REFERAT Studienævnet for Den Naturvidenskabelige Bachelor Uddannelse d. 19-12-2024

Mødedato Torsdag d. 19. december 2024 kl. 10:00

Mødested 28A.1-11 - Mødelokale A1

Indholdsfortegnelse

Approval of agenda..... 3
Approval of minutes..... 5
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
Approval of study regulations..... 12
Discussion of the study environment report..... 13
Differentiation in grading in project groups..... 15
Input for email to course responsibles regarding study.ruc..... 17
A.O.B..... 18

Punkt 1: Approval of agenda

Beslutning

The agenda was approved.

Present:

Martin Niss (VIP, SL), Torben Braüner (VIP), Pernille Hansen (STUD), Lærke Kønskov Vest (STUD), Annemette Palmqvist (prodekan, observatør), William Golding (VIP-suppleant), Pia Nyeng (VIP), Maria Køpke Kjeldsen (udd.koor. Kvalitetssikring, ref.)

Absent:

Maya Bolduc Degn-Andersen (STUD).

Punkt 2: Approval of minutes

Beslutning

The minutes was approved.

Bilag

Bilag 12-24-02 - Minutes from meeting 10.pdf

Punkt 3: Lukket

Punkt 4: Lukket

Punkt 5: Lukket

Punkt 6: Orientations from Martin Niss, study leader of NAB/NIB and chair of the study board

Orientation about the process for the provision and planning of study activities E25 and F26.

Orientation about the registration numbers for activities in Spring 2025.
The data is provided after the end of the registration period, the 16th of December.

Bilag

Bilag 12-24-06a - Procesplan til institutterne inkl. datoer E25+F26.xlsx

Bilag 12-24-06b - Tilmeldinger F25_161224_NAT og FM.xlsx

Punkt 7: Other announcements or orientations

Response of Christine Spanggaard regarding the proposal from SN not to have any exams in the first week of January and the opportunity to have exams for basis courses shortly after they end rather than in January.

<u>Christine's response:</u>

I forhold til eksamener i januar
Er det korrekt, at ønsket drejer sig om Basis-kurser (og dermed ikke Fagmodulkurser)?

Jeg forstår ønsket, men jeg kan ikke altid få planen til at gå op uden den første uge af januar – i 2027 hedder første uge af januar fx mandag 4/1-fredag 8/1.
Hvor "hurtigt" en eksamen kan afvikles, afhænger også meget af prøveformer og antallet af studerende,

Når det så er sagt, vil jeg gerne – sammen med studieleder – forsøge at undgå eksamener de første dage af januar, hvis det er SNs ønske.

En anden ting, der "fylder" relativt meget i januar er de tre dages forberedelse, der ligger forud for projekteksamener og dermed ikke kan bruges til andre aktiviteter. Dette fra et rent planlægningsmæssigt perspektiv, da jeg ved, at der helt sikkert er andre faglige årsager til dette.
Men rent kalendermæssigt, så er der ikke ret mange hverdage på en måned og jo flere der ikke kan bruges, jo mere kompleks bliver planlægningen.

I forhold til eksamener i semestret (basiskurser)

Ud fra den gældende studieordning er der primært tale om stedprøver. Jeg har prøvet at samle mine input i nogle overskrifter herunder.

Eksamensvagter: Flyttes stedprøverne til umiddelbart efter kursusafviklingen vil de skulle afvikles i en periode, hvor der stadig er undervisning og der vil derfor som udgangspunkt være færre store lokaler til rådighed.
Det vil betyde at flere lokaler skal i brug og der dermed kan være behov for flere eksamensvagter.
Derudover vil der fortsat være stedprøver i januar (fagmodulkurser og kandidatkurser). Der har indtil nu været et princip om, at små stedprøver skal forsøges samlet i samme lokale, for at minimere ressourceforbruget til eksamensvagter og opstilling af lokaler.

Lokaleforbrug og ressourcer: For hvert lokale, der er i brug til stedprøve udgår lokalet som hovedregel i to dage – en dag til opsætning og en dag til afvikling af eksamen.

Der vil derfor skulle bruges flere ressourcer for betjentene idet lokalerne skal sættes op til stedprøver og normaliseres igen flere gange. Der vil derfor være behov for, at I tager en dialog med Campus Service.

Planlægning af datoer: Som tidligere nævnt kan nogle basiskurser kombineres med kurser udbudt af fx IMT. Afvikling af INMs eksamener må dermed planlægges rundt om undervisning og eksamener på disse kurser.

Projektskrivning: Planlægges der eksamener efter afviklingen af blokkurserne, vil der alt andet lige være færre uger til intensiv projektskrivning.
Projektaflevering kan eventuelt flyttes til januar, men idet der også er et ønske om at friholde dage i januar er dette vist heller ikke en farbar vej.

Punkt 8: Approval of study regulations

The board is to formally approve the new study regulations that will take effect from September 1st, 2025.
The finalised versions will be forwarded later.

The board reviewed and approved changes to activities at the last study board meeting.
The board is to consider, if the study regulations have enough variation in terms of exam forms.

It is argued that the changes to the study regulations in this round is not of significant character, meaning that a hearing of the employer panel and the external examiner chairpersonships is not necessary before the final approval in the study board. The external examiner chairpersonships have been made aware of RUC's approach to GAI and position, as they were invited to a joint seminar in the fall 2024, where they could give input. In the spring 2025, the external examiner chairpersonships will be oriented of the changes and how the institute approaches to the use of GAI and declarations in exams by the secretariat.

Baggrund:
Bekendtgørelse om universitetsuddannelser tilrettelagt på heltid
§ 51. Ved udarbejdelse af studieordninger og væsentlige ændringer heraf drøfter universitetet den nye eller ændrede studieordning med aftagerpaneler, autorisationsmyndigheder og relevante organisationer og indhenter udtalelser fra censorformandskabet om de forhold, der berører prøve- og eksamenssystemet.

Beslutning

A board member argues that there is timing issue / deadline issue with the last seminar, as the students do not have time to submit a written assignment before the supervisors need to approve their attendance at the last evaluation.

It is suggested to use the term "legally absent" in cases of illness or other certain circumstances.

The supervisor decides the deadline and the content of the assignment. SN decides that the deadline for submitting written assignments is 3 days after the seminar. The board confirms that the supervisor decides upon the content of the assignment and has to approve it.

The study board decides that the project formation needs to be attended by the students, thus having the activity as a prerequisite for participation in the exam.

The board agrees to use the term "midterm" instead of "halfway" evaluation.

It is noted that some NIB students arrive late to project formation, which can present a problem considering it being a prerequisite requirement. The board decides that the students should take ownership of the process and must contact the class coordinator in order to pass the requirement of participation.

For the bachelor project, the board decides to remove the problem statement seminar as a prerequisite for participation in the exam.

Punkt 9: Discussion of the study environment report

See appendices.

Beslutning

Stress and well-being

A board member notes that the approach to the discussion needs to be considered - the board should ask the students why are feeling stress and loneliness and not try to guess why and fix it.

The variation in activities is discussed - it is argued that there a several different opportunites for students to take part in socially leading the board the consider that maybe it is an issue of awareness of the opportunities. The board notes, that if students actively choose not to participate in offered activities, it becomes difficult to address. It is also mentioned, that there is a lot of activities that are inclusive and do not involve alcohol for example.

It is suggested, that the class coordinators could discuss the matter with students at the class meetings in order to find out, why students report feeling this way. The attendance at the class meeting are however rather low. A member suggests take it could take place at one of the seminars as student attendance would be mandatory. Martin will follow up.

Academic study environment

The board discusses that it would be interesting to know whether it is the project formation that negatively impact student or the internal group project work. The project formation is known for being hard on students.

According to the exit survey, project work is a reason or many students to leave. But the numbers the not that high for NatBach students.

The idea of a project free semester and 10 ECTS courses is raised, but the board does not support this idea.

Feedback: The university is affected by the numbers of students, who reports that they receive feeback. SN would like the number to be improve. The peer to peer feedback during the project process does not work well in practice. Implementing written feedback has helped. Supervisors and lecturers can also play a role in explicitly saying when they are giving feedback, because discussions and short meetings are indeed feedback. Feedback is not only written notes. The fully outside perspective / feedback from an opponent supervisor or peers are very valuable to students.
When lecturers present "model feedback" after an assignment hand-in, this is also feedback.

It is clarified that the study environment is a part of evaluating the performance of the university and thus a part of the taxameter. Study intensity is also a part of it, which presents a problem as RUC students are reporting lower study intensity than other university students. The board argues that the students forget how much time they spend on their project work and discusses how to affect this - how could the board help supervisors and students in becoming more aware of both the amount of feedback and actual study intensity. The discussion should happen in collaboration with the class coordinators.

Harrassment and bullying

The board notes that the students have several options for seeking help or reporting issues at RUC. Coffee meetings at the institut with students have been valuable as they have brought cases to light.
A workshop at the institut have taken place in order to increase awareness, it was however poorly attended by the academic staff.

Bilag

Bilag 12-24-09a - Sagsfremstilling - SMV.docx

Bilag 12-24-09b - Studiemiljoevurdering_2024.pdf

Bilag 12-24-09c - SMV_2024_DEL1 NAB.pdf

Bilag 12-24-09d - SMV_2024_DEL1 NIB.pdf

Bilag 12-24-09e - SMV 2024 Del 2 - BA samlet.pdf

Punkt 10: Differentiation in grading in project groups

The Study Board is asked to discuss the attached overview of grade differentiation on group exams held in semesters E22, F23, E23 and F24. Notably, the grade differentiation rate is higher in the projects at NIB than at NAB.

Background information

The universities are required to use individual assessment for group exams, and the overview below provides an insight into grading practices.

RUC has not adopted a standard for what an appropriate degree of differentiation is.

The provided overview shows that:

- Differentiated grading for group exams takes place

- Differentiated grading varies between semesters

Explanation of overview:

DIFFERENTIATION RATE:

The differentiation rate in % is the proportion of project groups with different grades in relation to the total number of groups with 2 or more group members. Groups with one group member are not included in the numerator or denominator.

Total number of GRPs (N) (column F):

The population size is the number of project groups with a minimum of 2 group members.

Average group size (NUM_DIFFGRP (n)):

The average number of group members for the population. The number is included to enable you to relate activities with generally many large groups vs more common group sizes.

NOTE

Note that data is only shown for activities where N > 3, i.e. where there are four or more groups that have taken the exam in the term.

Beslutning

Martin frames the agenda point. The board discusses if there is a level of differentiation that could be considered the most ideal level. The board finds it really difficult to identify an appropiate level, but notes that differentiation takes place as it should.

Some supervisors can be reluctant to give different grades, but most supervisors differentiate where needed.

Supervisors are not allowed to differentiate the grades based on the project work process fx it is known to the supervisor that a certain student has not contributed to the project.

The study board would like to know if there is a pattern among supervisors in terms of if they are diferentiating or not. The secretary will look into the opportunities to have more data on the distribution and patterns among supervisors. What are the ages of the supervisors - fx at NIB the supervisor group is younger. This would be interesting to see for the study board.

Bilag

Bilag 12-24-10 - Karakterdifferentiering_2024 - INM.xlsx

Punkt 11: Input for email to course responsibles regarding study.ruc

The study board has formerly asked to see the email that course responsibles received regarding changes to study.ruc and input for how it can be improved.

Beslutning

The board states that the deadline should be presented earlier in the email. Additionally, there are mismatches between the email text and the study.ruc text boxes that are confusing. It is also an issues that study.ruc does not differentiate between the BA and MA level, because activity responsibles have more options at the master level to expand upon the exam situation, whereas this is not the case for the BA study regulation.

The inputs will be forwarded to the educational planners.

Bilag

Bilag 12-24-11 - Mail to course responsibles regarding changes to study.ruc.docx

Punkt 12: A.O.B.