



AALBORG UNIVERSITET

## Minutes from TB study board meeting October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021, 12.30-15:00

**Members:** Maj-Britt Quitzau, Lars Botin, Andreas Birkbak, Andrés Felipe Valderrama Pineda (from 13.00), Signe Pedersen, Maja Elisabeth Hultberg Rasmussen.

**Observers:** Sofie Rähr Graunbøl, Evie Marcelia Trappaud Rønne, Diana Wolff Bie (ref.), Rasmus Mølgaard Hansen (from 13.45).

### **Absent:**

**Members:** Ina Overgaard (mandate to Maja), Maurizio Teli (no mandate), Kista Bianco Kjær (mandate to Maja).

**Observers:** Laura Telling Clausen, Janni Rise Frellsen.

### **Locations:**

CPH: ACM15, 2.057

AAL: RDB14 3.368

### **Meeting agenda**

#### 1. Approval of agenda

Approved.

#### 2. Information from study board chair and secretary

- a. TB has received 100.000 kr. for a TECH integration workshop, a well-being event for students (christmas lunch entertainment) and teaching assistance pilot project. Zakarias Evald has been employed for 15 hr/week until Dec 31.

Zakarias has started the teaching assistance and the planning of the integration workshop. He has contacted the different semester coordinators to establish contact. With regards to the well-being event, the study chair thinks that it will be a small initiative and that we should follow up on this next year as well. The TECH integration workshop will be held in November and is part of the follow-up on the revisions for TAN in order to discuss how we can combine the more technical parts of the education with 'softer' parts (in a socio-technical way). The workshop is planned in cooperation with Department of Elektronic Systems and the intention is that both students and teachers participate. There is economy for 50 participants in total. We should have an interesting company to start things off. Lars Botin suggests Morten from Sundhed.dk.

- b. TB-SN budget for 2022

Maj-Britt has been asked comment on the budget for the Study Board developed by the

Economy section. Management wants the two study boards to be more aligned with regards to resources. The travel budget for TB-SN is too large compared to the other study board, and we have been asked to minimize it. Maj-Britt has asked for a larger budget for study activities, because we have received so many applications for funds from students that we have had to reject a lot of very sensible applications.

3. Short recapitulation on points from meeting in September (informative)

- a. Maj-Britt will develop a letter to TAN students that underlines that it is a Cand.scient. education and clarify the errors that have been made on external platforms. We need to make this more visible also at the website of our education. Also follow up with IDA.

The letter has not been developed yet, but **Maj-Britt will develop it as soon as possible.**

- b. Maj-Britt has revised the TAN study regulation documents in collaboration with Lars Botin and Lars Bo Henriksen. We have tried to incorporate all the comments from the hearing. Maj-Britt had a positive talk with the head of the anthropological censor network and the TAN recipient panel was also positive. All documents are ready. Maj-Britt still needs to formulate replies to all the parties that have sent hearing responses.

**Maj-Britt will make sure to send polite responses** to all the different parties from the hearing.

- c. Maj-Britt needs to develop a letter for the management based on our discussion about resources for teaching. Also try to draft a debate article for the Navigator newspaper. Maj-Britt had uploaded a first draft of a letter to management in order to advertise for a better priority of resources. Both teachers and students express that they would expect that teachers get a number of hours for developing courses, when necessary. The Study Board is happy with the letter and **Maj-Britt will develop it further** and try to also ground it better in the semester evaluations to have a stronger impact in terms of our quality assurance system.

Regarding an article for Navigator, it is important that it does not sound negative, but more in the direction of what it takes (in resources) to deliver proper teaching.

The study board approves of moving forward with this letter and **Maj-Britt will develop a draft for Navigator in collaboration with Sofie.**

- d. Maj-Britt will include follow up on well-being in the plan for next year.

**Maj-Britt will follow up on initiatives for well-being,** when developing the plan for the Study Board for next year.

4. TAN study regulation revision (appendix 4)

- a. Final approval

Approved by the study board. **Janni will upload everything in the system.**

Maj-Britt tried to see if we could get both external reviewer networks mentioned in the study curriculum paragraphs, because these are both mentioned in the accreditation of TAN.

However, the Education Law department has looked into it, and the feedback from the Ministry of Education is that the accreditation has been developed at a time, where each education could have 2 networks for external reviewers. This has, however, shifted and for this reason, we are not allowed. So in the final study curriculum for TAN, only the engineering network for external reviewers is mentioned. We are still allowed to use the anthropological network and should mention this in the semester description.

Maj-Britt also informed that the current TAN1 and TAN3 will be shifted to the new study curriculum in autumn 2022, whereas TAN5 will be maintained on the current study curriculum. On the master, all students will be shifted to the new study curriculum in autumn 2022.

Maj-Britt will send out polite replies for those that have produced hearing responses.

b. Draft of suggested implementation plan

Maj-Britt has proposed an increase in the resources for development of the education as a follow up to the study revision. It would be good if the study board took a more active part in strategically defining, where these development resources are needed. A specific draft has been developed for the Head of Studies for dialogue.

Implementation plan is approved. Maj-Britt will communicate the plan and the idea to involve the study board more strategically in the distribution of development resources within the coordination meetings and with the Head of Studies.

5. Semester planning for F22 (appendix 5)

Semester planning for spring 2022 has been started. The process for the study secretaries (who have taken over the scheduling process) was presented at the teacher's meeting recently.

Through the TAN revision it was clear that there are details which are revised in the semester descriptions but not in the curricula. It is important that these are aligned.

The teachers would like the study secretaries to decide the exam dates. However, the study board has to approve the dates first (through the semester descriptions). But suggestions can be made by the study secretaries based on, for instance, semester evaluations and former semesters. The teachers also requested that teaching schedules and exam dates are placed directly in their Outlook calendars.

*Comment by study secretary: It is possible for the teachers to set up their Outlook calendars to import their schedules automatically. You can find the guidance for this here:*

<https://www.its.aau.dk/vejledning/moodle/cal Moodle/#496228>

*If you need assistance with this, IT support can help you.*

OBS! Trine Hertz is from 1<sup>st</sup> november 2021 no longer the study team coordinator, as she is now the strategic advisor for the head of department. The study team will have a new coordinator by 1st January, if all goes well. In the meantime, the coordinator role is with the head of the secretaria, Lena Haugsted Laursen.

The suggested planning procedure for the Study Board was approved. Maj-Britt will discuss with Lena or the new study team coordinator whether we can involve secretaries in the planning of exam dates. We can try to experiment with this if some of the study secretaries and semester coordinators are willing to.

6. F21 semester evaluation (appendix 6)

Maj-Britt has read all the minutes from the steering group meetings and summed up the most important details in a file. The study board goes through the file. Regarding BD4, the comments about difficulties in the staffing area should be corrected, as Andrés points out that it is probably merely because a group of supervisors, who were very new and therefore untried in this job were involved. The students in BD are in general not always happy about toilet facilities, the light in the rooms etc. In our procedure, these study environment elements should be captured by the Head of Studies. We also have a problem with a couple of violations in different semesters. The Study Board discusses how to handle this, as we cannot see who that report these and follow up on dialogue. Sofie suggests to incorporate some kind of whistle blower element, where students can elaborate on the problems while

being anonymous. The study board agrees that Maj-Britt will make a general announcement for the students about these incidents and the code of conduct, and also include what to do if they experience, what they believe to be a violation. Maj-Britt will also follow up on two of the specific cases, where some of the participating students might have some insights, as they recognize the cases. Just to get an idea about what is going on.

Concerning steering group minutes: It is important to legitimize the minutes which means that if there are corrections, the students/coordinator must not write Approved. Maj-Britt will create a document describing the significance of the minutes in the quality assurance process for semester coordinators. The semester evaluations were reviewed and approved. Maj-Britt will send out responses to each semester coordinator based on the developed file.

7. Orientation about project funds for students from TB (appendix 7)

We have received applications for 67.000 DKK, and we usually only have funding for about 12.000 kr. The study board has requested more funds.

Most applications were from TAN and not very many from BD/SD. The Study Board approves of the balance with respect to how Maja and Maj-Britt have distributed the funds.

Part of the focus for the approved applications was employability, i.e. the applications for activities outside one's local area ranked higher, especially outside CPH. Also, funds for hotels or travel of an entire group were dismissed, so that most students got funds, but with less funding of the demanded activities. Sofie mentioned that it was really great with the elaborate answer in the e-mail that they received.

8. TB-SN position on employability (open dialogue about our vision and philosophy)

This point on the agenda was once again pushed, due to time limitations.

9. Aftagerpanel meetings – main points (program coordinators)

Maj-Britt participated in the panel meeting, which is mandatory in the new quality assurance process. In future, we have to remember to invite KarriereVIP and our employability colleagues (Nanna and Sidse) .

For TAN, the new study curricula and employability were the main subjects at the panel meeting. The focus on what the students can actually do at the end of their education is presented to them too late in the process. There was also some feedback regarding the external examination on TAN2, which has been changed to the technical course. Lars Bo in AAL is the head of coordinators for STEM and we should ask him to promote the possibility of teaching jobs at HTX as a possibility for both TAN and BD students. For instance, the course Computer Assisted Methodology. It could be a good idea to have HTX introduce the programmes which are then used at university/in businesses later on.

For the TAN panel, we need to recruit more people to this panel, because very few are active. Maj-Britt is happy to help with this.

For BD/SD, the new digital learning goals were discussed, which led to contributions of specific tools and perspectives to include. The staffing issues were also mentioned and the panel was encouraged to support in identification of DVIPs that can support the scientific staff. There was also here a good dialogue about employability. In this panel, there is a very good representation and it was a vivid and good dialogue.

The study board discussed how to establish better connections with companies and organisations outside the university. Maj-Britt suggested communication with relevant companies about an event each semester, where they visit us. Maj-Britt could handle the communication with these companies.

Andrés suggested that our students visit the companies instead to mobilise them to also do some arrangements.

Maj-Britt will make a schedule for what the study board needs to work on over the coming year in relation to strengthening these panels and our contacts outside of the university.

10. External examiners – overview & status (program coordinators)

TAN: Suggestions for external examiners have been sent to Janni.

BD/SB: These are still in process.

11. Information about evaluation of E-course on SD (Andrés)

Andrés tells that the evaluation of the E-course is in process.

Summer courses for the new masters admissions is still pending, as we need to figure out an economic scheme. We have to think creatively if we are to find the funds for this. Perhaps we can use former students to teach these courses. Lars Botin knows a couple of students at TAN who would be able to do this. The summer courses must be in the week before study start. Maj-Britt will follow up on this and create a delegated team for this task.

12. Drop-out status (appendix 12)

Study start test should be later than it was this year, i.e. as late as possible. This year the first study start test was on the 10th September. Next year the suggestion is to have the test for example on the 15th September and the reexam on the 22th September. Both exams must be over by 29th September as this is the deadline for reporting the results for the admissions office.

13. Hybrid teaching (TAN5 student letter) (appendix 13)

- a. Hybrid teaching – AAU policy is ‘back to normal’, but students can make local agreements with teachers.

We were just informed at a teaching meeting that students need to make local agreements. No common guideline is possible, other than asking the teacher for permission. Maj-Britt will write an answer to the students.

- b. Do TB want to develop some kind of guideline/recommendation for recordings?  
See above.

14. Delayed students (appendix 14)

Concerning a present case: According to the Educational Law department, we can grant a dispensation based on a doctors assessment on a students risk of becoming ill with stress even though the student is not ill yet. If this for example is a student doing their master thesis, then we can grant a dispensation for a few months extension. The study board agrees to allow for this kind of dispensation to avoid further aggravation of a students’ health situation in situations, where this would be relevant.

15. Inventory inspection

Maj-Britt will follow up on the purchase of cameras, dictaphones etc. We should have a permanent item on the agenda about equipment, and go through the list of what we have and what we need. Maj-Britt will incorporate this element to the yearly plan, e.g. in October.

It is mentioned that HUM Lab currently has delivery problems due to chip shortage.

16. Any other business (AOB)

AAU elections: There has been some fuzz in relation to the elections for the study board, since we interpreted an e-mail wrongly. This implies that we nurtured TAN CPH, which had actually already two people enlisting to the study board. It seems that TAN AAL also have two enlisted, although Maja is enlisting in two boards. We have an issue with BD/SD as Ina will not enlist again. Sofie is greatly

encouraged to enlist and finds it ok as long as it makes sense for her (being in her final year). Signe will try to mobilise a student from the BD bachelor.