Minutes from TB Study Board meeting

Date:	26-09-2022	Time:	12.30 – 15.00
Place:	AAL: RDB14 4.307 / KBH: ACM15 2.1.025 / Online via Teams		
Catering:	Lunch provided		
Minute-taker:	Study secretary Diana Wolff Bie		

Participants:

Name	Rolle	Attendance
Study Board Members		
Maj-Britt Quitzau (MBQ)	Study Board Chair	Present (AAL)
Lars Botin (LB)	Programme coordinator TAN CPH	Present (CPH)
Maurizio Teli (MT)	Programme coordinator TAN AAL	Present - online
Andrés F. Valderrama Pineda (AVP)	Programme coordinator SD	Present (CPH)
Signe Pedersen (SP)	Programme coordinator BD	Present (CPH)
Maja E. Hultberg Rasmussen (MHR)	Student rep. TAN AAL	Present (AAL)
Petrine Tveden (PT)	Student rep. BD/SD	Present (CPH)
Bob Mølgaard Sørensen (BMS)	Student rep. TAN AAL	Absent – mandate: MHR
Gorka Diaz (GD)	Student rep. BD/SD	Absent – mandate: PT
Andreas Birkbak (AB)	Rep. Department of Culture and Learning CPH)	Absent for maternity leave – mandate: AOA / MBQ
Observers		
Janni Rise Frellsen (JRF)	Study board secretary	Present (CPH)
Laura Telling Clausen (LTC)	Student study councillor BD/SD	Present (CPH)
Marc Dean Mejnert (MDM)	Observer (student study councillor TAN CPH)	Present (CPH)
Kristina Contaoi Nielsen (KCN)	Observer (student study councillor TAN AAL)	Present (AAL)
Helene N. Lauterbach Sandholdt (HLS)	Observer (student observer BD)	Absent
Bianca C. Irineu Fornill (BIF)	Observer (Guest student observer TAN CPH)	Present (CPH)
Emma Veland (EV)	Observer (Guest student observer TAN CPH)	Present (CPH)
Astrid Oberborbeck Andersen (AOA)	Rep. Department of Culture and Learning CPH	Present - online
Diana Wolff Bie (DWB)	Study secretary TAN AAL	Present (AAL)
Guest		
Frederikke Kusk Ødum	Guest, Study Environment responsible PLAN	Present (CPH)
Tom Børsen	Carree responsible for TAN CPH (KVIP)	Present - online
Christian Nøhr	Carree responsible for TAN AAL (KVIP)	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

Follow-up for Janni and Maj-Britt
Follow-up for others

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

AGENDA

1. Approval of agenda and meeting minutes from last meeting
2. Information from Study Board Chair and Secretary
3. Follow-up status
4. Agenda for Recruitment Panel meetings and status on members
5. Study environment update
6. Nordplus application
7. Graduation ceremony
8. Case: Reading material on TAN5 Ethics exam
9. Delayed students
10. Any other business

MINUTES

1. Approval of agenda and meeting minutes from last meeting

Timeframe:	12.30 – 12.35	**Responsible:**	MBQ/DWB

Presentation:	*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.*
Appendix	Minutes from TB-SN meeting from August 2022 (appendix 1)
Quality assurance:	-
Discussion:	None.
Conclusion:	The agenda was approved. The study board was competent to make decisions, as enough members were present or represented by mandates. The minutes from the August meeting were approved without further comments.

2. Information from Study Board Chair and Secretary

Timeframe:	12.35 – 12.45	**Responsible:**	MBQ/JRF

Presentation:	a. *TAN closure meeting* b. *TAN title in SU system* c. *Presentation of TB-SN on first semesters* d. *Status on BD revision – need for new approval in October*
Appendix	E-mail correspondence regarding SU (appendix 2b)
Quality assurance:	-
	a.TAN closure meeting. Maj-Britt gave a brief report from the TAN closure meeting. It was a good and constructive meeting. Louise Møller Haase (Vice Dean for TECH education) understood the feedback from students and teachers about our challenges, but wants us to be more specific about what we want to do. She asked for a more formal request for support, which Maj-Britt will follow up on through the task force. One of the suggestions was to get some mentoring regarding such a closure process. Pernille (Head of Studies) and Maj-Britt has met up with Eva Brooks, who was involved in the closure of Medialogy in Esbjerg and

sparred with her about the closure in TAN CPH. The dialogue showed that we are working in the right direction and it gave some good support. The TAN task force had developed a manifest for the meeting with Louise with the purpose of turning the frustrations into something constructive. Maj-Britt, Pernille (Head of Studies) and Maja have had some exchanges over mail about how to communicate this manifest to the students and it is agreed that oral dialogue is better than written. Communication with the students represent a core issue. Maj-Britt would like to prioritize some of our TB-SN ressources for some social and academic events that promote and celebrate TAN (in alignment with the manifest), so we can mobilise the students to do some fun stuff and use the opportunity to talk about the closure in a more constructive way.

Pernille (Head of studies) has also arranged a meeting with the Dept. of Culture and Learning in order to talk about the importance of ensuring that they can meet our requisitions during the closure period. Besides Pernille, Maj-Britt and Anne (Head of Department) will participate as well as the managers from the department of Culture and Learning.

b.TAN title in SU system.
The TAN title is not correct in the SU system, still – it says engineer. We have tried to get this changed, but the problem is that they are using a general code at AAU for a larger group of educations, so the result of all of our efforts is that it can, unfortunately, not be changed at this time.

c.Presentation of TB-SN on first semesters.
Maj-Britt is visiting the new semesters these days (1st semester for bachelor and master). It works well to get a proper contact to the students with this informal dialogue.

d.Status on BD revision – need for new approval in October.
Maj-Britt had a meeting with Louise (Vice Dean of TECH education) and Pernille (Head of studies). Louise remarked that we need to be a little more strategic and political in terms of how we present the education and the titles that we give projects and courses. She underlined the need to visualize and show that the education has a strong technical focus. Louise recommended that we update the titles of the courses so they reflect the technical contents more clearly.
Signe has updated the overview to make it more clear, that there are many technical courses.

Laura remarked that we have to make sure that the titles are serious and precise, so they make sense to the students instead of confusing them. If the main focus is on making them more technical, this aspect may be overlooked. There is agreement that this is an important balancing act. Maj-Britt reminded the study board that the revision has to be approved again of the study board before it becomes effective. It will, however, have to be approved via email this time due to the time frame. Please be aware of this.

3. Follow-up status	
Timeframe:	12.45 – 13.00 **Responsible:** MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	*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. The action list is inserted in the end of minutes from each TB-SN meeting.
Appendix	Updated action list (appendix 3)
Quality assurance:	Follow-up and execution of decisions and items
Discussion:	Maj-Britt asked if there were any comments to the list. None were given.
Conclusion:	No comments to the list.

4. Agenda for Recruitment Panel meetings and status on members

Timeframe:	13.00 – 13.15 **Responsible:** MBQ/Program coordinators
Presentation:	*Program coordinators have prepared an outline of the agenda for the Recruitment Panel Meeting for TAN and BD/SD. Pernille (Head of Studies) is participating in the meetings, and we should decide whether and what she should eventually say. There is a new procedure in relation to recruitment panels that imply that we need to get approval of the members and inform them about the new formalities. Maj-Britt has prepared an overview of the new recruitment panels and a cover letter for our Head of Department and the Vice Dean of TECH education. Emilie (employability) and Maj-Britt have also developed a flyer that informs the members about what a recruitment panel is and the formalities of the panel that we would like to get feedback on. Both agendas and members need to be approved by TB-SN. The Career responsible for TAN and SD have been invited to participate at this item.*
Appendix	Description of the new procedure for recruitment panels, overview of recruitment panels for approval by management and internal flyer on recruitment panels (appendix 4)
Quality assurance:	Recruitment panel item
Discussion:	*Status on members:* SD: only one person has been changed. Maj-Britt has developed a letter for the panel to be approved by the study board. The revision is going to be the main topic at the SD panel meeting. Pernille is going to be there at both panel meetings to introduce and explain the new procedure and rules, for example that they will be elected for 4 years at a time. TAN: There were 14-16 members before, and we are cutting it down to 6. Maurizio remarked that we still need a reply from the democracy people. It is agreed that Maj-Britt's proposal to include a few of the old members in case we do not succeed in recruiting new one's. We have recruited a lot of new members, so it look goods. Agenda of the TAN panel meeting has not yet been determined. There was a discussion of how to make it more attractive to be part of the panel. Several suggestions were made: We need to make a matching of expectations in terms of what the recruitment panel is and does, perhaps in the form of PR material. It was suggested that we develop and show small videos about the latest and greatest reports and technologies addressed in Technoanthropology. It is

relevant to discuss new skills with the recruitment panel, and perhaps also elaborate on the new digitalization elements.

We have previously in panel meetings discussed employability, but it needs to be more concrete.

We also used to present all the MSc theses for the panel. But another format could be an idea here. Videoformat or poster session from the students for example. Tom suggested a prize for the best poster for the students to motivate them to contribute to this.

The possibilities for internship and project collaboration could also be an important and interesting topic for the panel members.

Maja suggested that we ask the recruitment panel what information they would like to have or what they would like to discuss. On the other educations at PLAN, they have to hand in a video presentation about what they have been doing, about 3 weeks after the deadline for master thesis.

Kristina has had a talk with Sidse from Communication about making videos and presentations on what we are working on in AAL. These videos are for the education website. Kristina suggests that we could perhaps use this work for the recruitment panel as well.

Janni will send out the agenda approx. mid-October.

Maj-Britt will invite the programme coordinators for planning meetings.

Conclusion:	The list of members for the recruitment panel for SD is ready to be approved. For TAN, Maurizio and Maj-Britt will follow up regarding the last members that we need to clarify for the recruitment panel. When this is cleared, Maj-Britt will send it in for approval. Maj-Britt will call in for a meeting with the programme coordinators to discuss the agenda for the recruitment panel meeting in more detail. The good inputs from TB-SN should be taken into account, so that we work on making these meetings more attractive and beneficial for both the members in the recruitment panel and our education.

5. Study environment update

Timeframe:	13.15 – 13.30	**Responsible:**	Frederikke Kusk Ødum (guest)

Presentation:	*Update on status and initiatives regarding study environment by Frederikke, who is study environment responsible at PLAN. Frederikke presents the feedback from students from semester evaluations and outline some of the initiatives that study management at PLAN are focusing on. TB-SN provide their input and the efforts are discussed in order to ensure that initiatives respond to the most critical issues. Frederikke has been invited as guest for this item.*
Appendix	-
Quality assurance:	Study environment item
Discussion:	Frederikke outlined what has been done and what is in the pipeline regarding study environment with special emphasis on our educations. She has identified important themes in our semester evaluations. Already done: It is now possible for students to borrow dictaphones, video cameras etc. from the study secretaries at both campuses.

In some places in AAL, chalkboards have been replaced with whiteboards, and new chairs have required for study work spaces.
In CPH, there have been some problems with the temperature and toilets, which have been dealt with.
At both campuses, there has been an evaluation of the friendship group concept, and the outcome is largely positive. New posters with "Code of Conduct" have been made and sent out, as well as uploadet to moodle.

In progress:
A project on acoustics and sound throughout the CREATE building in AAL has started. It is expected to take a long time as the desire is to find the most optimal solution for the building and to get to the bottom of the acoustic challenges experienced by users.
And work is underway to create better space in the canteen in AAL for working.
In CPH, there are problems with indoor climate in several rooms at Frederikskaj.

In planning:
In AAL, more couches for the atrium are coming, and better signs that make it clear that the PLAN area is only for PLAN students and employees.
In CPH, green plants will be placed in room 1.66 and 2.66 in FKJ12, where the two large group rooms are for the students.

Semester evaluations:
TAN students in both AAL and CPH miss a sense of community – both socially and academically, especially TAN AAL miss social facilities.
And TAN students do not recognise that their student workspaces are able to support the academic environment.

Comments and wishes for Frederikke:
Laura asked for white board markers for the group rooms and study work places. This was discussed, because many of the students get these at the beginning, but fail to safe guard them. It is a balancing act and a discussion whether it is seen as part of the work environment or corresponds to e.g. pencils and so on that the students should buy.
Frederikke also explains that Head of Studies has decided that white board markers will not be provided for students in groups rooms and at study work places.
Maurizio requested an addition to the wanted-list, which is curtains for room 271 in Rendsburggade 6 in AAL.
Andres requested study rooms or work places for 9th and 10th semesters. This has long been a request to find a solution for this.
An option for these semesters could be the free seeting areas.
The lighting in the SD studios is not good enough, and they also need curtains.
Andres remarked that automatic lights in class rooms are problematic for teachers, as they cannot correct them when there is too much light.
Bianca talked about kitchen facilities for TAN group rooms, where they would like equipment, i.e. an electric kettle, a refrigerator, cutlery and plates. They also need room or space to meet.
Maj-Britt remarked that concerning space issues, some are PLAN's and

some are Campus's. There is a kitchen in AAL. <mark>Maj-Britt will follow up on how much is available where and what is possible</mark>.
<mark>Frederikke will help map out where these things could be placed, and what is needed exactly</mark>. For example to get a room from Campus Service to place this in or use for kitchen.

Pernille (Head of Studies) is taking over as chair of the Study Environment Council for Campus CPH. The council is responsible for the development of the study environment in Copenhagen.

Conclusion:	<mark>Frederikke will help map</mark> what is available kitchen-wise in AAL and what is possible in CPH. <mark>Maj-Britt will support</mark> and also look into it. Board markers will not be provided for students in group rooms and at study work places, since this have been decided by the Head of Studies. <mark>Frederikke has noted</mark> the other requests and feedback and will follow up.

6. Nordplus application

Timeframe:	13.30 – 13.45 **Responsible:** MBQ + program coordinators
Presentation:	*Maj-Britt and the program coordinators have prepared an initial outline of the application. The program coordinators have pointed out relevant collaborative partners and Maj-Britt has tried to formulate an overarching focus for the application. At the TB-SN meeting, we wish to discuss the draft with the aim of prioritizing partners to follow up with and further define and develop the focus of the application. The dialogue should enable further follow up and identify who will take the next steps.*
Appendix	Nordplus application draft (appendix 6)
Quality assurance:	Improve and develop teaching quality
Discussion:	Andres, Maurizio and Lars have sent round several names of collaborative partners and Maj-Britt has made a draft for a letter. This is not the final draft but only to move forward and contact institutions. And also to define what should the application be about and how to do this. Next step is: Who are the main institutions/collaborative partners to contact first and how? And what should the application look like? We also need to decide which students should meet up with whom, and in what format. And we need a budget. It is a agreed that the more specific dialogue is best to have in a working group. Something to remember in the preparations is, that Nordplus is more for big exchanges – entire classes, not individual students. Nordplus covers Aaland, Denmark, Estonia, Faraoe Islands, Finland, Greenland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden and South Schleswig. Maurizio suggested contacting the Nordplus Funding office, and to decide quickly who do we want to prioritise. Maj-Britt reminded the members that the applications must consist of: 1. Why do we want to do this? And 2. 'What is our 'mission'?' Nordplus is a possibility for both bachelors and masters. <mark>Maj-Britt will call for a working group meeting with the programme coordinators.</mark> After that, we will follow up with a meeting with the relevant project partners. When the format is in place, students (from TB-SN) could also be invited to the meeting to include their wishes and thoughts about it.

Conclusion:	<mark>Maj-Britt will set up a working group meeting</mark> with the programme coordinators to push the Nordplus application further. There is positive support for the application in TB-SN. It needs to be specified what the goal and mission is, who to involve from outside AAU and what the format should be. We also need to look at the budget.

7. Graduation ceremony

Timeframe:	14.00 – 14.15 **Responsible:** MBQ
Presentation:	*Pernille (Head of studies) has developed a new suggestion for the graduation ceremony for 2023 and would like feedback. The main changes are to give the candidate graduates an AAU coffee cup by saving the expenditure of the expensive folder they are currently given. It is also suggested to either abandon or minimize the ceremony for bachelors. This is because it is a heavy task, especially in CPH, to plan and execute both ceremonies. TB-SN talks about the suggestions and provide feedback and ideas on how to structure the ceremony.*
Appendix	Draft of new graduation ceremony (appendix 7)
Quality assurance:	-
Discussion:	There were two separate discussions for this item: Whether to remove the bachelors ceremony in both AAL and CPH (it has to be the same procedures in both cities to not discriminate), and whether to replace the usual envelope with a gift wrapped AAU mug.

Concerning the bachelors' ceremony: The possibility of changing the administrative work load is only possible in CPH, as CPH has two ceremonies, one for bachelors and one for masters. In AAL, it is all in one ceremony and removing the part of the ceremony for the bachelor students will only remove a very small part of the administrative work load. After a short discussion it was clear, that the ceremony has a lot of significance for both students and teachers. It was suggested, that if the administration finds the work load difficult then extra student assistance must be called in, either student workers or volunteers.

Concerning the expensive folders: It has already been decided by the administration not to use them in future ceremonies, so the question is whether to switch the usual envelope, which is handed to the students with their individual names on it, with a gift wrapped box with an AAU mug in it instead. This is the procedure at some of the other institutes at AAU. The envelope only has the competence profile in it, as the diploma is sent to the students via eBoks.

The cup was discussed in regards to replacing the envelope. Maurizio commented that no one would feel an honour in receiving an AAU mug at graduation unless it has the individual student's name on it. And as this would create even more work administratively, it is not an option. |

Conclusion:	TB-SN agrees that we want to keep the graduation ceremony for the bachelors, so we continue having the ceremony for the bachelors and for the master students together in AAL. ==Maj-Britt will provide== our inputs to the Head of Studies, especially the idea of finding a student helper to facilitate the organization. TB-SN is also very open about discussing the format in CPH to make it easier for the administration. TB-SN does not feel that funds should be mobilized for the mugs.

8. Case: Reading material on TAN5 Ethics exam

Timeframe:	14.15 – 14.30 **Responsible:** MBQ /Janni
Presentation:	*The TAN5 Ethics course has changed the exam format from oral to written. The new format has been applied at a re-examination, where both a student and the exam guard was surprised about the amount of material to read for a 4 hrs written exam. One of the course responsible has asked that TB-SN looks at the format and assess if the amount of reading material needed to answer the exam assignment is suitable. The exam assignment and the reading material for the re-examination is available in the appendix. TB-SN should make an assessment and provide feedback to the course responsible.*
Appendix	Exam assignment and exam reading material (appendix 8)
Quality assurance:	Teaching didactics and quality
Discussion:	The amount of reading material was discussed, specifically whether the reading material must be presented during the lectures in order for the students to have time to answer the cases during the 4-hour exam, and not just spend the entire time on reading new material. Tom remarked that it could be a good thing to present a new situation/case for the students at the exam, so they do not just repeat what was said in class, and that we therefore could figure out a structure for the exam for the students to have time to read new material. Maj-Britt remarked that another possibility could be to release the material a couple of days before the exam, so they can have new texts but also have some time to read the material. It could for example be released 24 or 48 hours before the written exam. This should be possible within the system. There is support for this idea. It was discussed whether the format should still be 4 hours or a 24 exam. Tom argued that with a 24 exam, the students tend to coordinate their answers. The students note that, when they collaborate they often learn more. It is agreed that the format with release of the exam case in advance provide a possibility for both reading and also for the students to discuss the case. At the same time, the students still have to answer the 4 hrs exam individually. A very satisfying result for everybody.
Conclusion:	TB-SN recommend that that the exam case (and the related reading material) is either given 24-48 hours in advance of the exam or form part of the lectures during the course. It is important for TB-SN that the students do not have too much new case reading to do as part of a short written exam. The questions for the case(s) will be given during the exam, e.g. a 4 hrs. written exam. Tom and Klavs can as course coordinators choose freely in terms of the details.

9. Delayed students

Timeframe:	14.30 – 14.45 **Responsible:** Janni
Presentation:	*Janni provides an overview of delayed students in order for TB-SN to look at the current status in our study programmes.*
Appendix	Overview of delayed students (appendix 9)
Quality assurance:	Delayed students
Discussion:	Janni explained the background for this item. Each semester we do a check up on the delayed students. The students are expected to pass 30 ECTS each semester, and if they do not do this, they are classified as delayed. There are different groups: red, yellow, green and white, depending on how many ECTS the students are behind. We take a look at whether there is a natural reason for the delay (for example maternity leave). If not, then we offer them a meeting and perhaps an individual study plan. This is not a policy aimed to kick them out of university, but in order to offer them assistance to get back on track. At present, approx. 60 students are delayed. 17 students are going to receive a letter from Janni, 10 Red and 7 yellow. This is an increase from previous years, but not an increase that causes concern.
Conclusion:	Janni will send out emails for the 17 students to offer them assistance and will have a meeting with those students who accept this invitation. TB-SN notices that the number of delayed students is increasing.

10. Any other business

Timeframe:	14.45 – 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:	None.
Conclusion:	None.

Subsequent processing of grant under item 6 from the August meeting:
The study board received an application after the August meeting, which study board members have voted for via email. Maurizio Teli and Petko Atanasov Karadechev have sent an application to the study board for a grant of 10.000-12.000 DKK to TAN7 AAL + CPH for transportation and meals, so the students with the two coordinators can see the exhibition "Post-Capital" at Kunsthal Charlottenborg and discuss it afterwards.
Conclusion: The study board approved via email the 10.000-12.000 DKK grant for the abovementioned field trip for TAN7 AAL and TAN7 CPH.