Subject Area Team Business (SATBUSS)

Meeting March 6 2018, 1.45– 3.00 pm, room 4A05

Participants:

Steffen Dalsgaard (VIP), Christopher Gad (VIP), Hanne Westh Nicolajsen (VIP), Anna Elizabeth Thomsen (SAP), Kristine Mituzaite (DIM), Stilyan Petrov (GBI)

Agenda

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of minutes (*Item 1*)
3. GBI Review (visit from external panel) - *Steffen*
4. Study Board – last meeting + upcoming – *Christopher (+see agenda for In Study Board folder)*
5. Open agenda/Any Other Business

Minutes

1. Approval of the agenda
   Approved
2. Approval of minutes (*Item 1*)
   Approved
3. GBI Review (visit from external panel) – *Steffen*

The meeting with the panel went well. The panel was enthusiastic and pointed out well-known challenges: internationalization, how do we facilitate global in the future, how to make evaluations feed into actual improvement of courses and not just overall monitoring. GBI is a 'Generalist' degree, which brings challenges as well in ensuring coherence. Will GBI still be competitive if the global goes?

The process from now on: Early April the panel will send a report. Then there will be a follow-up based on the review. The report will be presented to SATBUSS.

4. Study Board – last meeting + upcoming – *Christopher (+see agenda for In Study Board folder)*
   - Decision on exemptions will be moved to a sub committee under the Study Board.
   - Last time: the Study Board discussed the transparency of grading critea on particular courses. There was no conclusion to the discussion. It is very much up to the teachers to decide what will count in a course.

We do not have many resources for offering feedback – this contributes to make courses intransparent. DIM will work on that and is already looking into a particular course.

The department will provide support to coordination and organizing of courses, which should help free some time for feedback to students.

Student input: there is a need for feedback in the oral exam (D exams) about what worked well with the different components of a course.

Response: On a general level, academic form (arguing, structuring, presenting, substantiating claims) is always part of the evaluation – they are part of the overall curriculum objectives. Maybe we need to be clearer about that.

Student input: Different ways of writing reports/ different standards in different courses can be confusing. Response: this is also considered part of taking an MSc degree, but expectations must be clear.

5. Open agenda/Any Other Business

On-boarding of international students is poor, who handles this in SAP (no assistance with CPR registration, explaining demands etc., the process of presenting diploma from Qualifying degree)? Anna will look into this.

Quality Policy – Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), where and when are they made public? What parts of a course can change? Teachers are allowed to teach the course in the way they are most proficient in teaching it, but ILOs can't be changed during the course. Course Managers have a very high level of autonomy. ILOs are published in the course description.

Matching of external examiners with courses - we should find the time to look at the key words [for assigning external examiners] that goes with each course, they are not very fine grained. Some key words seems to have disappeared. What is the Quality Ensurance of that process. Anna will set up meeting with SAP (about the process of defining and altering key words)

Next meeting: GBI Review report, proposal to the study board to adopt principles for handling pre-approvals.