



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

ArT Study Board Members

Study Board Art & Technology
Rendsburggade 14, 9000 Aalborg Denmark
Contact: Elsebeth Bækgaard
Phone + 45 9940 8988 / E-mail: elsebeth@hum.aau.dk

Date: September 18 2019

Case no.: 2019-600-00342

ArT Study Board – meeting, September 18, 2019 at 13.00-16.00 **Rendsburggade 14 room 5.237**

Agenda

<i>Members</i>		<i>Present</i>	<i>Apologies</i>	<i>Not met</i>
<i>Line Marie Bruun Jespersen (Chairman)</i>	<i>LMBJ</i>	X		
<i>Anthony Brooks</i>	<i>AB</i>	X		
<i>Elizabeth Ann Jochum</i>	<i>EAJ</i>	X		
<i>Morten Søndergaard</i>	<i>MS</i>	X		
<i>Bo Allesøe Christensen</i>	<i>BAC</i>	X		
<i>Paula Uspenski</i>	<i>PU</i>	X		
<i>Sebastian Matthias Coleman-Larsen</i>	<i>SCL</i>	X		
<i>Sofie Grønvald Laustsen</i>	<i>SGL</i>	X		
<i>Anders Manøe Jepsen</i>	<i>AMJ</i>	X		
<i>Brigita Juzenaite</i>	<i>BJ</i>	X		
<i>Rikke Bogetoft Jensen (student counsellor)</i>	<i>RBJ</i>	X		
<i>Anton Thorbøll (student counsellor)</i>	<i>AT</i>	X		
<i>Tom Nyvang (Department KOM)</i>	<i>TN</i>	X		
<i>Winnie Ritterbusch (Department KOM)</i>	<i>WBR</i>	X		
<i>Lotte Brunø (Department KOM)</i>	<i>LB</i>		X	
<i>Minutes Taker:</i>				
<i>Elsebeth Bækgaard (secretary)</i>	<i>EB</i>	X		

Start of meeting:	13.00			
End of meeting:	16.00			

Meetings in 2019

14.08.2019, 13.00-16.00	ArT Study Board meeting
18.09.2019, 13.00-16.00	ArT Study Board meeting
09.10.2019, 13.00-16.00	ArT Study Board meeting
13.11.2019, 13.00-16.00	ArT Study Board meeting
11.12.2019, 13.00-16.00	ArT Study Board meeting

Items:	
1.	Approval of Agenda 18.09.2019
	Approved
2.	Approval of Minutes 14.08.2019 (Attachment #1)
	Minutes will in future be sent out within 14 days after the meeting for approval. Comments, if any, to be given by mail.
3.	News:
3.a.	Chair of Study Board (LMBJ)
	Licenses – Touchdesigner: We bought licenses. This is highly relevant for the 5 th semester.
	The semester has been kicked off. All new students showed up and we are very pleased with this.
3.b.	Students: The students shall select their new vice chair of the study board among them before the next meeting. Update: Anders Manøe Jepsen (3 rd semester) is the new vice chair.
	We have two new student members, who introduced themselves. Anders Manøe Jepsen and Brigita Juzenaite (both from 3 rd sem.) LMBJ introduced the study board work, emphasizing that it is a democratically elected body, which deals with many aspects of running the program. Passing of curricula, evaluations, developing the program, staffing etc. Discussions are confidential. As of February 2020 Media Arts Cultures will also be under this study board.
3.c.	Student counsellors (RBJ/AT)
	No news.
3.d.	The Department (TN/WBR)
	The department is still waiting for the budget for next year and preparing as much as we can.
	The accreditation system is changing a little bit. The structure will be slightly different. More news will follow. There is growing attention on exams and grades. We have to further document individual exams – it will be more formalized. We have to monitor grades in a new way. We already react to unusual patterns, but more news will follow about this.
	The GDPR department has invited VIPs for a course in Workzone. A selection of teachers and study board members has been invited to the course. What to do when you evaluate a student (credit transfer), how are you supposed to handle the information and documentation through the journal systems. We have to change from emails to the journalizing system. We have a legal department, that we can ask, if we have questions as to the handling of documentation (research and students). At some point, students should be introduced to this issue, so it should be a part of the curriculum. We have been waiting for some guidelines.
	Last week we handed in the key figures for the study board report. The study board will be expected to comment on irregularities.
4.	Study regulation revision 2020:
	PBL progressive learning goals (Attachment #2)
	AAU has decided that all study regulations needed to have learning goals that illustrated the progression in the PBL competences throughout the study. To make clear where and how students gained more knowledge throughout the curriculum in the study regulations. We have had teachers' meetings and meetings with student representatives, where we have discussed this. We have added new learning goals. Interpersonal, structural, problem oriented and meta cognitive competences are addressed at different levels. There is maybe less focus on the structural competences, but already next year we will be asked to add e.g. digital tools to manage group work etc., so it will have more volume by then.

	EAJ: On page 7 – change of words - Why? External partners is very broad – could be industry or artists or anything. If we use the more general term (eksterne samarbejdspartnere), it gives teachers more freedom. The language should open for flexibility, so we do not risk locking ourselves in. It was decided to change it back.
	The study board discussed and approved the study regulations.
	Course in interaction design for ArT students (5 ECTS) (Attachment #3)
	This will be a proper interaction design course. We have gathered different lectures. It has been moved from 4 th to 2 nd semester. The reason for this is that the students need more time on 4 th semester to focus on the project. Students agree that it is a good idea to place it on 2 nd semester. The background for this course was also to increase minimum confrontation hours. This is the first draft. We need to refine the text, maybe change the learning goals and decide on exam format. What should the proper title be? LMBJ will ask Markus and Anca to have a look at it. BAC will send text and references. LMBJ will circulate a final version asap asking for written feedback. Deadline is Oct. 1 st .
5.	Semester evaluation: Coordinator reports + complete Survey Xact data ArT 2-4-6 (Attachment #4a-f)
	ArT2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication and scheduling of exam in PID: It was very late. Action point: Keep our eyes on this for next year. • Excursion to Aarhus for the Art in Context course: Information about the travels etc. came out very late. The trip is a participation course. RBJ suggested it to be a voluntarily activity and maybe have an alternative assignment, if the students cannot make it on that day. LMBJ suggested that it could count as lecture, if the study pays. It was stressed that active participation should not rely on the students' economic capability. Action point: The main problem was the late notice. So we have to either find alternatives locally OR be better at announcing in due time and pay for the activity to secure that all students are equal. Decision: Field trips as part of active participation to be funded by the study board. • Joint semester: Terrible format, too long and too rushed. Action point: A poster session (6th sem.) would be very good and a white paper (2nd sem.) • Group formation process: Many struggled. Longer deadline would be a solution. Who is responsible for making groups – this should be very clear – the coordinator or the students? It is a learning process, too. Students' responsibility or else randomized groups formed. EAJ: it is on purpose with the ambiguity! It is important with this freedom. We should keep it not defined. The group format is very important. Action point: It is in our strategy to improve this process.
	ArT4: Postponed until next meeting. The semester coordinator will forward a new report.
	ArT6: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship: Students ask for more arts specific examples. Do we know anyone besides from alumni? Action point: To find relevant entrepreneurs. LMBJ will ask Anca and Jesper and propose a event with art entrepreneurs as an add on to the course and relevant to all students. • Play and event: Extremely well evaluated. • Performance technology course: Comments about the literature and covering the syllabus. There was an hour demo, which could have been a lecture instead. • Programming: Students want a broader palette of supervisors.

	Action point: LMBJ: We totally agree.
6.	Educational evaluation: (Attachment #5)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bad communication and planning is mentioned – too much confusion 2. Hard to tell the progression in the program – not evident progression 3. A lack of seriousness and gravitas towards studying art and technology <p>Remarks from the discussion:</p> <p>SGL: If there were supervisor guidelines or rules set, so that all supervisors go through the same things, this would make it easier for the students to see the progression.</p> <p>LMBJ: We are hesitant to make guidelines/rules for supervisors. Transparency is important, though. What is the responsibility of the supervisor and of the student?</p> <p>AB: There is a difference between teachers at school and at a university. That transition is not understood well enough.</p> <p>RBJ: Consistency would help the students. The students should get this information in the beginning - also that it will be different and change from supervisor to supervisor. Do not expect the exact same thing to happen next semester.</p> <p>SCL: We do not always know when we are given more freedom – we need to be told, when it is happening. Better clarity with everything.</p> <p>EAJ: We could take a look at the semester start – we could check in and present ourselves – show one slide, which shows the progression. The teachers should share these points. Expectation of coordinators to have face to face meetings with your teachers.</p> <p>Study activity model: Visualizes how the semester is planned in terms of workload. It is mandatory for 1st semester. It could be a way to clarify, what we are expecting from the students – so this could go into each semester.</p> <p>Conclusions: A teachers' meeting with focus on communication and progression and an action plan for how the students will feel this.</p> <p>LMBJ will attend the next SGMs on 3rd and 5th semester to discuss problems with progression and introduce the study activity model.</p>
7.	Study environmental evaluation + Plan of action + Feedback from faculty: (Attachment # 6+7+8)
	<p>Feedback has been received to be communicated to the students:</p> <p>CAS will monitor indoor climate.</p> <p>We have asked for permission to put up shelves in the semester rooms. That is not possible due to fire regulations. It is to be addressed by the department.</p> <p>Action plan: No comments - Approved.</p>
8.	Requisition spring 2020 – first draft: (Attachment #9)
	<p>The initial proposal to be handed over to the department.</p> <p>This will also circulate among the knowledge group leaders.</p>
9.	Agenda items for the meeting with the advisory board: Ideas and suggestions from the board:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the language change. • Mapping of what kind of programs alumni attends. • Question of still having an international profile/outlook – how can we keep working with preparing the students for that. What new opportunities does the language change offer. <p>EAJ: Suggested that the study board VIPs are invited to the meeting with the advisory board.</p>
10.	Annual report of the external examiners' chairmanship + External examiner reports: (Attachment #10+11)

	<p>Account of the areas of responsibility for the chairman of the censorship.</p> <p>External examiner reports are important: They are invited to write comments about how the exams went etc.</p> <p>We have received three sets of comments and they are overall positive.</p> <p>One say, however, there are too many learning goals on Art 3 and is worried that the semester theme is too complex for 3rd semester students.</p> <p>One mentions differences between how examinations are conducted depending on who the supervisor is. Apropos discussions above (item 6).</p> <p>We need to reflect on, whether we need to make an action point regarding this.</p> <p>TN: It is important that the students are treated correctly and get the right grade. We could call for a workshop for the examiners and present the examination rules.</p> <p>Action point: Call a teachers' meeting theming exams (TN to present the rules).</p>
11.	<p>AAU Explains: (Attachment #12+12a)</p>
	<p>This appears to be relevant to open the university to the society, but is it about marketing or is it about talking to our students?</p> <p>RBJ: It would make understanding quicker to the students instead of having to read a lot – they get a little snippet of info and can dig in deeper.</p> <p>A 5 minutes talk of what Art is.</p>
12.	<p>Any other business</p>
	<p>No comments</p>