

REFERAT Studienævn for Den Samfundsvidenskabelige Bacheloruddannelse d. 22-11-2022

Mødedato Tirsdag d. 22. november 2022 kl. 13:00

Mødested 14.2 - 023

Indholdsfortegnelse

Lukket.....	3
Approval of agenda.....	4
Approval of minutes.....	5
Result of the student election for the study board.....	6
Status for Allocation Spring 2023.....	7
RUC head of studies meeting about project formation.....	8
ISE DAY E22, 15th November - how did it go?.....	9
Discussion about how to group the students into SAB-teams.....	10
Discussion of midterm evaluations of courses.....	12
Discussion regarding Rector's report for rapport for inclusion and participation.....	13
Discussion and decision about active participation in study board meetings.....	15
Next meeting: December 20th.....	16
AOB.....	17

Punkt 0: Lukket

Punkt 1: Approval of agenda

Present: Helene Dyrhauge (Chair, VIP), Adam Ahlstrand Christensen (Deputy chair, student), David Kaltoft Østergaard Hansen (student), Harismi Balandram (student), Klaas Dykman (VIP), Kristine Juul (VIP), Lars Fuglsang (VIP), Mihaela Baltic (student).

Cancellation:

Absent:

Minute taker: Andres Wulff Vissing Christensen

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

1 Approval of agenda
Attachment: Agenda November meeting

Beslutning

Present: Helene Dyrhauge (Chair, VIP), Adam Ahlstrand Christensen (Deputy chair, student), David Kaltoft Østergaard Hansen (student), Harismi Balandram (student), Klaas Dykman (VIP), Kristine Juul (VIP), Lars Fuglsang (VIP), Mihaela Baltic (student, on teams), Halime Simsek (administrative staff, joined on item 9 via teams).

Cancellation:

Absent:

Minute taker: Andres Wulff Vissing Christensen

The study board approved the agenda but remarked that the items of midterm evaluation and inclusion, item 8 and 9 respectively, demanded ample time for discussions.

Bilag

Angenda November meeting.pdf

Punkt 2: Approval of minutes

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

2 Approval of minutes
Attachment: Minutes from October meeting

Beslutning

Kristine corrected the description in item 8 in the minutes of the October meeting regarding allocation practices:

The suggestion was to leave it to the individual team staff meetings, who know the qualifications of their staff members, to decide what teachers to allocate to course follow-ups. This ensures that teachers with expertise within the field are not fully allocated by follow-ups, but still available for supervision of projects themes related to course themes. Furthermore, it contributes to spreading of knowledge of course content among more staff members and ensures participative decision-making by not hollowing out the mandate of the staff meetings.

Bilag

Minutes from October meeting.pdf

Punkt 3: Result of the student election for the study board

Targeted time allotted for items 3-6: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

3 Result of the student election for the study board
Orientation Oral orientation by Helene Dyrhauge

Beslutning

Helene presented the results of the student elections for the study board:

Harismi and David from Frit Forum have been re-elected, while Ronja Aust and Sofia Rodriguez (SIB-students from Samrådet) have been elected as new members.

Punkt 4: Status for Allocation Spring 2023

Targeted time allotted for items 3-6: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

4 Status for Allocation Spring 2023
Orientation Oral orientation by Helene Dyrhauge

Beslutning

Helene informed the study board that the allocation of teachers to the teams is almost finished.

Helene explained the allocation process, which starts with an informal dialogue with the coordinators about their wishes for next semester, Helene also talk to the courses leaders about who is teaching on the basic courses. She also has a dialogue with the vice deans for both ISE and IMT.

She further noted that 25 % of the Sambach allocation come from IMT. She will have a meeting with the IMT vice-dean and others from IMT later this week to discuss the allocation of IMT staff to Sambach.

Project allocation for BA projects will be delegated to the subject modules to ensure a closer match between project and supervisor. Just as the aim is to create a stronger link between Sambach and the master programmes.

A result of this year's smaller intake of students fewer hours are needed for supervision of basic project 2. As usual Helene will try to make sure that Sambach gets the right competences for supervision.

Punkt 5: RUC head of studies meeting about project formation

Targeted time allotted for items 3-6: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

5 RUC head of studies meeting about project formation
Orientation Oral orientation by Helene Dyrhauge

Beslutning

Helene informed the study board of a recent meeting for all head of studies at RUC, where Rector and the vice deans explicitly had invited the team coordinators from all the BA programmes. Maria Duclos Lindstrøm and Tatiana Fogelman from Sambach participated.

The meeting focused on project formation and started with a presentation by Eva Bendix Petersen, who talked about PPL in project formation. This was followed by best practice from other degree programmes and group work, where it was possible to discuss different practices. The exchange of experiences were useful.

Punkt 6: ISE DAY E22, 15th November - how did it go?

Targeted time allotted for items 3-6: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

6 ISE DAY E22, 15th November - how did it go?
Orientation Oral orientation by Lasse Skovsgaard

Beslutning

The study board expressed their satisfaction with the ISE Day noting a large attendance of students as well as staff. The short presentations worked really well and everyone liked the person oriented style of the presentations, which suited the format.

A few students asked if the event would be in the spring as well. But Helene said it was only an annual event and the next ISE Day is expected to be next autumn.

Punkt 7: Discussion about how to group the students into SAB-teams

Targeted time allotted for item 7: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

*Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse
The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science*

7 Discussion about how to group the students into SAB-teams

Orientation

Two ISE colleagues from forvaltning have approached vice-dean Bodil Damgaard to ask if the distribution of new students into SAB-teams can be changed. They proposed changing it into subject modules, which Bodil rejected.

What does the study board think about changing the distribution of students into SAB-teams? The new students are currently grouped into teams based on equal distribution of gender in each team, and making sure people with the same first name are in different teams.

Beslutning

Peter Triantafyllou and Jesper Kelstrup from Politics and Administration have proposed to change how the students are sorted into SAB-teams. They want the students who are interested in PA to be in the same SAB-team from day one.

Helene explained that she and vice dean Bodil Damgaard had held a meeting with Peter and Jesper about this idea, but nothing had been decided and that there were several issues involved in making this change. Thus, she wanted the study board to discuss the idea.

Helene informed that 1st semester students is currently placed on teams with respect to gender (aim to have 50/50 on each team) and to the broadest extent possible not having same-name students on the same SAB-teams.

The study board remarked the following benefits of the idea:

- it could perhaps increase the intake on the MA programs. This is important to consider due to the financial considerations that are taking place across the university.
- it could give the students a stronger academic focus as well as having a positive social effect among the students. This could support the identity shaping of MA programs already from the first semester on the BA programme. It was mentioned that the faculty should work on this with the 3rd semester students regardless of the proposal.

The study board expressed the following negative consequences of the idea:

- It goes against principles and ethos of Sambach, especially its focus on interdisciplinarity and broad introduction to social sciences. The proposal follows a subject-module logic and not a Sambach logic.
- It reduces the possibility for the students to try out different subjects before specialising in their third semester.
- it is unclear what team the students who are combining subjects should choose.

- It challenges RUC's ideal of interdisciplinarity, although the curriculum for the different SAB-teams would not change.
- student recruitment: all the students in the study board agreed this was a bad idea and make RUC into a university like all the others. Indeed, 50% choose RUC for its broad interdisciplinary academic introduction.
- the students, who don't feel ready to make a choice of academic specialisation at the beginning of their 1st semester, will be alienated and will lose their sense of belonging.
- Fragmentation of responsibility: A change of practice would also obscure the role of the SamBach study board, as the board is responsible for the degree programme and risk fragmenting the quality assurance and development of the degree programme. It would also make the role of Sambach head of studies more difficult as the coordinators would look towards the subject-modules instead of seeing themselves as part of Sambach.
- it is also advised to wait on an eventual reform of the bachelor programs.

Summary of the discussion:

With the exception of Lars Fuglsang, the whole Sambach study board rejected the idea due to the above mentioned negative consequences and practical issues. However, the study board acknowledges the different crises that the university is facing concerning recruitment and retention of students.

Punkt 8: Discussion of midterm evaluations of courses

Targeted time allotted for item 8: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

8 Discussion of midterm evaluations of courses

Orientation

The study board is requested to consider the following key questions:

- Are there any issues across the courses, that the study board have to address?
- How have the course leader responded to the midterm comments?
 - Giving feedback to the students
 - Made changes to the course

Attachment: Collective material, SamBach midterm evaluations, E22

Beslutning

Based on the information in the attached midterm evaluations, the study board discussed a trend in all the mid-term evaluation, where the students said that found it difficult to read academic texts and that the students had an expectation that the literature should only be read and discussed if it is relevant for the specific exam.

The students should not only be reading for the exams but also to obtain a broad base of academic knowledge, which they can draw upon throughout their education and later in their professional life, as well as to strengthen their abilities to abstract and synthesize information, which is expected competencies for the academic workforce. The members of the study board agreed that students should be taught how the university has different expectations compared to highschool.

The study board discussed initiatives to convey this change from high school to university, as well as how to introduce the students to academic reading. A suggestion was to include these things in the "rus" period, which should be coordinated with "rus" supervisors and team coordinators. It would be beneficial with a academic reading workshop during the first or the second week of the "rus" period. Moreover, the rus-tutors should talk more about the changes to university and the different expectations.

Summary of the discussion and decision:

The study board decided not to discuss the midterm evaluation in future meetings. Instead this should be included in the course leaders' evaluation reports.

Bilag

Collective material, SamBach midterm evaluations, E22.pdf

BK1 Politologi, midtvejsevaluering, E22.docx

Grundkursus i politologimidtvejsevaluering, E22.docx

Punkt 9: Discussion regarding Rector's report for rapport for inclusion and participation

Targeted time allotted for item 9: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

9 Discussion in regard to Rector's report for rapport for inclusion and participation

Orientation

The study board is requested to hold a dialogue-based discussion on the board's framework and practices for participation, involvement.

It is essential that the experiences and perceptions of as many staff and students as possible are brought and staff representatives are therefore encouraged to engage with the wider community in advance of the meeting.

Input from this discussion will be included in the Institute's feedback to the Rector and subsequently included in the Rector's statement on participation and involvement.

Attachment: Indstilling til medbestemmelse og medinddragelse

Beslutning

Halime Simsek joined the meeting and led the discussion. The item is part of the department's input to the rector's biannual report on inclusion and participation at the university, to which the study board is asked to give input.

The study board asked for clarification about the topic. Halime explained that this was not just about the study board, but about how everyone personally perceived their ability to be heard and included at different levels of the university.

The study board had the following remarks on inclusion and participation at university:

- It is difficult to differentiate between the organisational levels, as the organisational structure is difficult to understand. Some members of the study board thought that the formal structure of decision making is often bypassed.
- several members commented that there have been a strong movement towards centralization, which has meant that local institutions have lost a lot of their mandate, making it less interesting for staff to participate in them.
- several staff commented that many of the rector's initiatives for collaborative decision making across the university is not as open as intended as solutions and decisions are given from the beginning. An example of this is the processes surround the MA reforms, where inclusion was communicated while decisions were pushed through by university management. In these instances, it would be better for the university management to acknowledge that they had made a decision and how staff had to follow this from the beginning.
- Centrally, there needs to be a genuine wish to incorporate the different boards at all levels. Coordination, early-stage involvement and few questions on the agenda to be decided on are important aspects to achieve this.
- another staff said that the same staff is elected several times, which make it difficult for new staff to participate in the elected boards both at departmental and university level. Another issue raised was the level of communication from the different boards, where it is difficult to know what is on the agenda and what is decided.

- students said that a lot of students do not know their rights and possibilities, which again points to a need for better communication, e.g., through updated pages on RUC intra.

Bilag

Indstilling til medbestemmelse og medinddragelse.pdf

5.1 Vedtaegt_for_Roskilde_Universitet_maj_2020.pdf

5.2 ISE_IR_Forretningsorden_februar-2018.pdf

Punkt 10: Discussion and decision about active participation in study board meetings

Targeted time allotted for item 10: 20 minutes.

Roskilde Universitet/Roskilde University

Studienævnet for Den samfundsvidenskabelige bacheloruddannelse

The Study Board of The Bachelor Study Programme in Social Science

10 Discussion of midterm evaluations of courses

Orientation

Article 21 of the common rules for boards and committees at Roskilde University stipulates that the board can ask for the substitute member to participate in meetings, if a regular member has not been present for 2 consecutive meetings.

The study board is requested to discuss whether to make active use of article 21 or not.

As the common rules are written in Danish, there is a translation of the specific article below, for the members of the board who do not read Danish. Everyone else is advised to read the article in the attached document.

§ 21 Long-term absence of members, etc.

The study board can decide whether to call upon a permanent member's substitute if the member in question loses his/her/their eligibility during the term of office or otherwise resigns, or when a member, due to illness, study trips or the like, is unable to participate in the work of the study board for 2 months or more.

At the same time the study board decides whether the substitute will take office for the remainder of the term or only for the period of absence.

Attachment: Forretningsorden - _pr._marts_2019

Beslutning

The reason for the proposal is to make the practice of replacing members who do not participate in meetings with their substitute or hold by-elections more consistent. The aim is to ensure that there are enough members present at meetings to make decisions.

The article 21 in the procedures for all boards and committees in the university, is already in place. The chair person asked the study board about whether to enforce it more rigorously.

Decision:

The study board agreed to the proposal.

Bilag

Forretningsorden - _pr._marts_2019.pdf

Punkt 11: Next meeting: December 20th

Punkt 12: AOB

Beslutning

The meeting in January will be the last meeting with the current representation.