



## MINUTES

13 MARCH 2023

**Forum** Board of Studies at Social Data Science

**Meeting held** 10 February 2023, 13.30-15.00

**Place** SODAS Large Conference Room, 1.1.12

**Minute taker** Sidse Gutfeld Overbeck Ærstrøm

**Present:** Friedolin Merhout (Head of Studies), Søren Kyllingsbæk (Chair), Samantha Dawn Breslin, Gregory Eady, Nikolaj Arpe Harmon, Kaylie Clark (Vice-chair), Csilla Duray, Camilla Veronica Branas, Tereza Blazkova, David Anthony Charles Broomham.

**Attendees:** Chila Nazeya Firouzi (Coordinator), Philipa Olivia Dige (Student Advisor) and Sidse Gutfeld Overbeck Ærstrøm (Programme Coordinator)

## Agenda

### 1) Approval of agenda and briefing on minutes from the last meeting / Søren

**Decision:** The Study Board approved the agenda. The minutes had already been approved by e-mail.

### 2) Constitution of the new Board / Søren

2.1 Welcome to new members of the Study Board (SB).

## EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

### SECTION FOR COORDINATION AND PLANNING

ØSTER FARIMAGSGADE 5, BUILDING  
12, 1ST FLOOR, ROOM 12.1.01  
POSTBOKS 2099

DIR 45 35 32 87 94

sae@samf.ku.dk

Søren welcomed the new members of the board. All members and attendees introduced themselves.

PAGE 2 OF 6

2.2 Decision: The SB must elect a vice-chairperson from among the student representatives.

**Decision:** Kaylie was elected as vice-chair.

2.3 Decision: The Study Board must set up a sub-committee for credit transfer and exemptions.

Friedolin informed the board about the previous setup with a sub-committee consisting of Friedolin and Maya (former student representative). Søren explained the work of the committee.

**Decision:** Friedolin announced that he would like to continue in the committee. This was supported by the board. Csilla was elected to represent the students in the committee.

2.4 Approval: The Study Board must approve the rules of procedure (annex 2, Rules of procedure for the study board at Social Data Science)

**Decision:** The rules of procedure were approved by the board.

### **3) Constitutional change in the SB of SDS / Søren**

3.1 Discussion and decision: should the principle of equal representation amongst staff in the SB of SDS be cancelled?

Søren briefed the board on the current constitution and representation of the board. Five representatives from the staff cover each involved department of the programme: Economy, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology and Political Science. The Study Board of SDS is the only board with this many staff representatives and Søren informed the board that the long-term goal would be to downsize the SB. At that point it will not be possible to maintain the representation of every department concerned.

The board discussed the pros and the cons of the cancellation of the equal representation in the SB:

**Pros:** With the current constitution, each involved department is equally represented in the board. The equal representation maximizes the democratic decision making of the board. The representation ensures diversity in the board since every department is being heard in the development of the programme.

**Cons:** Every department is represented in the board, but with the current constitution SODAS is not being represented. It's not possible to add an extra representative from SODAS since the total number of members may not be more than ten – if the staff were to add a member, then the students should also have to add a member to ensure parity. The equal representation is inflexible, and if one member withdraws from the board, it can be difficult to find a new staff member from the outgoing department. Lastly, one could fear that the departments will not assume their responsibility in relation to the programme.

**Conclusion:** The board did not reach an agreement regarding the cancellation of the equal representation in the SB for SDS, and the board will discuss the item on the next SB meeting for SDS. Sidse will gather more information on the different options of the board. Sidse will share the options with the board prior to the next SB meeting.

### 3) Plan for the work of the study board in the coming semester/year / Søren

#### 3.1 Planning of the meetings for the spring semester

Søren briefed the board about the last years meeting occurrence.

**Decision:** It was proposed that future meetings were held every sixth weeks and the board agreed to meet every sixth weeks from 15.00-17.00. Next meeting will be Friday 24 March, 2023.

#### 3.2 Preparation of overview of items with which the study board will work in the year to come.

Friedolin noted that it's particularly important to be aware of the deadlines regarding changes and revisions of the programme curriculum.

#### 3.3 Adjustment of this annual cycle if there is a change in the frequency of meetings.

The agenda of the future meetings will reflect the annual cycle.

#### 4) Curriculum (CUR) / Friedolin

4.1 Briefing on the status of approval of new curricula and minor curriculum changes applicable from 1 September of the current year.

**Decision:** The board agreed to adjust the Description (content) and the Learning Outcome of Advanced Social Data Science II.

The change will accommodate the shift of focus from the visual data image to audio-visual data.

4.2 Briefing on the preliminary work with ideas for new curricula/major changes is commenced (valid from 1 September of the coming year).

There are no major changes planned. However, Friedolin will look at the future offer of electives.

4.3 Discussion of thesis defense format, concerning length of student presentations and incorporating pre-meetings with censors.

It was discussed whether the allocated time for the oral defense of the Master Thesis should be redistributed to incorporate a pre-meeting between the examiner and the censor. For the time being the duration of the oral defense is one hour for one student, and approximately on third of the total duration is reserved for students presentation. The proposal is to include 10 minutes pre-meeting between the examiner and the censor at the beginning of the oral defense. The purpose of this change is to safeguard that the examiner and the censor have common ground before the student gives the oral presentation. The downside is that the student will have less time for the presentation, the discussion, and the feedback.

**Conclusion:** Friedolin will draft up something for the SB to decide on at the next SB meeting.

#### 5) Briefing on the Thesis Event / Christian

5.1 Briefing: How has the plans proceeded after the last meeting? Have we gotten closer to a budget for the event?

5.2 Discussion and decision: Who will continue the work? What is the next step?

Christian was prevented from participating, and the item was postponed until the next SB meeting.

## 6) Briefing from the Head of Studies/ Friedolin

6.1 Orientation on key study data and exam complaints statistics.

**Orientation:** Friedolin informed the board that he will brief the board on the key study data and the exam complaints statistics on the next SB meeting.

## 7) Briefing from the outgoing Vice Chairperson / the Vice Chairperson and the former student representatives

7.1 A brief resumé of what work has been done in the Study Board the last year.

## 8) Briefing from the Student Guidance / Philipa

**Orientation:** Philipa informed that the Student Guidance has updated the booking slots for students at SDS. Students can book an individual guidance session every Wednesday from 1.00 – 2.30 PM. If there are no available sessions, feel free to use the drop-in sessions Monday and Wednesday to Friday from 1.00 – 2.30 PM. You are also always welcome to call the Student Guidance at +45 35 32 46 00 Monday and Wednesday to Friday from 9 – 11 AM. Lastly, you can send the Student Guidance an e-mail at [studievejledning@samf.ku.dk](mailto:studievejledning@samf.ku.dk).

## 9) AOB / Søren

- Friedolin asked the students for their perspective on the group formation *Advanced Social Data Science I* and *Data Governance: Law Ethics, and Politics* in block 3.

The students had different perspectives on having the same groups for the two courses. It was stressed that more focus on facilitating the groupwork would be of good use.

**Conclusion:** The board agreed to continue having the same groups during block 3. To prepare the students for the group work, the board proposed to continue the collaboration with the Student Guidance and the Pedagogical Consultants. Furthermore, it was suggested to have a short intro to the group work in the TA-sessions.

### **News from the Students**

- Kaylie noted that the students feel a lack of female representation amongst the instructors. This will be an item of the agenda for the next SB meeting.
- Tereza asked for a status on the update on the students' general room on Absalon and the possible mentor programme.
- David added that the Base Camp room on Absalon is used for communication with the students, but in the future, there should be a specific Absalon room for this. He also noted that the process of applying for admission should be improved. It's particularly difficult to know as an international if you're eligible for the programme, but also to know, what documentation you should provide. Kaylie added that UCPH was the only University that she applied to with no open house. Friedolin suggested that a template is being made, and Philipa will check with the Admission Office if they can make a list of what degrees have been admitted.
- The students wish for more feedback.

### **10) Feedback on the meeting**

10.1 Discussion: What went well at this meeting? What could be improved for the next time.

**Good:** feedback and engagement from student representatives.

**Improvement:** keeping time, time-management, clarity in agenda (orientation, discussion and so on), debriefing from former students, order of who has the floor, info on the process regarding the procedure on election of vice-chair.

**Best regards**

**Sidse Gutfeld Overbeck Ærstrøm**  
Programme Coordinator