

REFERAT Studienævnet for Internationale Studier d. 26-03-2025

Mødedato Onsdag d. 26. marts 2025 kl. 12:30

Mødested 14.2

Indholdsfortegnelse

Members present.....	3
Approval of the agenda.....	4
Approval of last month's minutes.....	5
Application numbers.....	6
Vice-dean handling of disciplinary cases.....	7
Change in course title.....	8
Head of studies report and approval of new action plan.....	9
Guidelines for use of AI.....	10
Tools for digital in situ exams.....	11
Lukket.....	12
Lukket.....	13
Students item: Overlap with thesis start.....	14
External examiners report.....	15
Admission analysis.....	16
Department report.....	17
Any other business.....	18

Punkt 1: Members present

Beslutning

Present:

VIP

Johan Fischer (chair)

Thomas Paster

Line Engbo Gissel (online)

Paul Austin Stacey (online)

Student representatives

Sophie Loiwersheimer (vice-chair)

Liliana Calisto

Paula Kunz

Head of Studies

Markus-Michael Müller (GDS) (until 13:00)

Laust Schouenborg (IPG)

Absent with notice:

Lone Riisgaard

Absent without notice:

Sune Haugbølle (IS)

An orientation on the members of the Study Board was added orally:

The chair informed the board that student representative Sofie Würtz has chosen to step down from the study board due to no longer being an active GDS Student. The board thanked Sofie for her years of service doing a wonderful job of representing and supporting students, both as a member of the study board and as a study environment tutor.

The chair asked the student representatives to spread word that there is now an open seat for a new student representative as well as several vacant alternate seats.

Punkt 2: Approval of the agenda

Nomination:

The board is asked to approve the agenda.

Beslutning

The agenda was approved without comments.

Punkt 3: Approval of last month's minutes

Nomination:

The board is asked to approve the minutes from the december meeting.

Beslutning

The minutes were approved without comments.

Bilag

February 2025.pdf

Punkt 4: Application numbers

Nomination:

The study board is asked to inform themselves of the figures for applicants to GDS and IPG:

<https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/0f1a762e-4eb4-4771-abc0-db8c293a1379/reports/9c2155e9-c38b-4c2a-8fbb-3120cfa79792/0f9d3fb078347d6675c6?ctid=5cb8e839-a838-4bb8-92af-d7756c2b7916&experience=power-bi>

Beslutning

The board noted that it was good for IPG and the inclusion and support of students, that the number of USB applicants went down. It was also noticed, that GDS seems to have a nice global visibility.

Punkt 5: Vice-dean handling of disciplinary cases

Nomination:

The board is asked to take note of the new practise in regards to the handling of disciplinary cases.

Appendix:

- E-mail correspondence on the matter

Beslutning

The board took note of the new practise in regards to the handling of disciplinary cases.

Bilag

VS_ Prodekanernes håndtering af disciplinærsager efter 1. februar 2025.pdf

Punkt 6: Change in course title

Nomination:

The board is asked to take note of the change in course title for the F25 course *Power Analysis Method* that is now called "*Measuring Power in International Relations*"

Appendix:

- E-mail correspondence on the matter

Beslutning

The board took note of the new course title, which they found to be good and more clarifying.

Bilag

Re_ Navneændring på kursus.pdf

Punkt 7: Head of studies report and approval of new action plan

Nomination

The study board is asked to approve the proposed action plans in the study director reports.

Background:

The heads of studies of the individual programs prepare annual reports as part of RUC's overall quality assurance system. The reports are based on a number of key figures, which in turn lead to the heads of studies preparing action plans for the development of the programs, which are included in the reports.

The approval of the action plans in the head of study reports is anchored in the study boards.

Appendices

- Head of study report - GDS
- Head of study report - IPG

Beslutning

GDS:

The board approved the action plan.

The board agreed that it is fair to first understand the problem better before initiating major changes, particularly in relation to ECTS workload patterns.

A challenge remains with USB students, but intake-level adjustments are beyond the study board's control.

Regarding internships, students do not always perceive them as the career boost they are intended to be, often prioritizing student jobs instead. The Head of Studies will focus on this issue.

The Chair and Head of Studies will continue discussions on alumni engagement, employability, and internships.

IPG:

The board approved the action plan.

A more minimalist approach was taken in the IPG report, as things are generally going well. Study start and employment rates are improving.

Town halls: Positive feedback—higher attendance in the first semester, around one-third in the second semester. They provide a useful 360° perspective on the program and help collect valuable insights.

Bilag

Uddannelsesrapport Global and Development studies 2025_MMM.docx

Uddannelsesrapport IPG 2025 - final draft Mar 2025.docx

Punkt 8: Guidelines for use of AI

Nomination:

In connection with the work of the the exam committee's work in the fall of 2024, it was decided that all activity descriptions must contain guidelines for the use of GenAI tools in connection with the detailed description of the exam form. The guidelines must include descriptions of the permitted use of GenAI tools and the required declaration of this.

The individual course coordinator decides which bullets to include in the descriptions of the activity in question. All other text is mandatory.

The study board is asked to **approve the text, possibly based on the board's comments and adjustments.**

The secretary of the study board follows up with the activity coordinators on the board's programs.

Suggestion for formulation

The course coordinator can choose which formulations to use from the *cursived suggestions*.

In this course/project, the following generative AI (GenAI) tools are allowed in the exam work if the use is declared as instructed:

- *General use of GenAI tools: a declaration in the assignment according to [RUC's guidelines](#).*
- *No use of GenAI tools: a clear declaration of this at the beginning or end of the assignment.*
- *Autocorrect: no declaration.*
- *Generation of text fragments: citation with source reference to the GenAI tool, just as when citing other people's material. The reference must appear both as a footnote and in the bibliography. The prompt must be included in the footnote. The citation from the GenAI tool will be graded like other citations according to your demonstrated ability to interpret, evaluate and critically evaluate it.*
- *History of prompts must be attached as an appendix, alternatively shared in the bibliography as a link if the GenAI tool allows it.*

All use of AI tools must always take place within the framework of the university's [guidelines for the use of AI](#). You are always responsible for the text you submit for assessment in connection with an exam. exam, regardless of the origin of the text.

NB! Use of GenAI tools beyond the specified ways is considered exam cheating and will be treated accordingly, cf. the university's [guidelines](#). Use of GenAI tools is also covered by the rules for plagiarism. It is recommended to talk to your teacher/supervisor in case of doubt.

Appendix:

- Article from the Guardian put forward by the IPG Head of Study

Beslutning

There was disagreement on the right approach, and the suggested text needed reformulation. A task group consisting of Line and Thomas will draft a proposed formulation based on the discussion and circulate it via email. The board decided to do a trial run for a year and the evaluate how the formulation of guidelines works.

Bilag

UK universities warned to 'stress-test' assessments as 92% of students use AI _ Universities _ The Guardian.pdf

Punkt 9: Tools for digital in situ exams

Nomination:

The Study Board is asked to review and approve the attached text proposals for the framework for the use of assistive technology for digital in situ exams.

The text proposals will be written into the study regulations of the programs in question.

Background:

The digitization of in situ exams makes it necessary to be more precise in the use of language regarding which tools are allowed and how the examination proceeds. It is also important to clarify the use of the Observer program, which runs together with Digital Exam, and which has run in pilot projects with positive feedback from both students and teachers.

The Office of Registration & Exams has prepared attached texts for the curriculum elements that use on-site exams, which in the future will be digital.

The proposed texts will replace the current passage on tools: "Computer without internet access" with a description of how the internet can be used - and must be used in terms of running the program Observer during the entire examination.

US' description of Observer:

For the digital on-site exam, students have been asked to download a program called Observer. It only works from within Digital Exam and only when it is actively turned on and running with Digital Exam. It is the user of the PC who turns it on and off. The program works quite simply. It takes snapshots of what's on the screen. It cannot go into programs or do anything else on the PC. The program only creates a report of what is done during the test. Students have access to their own recording 2 hours after the test has ended. The employees in Registration & Exams who administer the tests in Digital Exam also have access to the recording, no one else.

The program is a significant help in ensuring that no unauthorized tools are used during the test. It is possible to do so, but then it will be visible on the recordings. For students, the recordings are "proof" that they have not done anything wrong, should such a suspicion arise. This is a significant improvement over a suspicion.

The Observer program shuts down when the test is closed in Digital Exam. It can also be closed manually. Observer can also be deleted again at the end of the exam if you wish.

Appendix:

- Proposed change for IS SN two courses with in situ exams (IS)

Beslutning

The board reviewed and approved the text proposals for the framework for the use of assistive technology for digital in situ exams. The formulations will go into two IS subject modules.

Bilag

Digitale hjælpemidler - IS.xlsx

Forslag hjælpemidler ved stedprøver fra studieordninger september 2025.xlsx

Punkt 10: Lukket

Punkt 11: Lukket

Punkt 12: Students item: Overlap with thesis start

Nomination:

The board is asked to discuss how to move forward with the issue of overlap between internships and exams in January and the official thesis kick-off on January 1st.

Background:

From the minutes of the October 2024 study board meeting:

"The board discussed concerns regarding the overlap of internships and/or January exams with the official start of the thesis writing process on January 1st. The board acknowledged the students' concerns about workload as legitimate and decided to seek clarification from the legal department on whether the current structure imposes more than a 30 ECTS workload on students in January is within the scope legally.

Additionally, it was noted that within IPG, there appears to be a practice where supervisors begin thesis supervision in February, following the semester structure, rather than in January. This delay means that students effectively lose a month of supervision.

The chair and the secretary will take these issues to the legal department for further clarification."

The secretary has reached out to the legal team for clarification, and has received the attached response.

Appendix:

- Original letter of concern brought forward through the student representatives
- Answer from legal department

Beslutning

It was decided that the student representatives will bring the issue up with the student representatives in the Academic Council, as the issue is university wide and out of the jurisdiction of the study board.

Bilag

Student item.pdf

Note from IDA - student item (1).pdf

VS_ Internships_ exams and overlap with thesis period (RUC 14412018).pdf

Punkt 13: External examiners report

Nomination:

It is recommended that the Board of Studies discusses the attached external examiner and examiner reports and considers whether the evaluations should be acted upon. Comments from the study board will be forwarded to the chairmanship of the board of examiners, if relevant.

Appendices:

- Cover
- Summary of the winter evaluation - GDS and IPG
- Global Studies (GDS)
- International Public Administration and Politics (IPG)

Beslutning

The board found no red flags in the external examiners' report based on evaluations.

The chair reminded members that it is possible to approach the vice-dean if issues arise with an external examiner, emphasizing the importance of doing so when necessary.

The board expressed gratitude to the external examiners for their work.

There was low response from internal examiners, and they are encouraged to complete evaluations.

Bilag

Cover IS.docx

Appendix 1 Summary evaluation winter 2024.docx

Appendix 2 Examiner evaluations winter 2024, Global Studies.pdf

Appendix 3 Examiner evaluations winter 2024, International Public Administration and Politics.pdf

Punkt 14: Admission analysis

Nomination:

Study board members are asked to familiarize themselves with the material on admissions in 2024. Note: The item was also on the agenda for the february meeting, but with the wrong report without 2024-data.

Background:

Data presented in the analyses at RUC level, broken down and compared at RUC, department and program level as well as main area, can be accessed here:

- <https://app.powerbi.com/groups/me/apps/52f94e3e-1768-4096-bfe2-dcf6c2316663/reports/15bcb684-780b-47f5-8ba7-d17f16af98a9/131c59c4d9224cc2c6b6?ctid=5cb8e839-a838-4bb8-92af-d7756c2b7916&experience=power-bi>

The purpose of the admissions report is to support initiatives and action plans targeted at admissions, recruitment and the ongoing work with quality in the programs at department and program level. Insights from the report can, among other things, be used in the study boards' discussions on admissions, and can thus form the basis for action plans that are included in the annual heads of studies reports.

Beslutning

The trends observed align with what the study board already knows—no surprises.

There has been an increase in USB students, and the board emphasized the need for continued monitoring. GDS, in particular, has seen a significant increase in admissions. It is also important that the department prioritizes supporting those USB students that are already here in order for them to succeed.

A member noted that only 45% of IPG and GDS students come from RUC's BA programs. The board discussed the potential to improve retention by encouraging more IS BA students to continue into IPG or GDS master's programs.

Punkt 15: Department report

The study board is asked to consider the vice-dean's preliminary draft of the annual department report and provide input where appropriate.

Beslutning

The board noted that data was missing for some programs, possibly due to the last MA reform.

Additionally, the board expressed a desire for more concrete and positive ideas on how to support the USB students already enrolled.

The board also pointed out that the EMGS program was not mentioned in the report, despite being under the jurisdiction of the department and this study board. The board would appreciate it if the department included the program in this and future reports to ensure better integration of students and staff.

Bilag

Institutrapport 2025 ISE_WiP_250321.docx

Punkt 16: Any other business

Beslutning

1. Status on EMGS

The board decided that the head of the EMGS program should be invited to an upcoming meeting to give a status update on the EMGS program.

The chair will email the head of EMGS to invite him to the next study board meeting.

2. Delegation of Internship Decisions

The IPG Head of Studies informed the board that there have been internship inquiries requiring a more principled ruling. The board had previously delegated decision-making regarding internship approval to the HoS but had specified that cases of a more principled nature or where the HoS is uncertain should be brought to the study board for discussion and decision.

The HoS presented two scenarios:

1. Is it acceptable to do an internship entirely online?

The board decided that this should be assessed on an individual basis. As online internships are likely to become more common in the future, there can be valid arguments for such arrangements. The HoS should make a decision for each case individually.

1. Is it acceptable to do an internship at RUC, such as doing research?

The HoS expressed doubt, as part of the learning goals is to gain experience outside the university. However, the board acknowledged that pursuing a career in academia is valid, and an internship at a research institution could help bridge that gap. The board agreed to assess such cases individually and that the HoS should put it forward to the study board if or when such a situation arises.