

To the members of the Board of Studies for Social Data Science and attendees at the meeting. The minutes are published on the [homepage](#).



MINUTES

29 APRIL 2022

Forum Board of Studies of Social Data Science

Meeting held 29 April 2022, 13:30-15:00

Place 1.2.26

Minute taker Jagger Andersen Kirkby

ØSTER FARIMAGSGADE 5 OPG. B
KØBENHAVN K

DIR 45 35 33 22 02

jagger@samf.ku.dk

Present

Members: Søren Kyllingsbæk (*Chair*), Hjalmar Alexander Bang Carlsen, Gregory Eady, Samantha Dawn Breslin, Alysha K. Chamadia, Marilena Hohmann, Felipe Arturo Perilla Reyes, Maya Ellen Hertz and Christian Thomas Nielsen Garcia (*Vice-Chair*).

Attendees: Friedolin Merhout (*Head of Studies*), Ditte Marie Arbjerg (*student advisor*), Ida Emilie Christiansen (*study administration*), Jagger Andersen Kirkby (*Study Board secretary*).

Absent: Nikolaj Arpe Harmon, Mads Øbro (*student advisor*), Sofie Trappaud Scholl (*student advisor*) and Hanne Kraak (*study administration*).

1) Approval of agenda for this meeting and minutes from the last meeting and approval of new practice for approving minutes via email

Annex 1: Minutes from the Study Board meeting 11 March 2022.

The Study Board approved the agenda for the meeting and the minutes from last meeting without further comments. The item of approving future minutes via email rather than at the subsequent

Study Board meeting was not discussed. Jagger will refer this question to the Board members in a written hearing.

PAGE 2 OF 6

2) Approval of the Study Programme Report for 2020/2021

Annex 2: Draft Study Programme Report for 2020/2021

Friedolin explained the background for the Study Programme Report and advised that because SDS is still a relatively new programme, it is difficult to say a lot about the report. Generally, the programme is doing well. Friedolin pointed out two factors that can be improved: student facilities, and students taking advantage of the 3rd semester mobility window.

The Study Board discussed how to make the case for keeping the SDS common room. Friedolin would like to see the numbers for how many people use the common room and kitchen on a daily basis. Christian agreed that he would send the numbers and the petition next week. It was commented that 25 students have signed the letter.

For the Study Programme Report, it was mentioned as a concrete suggestion that more integration between the course elements in the SDS programme would be preferable. Friedolin pointed out that we should definitely discuss course integration at some point, but that that specific topic is not relevant to the Study Programme Report. Student Guidance observed that the Study Programme Report is designed to look at the SDS programme at the macrolevel rather than at the microlevel.

It was asked what counts as a “drop out” from the programme, as that can have a negative influence on the results that the Head of Studies has to consider in their report. Jagger promised to find out.

The Study Board approved the Study Programme Report without further comments.

3) Orientation about evaluations and assessments of Social Data Science Base Camp and Social Data Analysis, Block 2, 2022

Annexes 3.1. and 3.2.: Evaluation summaries of Social Data Science Base Camp and Social Data Analysis, 2022.

Both courses received a B assessment. Friedolin started out by saying that the results of the evaluations of the two courses gave no reason for concern and mentioned that the courses are to be

improved as part of a continuous development of the SDS programme. One thing that was noted, however, was that attendance for Social Data Analysis was lower than for other courses. It was suggested that in order to improve attendance rates, exercise classes might be shortened. It was also noted that the course's timing in the programme at large could be a potential pitfall.

PAGE 3 OF 6

The students were informed that their input is welcome any time via Hjalmar.

On the evaluations themselves, it was suggested to include more microdata in them. Friedolin made clear that the course evaluation summaries are meant to condense information.

4) Introduction to credit transfers and course content assessments

Ida explained her work with credit transfers at the Faculty administration. She explained further that the new exchange agreements for which SDS students can sign up had created some difficulties, as graduate level courses were not necessarily generally available, why an SDS student had applied to take undergraduate level courses.

Ida informed the Study Board that they have the authority to approve courses at undergraduate level as part of a graduate level exchange abroad, and elaborated that most Study Boards would approve 4th year undergraduate courses as a general rule and then evaluate courses under 4th year undergraduate level on a case by case basis. A lot of questions were asked, among these whether it was not a university wide rule that graduate students cannot take undergraduate courses. Ida responded that this would be the case when it comes to applying for courses at other faculties at KU and at other universities in Denmark, but not for exchanges abroad. Ida moreover asserted that if the Study Board wished to approve courses at a "lower" level, that was not out of the question, however, Ida explained, it would be better to establish some general guidelines for how to handle such cases.

5) Course content assessment and establishment of guidelines

Annex 5.1.-5.5. Course descriptions from the University of Toronto.

Ida used an ongoing case as an example for how to assess course content and establish guidelines for the work of a potential Study

Board sub-committee, which could handle incoming cases. Ida suggested that the Study Board approve 4th year undergraduate courses as a general rule so that the study administration can approve those cases without having to refer the cases to the Study Board every time. The Study Board agreed on doing so and to referring all other cases of course content assessments in relation to credit transfers to the Credit and Dispensation Sub-Committee.

6) Establishment of a Credit and Dispensation Sub-Committee

The Study Board established a Credit and Dispensation Sub-Committee to handle credit transfer cases. Maya was elected as student representative and Hjalmar was elected as faculty representative. The ongoing case above will be handled by them in cooperation with Ida.

7) Approval of new Delegation of Authority

Annex 7. Draft Delegation of Authority.

The Study Board approved the new Delegation of Authority which had been drafted in order to secure an alignment between the delegations of all study boards across the Faculty of Social Sciences. In this, the Study Board delegates the handling of credit transfer and exemption cases to the sub-committee established under item 6.

8) Appointment of student and faculty representative for SDS Student Fund May 2022.

Friedolin explained that he will make a call and receive applications from students throughout the next two weeks. The results of these will be shared at the next Study Board meeting. It was revealed that there might be scholarships for students in the future. Greg and Felipe volunteered to be the faculty and student representative reviewing the applications for this round.

9) Discussion about whether to allow for external supervision of master's theses

The Study Board had been asked to discuss and make a decision on whether to allow for external supervision of master's theses as a result of a request for an exemption made by a student.

It was explained that Master's thesis students are allocated two (2) internal supervisors already. At the latest teacher's meeting the consensus had been that any external involvement should be in the form of an informal mentorship – but that it would be a good idea to, so to speak, 'formalise' the mentorship without the mentor therefore working on projects in any official capacity. Rather, the mentor should function within the limits of a good faith agreement. It was suggested that the relationship between mentor and mentee could be 'formalised' through a drafting of a letter from SODAS/SDS requesting the mentor to sign onto the project and that the mentor could subsequently be invited to graduation events and to generally make them feel as included as possible. The letter could also include an alignment of student and teacher expectations for the project.

The Study Board decided to not allow for any external supervision of Master's theses in an official capacity for the time being. Søren promised to let Hanne Kraak know and to Cc: the members of the Study Board when doing so.

10) Discussion of future practice regarding group exams in cases of illness or other exceptional circumstances

The changes had been drafted in advance by Sandra and Amanda to ensure that the SDS curriculum includes provisions for what to do when one or more exam group members fall ill. As of now, any group that ends up consisting of less than 3 members must apply for an exemption in order to complete their exam.

Jagger was not sure why some of the proposed changes entailed that re-examinations should be conducted individually rather than either individually or in a group. He promised to look into the matter and let the Study Board know why the proposed changes look the way they do.

11) AOB

Jagger asked the Study Board members to remember to fill out the Doodle poll he had created to establish a date for the upcoming Study Board dinner. Alysha and Marilena informed the Board that seeing as they would be finishing their degrees this semester, two new student representatives will be needed for after the summer holidays. They promised to probe among the SDS students to find

someone interested in joining the Study Board. Finally, Student Guidance asked the student representatives to spread the word among their fellow students that the elective course Data Collection is only offered in the autumn semester.