

Meeting date: 21 April 2026

Meeting venue: 1520-731

Meeting: Education committee for Physics and Astronomy

Participant: Students: Asger Petersen, Marie Vinkler Kristensen, Simon Mosgaard Jørgensen, Victor Kvist Loft Pedersen, Nanna Elizabeth Rosa Kalmar, Christoffer Emil Juul Hansen.

VIP/TAP: Head of degree programme Aurelien Romain Dantan, Head of degree programme Sergio Ioppolo, Professor and facilitator Hans Otto Uldall Fynbo, Student counsellors Sarah Benthin Smith (observer), Study coordinator Mette Alstrup Lie (observer), Programme coordinator Bjerg Brink Dalgaard (minute-taker).

AGENDA

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting, 18 February 2026
3. Results from the Retention Forum survey “Cracking the Code”
4. Distribution of PowerPoint slides
5. Guidelines for the scope of supervisors’ feedback on bachelor projects and their implementation
6. Portfolio examination – examination format and framework (Quantum Mechanics, Electrodynamics)
7. Follow-up regarding the use of artificial intelligence in Electrodynamics
8. Examination evaluations
9. Grading in general – students experience large differences in grading levels between courses
10. Course evaluations – procedure for handling feedback to teaching assistants
11. Preparation for the annual degree programme status meeting
12. Shortening of the thesis period
13. Any other business

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved without comments.

2. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting, 18 February 2026

The minutes were approved without comments.

3. Results from the Retention Forum survey “Cracking the Code”

The Committee discussed the results of the Retention Forum survey, the purpose of which was to investigate students’ doubts and their experience of “cracking the code” of university studies. In the survey, the same students were asked questions at different points in their degree programme (first, second and fourth semester).





Across all degree programmes within Natural Sciences, the results show that the greatest challenges for students relate to prioritising tasks, structuring their time and choosing learning strategies. Social integration challenges play a smaller role in the survey. Compared with 2024, changes are particularly evident in students' experiences of task prioritisation, time management and concrete subject-specific understanding.

The student representatives on the Committee recognised this picture from their own degree programmes. They pointed out that uncertainty in some courses leads students to prioritise tasks more strategically, which can increase stress and insecurity. The Committee discussed that such uncertainties should be reduced, for example through clearer frameworks for teaching and examinations.

The need for better information about examination formats was also discussed, particularly in relation to the new portfolio examinations. The Student Counselling Service prepares an examination presentation for first-semester students but lacks concrete knowledge about the new examination formats to present them adequately. The Committee therefore discussed the possibility of holding a presentation prior to the examination period in May and June, preferably with input from students who have already taken the examinations.

Follow-up:

The Committee will continue to work on initiatives that can reduce uncertainty surrounding examinations and the organisation of studies.

4. Distribution of PowerPoint slides

The Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of using and distributing PowerPoint slides in teaching, as well as the need for common recommendations.

The student representatives emphasised that receiving PowerPoint slides before the lecture is very helpful, as it allows students to prepare and to take better notes during teaching. Some students do not need the slides in advance but still experience it as an advantage if they are available before or after teaching.

Differences between degree levels and teaching formats were highlighted. At bachelor level, blackboard teaching is used more frequently than slides, and the need is therefore perceived as smaller. At master's level, teaching is more slide-based, and early access to slides is considered particularly beneficial.

The Committee agreed that slides should be prepared in a way that does not replace attendance, but rather supports learning before, during and after teaching.

Decision:

The Degree Programme Committee recommends that lectures who make Power-Points should make them available for the students prior to the lecture. The slides must be designed to support teaching without giving the impression that attendance is unnecessary.

5. Guidelines for the scope of supervisors' feedback on bachelor projects and their implementation

The Committee discussed the scope of supervisors' feedback on bachelor projects. According to current practice, supervisors may read and provide feedback on approximately five pages of the project prior to assessment. However, students experience differences in practice, with some supervisors providing very detailed feedback while others follow the guidelines more restrictively. This can lead to unequal conditions for students.

It was emphasised that feedback has significant learning potential, but that feedback prior to assessment can influence the final product and thus the evaluation. The recently introduced oral examination following submission provides an opportunity to even out conditions, thereby ensuring a more equal assessment. The possibility of providing feedback after assessment was also mentioned, as this offers considerable learning potential.

The Committee agreed that the guideline of feedback on five pages is reasonable, but that it must be communicated more clearly – including to doctoral students who act as supervisors. There is also a need to clarify how feedback should be handled when more than one supervisor is attached to the same project.

Decision:

The degree programme responsible will prepare a reminder regarding the guidelines for feedback on bachelor projects, including that feedback prior to assessment is limited to approximately five pages, and that additional feedback may be provided after assessment.

6. Portfolio examination – examination format and framework (Quantum Mechanics, Electrodynamics)

The Committee discussed the use of portfolio examinations in compulsory bachelor courses, including Quantum Mechanics and Electrodynamics. The student representatives pointed out that the bachelor programme currently relies almost exclusively on portfolio and written examinations in compulsory courses, and that students are therefore not prepared for purely oral examinations, which they encounter in the master's programme.

The students suggested that some courses should include oral examinations with preparation time, so that students gain experience with different examination formats. The



Committee discussed that changes in examination format require corresponding adjustments in teaching, so that students are prepared on an ongoing basis.

It was also noted that students can choose elective courses with oral examinations.

Follow-up:

The Committee will continue to work on how students can best be prepared for portfolio examinations and how greater variation in examination formats can be incorporated in the future.

7. Follow-up regarding the use of artificial intelligence in Electrodynamics

The Committee followed up on the use of artificial intelligence as a feedback tool in the course Electrodynamics. Students experience that there is a very low limit on the number of queries, which restricts the benefit. At the same time, concerns were raised about social inequality if some students can purchase access to more queries than others.

The Committee discussed the need for clear and consistent frameworks for the use of artificial intelligence in teaching.

Follow-up:

The course description will be reviewed to ensure that the examination format is correctly described and that the use of artificial intelligence is clearly defined.

8. Examination evaluations

The Committee discussed the need for systematic examination evaluations similar to course evaluations. There is a particular need for direct feedback on new examination formats.

The student representatives suggested a joint questionnaire survey among students. The Committee discussed that student members of the Degree Programme Committee could contribute with suggestions for questions.

Follow-up:

The possibility of a joint survey on examinations will be explored.

9. Grading in general – students experience large differences in grading levels between courses

Students experience large differences in grading levels between courses in the master's programme. The Committee discussed that this may be related to differences in learning objectives.



The Committee agreed that learning objectives are central, as they define what students may be examined in. A systematic review of learning objectives in course descriptions may contribute to a greater perceived coherence.

Follow-up:

Learning objectives will be included as a point of attention in the review of course descriptions.

10. Course evaluations – procedure for handling feedback to teaching assistants

The Committee discussed how feedback from course evaluations is passed on to teaching assistants. As teaching assistants often change, it is not always certain that feedback leads to improvements.

The Committee discussed that feedback does not necessarily always have to be given directly to teaching assistants but may instead be handled by lecturers or the degree programme responsible. The possibility of using experienced teaching assistants to train new ones was also mentioned, as well as the need for didactic support for doctoral students who act as teaching assistants.

11. Preparation for the annual degree programme status meeting

This item was not discussed.

12. Shortening of the thesis period

The Committee discussed the consequences of the master's reform, which entails that the thesis period will be shortened by one month for students starting in 2027. Four implementation models were presented.

The student representatives preferred model D, in which the assessment period and the examination period are shortened, as this model provides the longest continuous thesis writing period.

Follow-up:

The students' preference will be included in the further work on implementation.

13. Any other business

None other items were discussed.