



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

2To: Ann Morrison
Line M. B. Jespersen
Morten Søndergaard
Ståle Stenslie (Head)
Anna Vojtovicova
Freja Berger Petersen
Morten Nielsen (Vice)
Nanna Maria Kofod Schmidt
Invited: Betty Li Meldgaard (Obs.)
Falk Heinrich (CAT-school)
Winnie Ritterbusch (CAT-school)

Study Board ArT & Technology
Strandvejen 1, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark

Contact person: Anne Nielsen
Phone: +45 9940 9919
E-mail: amn@hum.aau.dk

Date 26.10.2013
Case No.: Paste the file number

ArT Study Board – meeting October 2, 2013 at 13.00-16.00
Strandvejen 1 room 124

<i>Members</i>		<i>Present</i>	<i>Apologies</i>	<i>Not met</i>
<i>Ann Morrison</i>	<i>AM</i>	X		
<i>Line M. B. Jespersen</i>	<i>LMBJ</i>	X		
<i>Morten Søndergaard</i>	<i>MS</i>	X		
<i>Ståle Stenslie (Head)</i>	<i>SS</i>	X		
<i>Anna Vojtovicova</i>	<i>AV</i>	X		
<i>Freja Berger Petersen</i>	<i>FBP</i>	X		
<i>Morten Nielsen (student chairman)</i>	<i>MN</i>	X		
<i>Nanna Maria Kofod Schmidt</i>	<i>NMS</i>	X		
<i>Betty Li Meldgaard (obs)</i>	<i>BLM</i>			X
<i>Falk Heinrich (CAT-school)</i>	<i>FH</i>		X	
<i>Winnie Ritterbusch (CAT-school)</i>	<i>WR</i>	X		
<i>Referent:</i>				
<i>Anne Nielsen</i>	<i>AN</i>	X		

Start of meeting 13.00

End of meeting: 16.30

Next meetings: ArT Study Board

October 21, 2013 at 13-16.
November 20, 2013 at 13-16.
December 12, 2013, at 13-16.
January 15, 2014 at 13-16.

ArT Advisory Board

November 8, 2013 at 15-21



1.	Approval of Agenda.
	Approved with some extra point under announcements.
2.	Approval of Minutes – August 21, 2013
	Approved
3.	Announcements:
	<p><i>News from Head of Study Board (SS)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Study Guides 2014 (approved by SS) – now Semester Guides <p>Some information's were missing in ArT5 about specification of exam. The latest up-date is not in the study guide. If there are options for two ways of exam. It is up to the teacher in charge to decide which one to be used.</p> <p>If there is a choice of examination the head of the course has the authority of deciding. It still has to be approved by the study board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the future the ArT Board must use this descriptions:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Study Regulations (studieordning) - rules, laws, outlines that are approved by the HUM.FAK.2. Semester Guides (semesterbeskrivelser) – plan for each semester, approved by the ArT SN. It is important that the text from the study regulations is correct, and use the schedules from the faculty. AN will put in the right information's and send it to the coordinators.3. Modules - descriptions of each projects and courses incl. all lessons.• Web-page<ul style="list-style-type: none">- LMBJ – the text has been updated, and text to the semester guides has been send to WR.- Zane is replacing Jannet.• Secretary position – update<ul style="list-style-type: none">- 1/3-1/2 position extra for both study and Obel has been asked for at the institute, but despite our needs it appears impossible to employ someone now.• Part time contract 2014-2015<ul style="list-style-type: none">- LMBJ suggest if we are going to offer courses for part time contract the courses must be placed the same day every week.- Proposal of a Summer school in Art and Sound. To be discussed at the next meeting and at the teacher meeting – budget and program. Remember to include administrative expenses.- 26.-30. November – Workshop on a book sprint (real time writing and production for print) of Research.- How to write a book. Could be offered as a Free Study Activity – needs to be approved by the Dean. <p>AM told that 2 ArT students now are at Master Program in Medialogy.</p>
	<i>Relate News (SS)</i>
	Are in progress of hiring one ½.time Obel Professor. Dead-line for applying was Sept.26. Received 16



	<p>applicants. Hopefully the position will be filled by March 2014.</p> <p>Lector position is under progress to be employed November 2013.</p>
	<p><i>News from CAT-School (FH)</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Revision of ArT study regulation- Remember the comments from ACE-Denmark considering the Master.- Profile of competences has to be tighter.- Need a meeting with this subject only.- To be put on the agenda for the ArT Advisory Board in November 2013.- Revision of test or exams of 80% present – The studyboard agrees that 80% should be changed and taken out. New formulation to be used is: Active satisfactory participation.
	<p><i>News from Students Representative</i></p>
	<p>RUS period is very hush for the students at 3. and 5. semester. At the same time they are having courses at the same time. It was decided that FBP presents to the teachers how it could be possible. Write a couple of line about her experience of the intense period with Programming.</p> <p>ArT5 – Elective is not really elective – ArT offers only one course. It is impossible to elect another course at another study because of need to attend courses at ArT.</p>
	<p><i>News from Study Counselors (MN/NMKS)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget for Student practice <p>HUM-Fak pays for materials. AN contact the faculty. Other materials might be available at AN and WR.</p> <p>Phone. At the moment ArT-lab has an extra phone for rent out.</p>
4.	<p>Student environment (from last meeting) (attached)</p> <p>SS and LMBJ have made a summary of the student environment and a conclusion. This will be sent to the faculty. Approved by the board.</p> <p>NMKS stated that there are no social activities, because of the place ArT is situated. SS urge to try to get more activities in the future. It is not satisfactory to go to Friday bars at HUM-INF and A&D because ArT needs their own way of saving money for study trips etc.</p> <p>Students and staff are felt intimidated by the restriction in the building and needs to address it to the HUM-FAK.</p>
5.	<p>How to inform students about the study (from last meeting)</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Web-page is up- Student environment is satisfactory at the moment- Study Guide at AAU.dk is taken care of.- Student Counsellors has been at Katedralskolen to inform about the Art study.- The international Brochure must be sent to Highschools and to "Højskoler"- Student Counsellors contact other Highschools for visiting and informations.- Profile and Marketing of the study (new item at each board meeting).- How do other studies sell themselves?



6.	International Marketing of the study (from last meeting)
	Look at item 5.
7.	Budget <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “STÅ prognose 2014” from the HUM-FaK. (attached) SS has calculated 98 STÅ for 2014. The budget has been made for 2014 with a payment of 82 hours/stå. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requisitions spring 2014 (attached) Because of the employment stop we have to change the decision from last meeting and coordinator for the spring 2014 will be this: ArT2 – LMBJ ArT4 – AM ArT6 – SS ask Mikael Vetner to find a coordinator from Communication. International Study trip – NN?
8.	Dropout rate <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What do we do? This item was postponed from last meeting (sept. 13). In the meantime FH has send this note about the subject to specify that it is ArT board and whole ArT teaching and research environment that has to make the study an attractive one. This is what is written: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>ArT study board has to decide whether it wants to accept high dropout rates or whether any measures should be taken to prevent students leaving the study. ArT is a very special programme that is dependent on a high degree of student commitment and the will to leap into a field of uncertainty in regard to further career and employment. Maybe a dropout rate of 30 % is what is 'natural' and also necessary for a study like ArT.</i>2. <i>In my view, a friendly, collegial and even enthusiastic atmosphere at ArT is the foundation for any improvement concerning dropout rates. Enthusiasm is contagious. As any other interdisciplinary programme, ArT harbours intrinsic dangers of misunderstandings and clashes of research 'ideologies' ranging from differences in what is seen as essential requirements to differences in approaches and content. In fact, most people teaching at ArT have very different understandings of what kind of artefacts ArT products actually are. In a Deleuzian jargon, ArT is field of multiplicities and differences, an intensive field. Seen from a remote position, this is marvellous and harbours many possibilities. Seen from within, this sometimes might feel chaotic and without direction, containing a lurking danger of frustration due to misunderstandings, lack of knowledge (nobody can simultaneously be an expert in C++, art history and philosophical aesthetics, and have an artistic sensibility – whatever that might be) and missing acceptance of differences. What is at stake here is that</i><ol style="list-style-type: none">a) <i>ArT has to create an atmosphere of trust, collegiality and curiousness.</i>b) <i>ArT has to define its own, more confined 'field of differences'. That is to say, ArT at Aalborg University must find its own more or less defined subject field(s) and methods. (What immediately comes to my mind here is 1) urban art and urban event and 2) embodiment, embodied interaction, and somaesthetics – of course this might change over time).</i>3. <i>There has been a renewed discussion about the weighing of the technological, the artistic-creational and the reflective analytical aspects and about what kind (depth) of technological, artistic and analytical competence ArT should teach and demand. This seems to be an eternal issue, because of the aforementioned differences</i>



	<p><i>and also because of the different expectation and demands of our students. Maybe, one solution to this problem may well be to differentiate the programme that is to say to create specialisations - let's say from the 5th semester on: a technological track and a more humanistic analytical track. How this could be implemented, is an interesting question and needs some more clarifications (for example, should there be to separate tracks or 'just' the possibility to choose different modules). At any rate, this would be more expensive in terms of teaching hours and needs the development and implementation of new, hopefully cheaper teaching formats (e.g. colloquium). This would also prompt a more extensive revision of the study regulations.</i></p> <p>Because the drop-out rate is so high, ArT board has to do something. The reason why people are dropping out - is mostly because the students want to change education. Therefore it is important to communicate what ArT is. Namely both ArT and Technology. A better specification of what kind of Technology we are using and what students may expect..</p> <p>LMBJ clarifies that Art started out as an ArT education, with a high drop-out percentage due. to lack of technical issues. We then made a huge revision of the study regulation to be more technical. And we still have a high drop-out percentage. After 5 years people are frustrated because of an overload of work and changing study regulations all the time. Does it help? And we do have other huge problems such as teacher commitments, student environments etc.</p> <p>It is necessary to communicate clearly - what do you want the study to become - make people fill in the evaluation form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AAU - Procedure for guidance of student who risk to drop out (attached).
9.	<p>Semester evaluation – spring 2013 (attached)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ArT2• ArT4• BA-ArT <p>If we are going to have anonymous evaluation it must be before exams - which the board agreed. Postponed for next meeting.</p>
10.	<p>Evt.</p> <p>Next meetings: ArT Study Board 21.10.13 – 13-16 20.11.13 – 13-16 18.12.13 – 13-16 15.01.14 – 13-16</p> <p>ArT Advisory Board 08.11.13 15-21</p>