

REFERAT Studienævnet for Den Naturvidenskabelige Bachelor Uddannelse d. 26-05-2025

Mødedato Mandag d. 26. maj 2025 kl. 13:00

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 a revised version of RUC's disciplinary rules.....	13
Written consultation of a revised version of RUC's GAI framework.....	14
Lukket.....	15
Discussion of the use of a semester calendar overview.....	16
Discussion of handling the removal of the prerequisite requirement for participation in project activ	17
A.O.B.....	18

Punkt 1: Approval of agenda

Beslutning

Meeting attendees:

Martin Niss (VIP, SL, chairperson, Maya Bolduc Degn-Andersen (STUD, vice-chairperson), Pia Nyeng (VIP), Lærke Kønskov Vest (STUD), William Goldring (VIP), Maria Køpke Kjeldsen (udd.koor. Kvalitetssikring, ref.).

The agenda was approved.

Punkt 2: Approval of minutes

Approval of minutes from the study board meeting in April and March.

The minutes from the April meeting will be made available later.

Beslutning

Postponed till the next meeting.

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

Change in practice for the publication of study activities on study.ruc.dk

Based on a recommendation from the Educational Planning department at US, ULF decided in its April meeting that, going forward, study activities will only be published for one academic year at a time on study.ruc.dk. This decision marks a change from the practice introduced in the fall of 2020, where mandatory activities for the following academic year were also published.

The reason for this change is that activities for the second academic year have previously been published before the related study regulations were approved. As a result, course offerings have often changed significantly after publication, causing uncertainty and planning difficulties for students.

The new practice ensures that only approved activities are published, thereby increasing the quality and reliability of the information on study.ruc.dk and reducing the need for duplicate work in setting up course offerings.

Beslutning

Head of Studies, Martin orientates about the hiring of two new study environment tutors at the institute.

Punkt 8: Other announcements or orientations

Beslutning

A student representative orientates about an issue of exam dates being provided late. The late announcement can make it difficult to act in due time in cases, where two exams could potentially overlap. The student representative will reach out to the course responsible.

Punkt 9: Written consultation of a revised version of RUC's disciplinary rules

The study board has formerly contributed to the revision of the RUC's disciplinary rules, a written consultation is now in process, where the study board can submit additional input.

The current draft was discussed at a meeting with all Heads of Studies on May 14th and have been amended thereafter. The powerpoint presentation from the meeting is provided as an appendix for orientation.

One of the key issues is the interruption of exams in cases of suspected exam fraud (§14 and §15). There are widely differing opinions on whether an exam should be interrupted or completed (with a disciplinary case conducted afterward). The administration would very much like to hear your views on this matter—preferably with suggestions for specific changes to the regulations.

Any comments on the draft should be submitted no later than June 25, 2025. After this, the final set of regulations will be presented for approval by the Rector. Naturally, the regulations will be translated into English, and the administration, in collaboration with the institutes, will ensure that updates are widely communicated to students before the start of the semester.

Beslutning

The board finds that there is a contradiction in requiring a student to leave an ongoing written exam due to suspicion of cheating while still proceeding in the case of an oral exam. The student representatives argue that it feels unfair to complete an exam when suspicion is present without prior notification. There is a concern about that even if the exam is allowed to continue, the supervisor might still suspect the students of wrongdoings leading to an unfair assessment.

A board member notes that many cases may arise due to insufficient generative AI declaration practices. Head of Studies, Martin summarizes that, depending on the situation, it may be reasonable to either allow the exam to continue or to halt it, with Heads of Studies handling each case individually.

Another board member emphasizes the importance of having clear rules, so students know what to expect. It is argued that if there is sufficient evidence to stop an exam before it begins, it should be halted. There is also debate on whether students should be asked to confess before determining whether the exam proceeds. A student representative comments that such an approach would make the exam uncomfortable for everyone involved.

The consensus in the board is that if clear evidence of misconduct exists, the Head of Studies should have the authority to stop the exam, making the decision independently and without consulting the students.

Bilag

Bilag 05-25-09a - Udkast til Disciplinærregler - maj 2025.pdf

Bilag 05-25-09b - Forklæde - Ændring af disciplinærregler og GAI retningslinjer.docx

Bilag 05-25-09c - PP præsentation til Studieledermøde den 14. maj 2025 om revision af Disciplinærregler.pdf

Punkt 10: Written consultation of a revised version of RUC's GAI framework

RUC's guidelines on the use of generative AI have been revised. The study board now has the opportunity to submit a written consultation response for the new guidelines that is to take effect from 1st of September.

Any comments on the draft should be submitted no later than June 25, 2025. After this, the final guidelines will be presented for approval by the Rector. The guidelines will be translated into English, and the administration, in collaboration with the institutes, will ensure that updates are widely communicated to students before the start of the semester.

At the last meeting, the Study Board approved a set of generic texts regarding GAI for study.ruc depending on each exam form. However, as of now the option of allowing the use of GAI without declaring is not an option in the guidelines - all usage must be declared in the proposed guidelines. The Study Board is therefore encouraged to address this in the written consultation response, if the Study Board finds it valid. If the option of not having to declare the use of GAI will not be possible, it is proposed that the use will simply have to be declared.

Additionally, there is still uncertainty regarding the exam form 'active, satisfactory participation' as this form can both be viewed as merely teaching and as an exam making it difficult to judge whether the students should declare the use of GAI, should not declare or are not allowed to use GAI depending on how one understands this exam form. The Study Board is to discuss its stands on the matter and provide inputs for the administration in the consultation response.

The material includes the proposed revised GAI guidelines and the formerly approved generic text for study.ruc.

Beslutning

Students highlight the need for clearer guidelines on when and how to justify their use of AI tools, such as Grammarly. There is uncertainty about the extent to which they should explain their reliance on such assistance. Students have the option to include their AI declaration as an appendix or integrate it directly into their assignment.

According to the existing guidelines, AI tools can be used for learning and preparation. The board is in agreement upon that the utilization of GAI in the exam form 'active, satisfactory participation' should generally be allowed as a part of the guidelines, but if course coordinators decide to prohibit the use of GAI, this information should be clear on study.ruc.

The board also concludes that AI usage should always be declared. Also in cases where the written material is not a part of the assessment.

The student representatives convey, that students remain hesitant about using or declaring GAI, fearing that it could lead to harsher evaluation and assessment.

Additionally, there is a point raised regarding master's theses not requiring oral defense. The secretary will investigate whether this rule originates from RUC or external regulations.

Bilag

Bilag 05-25-10a - with track changes - Retningslinjer for brug af generativ kunstig intelligens i skriftlige afleveringer til eksamener 280425.docx

Bilag 05-25-10b - Revision 2025 - Retningslinjer for brug af generativ kunstig intelligens i skriftlige afleveringer til eksamener 280425.pdf

Bilag 05-25-10c - Godkendt, 1. runde - Forslag til generisk tekst på study.ruc om brugen af generativ AI.xlsx

Punkt 11: Lukket

Punkt 12: Discussion of the use of a semester calendar overview

Each semester the Head of Studies prepares a calendar overview of the semester, which is distributed amongst supervisors. The board is to discuss to what extent this overview is being used in practice and valued by the supervisors or if the overview is redundant.

Beslutning

The board discusses the use of the calendar and agrees that it would still be useful to have for each group of supervisors and the class coordinators.

Punkt 13: Discussion of handling the removal of the prerequisite requirement for participation in project activities

In connection with the approval of changes to the curriculum, Rector has decided that it is no longer allowed to require participation in the evaluation elements of the project work as a prerequisite for taking the exam. Specifically, this means that there are no longer sanctions for students, who do not participate in the mid-term or final evaluation. Registering results on the project activities in STADS is therefore no longer possible and a lack of participation cannot prevent the student from submitting the project and participating in the project exam. Thus, the prerequisites requirements for the projects at NAB and NIB has been removed. Instead, the Rector encourages NatBach to work with pedagogical methods to make the students aware of the importance of attending the various project activities. In order to make this clear for students, a text under teaching and working methods in the study regulation has been added:

The project work's teaching process includes the following elements, in which each student must participate:

- *Project supervision by an assigned project supervisor.*
- *The project formation process, including the study program activity as well as the selection and delimitation of the project's problem.*
- *The problem formulation seminar, where the project's problem is presented and discussed within the team.*
- *The mid-term evaluation, including the preparation of written mid-term evaluation proposals and the group's opponent role during the mid-term evaluation.*
- *The group's project presentation and opponent role during the internal final evaluation.*

The Study Board is asked to discuss how we can deal with this new situation. The assessment is that it is not possible to change the decision, so the discussion should concern how we best implement the change. Additionally, even though the midterm and final evaluation will no longer be supported administratively, meaning that the administration will not be planning or coordinating a time and place for each group and opponent group + supervisors. The Study Board should therefore also discuss how these should be organised in the future.

Beslutning

The student representatives provided feedback on two different experiences.

1. The internal session went well. Each group presented their subject module for 15 minutes, followed by feedback. The students organized the session entirely, and supervisors participated. Head of Studies, Martin expressed that while there is no need for concern for the more resourceful students, however, this format might not be suited for students with a need for more support.
2. In the second instance, another group failed to engage, essentially not replying the organizers. The supervisors were unaware of the situation, and the group had exams at the time. To prevent such issues, it should be clearly communicated that these activities are optional, requiring students to sign up so that expectations are set.

It was emphasized that students should quickly recognize the value of attending these activities, provided they are well-planned. If students have a negative experience, they are unlikely to return.

Additionally, allowing groups to choose their own opponent group might be beneficial. It was also noted that older students reinforcing the importance of participation can have a positive impact.

SN will continue discussing these matters in future meetings.

Punkt 14: A.O.B.

