

REFERAT Studienævnet for Den Naturvidenskabelige Bachelor Uddannelse d. 18-02-2026

Mødedato Onsdag d. 18. februar 2026 kl. 13:00

Mødested 28A.1-11 - Mødelokale A1 - Videokonference (16)

Indholdsfortegnelse

Approval of the agenda for the constitution.....	3
Election of chair person and vice-chair person.....	5
Appointment of travel committee.....	6
Appointment of committee for preapproval, final credit transfer and exemptions.....	7
The rules of procedure revisited.....	8
Discussion and approval of the annual cycle.....	9
Approval of agenda.....	10
Approval of minutes.....	12
Lukket.....	14
Lukket.....	15
Lukket.....	16
Orientations from Martin Niss, study leader of NAB/NIB and chair of the study board.....	17
Other announcements or orientations.....	19
Project supervisor allocation for the bachelor project.....	21
Appointment of representatives for AR UDDU.....	23
Discussion of scope requirements.....	24
Tutoring - NAB and NIB.....	25
Strategy seminar - workshop.....	26
Approval of meeting dates.....	28
A.O.B.....	29

Punkt 1: Approval of the agenda for the constitution

Beslutning

Present:

Martin Niss (VIP, SL, forperson), Anna Beta (STUD), Pia Nyeng (VIP), Lærke Kønskov Vest (STUD), Marie Elizabeth Diniz (STUD), William Goldring (VIP), Hans Ulrik Hansen (VIP-suppl.) Fatima Hadi (STUD), Maria Køpke Kjeldsen (udd.koor. Kvalitetssikring, ref.), Simone Minana (sagsbehandler).

Martin is elected as conductor.

The agenda was approved.

Punkt 2: Election of chair person and vice-chair person

The chair person is elected among the VIP representatives and the vice-chair person is elected among the student representatives.

Beslutning

Martin Niss is elected as the chairperson.

Elizabeth is elected as the vice-chairperson.

Punkt 3: Appointment of travel committee

Appointment of one VIP representative and one student representative.

Beslutning

Lærke is elected as the student representative.

Jens Ulrik is elected as the VIP representative.

Punkt 4: Appointment of committee for preapproval, final credit transfer and exemptions

Appointment of one VIP representative and one student representative - usually this responsibility falls to the chair and vice-chair person.

Beslutning

Martin is elected as the VIP representative and Elizabeth is elected as the student representative.

Punkt 5: The rules of procedure revisited

The board is to review the Rules of Procedure - the board may alter the procedures.

Beslutning

The rules of procedure remains unchanged.

Bilag

Bilag 02-26-05 - forretningsorden_bach.pdf

Punkt 6: Discussion and approval of the annual cycle

The annual cycle is overview for the board of the known agenda items.

Beslutning

The annual cycle should be translated to English.

The annual cycle is approved.

Bilag

Bilag 02-26-06 - Nat_Bach_aarshjul_ver4_.docx

Punkt 7: Approval of agenda

Beslutning

The agenda was approved.

Punkt 8: Approval of minutes

Beslutning

The minutes was approved.

Bilag

Bilag 02-26-08 - Udkast til referat af møde 1 - 26 - åbent møde.pdf

Punkt 9: Lukket

Punkt 10: Lukket

Punkt 11: Lukket

Punkt 12: Orientations from Martin Niss, study leader of NAB/NIB and chair of the study board

Beslutning

Martin orientates about the open house and invites the board to come by.

Punkt 13: Other announcements or orientations

Beslutning

No other announcements.

Punkt 14: Project supervisor allocation for the bachelor project

Martin Niss will give a status on the process of allocating supervisors to the bachelor project coordinated by the Heads of Studies regarding the kick off seminar.

The Board is to discuss alternatives for a valuable allocation process of supervisors to the bachelor project.

Beslutning

The board discussed the ongoing challenges related to allocating supervisors for bachelor projects. Martin introduced the agenda point and explained that several different approaches have been tested in recent years to improve the alignment between student project interests and available supervisors.

Experiences with previous approaches

The board reviewed earlier attempts at facilitating the allocation process:

- A kick-off seminar was once held for all upcoming BA students, where VIP groups presented their research areas, and students filled out a survey to support allocation. This format did not meaningfully improve the allocation process.
- A survey sent to all students was tried more recently, but only about 50% responded, which limited its usefulness.
- Pulling data on how many students were connected to each subject module turned out to be more helpful than either of the above approaches.

Martin is also working on a project inspiration catalogue, but noted difficulties in getting other heads of study to contribute, as research groups differ in structure and in which staff members can supervise specific topics.

Reflections on the most recent kick-off

Several board members commented on the latest event:

- Only about 30% attendance, which some considered acceptable, while others felt it limited the value of the event.
- In some programmes (e.g., molecular biology and medical biology), all students attended, suggesting variation across fields.
- The event offered too little time for developing project ideas or discussing with peers.
- There was no real project market, and no opportunity to meet new potential group members - as this happens at the project formation. Many students had already chosen a topic and contacted a supervisor before the event, which in turn hinders the project formation process.

The Educational Committee (composed of heads of studies) has therefore agreed to discontinue the kick-off format, as it does not effectively support the allocation process.

Mixing NIB and NAB students at the event did not work well, even though interdisciplinarity remains an important goal.

A suggestion was made to use an open Padlet where students can exchange project ideas or indicate topic interests. A Padlet was used this year, but only to express supervisor preferences.

Early supervisor contact – opportunities and risks

Pia described the model used for the Master's thesis, where students are encouraged to contact a supervisor in December to start shaping a project idea early. This approach might be valuable for BA projects too.

However, concerns were raised:

- Some students do not get the supervisors they want, particularly in fields where supervision capacity is limited.

- Some supervisors had to decline multiple groups due to other teaching obligations.
- There is a risk that well-connected, resource-strong students approach supervisors early, while others fall behind.
- This creates inequality, especially for students who:
 - do not have existing contact with VIP,
 - are merit/transfer students, or
 - simply do not know how to approach staff.

Student perspectives

The student representatives in the board were supportive of enabling earlier contact with supervisors, but emphasised that all students must be informed that this is an option. It should not reward only the most proactive students. Additionally, a concern was expressed about PhD students supervising basic projects, as they may not be familiar with the RUC project model.

Ideas for improvement

The following suggestions emerged:

- Ensure clear information for all students about how and when they may contact supervisors.
- Provide a project inspiration catalogue and an overview of supervisor competencies.
- Make relevant materials available earlier—possibly through a Moodle page released in advance.
- Explore digital tools (e.g., Padlet) for exchanging ideas and forming groups.

Punkt 15: Appointment of representatives for AR UDDU

In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Academic Council, the Council must approve the members of the Education Committee (UDDU), who are nominated by the departments. The following members must be nominated:

- Four academic staff (VIP) members from the bachelor study boards (one from each department)
- Four academic staff (VIP) members from the master's study boards (one from each department)
- Four student (STUD) members from the study boards (one from each department)

As far as possible, gender balance should be ensured in the composition of UDDU. You are therefore encouraged to nominate both men and women where feasible.

Process for nominations:

- **By 25 February:** Submission of departmental nominations to me (VIP members from bachelor and master study boards, as well as student members from study boards).
- **End of February:** The nominations will be sent for written consultation in the Academic Council.
- **11 March, 13:00–15:00:** Constituent meeting of UDDU.

Beslutning

Martin Niss continues as the the VIP representative.

Elizabeth submits her candidacy to the institute as the student representative.

Bilag

Bilag 02-26-14 - Forretningsorden for UDDU af 23. januar 2025.pdf

Punkt 16: Discussion of scope requirements

The committee is asked to discuss recent issues related to compliance with the formal length requirements for written assignments. Since administrative staff no longer perform these checks, problems are increasingly being discovered only when examiners review the written work shortly before the oral exam. The same challenge arises in connection with project exams, where any deviations from the length requirements must be identified well in advance of the oral examination. The committee is invited to consider whether additional guidelines or procedures are needed to ensure timely detection of such issues.

Additionally, the board is asked to discuss what the scope requirements for solo project students should be.

Beslutning

The board discussed recent challenges related to compliance with formal length requirements in written assignments. Since administrative staff no longer carry out length checks, deviations are increasingly being identified only when examiners review the written work shortly before the oral exam. This creates operational difficulties, particularly in project exams, where any violations of length requirements must be addressed well in advance of the oral examination.

The board considered whether new guidelines or procedures are needed to ensure that such issues are detected earlier in the process.

Discussion on solo project scope requirements

The board also discussed the specific question of length requirements for students, who receive dispensation to complete a project as solo writers. Currently, the minimum page requirement for solo projects is considered by several board members to be unreasonably low.

Key points raised:

- When dispensations for solo projects are granted, the expected written scope becomes unclear.
- The current minimum requirement is viewed as inadequate; it was noted that *a student should not be able to pass with a submission as short as approximately five pages*.
- The board agreed that solo projects should follow the same length requirements used for BA projects, ensuring consistency and maintaining academic standards.

Conclusion

The board concluded that there is a need to strengthen procedures to ensure length issues are identified earlier and not at the point of examination.

Additionally, the board agreed that solo project students should follow the same scope requirements as Bachelor project students, and this should be reflected in future guidelines.

Bilag

Bilag 02-26-15 - Procedure for kontrol af omfangskrav ved skriftlige eksamener_sep25.pdf

Punkt 17: Tutoring - NAB and NIB

The chairmanship for tutoring has suggested that the tutoring of the new NIB and NAB students is done together, so that they form one tutoring group. The chairmanship argues that this was a great success when it was tried out a few years ago. The study board is asked to discuss whether it is a good idea or not. It should be noted that all the NAB and NIB students will have the one day RUS festival rather than the longer RUS trip for the NAB students.

Beslutning

The Study Board discussed the proposal from the Tutoring Chairmanship to combine the tutoring activities for new NIB and NAB students into a single, joint tutoring group. The chairmanship noted that this had previously been attempted with great success, as it led to improved interaction and communication between the two student groups.

Current differences in the introduction period

The board reviewed the existing structure of the introductory period:

- International (NIB) students currently have a one-day event on campus instead of a rustrip
- Danish (NAB) students have a 3–4 day RUS trip
- Some international students have felt left out due to this division
- At the same time, some international students found a long rustrip overwhelming as the first thing coming to DK
- Aside from specific elements—such as “New to Denmark”—the two programmes are largely similar

It was noted that from past experience, students tend to collaborate more and communicate better during the semester if they have been mixed during the introduction period.

Arguments for and against joint tutoring

The following points were raised during the discussion:

Potential benefits

- A joint introperiod could reduce the clear divide that later appears in classes
- Shared activities at the beginning may strengthen social cohesion and integration
- Students who start together are more likely to work together across programmes

Concerns and challenges

- A combined group places greater responsibility on tutors, who must facilitate activities for a larger group and adjust the programme accordingly
- Some Danish students have expressed frustration about being “forced” to speak English during the introduction period
- Even when students are mixed in the introperiod, they often still experience a separation later in teaching, which limits the long-term effect

Decision

The Study Board agreed that the advantages of a joint tutoring programme outweigh the disadvantages. The board will therefore write to the Tutoring Chairmanship to express its support for combining NIB and NAB tutoring, while also noting that the final decision lies with the tutoring organisation.

In addition, the board recommends that the letter includes comments regarding the lack of a full RUS trip for international students, encouraging further reflection on how to create a more equitable and inclusive introduction experience.

Punkt 18: Strategy seminar - workshop

Preparing the strategy seminar on NIB–NAB integration

The board is to discuss the structure, goals, and facilitation of the upcoming strategy seminar on improving integration between the NIB and NAB bachelor programmes, so that a clear outline for the strategy seminar can be developed.

The board should focus on:

- Defining what the study board wants to achieve with the seminar.
- Developing a structure and timeline for the seminar day.
- Identifying key discussion themes (programme coherence, language practices, learning environment, collaboration across student groups).
- Deciding how the seminar should be facilitated.

Beslutning

Workshop: Preparing the Strategy Seminar on NIB–NAB Integration

The Study Board discussed the upcoming strategy seminar focused on improving integration between the NIB and NAB bachelor programmes. The aim of the discussion was to clarify the goals, structure, and facilitation of the seminar so that a clear and actionable outline can be developed.

The board agreed that the seminar should be held in late Spring 2026, preferably after April 10, as a half-day event including lunch (12:00–15:00). A sign-up link will be provided.

Overall focus of the seminar

The board emphasised that the seminar should address *academic* integration rather than social integration. Although some shared activities currently take place outside the classroom, the board noted that meaningful integration must also be strengthened within teaching and project work. The central question will be whether the current degree of separation between NIB and NAB is appropriate, or whether more intentional bridges should be established.

Key themes to be addressed

Across the discussion, several core themes emerged:

1. Understanding why integration has been difficult

The board stressed the importance of examining why previous attempts at integration have not been successful. Potential structural issues should be explored, including:

- Lack of alignment in course schedules
- Challenges during project formation (some students unaware that cross-programme collaboration is possible; others in class during project-formation activities)
- Limited teacher involvement in supporting integration
- Past experiences where integration efforts “did not work out”

The seminar should begin with mapping these issues and identifying when and why integration becomes problematic.

2. Language practices and learning environment

Several members highlighted issues related to inconsistent language use in courses. For example, Danish sometimes replaces English in teaching situations meant to be conducted in English. This has caused frustration among international students, while some Danish students are disappointed that much of their teaching is delivered in English.

The seminar should address how to create a language environment that works for all students, and how English can be framed as a valuable professional competence.

3. Programme coherence and shared academic activities

The board discussed how NIB and NAB currently function as two largely separate programmes, sharing only a limited number of courses. A key question for the seminar is where integration makes academic sense, and where it might not. Suggestions included:

- Joint project seminars, especially during project formation
- Raising awareness about project markets to encourage more creative topic choices and cross-programme collaboration
- Considering whether elements of RUS could be held jointly, as this was effective in at least one previous year

4. Structure of the seminar

The board outlined a three-round structure:

Round 1 – Past:

Identify reasons for previous challenges. Explore structural barriers and experiences of when integration went wrong.

Round 2 – Present:

Discuss current issues without predefined themes. Look at what happens when integration problems arise and why earlier solutions have not been effective.

Round 3 – Future:

Mixed groups (students, teachers, administration, Study Board) develop concrete proposals for improvement. Groups should articulate practical actions and discuss where integration is meaningful.

A final plenary session will gather all groups' insights.

5. Facilitation, speakers, and participants

The board noted the importance of inviting people who understand where the problems occur and who have decision-making authority. Expected participants include:

- Students (open invitation)
- Class coordinators
- Selected course teachers
- Administrative representatives (particularly due to lab-capacity constraints between NIB and NAB)

It was suggested that class coordinators could serve as speakers. Course teachers might have less direct input but could still contribute valuable perspectives. The board also considered conducting a short student survey before the seminar; however, it was noted that the NAT Council is not currently active.

Punkt 19: Approval of meeting dates

The study board is to approve the meeting dates for Spring 2026:

- 18th of March - 13-15
- 29th of April - 13-15
- 26th of May - 13-15
- 23rd of June - 10-12

Beslutning

Approved.

Punkt 20: A.O.B.

