

Uddannelsesnævnmøde, Afdelingen for Arkæologi og Kulturarvsstudier

Referat

Dato: onsdag 5. februar 2020, kl. 12.00 -14.00

Lokale: 4215-032

Deltagere: Rainer Atzbach, Annika Pohl Harrison, Dorthe Boysen Pedersen, Christine Lundgård Kisum Nielsen, Lasse Steensgaard Sørensen, Lykke Olivia Kjeldsen, Sylvester Fogedgaard Jønsson, Birte Poulsen, Andres Dobat, Liselotte Malmgart, Mette Lang, David Harvey, Celia Haldan Voetmann (ref.)

Dagsorden

1. Godkendelse af dagsorden

Dagsorden blev godkendt.

2. Opfølgning

Bilag 2.1 Godkendt referat (fra UN-møde 22. januar 2020). Ingen bemærkninger.

Opfølgning på:

- Udvekslingsproblematikken. Studievejledning kommer gerne forbi et UN-møde for at tale om arrangementer og hvordan vi sikrer at informationen kommer ud til de studerende.
- Eksamen i Production and Communication of Heritage, er der noget nyt vedr. eksamen?
- Møderne ligger første onsdag i måneden, kl. 12-14, onsdag 5. februar 2020. Kan vi rykke møderne til 12.30 på følgende datoer: 4. marts, 1. april, 6. maj, 3. juni?

Kommentarer:

- Det ønskes at studievejledningen afholder et møde i efteråret for de studerende indeholdende information om udveksling, herunder fristen i december.
- Der er intet nyt ang. den pågældende eksamen. Eksamensplanlægningen er blevet adspurgt, vi afventer, men forventer afslag.
- De resterende møder i foråret ligger **12.30-14.30** i **4215-032**.

3. Behandling af undervisningsevalueringer fra efterårets undervisning (beslutningspunkt)

Undervisningsevalueringerne blev gennemgået enkeltvis og UN kommenterede.

Dato: 5. februar 2020
Ref: Celia Haldan Voetmann
E-mail: celia@au.dk

Side 1/11

Overordnet lader det til at der er problemer med portfolio-eksaminer samt undervisningslokaler. Der opfordres til, at man ringer til klimanummeret, hvis det er for varmt, koldt e.l. i undervisningslokalerne.

Opsummering og kommentarer fra mødet samt de studerendes kommentarer:

----- BA Arkæologi (2018) -----

Evalueringerne var overvejende positive, der var ikke yderligere kommentarer fra de studerende.

1st semester

Introduction to Archaeology (++)

42 out of 55 students evaluated the course taught by Lars Sass and Minos. The overall evaluation is excellent, but some critique is addressed towards the class room facility that was not appropriate for such a large group. Students asked for more feedback, but we had no resources left to allocate to this course. The students suggested themselves to work with peer feedback, which is an excellent idea.

The final presentations in presence of students from High School (studiepraktik) was regarded as successful. We will repeat this arrangement next autumn once again.

- midtvejsevaluering fungerede ikke

Artefacts & Ecofacts (could be improved -)

12 out of 29 students participated.

The overall evaluation is OK, some critique has been addressed towards the academic level of reading. The midterm evaluation evidently was not very successful or useful. The course was very interesting, but the balance between lessons and their associated preparation should be re-thought. Honestly, students mentioned a relationship between the selection of their portfolios and their engagement for the chosen topics. Probably, they were more engaged in their favorites. A lot of archeological topics were neglected, as textiles, stone, paper & parchment (which are scarcely found in archaeological contexts), leather and food. An interesting suggestion is to let the students choose a "joker" topic that has not been taught. Once again, individual feedback is a lack in this course. In this case, pre-feedback is allocated, i.e. a group-wise preparation of examination. Half-term evaluation should be executed by the course coordinator.

- gruppeevaluering var godt

Kulturhistorisk overblik

- Der plejer at være en positiv evaluering af dette kursus, men vi mangler bilaget.

3rd semester

Due to a change in academic regulation, the structure of this semester was changed containing two theoretical courses and a period course

Studium Generale (+)

Only 8 (!) out of 30 students answered. The course has been evaluated as successful, but with a workload slightly to challenging, which might correspond to a general lower engagement in this course (62% felt neutral or less engaged, i.e. they did not work hard and systematically). I have not heard before about Mint Master and the learning Brain, this sounds interesting, the students evidently appreciated its use, but asked for an earlier introduction to this tool. The standard question for the student instructor's quality is annoying, because there was not student instructor involved in this course. My suggestion is to ask the Board of Studies to make this an optional question instead of an obligatory one. The compressed format of this course has advantages and disadvantages, we will have a general discussion on this topic in our Board of Studies.

-Rigtig godt forløb, umiddelbart har de fleste fra holdet udtrykt sig positivt, også selvom kun fåtallige gav skriftlig feedback.

Material Culture and Society (+)

25 out of 28 participants. The overall evaluation is positive, even this first run of this course in its new position was not without problems.

Weak grading for the half way dialogue of evaluation (only 32% thought it was useful). Some critique addresses towards the structure of the course, only 36 % regarded the course as well-structured: A major problem was the compressed structure, which has not been appreciated. Moreover, some portfolio-exercises conflicted with exercises in the period course. The students wish a more continuous teaching throughout the term, i.e. some lessons of Studium Generale and Period Studies should be taught already in the beginning of the course. In other words: the compact course structure was criticised, but from a pedagogical point of view, Studium Generale has to precede Material Culture and Society. The type of examination has been under critique, because it causes an additional workload in the end of term. We should reconsider this examination type.

- underviserne bør koordinere eksamen pr. semester, så de studerende ikke knækker sammen under presset

Det nok mest kritisable forløb for 3.semester. Grundet strukturen og halveringen af fagets tidsperiode, blev meget af pensum samt opgaveforløbet klemte, mange oplevede især, at de fik stress-lignende symptomer fra november.

Period Course II in Prehistoric Archaeology: Bronze Age and Early Iron Age (+++)

12 out of 17 students participated in the evaluation. The overall evaluation was excellent. The students appreciated the use of Kahoot and Peergrade. It is a bit astonishing that academic writing was taught in this course that does not comprise a written assignment. The students suggest to get this introduction in an earlier course, which makes much more sense. Many comments appreciate the new type of half-term dialogue, which happened in groups, who answered on selected questions with written statements.

There is a desire for more hands-on exercises with find material and a slight restructuring of the course with more lessons in the start and fewer in the end in order to reduce the workload in the two other courses. Both teachers were praised for their pedagogical engagement.

- Best practical course according to the students

Utrolig positivt forløb, ingen yderligere kommentarer foruden ros.

Period Course II in Historical Archaeology: Late Middle Ages (+++)

10 out of 11 students participated in the evaluation. The overall evaluation was excellent. Structure, contents and pedagogical engagement of the teachers was praised. Some critique was addressed towards the predefined length of portfolio-parts, which should be more open (1-3 pages).

A problem is the overall structure of the semester, where the two courses of Material Culture and Society plus the period courses concentrate the work load in the end of the term. The portfolio-parts in these two courses should be coordinated in a better way.

Problemer med især sidste halvdel af forløbet, da portefolierne kunne have været bedre planlagt, især ift. Materiel Kultur & Samfund, som også have portfolio forløb.

5th semester

Bachelorproject FARK (+/-)

9 out of 13 students responded. The overall evaluation is OK, but evidently one student was not satisfied with this course. Moreover, both the teacher and the students address some critique towards the format of supervision: Some students ask for an individual supervision by different teachers, whereas the teacher suggests to collect both BA project courses in a joint course format. The half-term dialogue was not regarded as helpful (appreciated by only 33% of students).

Man kunne med fordel have anvendt de samme peer-feedback grupper gennem hele forløbet, som man gjorde det på HARK. Herudover kunne det være en ide, at underviseren nedsætter grupperne ud fra de studerendes fælles interesser vedrørende emner, teori, metode mv.

[Undervisere: Det var netop sådan det blev gjort i kurset.]

Der er et forslag i evalueringen om at samle BA-undervisningen på tværs af HARK og FARK - det forekommer umiddelbart ikke som en god ide ifølge de studerende, da de små hold netop sikrede et tæt forløb mellem vejleder og studerende, samt en god dialog til undervisningen.

[Undervisere: et tæt forløb mellem vejleder og studerende samt en god dialog kan realiseres på mange forskellige måder: BA-undervisning på tværs af HARK og FARK, dvs. som et mere samlet forløb med fælles forelæsninger og små arbejdsgrupper med intensiv vejledning er at foretrække. Dette i øvrigt også udefra et ressourcemæssigt perspektiv.]

Bachelorprojekt HARK

9 out of 13 students responded. The overall evaluation is excellent: intensive and individual supervision, feedback, the use of group wise peer feedback was appreciated, some critique addressed toward the class room facility (ventilation, today, we have introduced a climate number in all class rooms). What does it mean that half-term dialogue was held continuously??? (midtvejsevaluering blev foretaget løbende)???

The students ask for more ECTS-points for this course (20), but this cannot be granted.

Meget positivt -generelt roses forløbet og vejlederen.

Der blev ikke holdt en decideret midtvejsevaluering - i stedet var der løbende, efter hvert seminar, opfølgning på undervisningen og ønsker til de kommende seminarer. Det vurderes at dette fungerede godt.

Science in Archaeology I (+)

12 out of 26 participants, which is quite a bad rate. The Bachelor project was prioritised by the students to the disadvantage for this course, which caused a decreasing number of students attending classes. Nevertheless, the attending students were satisfied and appreciated the course both in pedagogical terms and workload, I am very curious to know, how the examination looks like with such a low attendance. Some critique was addressed towards feedback, which should be intensified and the indoor climate that should be improved.

- nogle studerende modtog individuel, skriftlig feedback, andre gjorde ikke, hvordan kan det være? opfordring til at skrive til underviseren ang. feedback

Generelt god strukturering af forløbet - det virker markant forbedret fra sidste år.

Fremmødet var meget lille, specielt i forløbet om dateringer, hvilket også ses af evalueringen.

International Elective Subject (IV-fag) Play and Creativity (--)

25 out of 29 students participated. Obviously, there is a structural problem of gathering students from multiple disciplines teaching them with multiple methods and approaches. The overall evaluation is weak (less than 50% saw a great or

significant outcome). This course should be reconsidered by the teaching team – or the description in the course catalogue should be clarified.
- ikke helt klart hvad der skal/bør ske i forhold til dette kursus

-----KA Arkæologi (2019)-----

Theoretical Perspectives (+)

18 out of 36 participated in the evaluation. Overall, this course has been evaluated positive: The students uttered the wish for a better integration of practical examples connected to theories, this is a topic, the teaching team will work with. There are some minor issues especially concerning the workload in the end of the term, which was conflicting with examination in the other two courses. I have to admit that our original idea of portfolio examination did not work at all: when using portfolio examination as preferred type of examination in many BA and MA courses, we thought it would have been used for a continuous submission and it would support a continuous working process. But this is not the case. Consequently, the portfolio submission both in Cultural Historic Seminar 1 and Archaeological Data Analysis collide with their deadlines with the home-set assignment in Theoretical Perspectives. We have to discuss the portfolio examination in one of our next meetings in the Board of Studies.

Kulturhistorisk seminar 1 (alle tre studieordninger):

- eksamensformen er svær at forstå for både undervisere og studerende
- Liselotte: dimittendundersøgelser viser at dimittenderne efterspørger bedre kompetencer inden for kommunikation, det bør adresseres i næste studieordning for KA.
- Birte: den grundlæggende idé om kommunikation i kurset holder stadig
- undviserne svarede ikke på mails i løbet af kurset!
- forslag om at emnet for opgavesamlingen kunne være det samme gennem hele kurset, bare belyst fra forskellige vinkler
- i evalueringen blev det nævnt at enkelte studerende efterspørger et kursus i at skrive synopser
- de studerende har ikke meget erfaring med mundtlig eksamen
- det forventes at lærerne selvfølgelig introducerer eksamen for de studerende i løbet af kurset
- kurset tages op på lærermødet i næste uge

Der manglede nogle klare retningslinjer for, hvad der blev forventet af de studerende til den mundtlige eksamen.

Der manglede sammenhæng mellem workshops og den kulturhistoriske del - det kan evt. løses ved at de studerende her ét emne de arbejder med gennem alle workshops

(a la kulturhistorisk seminar)

[Ref: UN havde en længere diskussion af kurset generelt, og flere problemer blev påpeget. Hermed er der god basis for at en fundamental gentænkning af kurset kan finde sted, eventuelt også tidligere end når revision af studieordningen kan realiseres.]

Cultural Historical Seminar 1 KLARK (+)

5 out of 6 students participated. Evidently, this has been a very active and intensive working group.

Overall, the evaluation of the thematic contents was positive, the teacher has been engaged and classes worked also from a pedagogical point of view. Critique was addressed towards the workshop-part, i.e. the communication part that suffered of an unclear relation to the course contents. The type of examination consisting of portfolios (associated with the communication part) and the oral examination was criticised as difficult to understand. The course felt like consisting of two independent parts.

Cultural Historical Seminar 1 FARK (--)

13 out of 22 students participated. The course has been evaluated being weak, only less than half of the students appreciated the academic outcome and to get the competences described in the academic regulation. The structure of the course was not satisfying and the workshops did not fit into the thematic part of the course, which should be separated into two courses. We will follow the suggestion to put the communication workshops in the end of the course in next autumn. The attendance was under 60%, this lack of engagement is also visible in the self-evaluation of the students, who evidently even lacked the interest to get a topic for their examination. Overall, here is a lot of space for improvement.

Det kan være svært at få fat i underviseren omhandlende spørgsmål og svar uden for undervisning.

Det kunne godt have planlagt noget bedre og måske heller ikke låse sig fat på primært bronzealder, men mere spredt eller i kronologisk rækkefølge måske

Cultural Historical Seminar 1 HARK

6 out of 12 students participated, which is quite a poor rate. This course has been evaluated slightly better than the FARK sister one, but in general, the evaluation shows the same problems with the structure and the relationship between workshops and thematic courses. The students did not feel well prepared for examination. We have to improve the relation between thematic and communication part.

Archaeological Data Analysis (--)

Only 16 out of 38 students participated, this is the worst rate of all evaluations. Evidently, it was a difficult course and there is still a lot of space for pedagogical improvement: students with low mathematical knowledge had difficulties in following and understanding the methods. The students would like to have two teachers in class (which would have been possible according to our time frame) and more examples that matches to their field of interest in classical or historical archaeology.

We will work on that. I have to point out that the course nevertheless managed to engage the students in a higher degree than other courses – and its outcome has been appreciated. Midterm evaluation did not work very well and – as usual – the students asked for more feedback. We have integrated feedback into this course and next autumn, each student will receive 20 min individual preparation to examination.

- tidligere et vel modtaget kursus, som nu er omstruktureret til færre ECTS, hvilket gør arbejdsbelastningen hård
- der ønskes større hensyntagen til de studerendes matematikkompetence
- dimittender er glade for kurset
- ukoordineret arbejdsbelastning på semesteret resulterede i at ca. 30 % ikke afleverede
- forslag om flere eksempler fra flere tidsaldre

Der mangler klassiske og historiske eksempler i både portfolio og den daglige undervisning - alle skal inkluderes i vores fælles kandidat.

-----KA Sustainable Heritage Management (2019)-----

Sources and Methods in Heritage Studies (+++)

17 out of 24 students participated in this evaluation. This course has received an excellent evaluation. Especially, I would like to point out the high degree of engagement, as the students evaluated themselves (90% studied hard, I think, I have never seen such a degree before!). The course worked fine both in pedagogical terms, in terms of supervision and alignment regarding the examination. Looks fine!

Theory and Concepts in Heritage Studies (+/-)

15 out of 25 students responded. Evidently, this course has been prioritised lower than the other two courses, with a lower engagement of students in class. The conflict between showing a variety of theoretical approaches and going into a deep understanding of each is without any solution. The students ask for a reduced number of "key texts" that cannot be provided if the broad range of theories is to be taught. The major issue is the placement of the course that should

close before 4 o'clock and the "competition" with the two other courses. Evidently, the balance of the three courses should be improved and their assignments better coordinated.

Understanding Heritage Management Frameworks (+++)

9 out of 25 responded. As usual, student presentations are not very appreciated, but the overall evaluation of this course is excellent. The students appreciate alignment, pedagogical engagement and preparation for the examination. Evidently, this course enjoyed the full focus of the attending students.

4. Tidslig aspekt i specialebedømmelse i Bæredygtig Kulturarvsforvaltning/Sustainable Heritage Management (beslutningspunkt)

UN tilslutter sig at ændre formuleringen til: "*define, process and conclude an academic project*" hvilket indstilles til studienævnet.

Studieordning	Nuværende beskrivelse	Ændringsforslag (vedtaget)
SHM 2019	Academic goals: define, process and conclude a project within a specified time frame	Academic goals: define, process and conclude an academic project

5. Godkendelse af fagbeskrivelser for valgfag E20

Behandlede ikke.

6. Orientering fra afdelingsleder

Niels Nørkjær Johannsen, suppleant i uddannelsesnævnet, er blevet valgt ind i Akademisk Råd på Arts.

Der arbejdes stadig med edu-IT og arbejdsgruppen har identificeret følgende kompetencer:

- håndtering af kritisk data – fra *data mining* til *data processing* og analyse
- brug af digitale værktøjer til præsentation og kommunikation, fra Powerpoint til billeddannelse
- brug af digitale værktøjer i udgravningsprocessen
- brug af digitale værktøjer til strukturering af tid og rum (fx tidslinjer, GIS)
- kommunikation ved brug af digitale formater – fra google docs til sociale medier.

7. Orientering fra studievejledningen

Præsentation af arrangementskalenderen. Der vil være specialeforedrag for både KA Arkæologi og KA SHM, samt arrangementet Karriereveje for arkæologer. Laura McAtackney og Rainer har diskuteret et kursus i projektmanagement for studerende, og UN diskuterede hvordan man bedst sikrer at flest mulige studerende har mulighed for og lyst til at deltage. Pizza i nobelparken måske?

8. Orientering fra studerende

Ingen orienteringer på dette møde.

9. Orientering fra Arts Studier

Godkendte/ikke-godkendte studieordningsændringer pr. 1. 9.2020:

KA arkæologi 2019	Kildehistorisk seminar 1	Ændring i prøvebeskrivelsen	Fjernes af beskrivelse af at eksamens synopsen skal tage udgangspunkt i opgavesamlingen som er lavet i undervisningen. Det giver en unødigt binding for underviser og studerende, hvis synopsen skal være baseret på opgavesamlingen, derfor ønskes det slettet.	Dekanatet godkendte ikke denne ændring, da studieordningen ikke har haft et fuldt gennemløb, og det ikke vurderes at der er noget i ændringen som ligger de studerende så meget til last, at reglen om fuldt gennemløb skal brydes. Fagmiljøet har mulighed for at indstille ændringen igen efter et fuldt gennemløb.
BA arkæologi 2018	Udgravningsledelse og antikvarisk virksomhed	Ændring i prøvebeskrivelsen	Der ønskes at fjerne omfangsbeskrivelsen af udgravningsrapporten, da omfanget af denne er helt uafhængig af kvaliteten.	Dekanatet godkendte denne ændring, for at sikre de studerendes bedømmelsesgrundlag.
KA arkæologi 2019	Speciale	Præcisering af varighed af mundtlig prøve	Beskrivelsen af mundtlig eksamen i forbindelse med produktspeciale er ikke helt klar	Dekanatet godkendte denne ændring, da det skal rettes af hensyn til formidling til de studerende, for at sikre de studerendes retssikkerhed.

Påmindelse om at overveje forslag til eksterne eksperter til uddannelsesevalueringen. Desuden skal der findes nye medlemmer til aftagerpanelet.

Nyhedsbrev Arts Studier februar (udsendes sammen med referatet)

Uddannelsesdagen 25/2 (tilmeldingsfrist 18/2): <https://studerende.au.dk/studier/fagportaler/arts/aktuelt/arrangementer/vis-arrangement/artikel/uddannelsesdag-arts-2020-tema-studieglæde-2/>

10. Nyt fra studienævnet

Studienævnet har konstitueret sig. Referat fra seneste møde er tilgængeligt på [hjemmesiden](#).

11. Eventuelt

Af afdelingshjemmesiden fremgår det stadig at man udbyder de nu lukkede uddannelsesretninger. Det vil blive rettet.