

## Minutes from TB Study Board meeting

Date:	27-04-2023	Time:	12.30 – 15.00
Place:	AAL: RDB14 4.307 / KBH: ACM15 2.1.023 / Online via Teams		
Catering:	Please register for lunch by e-mailing to tb-sn@plan.aau.dk		
Minute-taker:	Study secretary Cilline Elene Mølkær		

Name	Rolle	Attendance
<b>Study Board Members</b>		
Maj-Britt Quitzau (MBQ)	Study Board Chair	Present
Lars Botin (LB)	Programme coordinator TAN CPH	Present
Maurizio Teli (MT)	Programme coordinator TAN AAL	Present
Andrés F. Valderrama Pineda (AVP)	Programme coordinator SD	Present
Signe Pedersen (SP)/Søsser Brodersen (SB)	Programme coordinator BD	Present online (Søsser)
Mette Simonsen Abildgaard (MSA)	Rep. Department of Culture and Learning (CPH)	Absent
Maja E. Hultberg Rasmussen (MHR)	Student rep. TAN AAL	Present
Mathilde Eie Nielsen (MEN)	Student rep. BD/SD	Present
Martin Lunding Bentgtsen (MLB)	Student rep. TAN AAL	Present
Sophie Skotte Worm (SSW)	Student rep. BD/SD	Absent
Agnete Lund Freudendal-Pedersen (AFP)	Student rep. TAN CPH	Present
Sebastian Husted Petersen (SHP)	Student rep. TAN CPH	Present
<b>Observers</b>		
Janni Rise Frellsen (JRF)	Study board secretary	Present
Cilline Elene Mølkær (CEM)	Study secretary and study board minute taker	Present
Laura Telling Clausen (LTC)	Observer (student study councillor BD/SD)	Present (Online)
Hannibal Holm Johansen (HHJ)	Observer (student study councillor BD/SD)	Present
Marc Dean Mejnert (MDM)	Observer (student study councillor TAN CPH)	Absent
Kristina Contaio Nielsen (KCN)	Observer (student study councillor TAN AAL)	Present
Astrid Oberborbeck Andersen (AOA)	Rep. Department of Culture and Learning (AAL)	Absent

Abbreviations:

- TB-SN: Study Board for Techno-Anthropology and Sustainable Design
- BD: Bachelor in Sustainable Design (Bæredygtigt Design)
- SD: Master in Sustainable Design
- TAN: Bachelor & Master in Techno-Anthropology (Teknoantropologi)
- BDx/SDx/TANx: Semester within the named study programme (e.g., BD2 is the second semester of the bachelor of Sustainable Design)
- AAL: Aalborg campus
- CPH: Copenhagen campus

### Agenda:

- 1) Approval of agenda and meeting minutes from last meeting
- 2) Information from Study Board Chair, Secretary and others
- 3) Follow-up status
- 4) Study start evaluation
- 5) Semester evaluations incl. harassment
- 6) Self-evaluation action plan
- 7) Procedures for Study Programme evaluations
- 8) Yearly account from the Anthropology examiners
- 9) Well-being initiatives

Follow-up for Cilline, Janni and Maj-Britt

Follow-up for others

Headings marked with **bold** are quality items, and main conclusions in the summaries.

## MINUTES

---

1. Approval of agenda and meeting minutes from last meeting	
<b>Timeframe:</b>	12.30 – 12.35 <b>Responsible:</b> MBQ/JRF
<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>Approval of the agenda and statement of the board's decision-making competence with regards to attendance and mandates for this meeting. Approval of the minutes from the last meeting.</i>
<b>Appendix</b>	Minutes from TB-SN meeting from March 2023 (appendix 1)
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	Legal formality
<b>Discussion:</b>	The study board was competent to make decisions, as enough members were present or represented by mandates. The minutes from the March meeting and the meeting agenda were approved without further comments. MBQ introduced the new student study councilor for Sustainable Design Hannibal Holm Johansen.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	Minutes from March meeting and agenda were approved.

2. Information from Study Board Chair, Secretary and others	
<b>Timeframe:</b>	12.35 – 12.45 <b>Responsible:</b> MBQ/JRF
<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>a. Status on Thirdroom pilot testing b. News from Program Coordinators c. News from Student Study Councilors d. News from Student representatives</i>
<b>Appendix</b>	-
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	-
<b>Discussion:</b>	News from the Study Board Chair MBQ: The accreditation process is running, and almost done. Techno-Anthropology CPH was elected for the first round of the process. MBQ was interviewed by the accreditation panel this week together with other study board chairs and head of studies. The first round of the accreditation process is very general, and MBQ was interviewed about some overall questions about the quality system. A group of students will also be interviewed, but without representatives from TAN or TB-SN. The second round of the accreditation process will consist of more detailed audit trails investigating more specific areas/subjects. On May 11 we will receive information about whether we have been chosen for participation in round two as well. a. MBQ mentioned that there will be a pilot testing of Thirdroom during May and June at Create in Aalborg where Techno-Anthropology is located. After summer we can look into the possibility of beginning to apply the Thirdroom platform on selected educations in both AAL and CPH. We will gain access to Thirdroom very soon, and then we can have

---

---

a talk about how to address it. MBQ will keep the study board members updated.

- b. LB mentioned that honorary Professor Peter Paul Verbick visited us this week. He will continue to come and give lectures in the future.
- c. The student study councilors in CPH had a meeting/workshop with their new contact person Emilie Stenberdt last week where they went through and had a dialogue about the yearly tasks for a student study councilor. MBQ was very happy about the meeting as it facilitates networking and cooperation between all the student study councilors. Thus, we will look into whether there should be a similar meeting in AAL.
- d. No comments from the student representatives.

- 
- Conclusion:**
- There will be more information about the further accreditation process on May 11. MBQ will keep the study board members updated.
  - MBQ will talk to Emilie about arranging a meeting/workshop with the student study councilors in AAL.
- 

### 3. Follow-up status

<b>Timeframe:</b>	12.45 – 12.50	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ/JRF
<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>Status on the most important items on the action list in order to ensure that we follow up on items from former TB-SN meetings. The list helps to ensure that all actions from the meetings are executed. At each meeting, the main deliverables and updates are outlined in the appendix. Study board members are asked to review the list and point out if there are remarks about lacking items or concerns about the lack of follow-up. The action list is inserted at the end of minutes from each TB-SN meeting.</i>		
<b>Appendix</b>	Updated action list (appendix 3)		
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	Follow-up and execution of decisions and items		
<b>Discussion:</b>	-		
<b>Conclusion:</b>	No comments for the follow-up list. MBQ, JRF and CEM will go through the list at a planned working session.		

---

### 4. Study start evaluation

<b>Timeframe:</b>	12.50 – 13.05	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ/PK
<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>The study start is evaluated by looking through the questions about this. MBQ also shares insights from dialogues with tutors from TAN and Jan (coordinator in the study administration). Marc also presents insights from the study start tests. The new study start concept for the bachelor is</i>		

---

---

*evaluated and inputs for the planning of the next study start are formulated. If there is time, the new study start of the master is also discussed.*

---

**Appendix** See appendix 4

---

**Quality assurance:** 1 & 2

---

**Discussion:** During autumn 2022 the reception of new BSc students was moved from the first study year administration to the departments, and a new BSc study start setup for the BSc study programmes was launched. The new setup must be evaluated as part of the AAU quality system, and the central administration has done an analysis of the study start for each of the BSc study programmes.

Also, a new study start for the MSc study programmes will be implemented during autumn 2023 and the planning is currently in progress.

Unfortunately, MDM was absent from today's meeting, so the study board did not discuss the insights from the study start test. MBQ will make sure to have a talk with MDM about the study start test in order to inform the study board members later. All the semester evaluations regarding study start was shared as appendix for the dialogue.

Unfortunately, the TAN BSc study start in CPH was a bit chaotic. It was difficult to find tutors, and some tutors lost motivation and resigned during the semester. MBQ mentioned that she was in contact with some of the tutors who said that they found the study start administration to be very top-down and intransparent. They had the feeling that there was no room for creativity and input from the tutor corps. This resulted in less initiative for activities than we could have hoped for, and the new students also found that there were not enough social events. Especially TAN was not satisfied with the social-academic trip on the 1<sup>st</sup> semester being cancelled. Instead, a trip was planned during 2<sup>nd</sup> semester, but the students felt that they had to wait too long to get to know each other, as the trip was postponed.

Trips with more than one study programme is a good idea, as the students get to know each other across studies. SHP found that the trip worked well when it was done in relation to the TAN PO, as they got a chance to mingle and get to know each other across the year group, instead of just keeping to the people in their first group. MEN mentions that for BD it worked fine with the later trip.

MBQ emphasizes that in the new strategy of the study start there must be more focus on having a balance between social activities and academic learning.

AFP mentioned also that the tutors did not seem to know what the job was about in details. TAN is a complex education so the social events are very important to create a social environment where they can connect. During the study start 2022 the social-academic trip in CPH on the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester there was a mix between two Programmes (TAN and LAND was on a trip and BEM and BD was on a trip together). SHP was tutor and joined the trip for the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of TAN and LAND students. It went well but they did not interact much across the study programmes. SHP and AFP mentioned that the trip will be a good idea to have during the PO writing, because the students are more willing to interact in the beginning of the semester so

---

---

they do not end up being with their fellow students in the P0 group all the time.

MEN also mentioned that BD missed some social events in the beginning.

TAN AAL: They had a good study start event though they had a small group of students.

BD: Hannibal mentioned also that BD had trouble about finding the time for the social events because of the schedule of academic events. He mentioned that when he started on the programme the tutors had a trip before to plan the study start and events, and he thinks that it worked very well.

MBQ mentions in connection to this that she also had the experience of there being too much academic learning in the beginning. She thinks that there should be more focus on this in the planning process of the scheduling. MBQ, JRF and CEM will formulate some feedback to be sent to Jan Svendsen from the study board.

SHP asked for an overview of what the other programmes are planning or has made in 2022 to get inspired.

MHR mentioned that there are not enough hours for the planning process so a lot of tutors ended up working voluntarily for several of the hours. It also made an imbalance between the tutors when some of them are getting paid and some don't. Especially when it comes to the responsibility for the tasks. The voluntary tutors ended up with the tasks, that the paid tutors did not want to do. MBQ will look more into the payment with Jan and get back.

The study start of the Master's Programme was also discussed. Each study programme will receive 140 hours for the new study start.

SD had a good experience with the study start but unfortunately TAN was not a success because the tutor did not show up.

LTC stated that it was not only students who addressed problems but also the teachers that did not know that all the students weren't from the same educational background.

---

**Conclusion:**

- MBQ, JRF and CEM will create some feedback based on the inputs from the discussion about the study start and inform Jan Svendsen about it. They will look more into the planning process of the scheduling in order to make more room for the social events in the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> semester. The payment and balance between paid and volunteering students is also followed up in this regard.

---

## 5. Semester evaluations incl. harassment

<b>Timeframe:</b>	13.05 – 13.20	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ and PK
-------------------	---------------	---------------------	------------

---

---

**Presentation:** *The Study Board has received semester evaluations from autumn 2022 and these should be discussed and action taken where appropriate. An overview of main issues has been developed by the chair and program coordinators, students and student study councillors are expected to go through the respective evaluations. A special focus point in the discussion is episodes of harassment and how to handle these.*

---

**Appendix** Semester evaluations and overview (appendix 5)

---

**Quality assurance:** Quality area 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6

---

**Discussion:** MBQ has made an overview in which she highlighted the main challenges in the Autumn 2022 semester evaluations. She addressed that there is a tendency for some semester coordinators to not really address the identified problems, which she would like to be improved. Thus, she emphasized that the semester coordinators should take a deeper look at the evaluations as some of them seem a bit too positive which she has also mentioned in the feedback to the semester coordinators.

The practice of evaluating the semester and following up was discussed, as the lack of response to the questionnaire in the formal template does not necessarily imply that the coordinators do not evaluate and follow up. Many coordinators prefer to evaluate with the students in person and follow up through planning meetings and adjustments not reflected in the formal template. SHP agrees that other practices than the format exists and points out that he does not always find the overall evaluation to be in line with the comments from the students in the Survey Xact questionnaire. He mentioned that feedback in person during the semester works better as it is easier to discuss the feedback and avoid misunderstandings, so he really likes it when course coordinators choose to evaluate during the last lecture of a course.

HHJ found that it works very well with the monthly steering group meetings during the semester where the students get to give feedback. He also mentioned that he has the impression that the courses are in fact improving based on prior evaluations from the students.

The 9<sup>th</sup> semesters – especially on TAN – receive some critical remarks about the assessment. The programme coordinators believe that a change of the assessment to passed/not passed instead of grades would help resolve some of the criticism on the 3<sup>rd</sup> semester of the Master's Programme on Techno-Antropology. It is the same experience on Sustainable Design. LCT argues that because everybody are doing a different job during the semester so it is difficult to grade these exams.

AVP mentioned that there is a question in the evaluation about harassment that are a little confusing. The question about condescending language and abusive, harassing, bullying behavior need to be separated as it is two different things. He finds that it is escalating and we need to address it properly.

---

---

MBQ mentioned in this connection that TB inform the students when there has been a case of harassment and it is important that we handle the things that comes.

JRF mentioned that it should be more clear to the students that the semester evaluation is about statistic only and if they experience any kind of harassment they should report it to the Head of Studies. It is important that we inform them how to do so.

MBQ suggested to make guidelines on what to do if they experience for instance bullying, abusive behavior etc., so they know that

MHR suggested to show the students the poster during the study start and have it in the semester rooms too. SHP mentioned that the link to the harassment poster in Moodle did not work. Right now it links to an AAL Moodle room and not the poster. **CEM will look more into this.** The students want it to be more visible and maybe as a photo in stead of links.

BD: Two courses that has got red colour/evaluation. SB mentioned that in the new curriculum of 2023 these two courses will be changed into one. The two teachers that normally teach in this were on sabbatical and they got the notice late, so it created a little confusion. The issue is practical. **MBQ will follow up with a meeting with programme, semester and course coordinator.**

SD: AVP mentioned as LTC also stated that there was a teacher in the PSS-course has high expectations for the students. The teacher cannot assume that he is teaching only engineering students. There is a technical aspect but also the study programme includes a flexibility.

On 3<sup>rd</sup> semester of Sustainable Design Master's Programme there has been a tension between academic project and experience. AVP points out that students to some degree need to accept this tension, as there are always academic requirements, but will look into how this can be better addressed in terms of the level of reflexion and of academic accomplishment.

BD/SD and TAN AAL had a high number of students who answered. TAN AAL had a lot of courses that are yellow. MBQ mentioned though that the yellow range is quite big, so it is worth looking closely at the evaluations, when these are close to the red range. Usually in both TAN AAL and CPH the Culture and Learning courses have been evaluated very good, but they are not as good this semester. **MBQ will talk to Mette about it as this is a point of awareness in relation to the closing down of TAN education and the current difficult situation of colleagues from the SSH departments.**

The answering rate of TAN CPH is quite low. TAN5 had one student responding, so this evaluation will not be used. There were a lot of students on TAN1 that did not attend in the projects, which is surprising and something to address.

---



---

---

Otherwise the students are overall impressed by the teachers. They are very engaged.

Frederikke (the student helper of the Head of Studies) has looked through all the evaluation points about the study environment. Mette (PA of the Head of Studies) and Frederikke are taking care of these. MHR mentioned that it could be a good idea to talk to the semester coordinator on TAN5 to keep an eye on the social environment. There has been some problems here.

AFP responded to this and mentioned that they had problems in the groups especially after Theresa Scavenius left as semester coordinator. Instead they talked to LB and PBL group about it, and that helped.

Furthermore the students are not aware of what software they have access to through the university. **MBQ will talk to Mette about this.**

---

**Conclusion:**

Overall the evaluation was fine. TAN CPH had some issues about the low number of answers.

- CEM will look more into the poster about harassment on Moodle
- MBQ will talk to MSA about the lower ratings on the Culture and Learning courses and which kind of software the students can use on this.

---

---

## 6. Self-evaluation action plan

<b>Timeframe:</b>	13.35 – 13.40	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ
<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>The updated self-evaluation action plan is presented. It has been updated as a result of the dialogue with the TECH pro-dean and PLAN management as a result of the Quality Reporting. The changes in the plan are discussed and the main action points are specified.</i>		
<b>Appendix</b>	Self-evaluation action plan (appendix 6)		
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	Quality area 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6		
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>Our self-evaluation plan has been approved by the pro-dean. Some of our actions have been closed and a few new ones have been added.</p> <p>TB-SN will be moved to the new template in autumn and it should create a better overview, where we will be able to assemble action points under each target. It has been simplified from last year. TB-SN did not go so much through it as MBQ needs to check it together with Line V. (PLAN Quality employee).</p>		
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>MBQ will follow up with Line V. (PLAN Quality employee) to make sure that the updated action list is correct.</b></li></ul>		

---

---

## 7. Procedures for Study Programme evaluations

<b>Timeframe:</b>	13.50 – 14.10	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ/JRF
<b>Presentation:</b>	<p><i>The Study Board has previously discussed how to improve Study Programme evaluations. Current procedures are outlined and discussed and new initiatives are decided. Marc also presents insights from the study start tests in 2022 as these provide indications about background and expectations from the new students.</i></p>		
<b>Appendix</b>	Study programme evaluation dialogue with Mette (appendix 7)		
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	Quality area 1 & 2		
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>The procedure is not working in the current format and MBQ encouraged the programme coordinators to tell about their ideas.</p> <p>TAN do it during the semester in person, and MT don't want it to be a survey but rather an in-person dialogue with the students. When the students end their educations on TAN6 and TAN10 the semester coordinators can evaluate the programmes based on special points in the semester evaluation concerning the programme evaluation. TB-SN wants a better process than this.</p> <p>SB mentioned that BD/SD uses programme evaluations when they renew the curriculums but otherwise not.</p> <p>MBQ suggested a meeting each year to discuss the programmes. SB points out that we should be careful not to have too many more meetings and administration requirements. MBQ highlights that it is a formal requirement that we continuously evaluate our educations and since the practice currently is rather unstructured, there is a need to systematize the process. MBQ is open for a dialogue about this and would like the programme coordinators to send their inputs to her.</p> <p>MT wants to have a dialogue about the study start test in connection to gather the data a bit more. MBQ will talk to the Head of Studies to see if we can get a student helper to assist with this task, as there are not enough resources among neither MBQ nor programme coordinators to lift this.</p>		
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<p>The members do not want more formal evaluation and meetings regarding programme evaluation, but they want a more dialogue-based evaluation or feedback if it is the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The programme coordinators will send their inputs to MBQ, who will follow up.</li> <li>- MBQ will report back to the Head of study with a note that we need more hours to look in more detail into available material regarding programme evaluations (including study start tests with student expectations).</li> </ul>		

## 8. Yearly account from the Anthropology examiners

<b>Timeframe:</b>	14.10-14.20	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ/LB
-------------------	-------------	---------------------	--------

<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>We have received the yearly account from the Anthropology examiners and LB has also participated in their yearly meeting. Inputs from the anthropology examiners are discussed. Further follow up and dialogue with the examiners is discussed.</i>
<b>Appendix</b>	Yearly account from the Anthropology examiners (appendix 8)
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	Quality area 2, 5 and 6
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>LB informed us that he attended the yearly meeting with the Anthropology examiners corps. At the meeting LB talked about the status on TAN CPH. A key conclusion that he would like TAN to follow up on is that problem formulations in projects are generally too descriptive.</p> <p>Otherwise, the examiners are happy about the oral defense on the bachelor projects and the Master's theses.</p>
<b>Conclusion:</b>	The study board approves the yearly account and MBQ will send a thanks to Kristoffer (Chair of external examiners) for the good work. Special focus will be put on following up on the too descriptive problem formulations in TAN.

## 9. Well-being initiatives

<b>Timeframe:</b>	14.20 – 14.50	<b>Responsible:</b>	MBQ
<b>Presentation:</b>	<i>Inputs from the focus group interviews in TAN AAL and other inputs from CPH are presented. General issues and concerns regarding well-being are discussed. Key points for initiatives are pointed out and specified. After the meeting, the action plan is updated with this specification in relation to well-being.</i>		
<b>Appendix</b>	Points from focus group interview in TAN AAL (appendix 9)		
<b>Quality assurance:</b>	Quality area 2		
<b>Discussion:</b>	<p>A while ago KCN and MBQ had a focus group interview with three students from campus Aalborg where they had a nice dialogue. They are aware that they cannot not solve all the issues, but they will make an overview and add some of the issues to existing processes.</p> <p>Some of the issues are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sense of belonging of the students</li> <li>2. The group formation process</li> <li>3. A lack of physical attendance for the teaching, which especially has become a problem after COVID.</li> </ol> <p>MHR mentioned that a solution could be to make the teaching mandatory. However, this could potentially create other challenges, e.g., in case a student is sick and therefore cannot attend class. AFP mentioned that a big part of studying at AAU is working in project groups so if some students are not in a group, they might not feel obligated to attend the teaching because it is also based on work in the groups. A solution could maybe be to make new groups related to the course module teaching. MHR agreed with AFP and added that this</p>		

---

model could potentially also be used for the course exams.

KCN mentioned that attendance to class teaching probably also depends on who you are as a person and your connection with the classmates too. SHP mentioned that the TAN students are not good at attending social events e.g., the Friday bar. He is currently working on creating more social activities such as 'Brætspilseftermiddag'.

MHR mentioned that the TAF student organisation has money for social events, so the study board student representations, that were elected for the study board under the TAF student organization, should just apply for some of this – this can easily be done by simply answering the e-mails that she sent out.

It was agreed that the topic of well-being will be discussed again at another meeting.

---

**Conclusion:** All the well-being feedback revolves around issues with attachment to the community at the study programmes. MBQ will talk to the semester coordinators for them focus on this topic.

---

## 10. Any other business

---

**Timeframe:** 14.50 – 15.00      **Responsible:** All

---

**Presentation:** *Participants at the TB-SN meeting are invited to share information and issues that are relevant for TB-SN. No formal decisions can be taken at this item.*

---

**Appendix** -

---

**Quality assurance:** -

---

**Discussion:** -

---

**Conclusion:** No other business than MHR asking the student members of the Study Board to respond to her e-mail about Teacher of the Year.

---

## Action list from TB-SN meetings 2023

Last updated 16-04-2023

### Done

- JRF has informed Tom Børsen that TB-SN has agreed on including the 'Ingeniørarbejde' education as part of the list of acknowledged educations for uptake for SD and TAN.
- JRF has informed the legal department about the curriculum change regarding 'Ingeniørarbejde'.
- TB-SN decided on a procedure for follow up regarding semester planning in relation to revision process and status.
- Mette has sent out a suggestion for a new survey for educational evaluation that MBQ I part of commenting on.

### In progress

- Maj-Britt & Lars are working on a guideline for studying abroad on the bachelor and will also develop a list of previous studies abroad to exemplify possibilities.
- The focus group interview in CPH was again postponed – this time due to too little attendance of students. Maj-Britt will consider how to follow up.
- Janni has raised the issue of formulations regarding requirements of a doctor's note in order to ensure that it is clear to ask the doctor to write that it is based on a physical examination.
- Regarding student well-being, a focus group has been held in AAL and some focus areas are beginning to form. More follow-up is needed in terms of developing some initiatives for our action plan.
- Maj-Britt has contacted the TAN task force regarding how to follow up on discussing further support from Louise regarding the TAN CPH closure.
- Maj-Britt has sent an e-mail to semester coordinators to follow up on the idea about having funds to make TAN2 and TAN3 groups from AAL collaborate with students in CPH.
- Maj-Britt has followed up with Frederikke in relation to map out where kitchen facilities could be placed and what is needed.
- Maj-Britt will follow up on discussing the application of the new template for all of our educations with the administration. Consider if we could develop a template in Teams so it is easier to do.

### Pending

- Debate article for Navigator (to do).
  - The format is 3-4 pages. Deadline within a month, if we can make that.
- When Mette has produced a list with an overview of digital tools, Maj-Britt should take this up at a DSUR meeting to coordinate across study boards.
- Economic budget for alumni activities?! (Andrés is frontrunner)
- Maj-Britt discusses follow up on pedagogical initiatives so it becomes more systematic. Also issue in terms of hours for that.
- Maj-Britt will look into ways of finding data about students' expectations of the study programme in the study start tests to see if this can help to elaborate the quantitative data from the evaluations.
- Maj-Britt and Janni will plan a work meeting to go through this list to sort it out.

- Maj-Britt follow up regarding visualisation of progression for our studies with PK – this could be included in the Moodle semester rooms. Need to check what this was about in the self-evaluation report and minutes from self-evaluation meeting in 2020.
- Maja calls in the student members for a meeting about selecting teacher of the year.
- Maj-Britt should talk with Emilie about having the SD2 pilot project on semester group dialogues on TAN8 as well.
- AFP will look into implementing and investigating the subjects of study environment, culture and well-being into the work of the tutor corps in TAN BSc, and LTC will plan and conduct interviews with SD student representatives.
- MBQ will follow up on Thirdrom regarding this issue about data security and sharing.
- MBQ will push the new layout to the coming 1<sup>st</sup> semester students and have the study secretaries implement it.
- MBQ will inform the first semester coordinators and course coordinators about the new layout.
- MBQ will have a talk with Jan Svendsen about the new Moodle layout to coordinate how the study secretaries should contribute.
- MBQ and JRF will ensure that the two roles from March 2023 minutes are implemented in the coming semester descriptions.
- MBQ and JRF will produce an action plan to remind the programme coordinators and semester coordinators about semesters with new curriculums and setup meetings for coordination/planning meeting about the given semesters.
- The programme coordinators will look into and handle visualization of progressions in order to implement in semester rooms.
- JRF will draft a text for SD3 semester description about the 'fifth' option of credit transfer.
- JRF will send the response about the SD3 semester description to the semester coordinator.
- Program coordinators finalize the agendas for recruitment panel meetings and ensure to find new recruitment panel members.