

DAGSORDEN Studienævnet for Naturvidenskabelige uddannelser d. 02-05-2024

Mødedato Torsdag d. 02. maj 2024 kl. 14:00

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

Indholdsfortegnelse

Approval of agenda.....	3
Approval of open minutes.....	4
Lukket.....	9
Lukket.....	10
Lukket.....	11
Announcements from chairperson.....	12
Announcements from students.....	13
Approval of study activity descriptions E24.....	14
Evaluation of Thesis seminar.....	15
Discussion of social semester start event.....	16
Input to master thesis and programme evaluation.....	17
Any other business.....	18

Punkt 1: Approval of agenda

Punkt 2: Approval of open minutes

26. April 2024

Minutes of study board meeting

Dato: 4th of April 2024

Tidspunkt: kl. 14-16

Lokale: 28A1-11

Participants: Lotte Jelsbak (Medicinalbiologi, Molecular Biology and Molecular Health Science), Per Meyer Jepsen (Environmental Biology, Bioprocess Science and Environmental Science), Nicholas Bailey (Fysik/Physics and Physics and Scientific Modelling), Magnus Riber Mygind (Environmental Science), Mikkel Christian Gilberg (Chemical Biology), Camilla Michelle Thorup Andersen (Molecular Health Science), Marcell Balogh (Physics and Scientific Modelling), Annemette Palmqvist (vice-dean INM)

Absent: Jesper Schmidt Hansen (Mathematics and Mathematical Bioscience), Frederik Diness (Kemi/Chemistry and Chemical Biology), Anakin Johann Diermayr (Mathematical Bioscience)

Admin.: Susanne Bartram (ref.)

1.	Approval of agenda Agenda approved.
2.	Approval of open minutes Agenda approved.
5.	Intro on the evaluation system at RUC re. study activities including discussion of evaluation cycle Lotte gives a brief account of the evaluation system at RUC and how it is implemented at INM. The study board discusses 3 themes outlined below: 1) Is the annual cycle of course evaluation at master level sufficient? All new master courses have been evaluated after running for the first time. All other courses are evaluated every 2 nd year. The study board discusses if there is a need to adjust the rotation plan. The concern has been that since CB + MHS + ENVSC - students only have courses at their 1. + 2. semester the experience is that they have few opportunities to give feedback. This is experienced as intensified by the fact that elective courses are often cancelled and hence not evaluated. The study board decides: - Mandatory courses are evaluated every year

- Elective courses are evaluated in rotation

The secretariat will make new rotation plan and present to the study board for approval.

The study board also discusses how to avoid that the students will turn tired of answering the written evaluation, and how to increase the answering rate.

It is suggested that in order to motivate students to answer it is relevant to show by example how the results of the evaluations are used. This could be done at the beginning of each course and/or before the course ends when the evaluation is due. It is suggested that the secretariat produce a power point with few examples of how the feedback is used to approve/alter a course, which the lecturer can use to draw attention the importance and the appreciation from VIP and study board of this type of engagement from the students.

The mismatch btw. the fact that lecturers are asked to give the students time at the last lecture to answer the survey and the fact that some of the questions point to the relation btw. teaching and exams are to be addressed. It is noted though that the surveys are open until after the exams and that students are reminded to take part in the survey.

The study board concludes the following theme to be relevant in the survey:

It is the experience of many VIP that the level of student attendance has decreased, and it is suggested to ask about what motivates or de-motivates the student to decide on participating or not.

2)The use of the 'indspilsordning'

It seems that the opportunity of bringing up issues directly to the study board and to the head of study (both confidential) re. courses and projects are not well known among students.

At the current moment the above opportunity is stated at intra.ruc and the Head of Studies also informs the students in connection with the study start.

The study board underlines the effect of spreading the word and of repetition of the opportunity. Concretely this could be mentioned by the BA Head of Study at study start, by the class-coordinators (Nick has example), at the introductions of the subject modules, at the project-markets and at the thesis-seminar (in general whenever it makes sense).

Annemette clarifies that students can take contact with whom ever they feel comfortable with, which includes Annemette and Susanne Sørensen (the dean), and not only the study leader and the student representatives in the study boards.

This need to be made clear at intra.ruc.

Annemette also informs a new initiative by herself and Susanne S.: coffee-meetings twice a semester for the bachelor students. The meeting is confidential and an opportunity to vent topics related to the educational programmes of any sort.

The study board suggests Annemette and Susanne S to do the same for master students and the student representatives are asked to look into whether their fellow students think this a good idea.

	Annemette informs that the next coffee-meeting is the 18/4 (15-16) and is asked to extend the invitation to the master students. Abia (student tutor) is asked to send invitation via FB. It is suggested to investigate whether Julie (in RUC-admin.) can send note via Moodle to all students. 3) How does the oral evaluation work? Courses include ongoing dialogues or a midterm evaluation (potentially facilitated by the students), and most course teachers also schedule an oral final evaluation with the students as a supplement to the ongoing dialogue and the written digital final evaluation. But oral course evaluation can potentially be experienced as a difficult forum to express one's opinions. Especially the less positive ones. Ideas of oral evaluations: -Students write themes anonymously on a piece of paper that are then discussed in class - Do a 'poll everywhere' Written mid-term evaluation: The study board suggests that the oral evaluation could be supplemented with a shortened and anonymously written mid-term evaluation. The result is only for the lecturer and as a tool to adjust the rest of the course if needed. The purpose is to make sure that needed measures can be taken and implemented for the rest of the course. Further process: - The secretariat makes a proposal with the input from student reps. - It is looked into if the secretariat has the manpower to do this extra task - Annemette discusses the suggestion in the Uddannelsesudvalg - The study board discusses the result of the above
7.	Announcements from chair No announcements.
8.	Announcements from students No announcements.
9.	Discussion of program reports and approval of action plans Lotte gives a brief introduction on RUC's the quality assurance system: The head of study reports are part of RUCs reporting system. The report focuses on specific key performance indicators and contains an action plan. The action plan describes initiatives motivated by the conclusion of the report and are specific actions that the head of study wants to give focus the next year. Lotte also briefly introduces the Power BI report that contains the key performance indicators and an overview of what standards the INM master programs transgress.

	CB transgression: uptake, low ECTS E22 ENVSC transgression: uptake, unemployment, low ECTS E22 MB transgression: uptake, low ECTS E22 MHS transgression: low ECTS E22, first year drop out PSM transgression: uptake, low ECTS E22 + F23, drop out <u>Study board discussion of action plans</u> CB: no comments. Action plan approved. PSM: no comments. Action plan approved. The item on Project-oriented Internship is to be put on a Uddannelsesudvalgsmøde, with input from Per on experiences. MHS: no comments. Action plan approved. MB: postponed. The plan will be sent out to written approval soon. ENVSC: Replaced by Internal Programme Evaluation in May/June General comment from SB: missing lunchbreak is a huge problem to positive study environment and complicates the communication btw. BA and MA.
10.	Evaluation of Thesis Seminar Postponed.
11.	Any other business No other business.

Punkt 3: Lukket

Punkt 4: Lukket

Punkt 5: Lukket

Punkt 6: Announcements from chairperson

Punkt 7: Announcements from students

Punkt 8: Approval of study activity descriptions E24

Please read attached file for instructions on the theme.

Bilag

Approval of study activities_FM og KA.docx

Punkt 9: Evaluation of Thesis seminar

Oral evaluation - please consider input prior meeting.
Re. MHS and CB: how did the poster-session work?

Punkt 10: Discussion of social semester start event

Last year the student representatives arranged a semesterstart event for the new INM master students. This was thought as a supplement to the official study start event and was placed a week later on a Friday. The event had more of a social character.

The former members will tell a little about what we learned from last years event.

What: do the new representatives think its a good idea to arrange a similar event this September?

Punkt 11: Input to master thesis and programme evaluation

The study board is asked to continue their discussion of a new evaluation questionnaire for the theses and for the master programmes. The study board has reviewed until page 8 (and made suggestions). Please find attached description of process (Appendix 1).

The study board will:

- further discuss and decide on formulations regarding the following topics (appendix 2)
- process the rest of questionnaire (pages 8-10). Appendix 3

Bilag

Appendix 1.docx

Appendix 2.docx

Appendix 3.docx

Punkt 12: Any other business