

Study Board ArT & Technology

Rendsburggade 14, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark Contact person: Anne Nielsen Phone: +45 9940 9919 E-mail: amn@hum.aau.dk

> Date: 18.08.2016 Case No.: Paste the file number

ArT Study Board – meeting–, June 22, 2016 at 9.00-12.00 Rendsburggade 14 room 5.237

Agenda

ArT Study Board members

Members		Present	Apologies	Not met
Ann Morrison	AM	X		
Betty Li Meldgaard	BLM		x	
Morten Søndergaard	MS		x	
Palle Dahlstedt	PD	X		
Preya Ravichandran	PR	X		
Rebekka Kolding Borum	RKB		x	
Signe Aagaard Häggqvist	SA	x		
Signe Smedegaard Frederiksen	SSF		x	
Malthe Roed Jensen (student counselor)	MRJ			x
Falk Heinrich (CAT-school)	FH		x	
Winnie Ritterbusch (CAT-school)	WR	X		
Minutes Taker:				
Anne Nielsen	AN	X		
Invited: Elizabeth Ann Jochum		X		
Start of meeting:	9.00			
End of meeting:	11.30			

Next meetings:

ArT Study Board **17.08.2016, 8.30-11.00** 01.12.2016, 14.00-18.00

ArT Advisory Board



Items:	Subject:
1.	Approval of Agenda 22.06.2016
	Approved
2.	Approval of Minutes 04.05.2016 (Attached)
	Approved
3.	Semester Guides Fall2016, ArT5, ArT3 and ArT1
	ArT5
	EAJ gave a summary of ArT5 semester guide. Working with Aalborg Theatre, all courses will be part of the project – and end up in a performance at the Theatre. There will be workshops and collaboration with external partners at the space and external guest lecturers. Fewer dances than last year and more performance. EAJ has changed other thing according to the student's remarks.
	Exhibition will be 3 performances.
	ArT3
	AM will have a talk to Markus of the missing content.
	ArT1
	Not received – coordinator will not be employed until August 1.
	WBR gave a short orientation about the new template and the history behind – has been sent to all coordinators, and asked them to pass it on to all teachers.
	The semester guides has to be handed in August 14, at 8 pm. to AN.
4.	News:
	Head of Study (PD)
	Study Board reorganization in CAT School– the department accept that ArT needs a research group. The main issue about having a master to each bachelor education has to be solved in another way.
	WBR – FH is analysing all answers from all educations. A meeting with Head of Department of Com- munication and the Dean and Pro Dean of the Faculty of the Humanities will take place in August. Conclusions from this meeting will be announced hereafter.
	The positive issue for ArT is that there will be an ArT Knowledge Group – still not settled.
	Reconstruction of ArT classroom . It is still in the planning face. PD has described ArTs use of space – both to work in, teach in and making project in to the Head of Department. SAH urge PD to send out an e-mail to all ArT students.
	Teachers Meeting August 18, 2016 all day.
	Students (SAH/RBK)



	No news.
	Students Supervisors (MRJ/RBK)
	No news.
	CAT-School (FH/WRB)
	Re-organizing the school structure at the department at Communication and Psychology. New school will be all study boards at the Department. Decision lies with the Dean of HUM.
	Focus area in AAU strategy – Students Intensity – Number of working hours. Notice it might be an issue that the board may examine.
5.	How do we make PR to recruit students from outside Denmark?
	Will be discussed at the teachers meeting.
	Especially the Nordic countries
	Study abroad is worth mentioning for marketing.
6.	Agreement with exchange universities. (Attached list of previously approved stay)
	Two new in pipeline – Winnie
	University of Bologna, Italy
	CESI – Centre de Rouen, France
	It is decided to continue the efforts to enter IIA (ERASMUS contracts) with the two programmes.
7.	IIM Censor årsberetning 2015
	PD gave a summary of the remarks for ArT,
	Comment to a module which was given in Fall2014 (exam) and in Spring 2015 (re exam).
	The ArT Board have been aware of the comment and the module was strengthened in Fall2015, and the current teacher (Fall 2016) will be made aware of the remark and make sure that the learning goal is addressed correctly.
	The general BA-project – the Bloom's taxonomy, answer to comment "Den Bloomske taxonomi kan være svær at bedømme gradueret"
	The censor comment is not very clear. Still, Bloom's taxonomy in itself consists of a series of degrees of learning. And weighted together, applied on a number of learning goals, censors should be able to decide upon a grade
8.	Items for next meeting.
	Semester Guides.
9.	Any further Business.



Request from censor on exam rigor, some points to mark against for

- 1. oral presentation
- 2. report and
- 3. finished product... guidelines for the students to work too and the examiners to mark against

For product we agreed on (for ArT4):

- 1. The overall standard of the work--function, aesthetics, valuable contribution, address Stigsborg brief, fit to be included in exhibition
- 2. Fabrication and execution level--the physical elements, how well executed?
- 3. Interactive system and interactive logic design (and functions well)
- 4. Audience experience (engaging or --what designing experience for? Is this 1) well thought out? Does it work well? How can be improved?)
- 5. Specificity of site (work anywhere--address site needs--audience needs--short term with DGI or longer term with site development for habitation)
- 6. Interaction/Transformation--potential to alter the experience of the space for the participants
- 7. Novelty factor/Innovation Factor/Value of contribution (what will it add to the space per se?)
- 8. Criticality from group: ability to see the flaws and critically evaluate their product and process

End of meeting 11:30.