

The Study Board for the Professional Master's Programmes



MINUTES

11 APRIL 2024

Forum Study Board for the Professional Master's Programmes

STUDY BOARD SERVICES AND EXAM

Meeting held 11 April 2024

STUDENT AFFAIRS

Place Mærsk Tower, room 13.1.41

BLEGDAMSVEJ 3

2200 COPENHAGEN N

Minute taker Merete Evald

DIR 45 35 33 37 83

Present

Study Board: Lene Jørgensen, My Catarina von Euler-Chelpin, Louise Husted Feilberg, Rasmus Feld Frisk, Pernille Holst, Emmanuel Raju, Rigmor Højland Jensen

Administration: Tina Lewis, Mette L. Bergenser, Lisbeth Lyng Hansen, Merete Evald (minute taker)

merete.evald@sund.ku.dk

Agenda

1. Approval of today's agenda and the minutes from the previous meeting on 24 January 2024

The agenda and the minutes were approved with no additions.

2. Orientation from the study programmes

MPH: Ongoing recruitment for the next study year; planning the next MPH conference with the theme focusing on the upcoming report from the Health Structure Commission (Sundhedsstrukturkommissionen).

MDMa: Courses are running smoothly.

CACS: Focusing on the programme evaluation that is underway with assistance from the Administration.

Neurorehabilitation: Busy finalizing a new textbook; aiming to be finished before the September intake of students.

MIND/MRA: No updates; the current courses are running well.

3. Discussion on raising participation in Study Board meetings

The Head of Study Affairs, Tina Lewis, participated in the discussion and presented the issue. She highlighted the quorum issue in the Study Board, meaning that the Board has not been able to make decisions, and that administrative staff have sometimes outnumbered faculty members at meetings. She asked the Study Board to consider different formats for the meetings and whether the programmes would be better off in different Study Boards instead of a joint Board for all the Professional Master's Programmes.

Lene emphasized the absence of key voices and proposed that at the minimum, everyone should have an alternate, with administrative staff unable to substitute faculty members.

Setup of the Study Board

Regarding a change in the setup of study boards, My and Lisbeth raised concerns about the potential drowning out of smaller programmes like MPH if they are merged with larger ones. Pernille and Rasmus expressed appreciation that there is a study board dedicated to the smaller professional master's programmes, enabling discussions on management of the programmes, the political agenda of continuing education and ensuring a common voice.

Format of meetings

The members of the Board had different preferences for in-person, hybrid, or online meetings, but there was general agreement that flexibility is needed, and if hybrid or online meetings are what make quorate Board meetings possible, then that is the solution. Likewise, there were different views on the right time of day for the meeting.

The Board also discussed how to make the meetings more content-rich and minimizing time spent on routine approvals. There was general interest in trying to organize the four mandatory annual meetings as two online meetings focusing on routine approvals and two hybrid meetings focusing

on content and substantive topics. Suggestions for content will be discussed at the next meeting in September.

4. Discussion of new proposals for common rules on master's projects

Mette introduced the two new proposals to address the lack of common rules for master's projects, aiming to resolve discrepancies in students' rights and obligations across the programmes. The Study Board had to choose between the two proposals. Proposal 1 is generally like the current setup, but may mean significant differences for CACS, MIND and MRA.

The discussion of the proposals focused on clarifications about dispensations and postponing submission and the central issue of fixed dates for submission of the master's project. Rigmor and Rasmus supported fixed dates, emphasizing the need for international students' planning, while Pernille expressed concerns about resource constraints and administrative burdens, advocating for more flexibility.

Finally, Pernille raised concerns about the reduced involvement of heads of studies in project agreements, with Lene suggesting that although she will be informed about them, fewer agreements will need her signature.

The Board agreed on Proposal 1, with the possibility of shortening the withdrawal period to one month instead of two, which the Administration will consider.

The changes following Proposal 1 to course descriptions and the programme-specific curricula were sent for written approval and approved on 24 April 2024.

5. Discussion and approval of programme reports and programme evaluation

There was not enough time for the item at the meeting, so the programme reports were sent for written approval and approved on 24 April 2024.

6. Discussion and approval of course evaluations – Fall 2023-2024

There was not enough time for the item at the meeting, so course evaluations were sent for written approval with a categorization from the relevant head of study for each course. The course evaluations were approved on 14 June 2024.

7. Follow-up on sustainability questions from the working group

PAGE 4 OF 4

There was not enough time for the item at the meeting, so the topic will be discussed at a later point.