Development dialogue Research master Clinical and Pscyhosocial Epidemiology, Groningen University

Sarah Boer, panel secretary

The development sessions were organized around the Compass method, which was used to explore the topics described below from four perspectives: *North – vision and ambition; East – education and implementation; South – students and the learning process; and West – organisation and preconditions*. Participants used colour-coded sticky notes to identify strengths, areas requiring clarification, risks and opportunities.

Theme 1: Strengthening interdisciplinary education through a shared vision, educational design and student development

The panel recognizes the potential of a phased approach to interdisciplinary education, moving from disciplinary grounding and exposure to other disciplines towards comparison, reflection and integrative competence. A clear programme identity, shared understanding of core concepts, and alignment between learning outcomes and assessment are important. The panel recommends balancing breadth and depth and clarifying the cultural change the programme aims to achieve. The diversity of disciplines and opportunities for collaboration, including interfaculty education, external partnerships and real-world applications, are valued. At the same time, introducing too many disciplines, methods or themes may result in fragmentation without sufficient structure and shared language. The panel therefore recommends ensuring that interdisciplinary education remains realistic within the compact programme and that sufficient expertise and integration are available. A strong disciplinary foundation remains important. The programme should clarify which core knowledge and interdisciplinary competencies students are expected to develop and how these are addressed through admission and the curriculum. Students should be involved in developing interdisciplinary education, while assessment criteria require careful calibration and collaboration among teachers to ensure that interdisciplinary learning and integration are assessed appropriately.

Theme 2: Integrating AI literacy and responsible AI use across the curriculum

The panel recognizes that an isolated AI course is no longer sufficient, as students already use AI extensively. AI-related learning outcomes should therefore be embedded throughout the curriculum. An introductory AI literacy component could familiarise students with available tools, opportunities and risks, including their use in scientific writing and research, and these topics could be revisited throughout the programme. Rather than prohibiting AI, the programme should establish clear criteria and regulations for responsible use. AI may support activities such as coding or troubleshooting, while remaining subordinate to the intended learning process. Open discussions with students and teachers about appropriate use and potential risks are important, particularly as identifying AI-generated work may not always be reliable. The panel further emphasizes that responsible AI use should be explicitly taught through structured practice, including developing and evaluating prompts. As AI use becomes transparent and permitted, assessment should place greater emphasis on the learning process rather than solely on the final product. Existing thesis assessment practices already provide a strong basis for this, but could be strengthened by explicitly documenting how AI was used, including prompts and its role in the work. Students should also retain the option not to use AI, ensuring that it supports rather than replaces their learning.