

REFERAT Studienævnet for Den Naturvidenskabelige Bachelor Uddannelse d. 26-06-2025

Mødedato Torsdag d. 26. juni 2025 kl. 10:00

Mødested 28A.1-11 - Mødelokale A1

Indholdsfortegnelse

Approval of agenda.....	3
Approval of minutes.....	5
Lukket.....	6
Lukket.....	7
Lukket.....	8
Lukket.....	9
Orientations from Martin Niss, study leader of NAB/NIB and chair of the study board.....	10
Other announcements or orientations.....	11
Written consultation of RUC's common rules.....	12
A guide for project supervisors and students on Generative AI.....	13
Lukket.....	14
Continuation of the discussion of handling the removal of the prerequisite requirement for participa	15
Course and exam planning for Spring 2026.....	16
Strategy seminar.....	17
Study board meeting in August.....	18
A.O.B.....	19

Punkt 1: Approval of agenda

Beslutning

Present at the meeting:

Martin Niss (VIP, SL, forperson), Maya Bolduc Degn-Andersen (STUD, næstforperson), Torben Braüner (VIP), Lærke Kønskov Vest (STUD), Heather Lauren Anker Cole (STUD-SUPP.), William Goldring (VIP), Karoline Dittman Nedermark (STUD), Maria Køpke Kjeldsen (udd.koor. Kvalitetssikring, ref.), Simone Minana (sagsbehandler).

The agenda was approved.

Punkt 2: Approval of minutes

Approval of minutes from March, April, and May.

Beslutning

The minutes was approved.

Bilag

Bilag 06-25-02a - Udkast til referat af marts mødet.pdf

Bilag 06-25-02b - Udkast til referat af april mødet.pdf

Bilag 06-25-02c - Udkast til referat af maj mødet.pdf

Punkt 3: Lukket

Punkt 4: Lukket

Punkt 5: Lukket

Punkt 6: Lukket

Punkt 7: Orientations from Martin Niss, study leader of NAB/NIB and chair of the study board

The educational reports for NAB and NIB have been approved.

Punkt 8: Other announcements or orientations

The institute report has been approved by the Rector.

Beslutning

Lab safety course

The Study Board discussed recent administrative changes regarding the lab safety course. The course is now being registered in STADS and integrated into the study regulations. Hopefully, this will be fully implemented before the fall semester. This enables future tracking of which students have completed and passed the course. Previously, there have been challenges ensuring that, for example, HumTek students completed the course before beginning their subject module. Furthermore, a lack of attendance has been a recurring issue, as there were previously no consequences for non-participation. A re-examination opportunity should be established. The Study Board expressed support for these administrative improvements.

A suggestion was made to include the lab safety course as part of the “førsteårsprøve” (first-year exam requirement). The Study Board will revisit the study regulations in the autumn to consider this and other changes.

Student feedback on invigilated exams

Student representatives reported several challenges related to invigilated exams:

- **Inconsistent procedures:** Students have encountered confusion among exam invigilators regarding upload times for exam assignments. Procedures appear to vary between exams.
- **Observer programme:** When no IT personnel are present, both students and invigilators feel uncertain about using the Observer programme. Though course coordinators try to brief the exam staff on exam procedures, staff changes often result in breakdowns in communication. The hybrid format (both printed and digital materials) is not functioning effectively.
- **Exam material issues:** Students noted that exam materials delivered in Word format presented several issues. Materials should be more thoroughly reviewed before uploaded to Digital Exam.
- **Upload time variability:** There are inconsistencies in whether students are allotted time to upload their answers after the exam concludes.

Recommendations and follow-up

Students expressed a need for:

- A proper evaluation of the exam period in collaboration with the exam administrators, due to the many inconsistencies across exams.
- More open-house sessions for students to try out the Observer program and the camera used for scanning handwritten answers.
- Additional support for downloading and using the Observer software and related equipment.

Bill has already submitted feedback to the exam team, and the secretary will follow up with them regarding these concerns.

Punkt 9: Written consultation of RUC's common rules

The study board is to discuss the changes made to the common rules and submit a written consultation response. The deadline for submission is the 27th of June.

Beslutning

The Study Board discussed the draft revision of the common rules and highlighted the following points:

§ 18, section 4:

It was noted that, under the proposed rules, it is no longer possible to change a submission after uploading, which may cause issues. The Study Board also expressed concern that students are excluded from the re-examination if they fail to submit their product for the ordinary exam. This is considered inappropriate and may unnecessarily delay students' progress. The Board agreed that students should be allowed to submit a product for the re-examination even if they did not submit at the ordinary exam.

§ 19, section 2:

The Study Board finds it problematic that students lose an exam attempt due to formal deficiencies in their submission. This is especially the case when a student has previously had their product rejected for similar reasons. As a result, the student is excluded from participating in the oral re-examination. The Board considers this an unnecessarily harsh penalty and agrees on the need for a more lenient approach.

§ 24, section 2:

The Study Board noted that the inability to assess and grant exemptions in individual cases – such as exchange stays or illness in a family member abroad – creates an unnecessary barrier and may delay students. There should be an option for the Board to grant exemptions in special circumstances when deemed appropriate. It was proposed that the Head of Studies should have the authority to decide whether an exam can be conducted online, based on guidelines established by the Study Board. It was mentioned that it is often difficult to recruit external examiners – particularly in cases involving projects with specialised themes.

General remarks

- Concern was raised about the lack of clarity regarding whether decisions are to be made by the Study Board or the Head of Studies. A clearer division of responsibilities is needed.
- The Board wishes for increased flexibility in adjusting group sizes within its own study programmes.

Bilag

Bilag 06-25-09a - Bemærkninger til forelæggelse for studienævn- fællesregler.pdf

Bilag 06-25-09b - Oversigt over de vigtigste ændringer med bemærkninger - RUC's fællesregler.pdf

Bilag 06-25-09c - Høring af studienævn - fællesregler med track changes og kommentarer.docx

Punkt 10: A guide for project supervisors and students on Generative AI

The Head of Studies Martin Niss has developed a guide for project supervisors on generative AI that can be used in relation to the project exam.

The board is to discuss the proposed framework. After the first treatment in the study board, the guide will be discussed among the class coordinators and then returned to the study board for final approval.

The board is asked to give feedback on the content, the scope, and the intermediation.

Beslutning

The Study Board discussed the draft guideline document concerning the use of generative AI (GAI) by students.

Student representatives found the document well-written and appreciated its clarity. However, it was emphasized that it should not enable assessors to assign lower grades simply because GAI was used—provided that proper citations and declarations are made. Declared use should not affect grading negatively, while undeclared or misused instances may rightly impact the assessment.

Several participants expressed concern that the document might be misinterpreted or misused. In particular, there was a sense that the burden of proof may shift unfairly to the students. It was also noted that some of the wording might lead students to mistakenly believe they have broader permission to use GAI than they actually do.

The Board agreed that although the document is not legally binding or part of the official examination regulations, it could be a valuable tool for both students and assessors. Therefore, a student-facing version was proposed in addition to one for project supervisors, clearly referencing the official rules and helping students understand how their exam submissions may be evaluated.

It was also suggested that the guideline should do more to differentiate between appropriate and inappropriate uses of GAI, especially in relation to how such usage affects grading. The Board encouraged adding elements that require students to reflect on their use of GAI, showing genuine understanding and ownership of their work.

In addition, the document may help create clarity within project groups, offering a basis for discussions on expectations and responsible usage of GAI.

The Board also expressed interest in exploring whether a broader position paper on generative AI and learning should be developed in the future.

Bilag

Bilag 06-25-10a - GAI and Exam guidelines.docx

Bilag 06-25-10b - GAI og eksamen retningslinjer.docx

Punkt 11: Lukket

Punkt 12: Continuation of the discussion of handling the removal of the prerequisite requirement for participation in project activities

Heads of Studies, Martin Niss will frame the discussion point and suggest a process for the involvement of more stakeholders.

Beslutning

The agenda point was postponed.

Punkt 13: Course and exam planning for Spring 2026

The courses and project work have become increasingly difficult to plan for the educational planners, a proposal for changes have therefore been put forward. The proposal has been discussed in the INM educational committee, where the changes was approved. The study board is now the discuss the proposal.

Beslutning

The Board approved the suggestion, however, it was suggested to move the course exams to a few days later, so that the students do not lose preparation time. The Head of Studies will look into the possibilities.

Bilag

Bilag 06-25-13 - Forslag til ændring af kursusperioder i F26.docx

Punkt 14: Strategy seminar

Previously, a full-day seminar was held once a year with ample time to discuss a major theme concerning NatBach, involving a broader group of stakeholders than just the study board members. Past themes have included the relationship between project and course work, and challenges with large courses.

The study board is asked to discuss:

- Whether a strategy seminar should be held in the near future.
- If so, when the seminar should take place, e.g., in autumn 2025 or spring 2026.
- If so, what the approximate theme should be. Some ideas are listed in the appendix, but other suggestions are also welcome.

Beslutning

The agenda point was postponed.

Bilag

Bilag 06-25-14 - Strategy_Seminar_NatBach_English.docx

Punkt 15: Study board meeting in August

The board is to find a date for the study bod meeting in August.

Beslutning

The Study Board meeting in August will take place the 26th of August from 10-12.

Punkt 16: A.O.B.

