

## SATBUSS Minutes, April 20th 2022

### Participants:

Khurram Murtaza Khan, Oliver Krancher, Louise Klitgaard Torntoft, Anna Elizabeth Thomsen, Liselotte Lagerstedt, Anders Puggaard Lyngesen, Simon Bruël-Holler, Louise Harder Fischer.

---

- Welcome: Oliver leads the meeting.
- **Welcome to Louise Harder Fischer, Head of the DIM programme as our newest SATBUSS member**
  - Presentation: Louise, New head of programme.
  - **A short presentation round of all present**
- **Approval of agenda:** Agenda approved.  
Simon adds an item on group-size/group-issues at GBI 1.sem/2.sem. to AOB (see below).
- **Who will take the VIP seat at the Board of Studies as representative from SATBUSS?**
  - Louise and Irina Papazu (Co-Head of DIM) has suggested that Louise invest efforts in the employers panel. Irina then represents DIM in the Board of Studies.

Conclusion: Head of DIM programme fills in the seat in the Board of Studies.

### Action needed:

Anna, Lene Pries Heje and Louise will have dialogue with Jens Christian about settling this re-appointment of Irina to the Board of Studies – to allow Louise to prioritize employers panel.

- **News from the programmes?**
  - **GBI**
    - 1) Oliver mentions how there is a shift in terms of fixing challenges on the course: “Database Use and Design”  
Pratim Datta, US based lecturer, is building the energy. Part of teaching team – teaching a part online.  
  
Fatemeh Saadatmand is Course Academic Responsible.
    - 2) Oliver let’s SATBUSS know that he continues to work on the revision of the study programme GBI.  
Focus area:
      - student interest and relevance of current programme (an issue in the evaluations)
      - international/global aspect
      - student literacy in the spectrum of research methods
  - Updating GBI: while balancing both the focus on research from within socio-technical orientation and the business oriented. Continue to mix and blend. The

GBI programme stands out compared to similar study programmes at other universities and will continue to be.

**Student Question: will Oliver continue the video intro for each semester?**

Yes: let's plan to continue a video for each semester.

The planning and communication works well. Well received among students-

Meant as a "start up" to the semester. To let the students know what will be just around the corner. Students seem happy and content with the videos.

New videos will be recorded.

**Student: Comment: related to revision of the 4<sup>th</sup> semester:**

In the minutes from last meeting (follow-up point from previous meeting):

A continual focus on projects – and distribution across semester.

It seems we are just adding things and not removing anything– but there is a worry that we will simply add things and the burden will add up in the end.

It might be a good idea to run the proposals past the students that are currently attending GBI.

Oliver: The idea is that Business process modelling turns into Business process modelling and automation. This is to give a shift in focus.

Oliver have discussed this with the 2. Year students. They feel "underchallenged".

Khurram: Was different in the past. We might get inspired from this earlier version of the course + drawing on automation / robotic processes in industry.

Oliver listens to the concerns about having two empirical projects in one semester. However, it might be about how it is planned and outlined. Synergies – maybe one company-contact.

**News from students at GBI?**

Simon lets SATBUSS know he has been made aware that a 4th semester student got a new job at Novo (novo innovation hub → at 5<sup>th</sup> floor). This student is in process of passing on an invitation along with Novo to create more interaction with students (a 5<sup>th</sup> semester project she is doing).

Ideally they might want to arrange a meeting with SATBUSS.

Oliver: suggests it might work as a reminder as Head of study programmes to have a continued meeting with Novo Innovation Hub to make sure we benefit from any possible collaborations.

- **DIM?**

**Anna:** From administrative side:

We're handling admissions. Slightly less applications than usual. A general post-corona effect. We haven't experienced as large a drop in applicants as other programmes.

**Louise:** There will be some readjustment among teachers: we're planning ahead for the next semester. DIM will have different teaching teams from September.

**Question from Khurram about DIM course discussed in previous meeting:**

- 1) Some students complained that readings were recommend readings – not clear what is mandatory what is optional.
- 2) The number of pages – is it mandatory or optional (confusion in this particular course)

**Follow-up:**

Louise clearly states that there has to be a syllabus. The basis for the exam needs to be very clear.

**Suggestions to the process/agenda for the SAT Buss meetings in general:**

Khurram suggests having as part of the agenda some follow-up steps from last meeting. If there are action points.

The agenda is published and as such we should not have specific course info directly in the public domain; eg. If we discuss a situation on a course → then faculty e.g. should hear about it properly; not through reading the minutes from the SATBUSS meetings.

- **ILM**  
No news from ILM

- **AOB**

- **Group-size at GBI:**

Students are frustrated about group-size (demand to be 6 rather than eg. 4).

The background / Experience:

We were put in obligatory study groups half way through the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester. Some students were already in groups and doing work (fieldwork observations etc). We were left to juggle our groups on our own.

Problem: TA's add new members to make puzzle go up.

A few students were not in a group. Then to solve the issue –TA's assigned individuals to be simply placed in already existing groups. This caused a challenge for the dynamics of the groups.

Specific issues from one group: When a new group member was added (late in process) the group had already made a non-disclosure agreement with a company. This caused problems and tension with the company.

**Question:** why do we have to be 6 in a group? What are the common guidelines and frameworks?

4-5 group members are preferred. 6 in a group is a big group. The students suggest having at least same flexibility across semesters.

It works well on the first semester with assigned groups of around 6 students per group. You learn to work in a group. You get to know each other socially as well. It is a lot more challenging on the second semester. The groups take up a lot of space when there's a need for reshuffling and catching up. This is where there is a need for change. Smaller groups ideally.

2<sup>nd</sup> year, Oliver explains:

3-4 students – however – with the higher intake. We've had to adjust to larger groups. It's a necessary compromise. Groups of 6 for 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> semester.

Students suggest considering groups of 5-6. Oliver listens to their comments.

**Louise/study advisor: Might there also be a need for a general guideline and support-entity in terms of group-formation/group support?**

(RUC has their practice settled and clear → what about ITU?)

Raise the issue that it might be worth keeping in mind or suggesting a heightened focus on where to turn for support in group matters?

- **as a student?**

(the study and career guidance is continually developing their offer as a visit / workshop in 1<sup>st</sup> and/or 2<sup>nd</sup> semesters at GBI and DIM)

Both to offer a first step “shared language for group-issues and collaboration” but also to communicate the study and career guidance exist also as a support in terms of group issues.

- **as lecturers / TAs?**

SATBUSS does not know where the TAs/teachers can turn for general guidelines and an ITU defined process towards group-formation and group practice.

NB: The Dean of Education is working on something in relation to this.