

Program council meeting MCT 1 February 1.2.2019 10.00-11.30

Location: The portal.

Present: Robin, Andreas, Anna, Alexander, Stein, Terje, Eigil, Peter, Sam, Maj

Agenda:

1. Welcome and review of agenda
 - a. Round of introductions / roles (all welcome to talk!)
 - i. 4 academics (2 from each site), 1 is the leader of the study program for 2 years (until early 2020 or 2021)? “bytte hvert annet år”
 - ii. 2 administratives (1 from each site), 1 is the secretary
 - iii. 2 External representatives from companies: Excuses for this time. Who can we ask for next time? Perhaps the companies related to the external projects from MCT? What is the fee? Please help with proposals at least 1 per site! Alexander: We decided not to have any follows UiO rules, but according to NTNU we need two externals. Sigurd had proposals somebody - from Cisco? We should ask Sigurd. What about companies/enterprises students work with now(?) Somebody from Huddly?
 - iv. 2 student representatives, for how long? shall we do the same? What do the students think? Eigil & Sam agree to be on board for 2 years.
 - b. Goals: <https://innsida.ntnu.no/wiki/-/wiki/English/Programme+council>
 - c. Quick overview of the agenda
 - d. Who is taking notes? Maj but we can all write
 - e. Decisions:
 - i. Contact Sigurd regarding proposals to external representatives (Anna)
 - ii. Student representatives are in the board for 2 years(current students representatives til spring 2020)
 - iii. Publish the Program Council webpage (Maj/Anna) and UiO should link it (Alexander). Andreas reports course reports at NTNU are all [here](#) (it is both a system for entering and looking up reports for course and reference group reports).
2. Course evaluation MCT Autumn 2018 (Maj)
 - a. Subject report / Reference group report, documents in the “Meeting Documents” folder ([Minutes_Ref_meeting_NTNU_07.12.18](#), [Minutes_Ref_meeting_NTNU_11.10.18](#), [Students_notes_NTNU_07.12.18](#))
 - i. Maj gives us a summary of the students’ feedback:
 1. **MCT4000** Introductory Course: 1) grading based on prior knowledge, perhaps move to pass/no pass? 2) Inconsistency sometimes with the learning outcomes 3) Oslo access to music tech facilities => solved 4) instructor on both sites => solved 5) some prior workshops? => we will

address it in our teachers workshop, students agree with the MCT webpage explaining

2. **MCT4010** Research methods course: Group structure is good. Practical issues: 1) Problems with the room structure in Oslo => solved 2) Need of somebody at the other side => solved because we have improved with the tech and more efforts with the comm (working on the templates) 3) More feedback, even a mid-term paper? => improve quick feedback (1 week?) 4) Lack of practical guidelines for submission of assignments (student numbers/inspera) and how to submit 5) Foreign students need even more follow up on 4)
3. **MCT4021** Portal course => Possibility of a crash-course on the mixer. More classes and workshops with Robin => Many tech issues have been solved.
4. **MCT4011** Entrepreneurship course: Good course, learned a lot. 5 weeks a short course to get the products done, too intense. The weekly workload was OK.
5. In addition, the students wish to access external courses (locally and internationally) and they ask for a list of available/recommended courses. Practical/administrative challenges to be solved first. Aiming to solve it for the 2nd MCT edition.
6. Stein proposes to simplify the program to balance the courses and credits between the 2 institutions. Perhaps from Spring 2020 to divide the courses to one single place? It requires to agree who owns what and close the course from one of the institution. Specific: MCT4021(10 ECTS) + MCT4023(10 ECTS) to be UiO courses. MCT4022(10 ECTS)+ MCT4015(10 ECTS) to be NTNU courses.

b. Decisions:

i. Add to the MCT teachers workshop (Alexander):

1. Discuss the students' feedback.
2. Create guidelines for teachers to be consistent across campuses and between teachers.
3. Discuss the entrepreneurship workshop.
4. Discuss the preparation webpage (see decision iii)
5. Include a crash course of the mixer (beginning).
6. Provide list of courses (local & international).

ii. After the MCT teachers share students' feedback document with students for archival purposes (Maj).

- iii. Make from draft to public the webpage about 1) knowledge recommended (be careful to exclude multidisciplinary) 2) guidelines of submission assignments / Norwegian university regulations addressed to prospective/applicant students and current MCT students. (Alexander/Kristian)

- ii. Take action on Stein's suggestion about dividing the courses into the 2 institutions to simplify the process of signing up. Refer to #6 (Maj (NTNU), Terje (UiO)).
- 3. Reference group meetings Spring 2019:
 - b. Preferred approach? 3 meetings with representatives vs all-students feedback (Andreas/Maj) Andreas: No forms – but a meeting for the students where one take notes. Will this cover everything? Robin: Salto research project needs a lot of feedback. Peter: Course evaluations, how to do that? Nettskjemaer.

One system for the entire programme/One form at the end? The two student representatives find that the evaluation is fine as it is (2 representatives 3 times per semester).

- i. Example of anonymous questionnaire forms:
 - 1. [MCT semester evaluation template](#)
 - 2. [Final evaluation Choreomundus \(end of master\)](#)
 - c. Decisions
 - i. Add to the MCT teachers workshop (Alexander):
 - 1. Discussion on how (admin/pedagogical) to eval (reference group vs anonymous form), add a final questionnaire. Be consistent and not overload the students. Get as much info as possible. Check Nettskjemaer.
 - 2. Be more consistent if the teachers want to evaluate the workshops (pre and post-questionnaires).
 - 3. Common policy between teachers. Here's an example: [MCT Teachers Policy](#). Check the NTNU/UiO ethics guidelines, grading policy & routines.
 - ii. Check with all MCT students that they are happy with the existing evaluation scheme (Maj).
- 4. How to evaluate the quality of the program
 - a. Quality report. Deadline December 1, 2019.
 - i. Revise templates / documents: [“Emnerapport 3054 H17”](#), [“Studieprogramleders kvalitetsmelding til instituttleder Musikkteknologi”](#)
 - ii. Each university has a particular template. Master file?
 - iii. Both need to submit a quality report to the Faculty.
 - iv. **Overall aim: Evaluation of the entire program.**
 - v. Deadlines:
 - 1. April 1, 2019 (UiO).
 - 2. December 1, 2019 (NTNU) => 2018/2019.
 - vi. Andreas propose that we write the report together during the fall. Peter is working on this now.
 - vii. The QR should include all the quality-assurance reports (students, reaccreditation, etc).

- viii. Reposts have to be passed by programme councils.
 - b. Decisions:
 - i. Program board meeting again before March 1, 2019 to decide how to proceed with the report (@All: collaborative writing in a master document).
 - ii. Make an annual / "Årshjul" timeline for reporting (@All). Next meeting decide what is the best tool.
5. Other
- a. Stein: Master thesis? Sigurd and Alexander talked to all students last semester and this should happen again this semester.
 - b. Andreas: Daniel Formo's contract is on its way (90%).
 - c. Decisions:
 - i. Set up appointments with students to discuss the current topic of their master thesis (Alexander/Anna).
 - ii. Find out the guidelines and resources regarding supervision (Maj/Terje).
 - iii. Add to the MCT teachers workshop (Alexander):
 - 1. MCT master thesis supervision: Who is supervising who? When does it start?
6. Schedule Next meeting
- a. Expected to meet 1-2 times per semester, linked to milestones of the program / academic year e.g. work on programme descriptions and the quality assurance report (Andreas)
 - b. File/folder available for students at all times so that we can deal with issues from students beforehand the program board meetings.
 - c. Decisions:
 - i. A meeting by end march before April 1 deadline in Oslo. We should send out a Doodle (Maj/Anna will send invitation next Wednesday 13.2.2019).
 - ii. We are testing standards regarding minutes. What do we prefer? To be discussed in the next meeting.
 - iii. Find a suitable platform so that students can raise issues for the program council meetings. Perhaps add a contact person in the forthcoming website? To be discussed in the next meeting.
 - iv. Both sites should offer pastries/wienerbrød (Photoshop files are also accepted!)