme itself, reflected in its inclusion of a programme ILO relating to digital and AI literacy. Following the panel, we distinguish between assessing knowledge and skills, assessing AI literacy and employability, and our own use of AI in educational formats.

1. Graduate competence

The aim within our bachelor programmes is to safeguard academic integrity and, at the same time, prepare students for a labor market in which AI is a standard tool. Rather than offering a separate AI course, we embed AI into existing courses. This connects to our existing ILOs on digital literacy. A complicating factor is that AI develops very quickly, therefore materials and examples can become outdated within months, which means we will need to update and prioritize continuously.

A key thought is that we want students not only to produce a "good product", but also to develop evaluative judgment: recognizing what quality is, and judging whether a text, analysis or design is acceptable and well-reasoned. This requires a basic understanding of what AI can and cannot do, and how to check and improve AI outputs.

2. Staff development

To support our ambitions, AI literacy among teaching staff should also be at a sufficient level. We do not expect every teacher to become an AI expert, but staff need to understand the main implications of AI for their courses and assessments. From the examples presented by the panel we see options we could adopt, such as design oriented workshops, support by educational developers, and practical tools (templates and question frameworks) that help teachers to redesign written assessments with AI in mind and that help to keep programmes aligned.

3. Assessment policy development

At first, response to AI was to safeguard assessment validity which includes reverting assessments to invigilated exams and re-designing assessments to be more AI-resilient.

Our aim is to move towards a learning outcomes first approach. We want to start from what we expect students to know and be able to do and then decide where AI should be restricted and where it should be integrated, in collaboration with our Examination Board.

The panel showed that other institutions tackle these issues by deciding for each ILO where secure assessment is essential and where AI assisted work is acceptable. This is an option we can use as we develop our own assessment policy. Not every ILO must be secured in every

course, but certain ILOs must be demonstrated without AI at least once, while in other courses AI can be integrated as a learning tool. The panel also discussed how using multiple data points, such as products, progress meetings, oral components and reflections, can provide a richer basis for judging whether students have achieved the ILOs and for reducing the risk that students finish a programme without sufficient understanding.
A return to traditional exam hall testing for all assessments is not a desirable or feasible solution. A more sustainable response is to design assessments that are less vulnerable to misuse. This includes in class and group activities, oral examinations and reflective tasks that make students' reasoning visible. We still expect basic conceptual understanding although the use of tools is allowed. In a similar way, we want students to be able to explain and justify their work, even if they have used AI as a support tool. A safe, licensed AI environment for students and staff will enable us to integrate AI more explicitly into teaching while safeguarding privacy. For RSM, the design and adoption of such a safe environment will be a key factor in how far we can go in requiring AI use as part of the learning process.

4. Pedagogical redesign

The panel presented several options that RSM may consider. One is to explore alternative capstone formats in which the work is spread over a longer period with staged assignments and progress discussions instead of only a written product at the end. Another option is to move towards more programmatic assessment, where multiple data points together support the final judgment about whether a student meets the end terms. To implement these options in large bachelor programmes, where supervision capacity and peak period bottlenecks are important constraints, arrangements must be sustainable and scalable, with clear choices at programme level about in which courses which competences are summatively assessed.
In large bachelor programmes, teachers cannot maintain close contact with every individual student and therefore rely on written assessments for quality control. In line with the panel's recommendations, we will explore the possibilities to move towards assessments that combine summative and formative aspects. At programme level this means concentrating summative assessment of writing and collaboration in a limited number of well designed courses, while allowing more flexible and AI supported work in other courses where these skills are not the primary focus. For group work, the focus can shift from only the final product to the development process and individual contributions, supported by reflection and, where feasible, oral elements. AI can support this shift by taking over some routine tasks (for example basic feedback), allowing teachers to focus more on formative interactions.
Across all these developments, evaluative judgment becomes central. We want graduates who not only can produce work, but who also understand what good work is, can recognize it in themselves and others, and can use AI critically and responsibly to reach higher quality products.