

Meeting: 13th March 2024 at 11.00-13.00

Minutes

Place: 1481-366

UN-meeting, LICS

Present:

UN members: Jakob Steensig (UN-chair), Alexandra Kratschmer, Nina Vad Thomsen (stud. rep.), Victoria Engberg Lowe (stup. rep.) UN LICS

Observers:

Mikkel Wallentin, Andreas Højlund, Cordula Vesper, Andrrs Højen, Bill McGregor, Roberta Rocca, Marc Malmdorf Andersen, Suzan Kurt (stud), Maja Oresnik (stud.), Christian Stensbo (student guidance), Joshua Skewes (Head of Department) and Camilla Mark Thygesen (SNUK minute taker) Side 1/5

Absent:

UN members: Ethan Weed, Anne Christine Vig Jensen (stud. rep.), Sabrina Bækkelund Hansen (department coordinator)

MINUTES

1. Approval of agenda and follow up on the minutes from last meeting (decision)

The agenda was approved and there was no follow-up on the minutes from the last meeting.

2. Briefings (orientation)

2.1 News from the Board of Studies

The UN was informed about an upcoming discussion in the Board of Studies regarding good pedagogical practice for including students with diagnoses in the teaching. The UN are asked to give input to this discussion at the next UN meeting in April (see 6.1).

2.2 News from the Institute Forum

The Institute forum representative, Anders Højen informed that there is a meeting tomorrow and therefore there is no news yet.

2.3 News from the student guidance

The student guidance informed that:

- There has been an evaluation of the mentor programme at Cognitive Science, which shows that it is going well.
- They get a lot of questions about the exams from new students, who are nervous about this, but that is normal at this time of the year.

2.4 News from Student forum/fagrådet

Students informed:

There has been a General Assembly at the fagråd where a new chairperson and vice chair was elected.

It has been discussed at the student forum meeting how to get more students to join the student forum and the UN meetings. This will be done e.g. by going to classes and inform students about the possibilities for participating.

2.5 News from the study administration

The UN was informed that the newsletter from Arts Studier is available at:

<https://medarbejdere.au.dk/fakulteter/arts/til-undervisere-paa-arts/nyhedsbrev-fra-arts-studier/>

3. End-of-term evaluations from the autumn 2023 (discussion)

The UN discussed the end-of-term evaluations from autumn 2023 and the input to the Head of Department's summary report.

The Board of Studies (SN) has decided to continue with the simplified reporting format. Based on the discussion in the UN, the Head of Department is to write a summary report (approx. one page) on the evaluations from autumn 2023 using the reporting format.

The summary report must be formulated in a way that is appropriate for publication on the AU website.

Ahead of the UN meeting, the official elected UN members have received the evaluation notes from each course in order to be able to qualify the discussion of the summary report using the information from these.

The UN members commented that the summary seems to cover the evaluations, and had no comments for change.

Next step:

The Head of Department has received an e-mail from the Director of Studies Lars Kiel Bertelsen that the evaluation report must be sent no later than 10th April 2024 to studieleder@cc.au.dk.

After the review, the Director of Studies forwards the reports to the Board of Studies (Studienævn).

4. Evaluation of Project Placement autumn 2023

The UN discussed and commented on the evaluation of Project Placements for Autumn 2023 from students and project hosts, with particular focus on the three sub-elements of the project-oriented process and on the correlation between these three sub-elements (1. Supervision and/or teaching, 2. The stay at the host organisation and 3. The exam form), as well as the general context throughout the semester.

Ahead of the UN meeting, the official elected UN members have received the evaluation data in order to be able to qualify the discussion of the Coordinator's summary.

The Project Placement coordinator Andreas Højlund explained that, due to some technical challenges, the student evaluation has not been made. Some changes in the procedure have been made regarding to the person who has to initialize the evaluation and therefore something went wrong this year. They will look more into this, so it does not happen again.

The main issue that students have mentioned to the coordinator is the length of the placement which is 3-4 months. The more attractive places often want students to stay longer and also stay there in January. This has been an ongoing challenge.

5. Focus areas in connection with new guidelines for course evaluations at the School of Communication and Culture (11.55-12.40)

The faculty management team has decided on a new policy for course evaluations at Arts: [Politik_for_kursus-evaluering_paa_Arts.pdf \(au.dk\)](#).

The new policy states: *The School management team (institutedelsen) is then responsible for drafting the School's guidelines and processes. This work must be done in cooperation with the Board of Studies. The local guidelines must be approved by the vice-dean for education.*

In collaboration with the chair of the board of studies, the vice-chair of the board of studies and the School management team, it has been decided that the Director of Studies will draw up the new guidelines with input from the degree programme board (UN), the board of studies (SN), management and other relevant stakeholders.

The framework for the new guidelines at the School has been set out in faculty policy, but there is room for departmental development work for the specific departments. At the Department of Communication and Culture, the school management team would like to focus on a joint, academic reflection on the forms and outcome of the teaching, rather than on a 'satisfaction survey'.

The management at the School of Communication and Culture wishes to focus on three areas in particular:

1. Freedom of method in the mid-term evaluations and the possibility of continuous (formative) evaluation
2. Simplification of the digital evaluation setup and reporting back on it
3. Clearer follow-up and visibility of the actual use of the evaluation

At the meeting in April, the Board of studies (SN) will receive a summary of the discussions from the nine Degree Programme Boards (UN) at the School of Communication and Culture. The summary will be prepared in collaboration with the chair and vice-chair of the board of studies and this will form the basis for discussion in the board of studies. Subsequently, *Guidelines for teaching assessment at the School of Communication and Culture* will be prepared in collaboration with the chair and vice-chair of the Board of Studies and presented to the Board of Studies for comments. The vice-dean approves the final guidelines.

The UN discussed the three focus areas:

1. Freedom of method in the mid-term evaluations and the possibility of continuous (formative) evaluation

The UN supports the idea of freedom of method for the mid-term evaluations. This support is related to the fact that the courses are very different in both content and structure, and a standard format might not make sense for all courses.

The UN also agreed that the mid-term evaluations are important, and that it is also a good idea to make a continuous evaluation throughout the course, if that makes sense for the specific course and teaching style.

Students said that they also find the mid-term evaluations important, and that it is important that they feel that they can speak up and say what they want. The issue of anonymous evaluations was discussed.

Different ways of doing the mid-term evaluation were mentioned e.g. using Menti, Google Docs or a padlet. But it can also just be a discussion in class. It was mentioned that the teachers should have some exchange of experience and learn from each other on this point. Head of Department will put it on the agenda for the semester meetings. The form chosen for the evaluation also has an impact on the amount of time spent on the evaluation, which is time taken from other parts of the teaching.

The UN reached the conclusion that all teachers should be recommended to let the students take part in the discussion of the format of the mid-term evaluation, and that it is a good idea to always make room for anonymous evaluations, if students prefer that.

2. Simplification of the digital evaluation setup and reporting back on it

The UN discussed the number of questions in the list of questions that the teachers can choose from (spørgsmålsbanken). It can be very difficult to find the right question with so many to choose from. And sometimes no questions fit, and teachers need to have the possibility to create new questions.

It was mentioned by the students that they like having this venue to give feedback to the teachers. But sometimes there is a focus on the negative aspects in the evaluation, but it should also be possible to provide positive feedback. The Head of Department mentioned that his experience is, that students often write positive comments as well.

It is not always clear to the students how the evaluations are being used. This could be framed more clearly by the teachers, but it could also be mentioned in the evaluations. This might make it easier for students to understand the importance of the evaluations and the influence they can have.

It was discussed how the students can profit from participating in the evaluations, even though it will only affect the next cohort. Students mentioned that they also reflect on their own participation in the course, and this can be useful for themselves as well. The evaluations also help create a good environment at the department and they improve the quality of teaching in general, not only for the specific course.

Concrete recommendations from the UN:

Side 5/5

- Simplify the list of questions to choose from, but still keep it possible to add a few new questions.
- Put in an introductory text at the top of the questionnaire to give students some background information on how the evaluations are being used.
- Remove or change the question about usage of digital tools. This is not relevant for all courses.
- Rephrase the question about whether the exam is useful. The students have not taken the exam yet and they can only reflect on the form of the exam, not on the exam itself – this should be clear in the question.

3. Clearer follow-up and visibility of the actual use of the evaluation

Students mentioned that they sometimes feel like they spend a lot of time on the evaluations but they are unsure about whether they are being used. It was explained that there are local procedures at the department, that ensures that the evaluations are being used and discussed in the groups of teachers. An introductory text should be put into the evaluations (see focus point 2) in order to make it more visible how the department actually uses the evaluations afterwards, and how they are part of the larger system of quality insurance/control at the faculty.

Next step:

The head of department/UN-chair sends output from the discussion in the UN no later than 3 April 2024 (approx. half an A4 page) to studieleder@cc.au.dk

6. Issues for upcoming meetings

6.1 Issues for upcoming UN meetings

- Input for research workshop om MA in Linguistics.
- Point from Board of Studies about students with special needs.

6.2 Issues for upcoming meetings suggested for the Board of Studies

7. AOB