



## Mintes from TB study board meeting

June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2022, 12.30-15.00

### **Present:**

**Members:** Maj-Britt Quitzau (Head of Study Board), Lars Botin (Programme coordinator TAN CPH), Maurizio Teli (Programme coordinator TAN AAL), Andrés Felipe Valderrama Pineda (Programme coordinator SD CPH), Signe Pedersen (Programme coordinator BD CPH), Maja Elisabeth Hultberg Rasmussen (student rep. TAN AAL), Gorka Diaz (student rep. BD/SD).

**Observers:** Laura Telling Clausen (student study councillor BD/SD), Kristina Contaoi Nielsen (new student study councillor TAN AAL), Janni Rise Frellsen (Study Board secretary), Diana Wolff Bie (study secretary TAN AAL and minute taker); Emilie Stenberdt Nielsen (Employability consultant).

### **Absent:**

**Members:** Andreas Birkbak (rep. Dep. of Culture and Learning CPH) – mandate to Maj-Britt; Bob Mølgaard Sørensen (student rep. TAN AAL) – mandate to Maja; Petrine Tveden (student rep. BD/SD) – no mandate.

**Observers:** Marc Dean Mejnert (student study councillor TAN CPH); Rasmus Mølgaard Hansen (student study councillor TAN AAL); Astrid Oberborbeck (rep. Dep. of Culture and Learning AAL); Helene Nynne Lauterbach Sandholdt (student rep. BD);

### **Locations:**

CPH: ACM15 2.1.023 (at Globegangen)

AAL: RDB14 4.307

Online link

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

### Follow-up for others

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

### **Meeting agenda**

1. Approval of agenda
2. Information from study board chair and secretary
  - a. Mail from Maja concerning problems with the identification and classification of the TAN education both in the SU system and IDA. Maj-Britt will follow-up.
  - b. Positive meeting between BD program coordinator and Head of Studies about the BD revision. Further focus by the Head of Studies on digital tools (mapping of these). Overall, a good plan and we will move forward with approval with the pro-dean.
  - c. The two study boards have updated the guidelines for application of study board funds for students. The deadline has been pushed from 1-3 to 5-3 and 1-10 to 5-10, so that it corresponds to the deadline of the funds from the Head of Study. We have also made it clearer that there are limited funds.
  - d. The SD3 module on entrepreneurship has been approved and is integrated in the semester description and study regulation.
  - e. TAN5 has received an approval to do a written exam instead of an oral exam in the ethics course.
  - f. Information from meeting with the pro-rector about the new AAU Innovation and Science Hub building, which we should remember to utilize for external panels, teaching, etc.
  - g. New rules regarding student study councillors, opening hours and computers

3. Short recapitulation of points from earlier meetings (appendix)  
*This point on the agenda contains the action list from previous meetings. The list helps to ensure that all actions from the meetings are executed. At each meeting, the main deliverables and updates are outlined.*
4. Exemptions and documentation  
*Janni has had a dialogue with the Educational Law department and the other study board about exemptions regarding 1<sup>st</sup> year requirements. AAU has a rule that in order to access re-exams, students must have participated in the ordinary exam in the given exam period. This causes problems as we have discussed earlier. It's a follow up on this regarding an earlier meeting, where Janni had to leave before we handled this point.*
5. **Semester descriptions Autumn 2022 (appendix)**  
*The semester descriptions are reviewed, discussed and approved. There have been some revisions of the template for semester descriptions for TAN and some of these issues are discussed in general. Including the new overview table, the re-exam information for projects and a less specified course module description. The program coordinators are expected to have looked the descriptions through for their educations. The chair has included feedback and produced an overview of issues and concerns to raise.*
6. **External panel meeting (appendix)**  
*Follow up on recruitment to the external panel meeting. It is a new rule that Pernille will participate at all the meetings as Head of Studies. As discussed last time, we need to adjust the panels according to Nanna's report. Last time, we agreed on a meeting between the study board chair, program coordinators, employability employee and VIP Career. At this meeting we would like a broad dialogue on what we want with these panels and how to make the meetings with them fruitful for both them and our educations.*
7. Dialogue about delays and leave among students (Andrés) (appendix)  
*Andrés is experiencing a lot of leave and delays regarding SD3 and is looking into this. Andrés will present his findings based on the dialogue with the students and we will discuss how to address this, since it provides challenges for both students and teachers. On one side there is the pressure to push the students through the education on nominated time, while on the other side, we have to acknowledge that many (and more) students are struggling during their education.*
8. Dialogue about the strategic process concerning research-based foundation of teaching  
*The head of studies has initiated a dialogue about research base foundation. How does the study board view this approach and do we wish to have a say about how the process is done and which areas of expertise that should be involved in each education. This point should be an open dialogue about this to also discuss the role of the study board and how it might impact the quality of our educations.*
9. Pilotstudy regarding new student app for projects (appendix - confidential)  
*The AAU administration is currently considering developing/applying a new student app, which will help to support student reflect about their competences and provide a connective platform for companies/organisations and students to identify interesting real-life projects. This is very new and innovative. It is still unsure which platform will be used, so the appendix is just a proposal. Maj-Britt and Sidse has suggested that BD/SD and TAN could serve as pilots, so we want a dialogue about the idea of such a platform, which semesters it would be most relevant to approach and how we can best embrace incorporation of such an idea (especially in this early phase).*
10. Any other business (AOB)  
*This is a standard point on the agenda if some of the members of the study board should have any issues that they would like to raise. Please do also remember that you can always ask for having points on the agenda.*

## Meeting minutes

1. Approval of agenda  
The agenda was approved with an addition of point g. The study board was competent to make decisions, as enough members were present or represented by mandates. The minutes from the May meeting were approved without further comments.
2. Information from study board chair and secretary
  - a. Mail from Maja concerning problems with the identification and classification of the TAN education both in the SU system and IDA. Maj-Britt will follow-up.  
TAN is categorized as an engineering education in the SU system and with IDA. Maj-Britt has sent a description of the problem to IDA, which has already solved it. SU is also currently looking into the problem. Maj-Britt will follow up to make sure this mistake is corrected.
  - b. Positive meeting between BD program coordinator and Head of Studies about the BD revision. Further focus by the Head of Studies on digital tools (mapping of these). Overall, a good plan and we will move forward with approval with the Vice Dean.  
Pernille (Head of Studies) has asked her PA, Mette Brixen, to collect info about which digital

tools we use. Maj-Britt will await that the list is produced and suggests following up with a dialogue at the DSUR meetings with the TECH Vice Dean of education (Louise).

- c. The two study boards have updated the guidelines for application of study board funds for students. The deadline has been pushed from March 1 to March 5 (spring semester) and from October 1 to October 5 (fall semester), so that it corresponds to the application deadline of the funds from the Head of Studies. We have also made it clearer that there are limited funds. The application deadlines for 'Funding for activities for student project work' (study board funds) and 'Financing of activities related to the study environment' (Head of Studies funds) has been aligned, so that they are both March 5 (spring semester) and October 5 (fall semester) to avoid confusion and to give the students a little longer to apply for funds for their project work. The application deadlines for 'Financing of semester study activities' (study board funds) are still January 15 (spring semester) and August 15 (fall semester). Also, we have emphasized that the study board funds for student project work are limited, and that travels abroad usually cannot be funded. This is since the study board has prior received several applications for very large amounts which we have not been able to accept resulting in disappointed students. Also, the max. amount pr student is lowered from 2500 DKK to 2000 DKK.

- d. The SD3 module on entrepreneurship has been approved and integrated in the semester description and study regulation.

Done.

- e. TAN5 has received an approval to do a written exam instead of an oral exam in the ethics course.

TAN5 has received an approval from the Educational Law department at AAU to do a written exam instead of an oral exam in the course Ethics and Technological Intervention Processes in the Fall 2022 semester.

The examination format for the 5<sup>th</sup> semester course *Ethics and Technological Intervention* is 'oral examination'. However, due to experienced challenges with this examination format in the course the study board has applied for and received an exemption to change the examination format in the course from an oral examination to a written examination at the Fall 2022 semester. Based on the approval of our application, the format has been changed in the Fall 22 semester descriptions. The exemption is only relevant for Fall 2022 as the new 2022 curriculum will enter into force at the 5<sup>th</sup> semester from Fall 2023, and in the new curriculum the course examination format in the specific course is 'written or oral' allowing us to choose.

- f. Information from meeting with the Vice Rector about the new AAU Innovation and Science Hub building, which we should remember to utilize for external panels, teaching, etc.

The new AAU Innovation and Science Hub is in AAL, so it might be difficult for CPH to use it, but we can use it for meetings with our external panels and special teaching workshops. It is placed physically on Niels Jernes Vej in Aalborg East. It is possible to get a guided tour of the buildings.

- g. New rules regarding student study councillors, opening hours and computers.

The study board has chosen to give an exemption from the rules about fixed opening hours for our student study councillors. They are allowed to have more flexible opening hours. It is, however, important that there is a clear formulation at our website about how to get in contact with our councillors.

The student study councillors must have an AAU work computer according to the new rules. Pernille (Head of Studies) will buy a computer for each. If the student study councillors so wish, they can choose the computer to match what they already have. Wishes from the councillors should be sent to Maj-Britt, and she will forward to Pernille. If the AAU computer is not compatible with their own computer, so they need to shift between the two computers, it is agreed that they are allowed to reduce their flexibility and to communicate how often they will check their mail and reply.

In the new rules, there are also requirements regarding certain courses. Maj-Britt will try to systematise follow up regarding this in relation to the yearly employee satisfaction talks (MUS) that she has with the student study councillors.

3. Short recapitulation of points from earlier meetings (appendix)

*This point on the agenda contains the action list from previous meetings. The list helps to ensure that all actions from the meetings are executed. At each meeting, the main deliverables and updates are outlined.*

The list was not read out loud, but can be found in the appendix.

There was a question about when staff can apply for funds to do semester activities for the students.

Janni answered, that an email will be sent out to the semester coordinators the same week as this meeting, and that the application deadline is August 15.

4. Exemptions and documentation

*Janni has had a dialogue with the Educational Law department and the other study board about exemptions regarding 1<sup>st</sup> year requirements. AAU has a rule that in order to access re-exams, students must have participated in the ordinary exam in the given exam period. This rule causes problems as we have discussed earlier. It's a follow up on this regarding an earlier meeting, where Janni had to leave before we handled this point.*

At the study board meeting in April, we discussed the rule in 'Rules for Course and Exam Registration and Credit Transfer at AAU' stating that a student who has not participated in the ordinary examination cannot participate in the reexamination within the same exam period but can only register for the following ordinary examination. This rule has caused some problems and frustrations for us, as one of our first year BSc students did not participate in the S22 ordinary examination (without the presence of extraordinary circumstances), which means that the student should not be allowed to participate in the reexamination. However, due to another rule stating that students who have not participated in all examinations before the end of their first year of study following enrolment will be withdrawn from the University, this would result in us having to terminate the student's enrollment at our study programme, leaving us with a higher dropout rate. Another first year student was sick at the S22 ordinary examination and afterwards handed in a doctor's note to be registered as 'sick' and sign up for the reexamination. Unfortunately, the study board was not able to accept the doctor's note as valid documentation for illness, as it did not contain a medical examination but only stated that the student had informed the doctor about being sick. Thus, the student was registered as 'absent' at the ordinary examination not allowing him to participate in the reexamination – again leading to termination of enrollment due to a lack of participation in all examinations before the end of his first year of study. Janni spoke to the AAU Legal Department about the challenges that the above situations caused for both the students and the study board, such as us having to terminate the enrollment of the students, as there were not documented extraordinary circumstances justifying an exemption. They were already aware of these challenges and working on possibly removing the rule that students who had not participated in the ordinary examination cannot participate in the reexamination within the same exam period as the rule do not have the desired effect. Also, they were working on finding an alternative way for students to document illness if they are not able to get a medical evaluation. The AAU Legal Department understood the study board's dilemma in relation to on one hand having to follow the rules, and on the other hand not wishing to exclude students from our study programmes. However, we are not allowed to create our own practice by e.g., giving all students a chance for an exemption from the rule. Instead, we must make sure to evaluate each case individually and decide based on the given circumstances and the consequences for the student. **The study board allows Janni and Maj-Britt to individually assess these student cases, and only special cases or decisions resulting in the student having to leave the program are handled at study board meetings. It is also agreed that we must try to communicate the requirements regarding a doctor's note more clearly to the students.** Janni will follow up with the administration to ensure that we include in our guidelines what must be put into the

doctors note, so that we ensure that students do not get into problems regarding a doctor's not that does not follow the guidelines.

5. **Semester descriptions Autumn 2022 (appendix)**

*The semester descriptions are reviewed, discussed and approved. There have been some revisions of the template for semester descriptions for TAN and some of these issues are discussed in general. Including the new overview table, the re-exam information for projects and a less specified course module description. The program coordinators are expected to have looked the descriptions through for their educations. The chair has included feedback and produced an overview of issues and concerns to raise. (See the overview in the appendix for more detailed corrections).*

BD1: The semester description for BD1 is approved with some minor updates and revisions.

It especially needs definition of page numbers allowed for the project.

Reexamination of PBL in week 2: Normally the reexamination periods are in August and February, but it is possible to place it where we wish to and where it makes sense. We can be flexible with the different educations.

However, Andres remarked, that students who fail a course are probably already overworked during that period and they will need more time to study. Therefore, the reexamination should be later. **It is generally agreed that coordinators should be made aware that re-examinations should be planned in either August and February.**

BD3: The semester description for BD3 cannot be approved, because key course coordinators are still missing. The study board discusses when to approve or not to approve a description and **it is agreed that it is a minimum requirement for approval that the appropriate coordinators have been appointed and have taken part of editing the semester description.**

BD5: The semester description for BD5 is approved with minor revisions. Better descriptions concerning the electivity of the projects is needed. We must have electivity according to the rules. The electivity is connected to the project modules, and when the same instructions are planned for two elective projects and students do not have a free choice due to group formation issues, then it becomes an issue regarding electivity.

Laura remarked that the students (under previous curricula) found it frustrating that the choice of the 5<sup>th</sup> semester elective project was not written on the diploma. All students got the same title.

There was a comparison and discussion relating to TAN5, which has a similar electivity. Lars Botin clarified that as this is now the 2020 curriculum: this is the first time that TAN5 has electives on 5<sup>th</sup> semester, as they now have the 2020 curriculum. Last year it was the 2019 curriculum.

Maj-Britt suggests that a solution could be to have a free choice of project and then let the students e.g. follow instructions for either one of the two project profiles (materials or infrastructure). So, divide the current instructions in the semester description into each elective project module. If students would like to follow both, they could.

Andres remarked that he fears that the students would then only attend one of the electives, and the teachers would like them to follow both.

The electives also result in administrative issues, because the students are asked to choose, but the electives are not explained until the new semester starts. This results in a lot of uncertainty and frustrations among the students. The secretaries explain that the electives can wait until mid-september for sign-up, so we could encourage the students to simply wait or inform them better that they can change their election after group formation. **It is decided that this is an important issue that we need to address** and follow up on. **Janni will make sure to inform semester coordinators** that they have to communicate and respect the electivity better in the semester descriptions and throughout the election process.

Excursions on BD5 and SD1: These two semesters have indicated needs for funds directly in the semester descriptions. The funds are not automatically approved just because the coordinators put it into the semester description. They will still have to apply for it and we need a budget from the

coordinators. The decision about what to fund will be followed up on the August meeting, where this is on the agenda. **Maj-Britt will be it put on the August meeting agenda.**

SD1: The semester description for SD1 is approved with minor revisions.

SD3: The semester description of SD3 is approved, including the new entrepreneurship module.

TAN1 CPH: The semester description for TAN1 CPH is approved with some minor revisions.

TAN3 CPH: The semester description for TAN3 CPH is approved with some revisions.

TAN5 CPH: The semester description for TAN5 CPH cannot be approved, since one of the courses has not been updated yet. Also, a remark that – APA vs. Chicago style under plagiarism is not aligned, but there is agreement that the students should be able to juggle different styles. .

TAN7 CPH: The semester description for TAN7 CPH cannot be approved, since it has not been looked through by an appointed semester coordinator.

TAN9 CPH: The semester description for TAN9 CPH is approved with some minor revisions.

TAN1 AAL: The semester description for TAN1 AAL cannot be approved, because some part of the text (introduction + P1) reflects the old curriculum. The semester coordinator has to correct this to fit the new curriculum. Also, some of the course texts have to be corrected.

TAN3 AAL: The semester description for TAN3 AAL is approved with minor revisions as indicated in the file.

TAN5 AAL: The semester description for TAN5 AAL is approved with minor revisions.

TAN7 AAL: The semester description for TAN7 AAL is approved with minor revisions as indicated in the file.

TAN9 AAL: The semester description for TAN9 AAL is approved with some minor revisions and comments regarding missing exam dates and text.

## 6. **External panel meeting (appendix)**

*Follow up on recruitment to the external panel meeting. It is a new rule that Pernille will participate at all the meetings as Head of Studies. As discussed last time, we need to adjust the panels according to Nanna's report. Last time, we agreed on a meeting between the study board chair, program coordinators, employability employee and VIP Career. At this meeting we would like a broad dialogue on what we want with these panels and how to make the meetings with them fruitful for both them and our educations.*

SD external panel is missing public representatives, but otherwise this panel looks good and is well functioning.

TAN external panel only had 2 participants at the last meeting, so this needs to be improved.

### What do we want to use these panels for?

The panels are about keeping our educations updated according to what is needed in the “real” world. We also need them for branching out.

Maurizio remarked that we have an agreement with Sidse to contact certain companies, which are part of a think tank. The people at this think tank should be easy to get to participate in the panel meetings, as we have a kind of value alignment with them. There is a market there that we need to cultivate. We could also try to reach out to NetCompany or CMI, who also employ many TAN graduates.

Maja remarked that the TAN alumni could talk to their leaders of companies about participation.

Maj-Britt suggested that we consider who could be relevant to invite. Should it be HR people that focus on recruitment or more academic directors or is it ok with our own candidates.

Maj-Britt suggests that we should discuss how we advertise our external panels better and also make it clear what we expect from them and what we offer. Emilie also mentions that there are some potentials in terms of collaborating with the members of the external panels in relation to other events at AAU.

Maurizio mentioned that the original list of members for the TAN panel has 14 names, and since we

only need 5-6 in the revised external panel, we will have to make difficult choices. Maurizio remarked that we need to make sure for TAN that we get people withjn health, digitalization and sustainability. **It is decided that it would be good at the coming meetings with the external panels to have a dialogue with them about how we can best make use of each other. We need to be clear about what the differences between the TAN and SD panels are as well as having a very clear and relevant agenda for the meetings that we keep to. Next, we send out a minimum of material with specific questions for the participants.**

The next external panel meetings will be scheduled in October, so we need to get in contact with people soon. As a study board, we need to be more specific about what we want to do with the meetings, so this needs to be clear asap.

**Maj-Britt will invite to a preparatory meeting with the responsible (Career coordinators, program coordinators, Emilie and herself) in August.** The study board should also be included in the dialogue about the focus of each agenda.

7. Dialogue about delays and leave among students (Andrés) (appendix)

*Andrés is experiencing a lot of requests for leave and delays regarding SD3 and is looking into this. Andrés will present his findings based on the dialogue with the students and we will discuss how to address this, since it provides challenges for both students and teachers. On one side there is the pressure to push the students through the education on nominated time, while on the other side, we have to acknowledge that many (and more) students are struggling during their education.*

Andrés presented the dilemma and stressed that 1-2 students normally apply for leave before 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> semester each year, but that this year it is 8 students which is a lot.

They all have in common that they are overburdened due to jobs, family situations, health situations etc. and they are all having psychotherapy outside uni.

So how do we handle that they cannot have a full time study, as they need to work, at the same time as we need to handle the rules/restrictions coming from the government about pushing the students quickly through?

Maj-Britt remarked that some of the key performance indicators that we have in our system are conflicting. For example, study jobs are important to get access to the labour market (employability), but at the same time the students must study full time and get through their educations as quickly as possible (finishing at norm).

Study jobs *are* the main thing that leads to a job afterwards, which means that we could be sabotaging it with the demand of full-time studies.

We have an unrealistic structure for students who must have jobs.

Emilie commented that at SD, it is necessary to have a job during the education as the students will not have a job afterwards if they do not.

Maj-Britt stressed that this is a delicate balancing act and that we need to figure out what the consequences are. Janni e.g. stressed that there are economic benefits connected to students finishing at the norm.

There was a suggestion of a pedagogical seminar for teachers about this, as this could be a very good topic for it. We need to have a 360-degree view of this.

**Maj-Britt stated that we will not reach a final conclusion here, but this represents an important theme in our action plan. We agreed to push upwards by outlining the challenges through e.g. a letter. And we also have the focus groups ahead of us with the students, where we hopefully can get a better idea about how to help the students in the daily practice. Maj-Britt will include this point on the action list to ensure that we follow up.**

8. Dialogue about the strategic process concerning research-based foundation of teaching

*The head of studies has initiated a dialogue about research base foundation. How does the study board*

*view this approach and do we wish to have a say about how the process is done and which areas of expertise that should be involved in each education. This point should be an open dialogue about this to also discuss the role of the study board and how it might impact the quality of our educations.*

**Postponed** to the August meeting. There should be an academic dialogue about this.

9. Pilot study regarding new student app for projects (appendix - confidential)

*The AAU administration is currently considering developing/applying a new student app, which will help to support student reflect about their competences and provide a connective platform for companies/organisations and students to identify interesting real-life projects. This is very new and innovative. It is still unsure which platform will be used, so the appendix is just a proposal. Maj-Britt and Sidse has suggested that BD/SD and TAN could serve as pilots, so we want a dialogue about the idea of such a platform, which semesters it would be most relevant to approach and how we can best embrace incorporation of such an idea (especially in this early phase).*

The necessary material has not been received before the meeting.

There is a development process about creating a new student app that can act as both project database and student competence profiling. **The further details of this app is confidential and will not be summarized.** The startup company behind it is called Third life. It is kind of like a LinkedIn for students and businesses. It will be like a mix between a project portfolio and a professional Tinder, where students can contact each other, and businesses can see CVs etc.

Maj-Britt and Sidse had a meeting with the responsible project leader from the administration, and we have agreed to be testpilots for it. It will be from sometime this autumn. They plan to make a decision about the platform soon and will get back to us afterwards. Sidse and Maj-Britt already have a follow up meeting arranged together. **Ideas concerning which semesters would be good to use for the test must be sent to Maj-Britt.**

10. Any other business (AOB)

*This is a standard point on the agenda if some of the members of the study board should have any issues that they would like to raise. Please do also remember that you can always ask for having points on the agenda.*

Maurizio mentioned that they had an interdisciplinary project, where the examination did not go well. He would like to direct attention on how to make such innovative collaborations more smooth in the future. Maj-Britt mentioned that two students from TAN CPH might be joining the study board after the summer vacation as observers, since Marc is now student study councillor, so we are missing two representatives from TAN CPH. This is especially important, because of the TAN CPH closure to ensure a good communication.

Maj-Britt mentioned that we need to follow up concerning the mail boxes for the intro courses on the master for SD and TAN. After Jorge has left his position there is nobody to respond at the mails that we are receiving here. Diana and Maj-Britt will coordinate and make sure that students get enrolled and get answers.