

The Study Board at Sociology



MINUTES

12.04 MARTS 2024

Forum Study Board of Sociology

Meeting held 15.03.2024

ØSTER FARIMAGSGADE 2A
KØBENHAVN K

Location Room 16.1.62

Minutes taker Andrea Ella Andersen Hald

DIR 35 33 18 15

aeah@samf.ku.dk

Present

Board members: Lasse Suonperä Liebst, Jonas Toubøl, Mengni Chen (online), Pia Cecilie Enevoldsen, Mira Chatterji Rosen Sørensen.

Alternates: Asmus Oliver Lewis, Askil Brandt Broegaard Ryan.

Guests

Hanne Kraak

Absent

Anemone Frederikke de M Dalsgaard.

Agenda – closed meeting

Nothing on the agenda.

Agenda – open meeting

- 1) Approval of agenda /Lasse
- 2) Approval of course descriptions /Lasse

- 3) **Discussion of group formation issues /Student representatives**
- 4) **Orientation on (layout) revision of the program curriculum /Andrea**
- 5) **AI follow up discussion /Lasse**
- 6) **Briefing from Char of the Study Board**
- 7) **Info from the student representatives**
- 8) **Any other business**

Minutes

- 1) **Approval of agenda /Lasse**

Decision: *The agenda is approved.*

- 2) **Approval of course descriptions /Lasse**

The Board agreed that some of the issues they had with the course descriptions last time still apply.

Course coordinator Hanne Kraak commented that it is an issue, that the administration gets the descriptions very late and without all the information.

The Board discussed whether they could approve the course descriptions.

Decision: *The board agreed to approve all course descriptions, on the assumption that all missing information will be filled out sensibly, except from the course description for “Anvendt case-analyse”.*

The Board agreed that further on there should be a stricter approach to approval of the course descriptions and that head of studies should help to enforce this.

The Board agreed not to approve the description for the mandatory course “Anvendt case-analyse”. This was due to a concern in the Board that the new content of the course could create a hole in the curriculum because of the lack of classical case analysis as a methodology. The Board wants to make sure that it is, more broadly, covered in the BA program. The Board discussed whether it had to be in this course, and several made the point that it would make sense. It was mentioned that and if it gets covered in this course, there needs to be a learning goal under knowledge that concerns case methodology. They also discussed that there should be a conversation across sociology about different approaches to case analysis.

It was suggested that it would be a good idea to have a discussion amongst the VIP to make sure that case analysis as a methodology doesn't vanish from the curriculum.

The student representatives made the point that they would like the course to focus more on unique sociological methods; how sociological tools can be used in the workplace. It was stated that this might also be clearer if the sociological view and methodology of case analysis was integrated more.

3) Discussion of group formation issues

The student representatives presented how the group formation is currently taking place in the first, second and third semester of the BA and presented their view of the issues.

First semester: Groups are randomly assigned, and it works fine. No students had problems with the process here. Halfway into the first semester (ESM 2) the students get put into groups based on preferences. Generally, the students think it is okay, but some criticize it.

Second semester: At the second semester the students get the information to form groups for the coming semester over the holidays, which the students experience as stressful. However, it is good that the students can form groups across sessions.

Third semester: When starting third semester the students are told that they are not allowed to form groups across sessions, which the majority perceived as the general process and therefore already made groups that aren't allowed.

The main issue from the student perspective is that they don't get information and know the process in good time.

Lasse summarizes the issues: change of praxis and late notice.

It was discussed whether the teacher should manage the groups. The student representatives mentioned that they were not requesting guided group formation but more information earlier on mail or at KUnet.

Jonas argued that he does not think the students should do their own groups. He made the point that teachers should make sure that there is a way all students have the possibility to get into a group; that the teachers should be aware that it is part of teaching a BA course to use or create some form of

process around the group formation. Group work was also emphasized as a work market ability.

It was emphasized that the students can always choose their own group or do an individual exam.

The student representatives agreed that it would be good to have a framework for the process set by the teacher and communicated in good time.

Lasse mentioned a compromise: that it is communicated to the teachers, that as a minimum you need to communicate good group formation ethics, good practice and you need to think about a procedure that facilitates the group formation.

Jonas argued that the formulation should be stronger; that it is perceived as a natural expectation that the teacher facilitates the group formation. Lasse agreed.

It was discussed where the information should be, and course coordinator Hanne Kraak said it should be on the study information sites and not in the course descriptions.

Lasse made the point that this is important not only because of the student's well-being but because there are strong associations between lower group sizes and bad grades; especially in the methodology courses.

It was discussed that the teachers might want to learn more about it and get some tools for it. The Board would like group formation to be a theme for a VIP meeting or a teacher-oriented workshop at "kollekolle". Jonas is volunteering to be responsible for it but won't do it by himself.

Decision: Information on group formation must be accessible in good time before the course starts, and teachers should, in some way, facilitate the process and there should be a VIP meeting or workshop concerning this.

4) Orientation on (layout) revision of the program curriculum

Andrea shortly presented the revised curriculum. It was mentioned that currently the revision states that you can be a maximum of 4 students in a group. This will be a proposal for the next study board meeting and will be revised if the proposal is not approved.

The Board was positive and found it better to navigate in.

The VIP representatives suggested other points to propose to revise:

Future agenda point: Pensum is currently defined as literature. It is outdated, it should instead be defined as material and encompass a variety of material such as movies, podcasts, pictures etc. as well.

Future agenda point: It should be on the agenda for a future meeting to discuss a proposal to have all oral exams conducted with co-examination.

The student representatives mentioned that it doesn't say explicitly in the BA curriculum that you can go on exchange in the mobility semester; like it says in the KA curriculum. **Andrea will add it explicitly to the BA curriculum.**

Mengni asked about the process of co-examination on courses taught by two teachers. Lasse said that was a question for Merlin.

Future agenda point: Jonas added that it should be a proposal on a future meeting to change the fact that reexam for active participation must always be Fri skriftlig opgave. He argued that if the idea is to train the students to do different tasks and attain different competencies, the reexam form should be changed to Bunden skriftlig opgave to make sure that the students demonstrate knowledge of the areas covered in the course.

5) AI follow up discussion

Lasse introduced the theme of the discussion: now we have more experience with AI; how did it go? Do we need changes? Lasse is part of the AI taskforce at the faculty and would like a discussion and some input.

The student representatives agreed that the current policy is sensible. It enables students to use AI and train competencies for the work market. But they sensed a general nervousness around using a new technological tool as AI amongst the students. Many ended up not using it because they were afraid that it would be considered cheating. Those who use it do so in their own way and very differently and with a different skill level.

Lasse encouraged reflections on what to do further in this department.

Lasse mentioned that most students use it for proof reading. The general impression was that students don't necessarily use it for the better. Lasse mentioned concerns that the students use it but don't acquire the skill to use it in a good way which can even make their products blander and more boring. Lasse argued that we have the tool, but we are missing the opportunity to teach the students how to use it. Like the group formation discussion Lasse

argued to take responsibility for allowing the use of it by providing education with focus on learning how to use it properly.

The student representatives agreed. As an academic practical skill, prompting AI should be integrated in the courses. As the ideal for literature searching.

Lasse mentioned that if it is considered an academic skill, we should make sure that the students are taught in it to put them on an equal level.

Lasse presented a new recommendation model from the task force, where each course can be assigned a colour/policy specification (Red: no use of AI, Yellow: limited, specified use of AI, Green: All use of AI allowed). He argued that it should be done the same at Sociology with a new AI policy. Lasse also mentioned that he thinks that 1 or 2 courses should be green and here AI skills should be integrated in the course(s).

The Board was positive towards the suggestion. Jonas mentioned that the green courses need to be flexible and adapted to teachers who want to work with it and have the prerequisites to teach it.

Course coordinator Hanne Kraak also mentioned that the three colored options would be a good way to do it and that the color of each course should be in the course descriptions and the description of the different color policies should be in the curriculum.

The members briefly discussed and agreed that the red policy would only make sense in a few courses where it can be controlled: oral, placebased.

The VIP representatives voiced a concern that many teachers might choose the red one. It was discussed that the color policy should be tied to exam forms.

Jonas mentioned that the trial green course should be on master level to ensure that our students are first movers and as quickly as possible bring these competencies to the labor market.

It was mentioned that we might be able to draw inspiration from ITU, who just made all their courses “green”.

6) Briefing from Chair of the Study Board /Lasse (11.40-11.45)

Nothing.

7) Info from the students (11.50-12.00)

The student representatives informed that they are reorganizing Fagrådet which will get a “Styregruppe” separate from the study board representatives.

SIDE 7 AF 7

8) Any Other Business (11.55-12.00)

Andrea informed the study board that the possibility of an extended BAKA that guidance counselor Nina Stenvang Holmsgaard talked about at the last study board meeting unfortunately will not be possible anyway. It will stay the same.

Andrea reminded the student representatives of the deadline for submission for the KU teaching award 4/4. **Andrea will send a link to the student representatives with more information after the meeting.**