

REFERAT Studienævnet for Erhvervs- og Samfundsøkonomi d. 24-03-2025

Mødedato Mandag d. 24. marts 2025 kl. 09:10

Mødested 14.2-023

Indholdsfortegnelse

Members present.....	3
Approval of the agenda.....	4
Approval of last month's minutes.....	5
Approval of meeting dates.....	6
Approval of guidelines for use of AI.....	7
Lukket.....	8
Comments to the department report on our programmes (Bodil's report based on the HofS reports)..	9
Grade statistics.....	10
Analysis of intake 2024.....	11
Study board wishes in relations to the upcoming BA-revision.....	12
Tools for digital invigilated exams.....	14
Application numbers.....	15
Alignment of HofS's way of identifying plagiarism.....	16
Orientations from Heads of Studies.....	17
Any other business.....	18

Punkt 1: Members present

Beslutning

John Damm Scheuer (Chair)

David Burgener (Vice-chair)

Margit Neisig

Flemming Sørensen

Louison Cahen-Fourot

Mette Apollo Rasmussen (Head of Studies, EØ)

Maria Duclos Lindstrøm (coming Head of Studies, EØ)

Helle Rønne Warburg (minute taker)

Punkt 2: Approval of the agenda

The study board is asked to comment and approve the agenda

Beslutning

The agenda was approved.

Punkt 3: Approval of last month's minutes

The study board is asked to comment and approve the minutes of last month's meeting.

Beslutning

The minutes were approved.

Bilag

Minutes-2025-02-24.pdf

Punkt 4: Approval of meeting dates

The following meeting dates/times are suggested:

April:

Monday 28, 9.30-12

May:

Tuesday 20, 9-11.30

June:

Monday 23, 9.30-12

August:

Thursday 28, 9.30-12

Beslutning

All dates were approved.

Louison will probably be online on the June meeting.

Margit away for the June meeting - we will call for substitute.

Punkt 5: Approval of guidelines for use of AI

Recommendation

The study board is asked to approve the text below, possibly based on the board's comments and adjustments.

The secretary of the study board follows up with the course responsables on the board's programs.

Background

In connection with the exam committee's work in the fall of 2024, it was decided that all activity descriptions must contain guidelines for the use of GenAI tools in connection with the detailed description of the exam form. The guidelines must include descriptions of the permitted use of GenAI tools and the required declaration of this.

The individual course responsible decides which bullets to include in the descriptions of the activity in question. All other text is mandatory.

Proposed text for Study.dk

In this course/project, the following generative AI (GenAI) tools are allowed in the exam work if the use is declared as instructed:

- General use of GenAI tools: a declaration in the assignment according to [RUC's guidelines](#).
- No use of GenAI tools: a clear declaration of this at the beginning or end of the assignment.
- Autocorrect: no declaration.
- Generation of text fragments: citation with source reference to the GenAI tool, just as when citing other people's material. The reference must appear both as a footnote and in the bibliography. The prompt must be included in the footnote. The citation from the GenAI tool will be graded like other citations according to your demonstrated ability to interpret, evaluate and critically evaluate it.
- History of prompts must be attached as an appendix, alternatively shared in the bibliography as a link if the GenAI tool allows it.

All use of AI tools must always take place within the framework of the university's [guidelines for the use of AI](#). You are always responsible for the text you submit for assessment in connection with an exam, regardless of the origin of the text.

NB! Use of GenAI tools beyond the specified ways is considered exam cheating and will be treated accordingly, cf. the university's [guidelines](#). Use of GenAI tools is also covered by the rules for plagiarism. It is recommended to talk to your teacher/supervisor in case of doubt.

Beslutning

The study board decided not to approve the guidelines but to point out some observations and comments to the working group that will try to come up with a common suggestion for AI guidelines on Study for all of RUC.

Autocorrect: Which autocorrect? Word, Copilote, ChatGPT? Maybe it has to be declared if it is something other than Word that is already allowed?

History of prompt: Would it be enough to declare? The instruction/demands have to be precise for the students to understand the demands. Training/help needed for them to do it correctly. The study board recommends an appendix solution for declaration of prompt history.

The study board recommends that the working group has pedagogical knowledge added to it (EAE or HofS).

Should we ask students to write if they did not use AI?

Punkt 6: Lukket

Punkt 7: Comments to the department report on our programmes (Bodil's report based on the HofS reports)

The study board is asked to comment on the Vice-Dean's report about the programmes of the department based on the HofS reports.

Beslutning

The study board commented on 2.4 Forskningsbaserings og 2.5 Kvalificering til arbejdsmarkedet:

2.4

"Trods nyansættelser har vi ikke kunnet følge med væksten på BAL. Med yderligere nyansættelser undervejs og forventet nedgang i USB-optaget, vil VIP/DVIP-ratioen og STÅ/VIP-rationen rette sig"

But there are still a lot of students. The study board recommends that the development is followed closely.

2.5

IPG has the best result, but both PF og BAL have a positive development.

Helle writes an e-mail to Bodil stating the above.

Bilag

Institutrapport 2025 ISE_WiP_250321.docx

Punkt 8: Grade statistics

The Study Board is asked to familiarize themselves with the grade statistics for the activities where exams have been held in connection with the winter term 2024.

Attached are screenshots from the Power BI report with grades.

The Power BI report with grade statistics can be accessed at the link below.

Remember to download the document for the link to function! - or copy the URL:

<https://app.powerbi.com/groups/8f05ae67-cf85-42aa-96f3-1e0a734254b2/reports/943797b8-99f9-4f11-a67c-e23bb1636799/ReportSection?experience=power-bi>

Contact Andres Wulff Vissing Christensen at awvc@ruc.dk if you have any problems accessing the report.

Beslutning

BAL:

The study board would expect the grades to improve when new students are taken in according to the new criteria.

In general:

It would seem that the students get better and better from first to third semester. This supports the need for good onboarding.

Bilag

Grade statistics winter 2024, Business and Socio Economics.docx

Punkt 9: Analysis of intake 2024

This item was postponed at the February meeting.

Study board members are asked to familiarize themselves with the material on admissions in 2024. Data presented in the analyses at RUC level, broken down and compared at RUC, department and program level as well as main area, can be accessed here:

<https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/52f94e3e-1768-4096-bfe2-dcf6c2316663/reports/15bcb684-780b-47f5-8ba7-d17f16af98a9/131c59c4d9224cc2c6b6?ctid=5cb8e839-a838-4bb8-92af-d7756c2b7916&experience=power-bi>

The purpose of the admissions report is to support initiatives and action plans targeted at admissions, recruitment and the ongoing work with quality in the programs at department and program level. Insights from the report can, among other things, be used in the study boards' discussions on admissions, and can thus form the basis for action plans that are included in the annual heads of studies reports.

Beslutning

The study board did not have a lot of comments but urge the coming HofS to continue the present HofS's cooperation with US (Rikke Bartholdy) and regional university colleges to clarify admission demands. Especially since the intake of professionsbachelorer (bachelors from university colleges) has not increased as we want it to.

Prof.bach. has not increased - we want it to. Continue the work with Rikke Bartholdy.

Punkt 10: Study board wishes in relations to the upcoming BA-revision

Introductory discussion about what the study board would like to obtain with the upcoming BA-revision.

Beslutning

The item was on the agenda since Peter Triantafyllou (AR rep.) has contacted John in order to coordinate across ISE.

Need more room at the basic studies.

Broad introduction including Plan, Rum og Ressourcer.

More flexibility in the projects (50-50 could be discussed) and courses. More EØ-ECTS at SIB/SAB.

Combination studies at BA-level - 50-50. Does not procure enough EØ-ECTS to go to VL/BAL.

Reconsider the combos.

Arbejdsliv-kombo lukker. HA-HRM better

We need our BA students to have legal claim for VL/BAL.

Combo with Tech? Science? Communication?

EØ (og alle de andres) -proj. at third semester? How do we go about supervision?

2 disc.:

Combo - some will close, finding new friends

Ped. model - what do we want to do? Hanne Leth must be clear about what will be possible onwards.

HA and BA are already very specialized - but not VS and BS.

What makes RUC special?

P, R, R - not mandatory - option to choose more business like courses.

Or: how can PRR be more relevant to EØ-students?

What do we give our students before they enter

More relevant than the actual PRR: circular economy - PRR could be reframed.

Reduce basis. Are two semesters needed? Some say yes, some say no (academic skills are learned here)

Why do we lose the students after BA? Not enough of what they want to study. We have to give them what they want on the master. More focused back.

Look into reputation of RUC. Strong and weak points (according to companies and parents).

We should look into what graduates lack or profit from from their programme/degree

1. Space for foundational course instead of PRR. 2. - reframing PRR.

50:50 for projects? More flexible? More demands to content of project?

Another suggestion is to have only one semester of broad introduction.

Have to be discussed: what is the overall good programme?

Reintroduce the house concept - could still visit more houses. Make exercises in the houses.

Project seminars - broad topic, literature. Something in between prof. decided and student decided projects.

Two semesters of broad intro suggested.

Criteria for good programme - we should discuss

Punkt 11: Tools for digital invigilated exams

The Study Board is asked to review the attached text proposals for the framework for the use of assistive technology for digital, in vigilated exams. The text proposals will be written into the study regulations of the programs in question.

Appendices:

Memo from US about the changes (why, how)

List of affected courses at ESØ

Beslutning

No comments.

Bilag

Memo-UK-Digitale hjælpemidler ægte.docx

Forslag hjælpemidler ved stedprøver fra studieordninger september 2025.xlsx

Punkt 12: Application numbers

The study board is asked to inform themselves of the figures for applicants to BAL and VL:

<https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/0f1a762e-4eb4-4771-abc0-db8c293a1379/reports/9c2155e9-c38b-4c2a-8fbb-3120cfa79792/0f9d3fb078347d6675c6?ctid=5cb8e839-a838-4bb8-92af-d7756c2b7916&experience=power-bi>

Beslutning

No comments.

SØK glade for godt ansøgertal - 26 førsteprioritetsansøgninger.

Punkt 13: Alignment of HofS's way of identifying plagiarism

The chair has asked that the item is discussed.

Beslutning

Coordination, standardisation - not dealt with in the same way. Hopefully less cases.

Better instructions to teachers.

Meeting with the librarian and EØ supervisors.

Punkt 14: Orientations from Heads of Studies

Beslutning

Method course Økonometri open for HA students.

From now on less specification about future method courses - will be specified the semester before.

Same exam question for reexam as for the ordinary exam is not allowed.

Punkt 15: Any other business

Beslutning

Double degree should be promoted better. Would be good to use the current students.

Introduction to platform i hendes project - Baltic.

COVE - erhvervskandidaten for VL

Skriv Margit og spørge.