



tropEd June GA (Witten / hybrid) 2023

June 15 - 17, 2023

Participants (registered)	1
Session 1: 10:00-11:30, Chair: GF	2
Implementation of the Agenda, Acceptance of Minutes	2
Feedback on tropEd as Legal Association	2
Financial Report	2
Annual Report	3
Updates on Membership Issues	3
Feedback from the Working Groups	4
Session 2: Membership Presentation: 13:00-14:00, Chair: JP	5
Session 3: Scientific Session on GhatGPT: 14:00- 16:00, Chair: ML	6
Session 4: 09:00 – 12:30, Chair: GF	7
Course Accreditation	7
Discussion on EC Legal Reform- Part 1	7
Session 5: Students Online Satellite: 10:00 – 12:00, Chair: JP and RR	9
Session 6: 09:00 – 11:30, Chair: JP and RR	9
Discussion on EC Legal Reform- Part 2	9
Updates from Students Satellite by SM and AA	11
Learning Experiences within tropEd: ISGlobal and Umea Collaboration by ML and NC	12
Upcoming Events by NC	12
Location of Summer and Fall 2024 GAs by GF	12

Executive Secretary: Guenter Froeschl (LMU)
 Secretariat Coordinator: Rayan Korri (LMU)
 President Elect: Marie Lindkvist (Umea)

Participants (registered)

Abayomi Adeosun (AA)	Student representative
Alberto Matteelli (AM)	Brescia
Angelica Johansson (AJ)	Umea
Anne Fabricius (AF)	Heidelberg
Beatrice Formenti (BF)	Brescia
Bruno Broucker (BB)	ITM
Eva Kuhn (EK)	Bonn
Eva Mertens (EM)	BNITM
Farzana Yasmin (FY)	Witten Herdecke
Gaelle Feghali (GFe)	Student representative
Guenter Froeschl (GF)	LMU
Hans-Friedemann Kinkel (FK)	Charité
Jani Puradiredja (JP)	BNITM
João Piedade (JaP)	Lisbon
Kafuruki Shubis (KS)	IHI
Karin Gross (KG)	Swiss TPH
Lisa Hoffaeller (LH)	LMU
Lisanne Gerstel (LG)	KIT
Marie Lindkvist (ML)	Umea
Martina Fier (MF)	Witten Herdecke
Megumi Nagase (MN)	Witten Herdecke
Miriam Müller (MMü)	Student representative
Nguyen Thanh (NT)	Hanoi
Nuria Casamitjana (NC)	ISGlobal
Ralf Weigl (RW)	Witten Herdecke
Rayan Korri (RK)	LMU

Rodney Reynolds (RR)	Individual member
Seydou Doumbia (SD)	USTTB
Sidra Msroor (SM)	Student representative
Sven Gudmund Hinteraker (SGH)	Bergen
Tamara Mosimann (TM)	Student representative
Walter Bruchhausen (WB)	Bonn
Yolanda Amat (YA)	ISGlobal

Institutional Members: 17

Individual Members: 1

Student representatives: 5

09:00 – 10:00 – Opening by GF and RW, welcome speech by Dr. Jan Ehlers, Dean of Education in UW/H, group photo

Session 1: 10:00-11:30, Chair: GF

Present: WB, BB, AM, AF, ML, NC, JP, RW, FY, MF, MN, RR, GF, RK, KG, SGH, LH, LG, JaP, SD.

Implementation of the Agenda, Acceptance of Minutes

- GF presented an overview of the agenda, which was accepted by all attendees.
- GF went through the minutes of the spring GA, page by page, which took place in Munich on the 09th and 10th of February 2023. **Voting on the Feb GA 2023: 14 acceptances, 0 rejection, 0 abstention.**

Feedback on tropEd as Legal Association

GF gave feedback on the status of the network as legal association:

the secretariat received back the document from the court in Munich, which approved on all the statutes changes: 1) moving the seat of the network to Munich, 2) allowing online GAs, 3) confirming the current composition of the EC. The next step will be opening a bank account in Munich and do all the transfers from the account in Basel to the one in Munich. GF is in contact with Sparkasse, a German bank, in order to open an account. Unfortunately, it will deduct 15 euros as fee for each incoming payment. This is a regulation for non-profit organizations. This means that an amount of 250 euros will be deducted each year from the network- as fee for incoming payments. When opening the bank account, a document needs to be signed by the majority of the EC (three members).

Financial Report

- Axel Hoffmann, the treasurer of the network, and KG and EM, the reviewers of the reporting year, have developed the financial report of 2022. EM and KG agreed that all financial documents of 2022, including the invoices, are in line. However, only one bill needs to be corrected. It is related to the support fee for the secretariat coordinator.

The network should transfer a total amount of 20.000 euros per year to LMU, as salary of the secretariat coordinator. In 2022, only 10.000 euros were transferred. ISGlobal paid it membership fee of 4.500 euros to LMU instead of tropEd (due to practicality). That means that an amount of 5.500 euros is still missing and needs to be transferred to LMU. Axel is aware of the issue and should be reminded by the secretariat about the necessity of doing the transfer as soon as possible. The transfer will be executed in 2023, so it will not be shown in the financial report of 2022. The secretariat will have to keep that in mind for the financial report of 2023.

Voting on release of EC of financial reporting duties for 2022: postponed to the fall GA in Barcelona due to an incomplete payment.

- AF: if there is a problem with Sparkasse, why don't we use the 16G account of LMU as an alternative?
- GF: it is not possible since we are an organization and we need a tax consultant. Therefore, it cannot be done with the account of a university.
- EM: an outlook from the financial report 2022: we should always keep an eye on our balance when planning expenses.
- GF: that's why I give restrictions when talking about expenses such as paying speakers.
- KG: how is the traveling of the student representatives monitored/ regulated?
- GF: we voted on that in a previous GA, in Barcelona, where we decided that a total of 700 euros per GA can be dedicated for student representative, because it was only one, MMü. However, it is different now where there is a group of student representatives.

Annual Report

- RK presented the key findings of the annual report of 2022. The findings are based on the responses submitted by 17 tropEd member institutions.
- NC: language is reported as an obstacle of students' mobility. Does that mean the language of the courses or the language in the every day life in another country?
- RK: language of courses.
- GF: submitting the questionnaire of the annual report is an obligation to all member institutions. Only 17 out of 24 submitted for 2022. The deadline to submit for 2023 is 28 February 2023.

Updates on Membership Issues

- GF gave quick feedback regarding the membership application status of four institutions: Kathmandu University School of Medical Sciences, School of Global Health of Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok, University of Caracas in Venezuela, and University of Minnesota.
- AM: visited the University of Minnesota on 17 and 18 May and in the process of preparing the site-visit report. General impression: the university is mainly targeting medical students who have to pass a state exam on global health. The team working there is open, young, and has global health teaching services. There is an idea to plan a course with us, in which all categories of global health are covered. The University of Minnesota will definitely be an added value to the network. They will be invited to the GA in Barcelona.

Feedback from the Working Groups

- Scientific session (WG1: ML):
ML: we are having nice scientific sessions and we should keep on having them. It depends on the place in which the GA will take place. For example, in the Witten GA, a former colleague of RW will be the speaker of the scientific session.
NC: It is true that every WG has an expiry date, but it is important that someone keeps the work alive.
GF: we can call it a standing WG.
RW: is it possible to have it more in depth and perhaps generate publications?
ML: it is possible. If someone is interested, then this person has to approach us to organize that.
GF: publication production is heavy work. However, having a standing WG allows rich sessions with scientific input and content.
AM: agrees that WG1 stays. Maybe change its composition in order to have more than one responsible member and a rotation?
BB: including the host institution is kind of a rotation.
KG: we are four members in the WG. It is ideal to have five.
GF: this is an open invitation for people who would like to join WG1.
- tropEd recognition (WG2: FY and BB):
BB: we received two files of students, which FY and I checked based on the list of criteria. Govert was responsible of that before retiring and he was keeping all the files in an archive at our institution. So I suggested to keep that archive with the secretariat, who can have an overview of all past and future files and prepare the certificates. This will help the WG and it makes sense in a sustainable way.
GF: FY is on maternal leave. Is another person needed?
BB: I can take it alone in her absence. But it is better to have four eyes when checking the files. So, it is an open invitation to also join the group.
RW: as I know, FY would like to continue with the tropEd work while on leave.
BB: so we are fine like this.
- Teaching in times of COVID-19 (WG3: JP):
JP: there was a pressure regarding the abstract that was submitted to ECTMIH, which was not accepted. It is possible to have a new round of survey to further reflect. It is something that I will think about and notify you accordingly.
- Students Issues (WG4: RR):
RR: the WG had a recent meeting to receive updates from the student representatives and talk about the KARA platform. The concern regarding data security, if the data is based in Europe, and the possible implications of using the platform in other countries were brought up. Once we have the privacy document, we can proceed with KARA. We will need then a group of students who will test the platform.
- tropEd summer school (WG5: JP and NC):
JP: the advertisement of the summer school started in May 2023. We are considering this year as a pilot one. In the beginning, we received a lot of applications from Nigerians. After modifying the flyers and having the institutions sharing it, we are receiving applicants that are more diverse. Since a payment indicates that the applicant is more inclined to attend, we decided on a 50 euros fee for a certificate of participation.

NC: we should keep the attendance and participation in the summer school free. It is a promotional activity for the network. Regarding Nigerians, we experience the same thing at ISGlobal. They show interest in courses/ programs but cannot pay their fees. So free activities are the only trainings that they can attend.

JP: the summer school will give frontal lectures. There will be template that I will prepare to have one standard for all lectures. It will not be feasible to have interaction then.

- EC reform (WG6: ML):

ML presented 4 suggestions which were decided by the WG on the EC reform:

Option 1: Keep as it is: rotating presidency and 3 EC legal reps

Option 2: Keep rotating presidency and 2 EC legal reps

Option 3: Keep rotating presidency and Executive Secretary is legal rep

Option 4: Drop rotating presidency; all 3 presidents replaced simultaneously after 3 years and 2 EC legal reps

Closing of Day 1 of the GA.

Session 2: Membership Presentation: 13:00-14:00, Chair: JP

Present: WB, BB, AF, ML, NC, JP, RW, FY, MF, MN, RR, GF, RK, EM, BF, KG, SGH, LH, JaP, SD, AJ, MMü, TM, YA.

Dr. Somporn Kamolsiripichaiporn, Prof. Kiat Ruxrungtham, and Prof. Nattiya Hirankarn from the School of Global Health of Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, gave a 25 min online self-presentation as part of their membership application to join the network. The presentation was followed by a Q&A session:

JP: what do you expect to get out of the network?

Nattiya Hirankarn: we are interested in having a new degree in global health and it would be perfect to have a connection with the tropEd community to have guidance and opportunities of collaboration.

Kiat Ruxrungtham: we focus on tropical disease education, so we should be able to contribute to the work of the network. It would be beneficial to have our expectations together (the ones of the network and Chulalongkorn Uni) and try to match them. A certain focus is needed when deciding what to develop together. One health topic is an example.

WB: One health is present in Bonn Uni with a broad approach. There is a focus in your university on zoonotic diseases. Why that? Is it because of the health challenges faced in your country so you strengthen your research in that area? Do you have other areas with health equity approach?

Kiat Ruxrungtham: we believe that educational programs are strong if based on existing research. We have a strong excellence center and a number of faculties' communication, which give us strong research programs. The zoonotic diseases group is the strongest and works towards impact and not only education. They come in parallel: research and educational training.

NC: you present a big opportunity by bringing new perspectives to the network. What is the duration of your master program? How does your credit system look like? Is it transferable? Are there any language issues?

Nattiya Hirankarn: we have read the tropEd website in detail and looked into the ECTS system. It is possible to make it match with our system. Our semesters start in August and December.

1 credit in Bangkok is equal to 60 hours, so 2 ECTS. When visiting us, it is possible to see how to make that equivalent for international students. Students can come for one semester and pay the part-time student rate. Some courses are in English, but not all. One health and vaccinology are examples of English courses.

RW: can you tell us about the students learning experience and your teaching experience? What are the highlights? What to expect?

Nattiya Hirankarn: most of the courses are in Thai. We have to offer more in English. We want to make it like a block system. Example is the one health course, which can also be offered online. The highlight will be the practical part: to go to the field and talk to people outside the university.

GF: we used to have a member from Thailand. Is it possible to have thesis generation? Can students come to make their master thesis with you? Be engaged in primary data collection? You said that your courses are done on a daily basis during the semester but you want to change that to have blocks. Do you have the liberty to do so?

Nattiya Hirankarn: yes, we did that before for our medical students. We also do hybrid. There are no regulations that constraint us, but we organize it ourselves. Regarding primary data collection: it is important to find the matching professor. We get such requests very often. It is something feasible but the challenge is when finding the matching professor in regard of the topic.

The three representatives were moved to the waiting room of Zoom and the following discussion took place between the institution representatives of the network:

RR: very positive about the additional value that they will give to the network.

GF: they are a super tanker. Thailand is perfect to have field data collection. It is something that should be done more. It is important to get their active participation- something that should be clearly said and understood.

JP: they are super prepared for the presentation and our questions.

WB: true, but it is also risky to have them. They should be encouraged to see what students need and not be very specialized.

NC: would like to see more about their educational programs and methodology. Our students have an increased interest for courses in Asia. If there is a risk of commitment, then this should be addressed later.

JP: sees less risk because it is an institutional application and not a personal one.

Voting on proceeding with the membership application: 12 votes agreed, 0 votes rejected, and 1 vote abstained.

The three representatives were invited back to the zoom meeting, where JP gave them a summary regarding the discussion of the institution representatives. She advised them to focus on their educational perspective, to have an approach on the theoretical level of global health, and to plan how develop that in the future. RK will send them the self-evaluation report template, which should be completed and sent back to the secretariat within the next six months.

Session 3: Scientific Session on GhatGPT: 14:00- 16:00, Chair: ML

Present: WB, BB, AF, ML, NC, JP, RW, FY, MF, MN, RR, GF, RK, EM, BF, KG, SGH, LH, JaP, SD, AJ, MMü, TM, YA.

The scientific session had the title: Are we ready for ChatGPT in higher education? Exploring opportunities and minimising threats. Dr. Martyn Stewart, from Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, presented and moderated the session. After his presentation, GA attendees were engaged in the session through exploring ChatGPT themselves in addition to group discussions.

Session 4: 09:00 – 12:30, Chair: GF

Present: WB, BB, AF, ML, NC, JP, RW, FY, MF, MN, RR, GF, RK, EM, EK, BF, KG, SGH, LH, JaP, SD, AJ, LG, NT.

Course Accreditation

13 courses from seven institutions were submitted for accreditation. The course representatives, reviewers, and other institution representatives joined two Zoom breakout rooms, where the course accreditation took place in hybrid mode. The categories of the courses were decided, after engaging in discussions with the course representatives.

Feedbacks of the course accreditation session:

NC: happy to do it like it used to be before the pandemic. It is a way to share and learn from each other.

EM: why to have big groups?

GF: in order to have the right allocation of EC members and reviewers.

JP: it is a good experience. We discuss openly because we are comfortable with each other. It is a learning experience and we do not take it personal.

BB: the deadline of the courses submission should be longer. Also during the discussion, we should not explain all the comments but discuss the points/comments that should be explained to the reviewer.

AF: it is better to make the division of the groups better from the beginning. I did not review any course because I did not know in which group I will end as a reviewer.

GF: that is true, But it also depends on the number of people registered in the GA and the number of courses that will be submitted for accreditation.

KG: appreciated the discussion. Having two groups separation will give limited on which courses to review.

NC: it should not only be the responsibility of EC members. It should be a shared one.

GF: completely agrees, but it depends on who will be coming for sure.

Discussion on EC Legal Reform- Part 1

RR: if we have a bank account already in Germany, why to open another one in another bank?

GF: because it depends on the individual who has to go to the bank. It cannot be in another branch of the same bank.

WB: if the annual fee of incoming payments is 250 euros, why to stay with Sparkasse? Maybe have another account with more flexibility and lower fees?

GF: it is legally not possible as association to have this flexibility and lower fees. Because it is like we are a company and we need an external reviewer.

RW: we are using Western Union instead of other banks- when the fee is high.

GF: it is better to separate the discussion between bank account and legal reform, due to the time limitation.

BB: advocates for option 4, because it allows stability and continuity. It means that only one meeting has to take place in Munich every 3 years. Usually in the network, we form WGs

based on topics that come up without clear future planning. If there is a more stable EC then a planning can take place.

NC: totally agrees with BB. The work in the WGs should be more continuous and robust.

JP: it gives a better feeling when being represented legally by more than one person. There is a dilemma here: liking the idea of rotating presidency every year but in term of practicality option 4 will be more suitable.

RR: if we go with option 4, then having three presidents loses its logic. We should have one main representative of the three. What is our motivation for the EC reform: the number of times we have to go to the legal office per year/ X number of years or the work of the EC? If it is the number of times we have to go to the legal office, then will go with option 3.

KG: cannot decide between options 2 and 4. Option 4 is better for stability but the problem is with the commitment for three years. It is a lot of work with everything that we have on the side. Maybe it is better to make it clear: how will the tasks be divided between the three presidents of option 4?

ML: in the current division of the EC, we work together and we do not divide the tasks.

JP: you still commit for three years when entering the EC: president elect then acting president then past president.

ML: if we compare 2 and 4, we can decide and choose the 2nd person for legal representation.

NC: we discussed a lot in the WG on representation and the four eyes rule. It is always better to have at least two people. The Ex Officio member should not be an individual member but an institution representative.

BB: agrees with NC and does not see a lot of difference between option 4 and the current situation. Also would not put some emphasis only on the practical steps/ who actually signs. The practical considerations are less important than the spirit of the network. To build a strong network for the future, we should have one robust EC with a clear plan for three years. We have discussions that reoccur in the network again and again without making decisions and that's because we do not have a clear plan.

GF: really likes the current EC role and composition and objects the choice of option 4. We should work to recruit new people and option 4 allows having fewer changes across the years.

ML: we did not complete the work on option 4. We can refine it and decide that three new members can have an extension.

GF: ideally, every year new members join the network. There is no strong enough argument to remove the rotating presidency. We have to differentiate between the spirit of the network and the practical issues. The legal representative should go to the legal office and not more than that.

ML: the person at the legal office in Munich said that having two people/ legal representatives is more common.

GF: we will not make a conclusion today but it is important to have the discussion and digest everything. I suggest to start tomorrow at 9 and not at 10 am.

BB: a decision in this GA will be good because the discussion can go on and on and the work towards one option will also take time.

RR: there are two decisions: the role and composition of the EC and the legal representation. It will be good to keep them separate and prioritize the legal representation. If we have two legal representatives, then one can stand for the other. They can make a decision together on a particular topic. Why then not keeping the EC and have an additional legal representative?

BB: it like being in a parliament without having an idea of how to govern.

NC: when deciding before on having three presidents in the EC, the motivation for that was to expand the representation of the GA. We should keep this motivation and principle. Options 2

and 3 are not different because it is the GA at the end that takes decisions. Also regarding the vote for presidency: it was real candidacy before when the candidate had to commit with a working plan and interests. Now we only put names on the sheet and vote on them. The way it was done before secured a higher level of commitment.

JP: it is true that the legal representative cannot go and just make decisions without the approval of the GA. However, it is still possible to write a document, fake signatures, and go to the legal office. That's why there is the four eyes principle.

ML: regarding voting, it can be postponed to Barcelona. It is not a lot of time until then and we can think more about our choices meanwhile.

GF: in case of choosing a certain option, we have to rework our statutes. We also have to send a clear invitation and plan to all member institutions six weeks prior to the GA. After voting, three out of five EC members should go to the legal office and sign for the change to take place.

RR: maybe we should set a timeline. Because it is kind of a distillation process: GA then EC then legal representation. The EC is based on the GA and the legal representation is based on the EC.

GF: who would like to vote on the options here in Witten?

Only 4 member institution representatives out of 7 raised their hands. A voting that includes only 7 out of 25 institutions is not representative.

BB: suggests to generate a document where all the options are elaborated. The document will be sent to the network before the GA in Barcelona and we do the voting in that GA.

NC: it should be the first point of the Barcelona GA's agenda. It is not comfortable to make a decision now when having only few present members.

GF: the discussion will be continued tomorrow at 9 am.

Session 5: Students Online Satellite: 10:00 – 12:00, Chair: JP and RR

Closing of Day 2 of the GA.

Session 6: 09:00 – 11:30, Chair: JP and RR

Discussion on EC Legal Reform- Part 2

JP: gave an overview on the 4 options.

GF: these options will lead to changes of the statutes. We should be aware of them, inform the members of the network, and send an invitation 6 weeks before the next GA- with a clear agenda. After that, we have to go to the legal office with 3 EC members.

WB: the legal representation does not have anything to do with the association, its work, and spirit. Colleagues from outside Germany have other ideas on what legal representation means. It is a purely formal step. It would be good to explain the real concerns. WB supports option 3.

EK: one question about option 4: is it likely for someone to commit for six years?

NC: yes, it happens very often.

WB: what are the decisions that might influence tropEd if taken by only one person? The decisions of the network are clearly bound to the GA and the presidency.

RW: we are getting two groups here: one group with members supporting option 4 and one group supporting the rotating presidency. The group with option 4 would like to have more effectiveness of the presidency.

JP: some people feel uneasy, regarding the spirit of the network, because not all members are being represented in all processes of the network. It is about sharing.

AM: we can compare option 4 vs. options 1, 2, and 3. The most important thing is the rotating presidency. We are a small network, in good relationship with each other, and noone takes big responsibilities. AM is against option 4. Being part of the EC will give an opportunity to learn and take an active part of it. Between options 1, 2, and 3, AM will choose option 3 because it is more manageable.

GF: it is important to keep the network functional without any burden. GF strongly supports the rotating presidency. If this will be changed, then fine, but we should not have the rule of three years presidency. A problem of equity will raise: when someone from the Global South should come all the way to Munich just to sign a document in the legal office. It is a one minute action (the signature) in a legal office. It cannot be interpreted as a group effort when going to the legal office. GF is happy to see more people defending this position. Also option 4 will cause additional tedious expenses.

WB: my point is not about if the presidency is rotating or not but the issues of legal representation, practicality, and equity. We should question if the legal representation will really mirror the spirit of the network. Formal issues should not be given weight more than equity and inclusion. We are facing here: politics vs. science and feelings vs. facts.

BB: option 4 also represents a rotating presidency but only for three years. It is not about two groups as option 4 vs. options 1, 2, 3. The role of the EC is missing in this discussion. It should be representative and we should give it the necessary power to plan what to do with the network in the future. What we have now is a system that allows inclusiveness and learning but not planning ahead. The practicality concerning travels to sign every three years: it is something minor that you will commit to when committing to the EC. The four eyes rule is to avoid something to happen even when there is a change with the secretary. It is common sense and leads to good governance.

NC: the four eyes principle is something recommended by a lawyer. NC is in the network since 2006 and saw that most people stay for an additional mandate, so three years then again three years. Option 4 has a better perspective of strategic learning and planning, which we lost in the network. Not everything should fall on one person- the executive secretary. Maybe there is a mechanism that allows online signature. NC supports the sharing spirit, the four eyes principle, and the strategic planning.

GF: the rotating presidency that we have now is where the same one person/ president goes into three positions. However, with option 4, the same person will have the same position for three years, so not actual rotation. It is important to use the same terminologies.

RW: it is good to have clear terminologies. It is better to name the presidency of option 4 as block rotation or internal block rotation.

JP: GF said that two people can represent each other in the legal office, but again one person can do that (the signatures and the work). So one suggestion is to have the Ex Officio and the Executive Secretary as these two people, since they have a longer role in the EC.

AM: can the legal representation happen in distance? Online signatures?

GF: it is technically possible through embassies. It is not possible to do something completely online. We should show up in presence for signatures.

BB: the Ex Officio member is considered an additional member to the EC. But then he/ she stays for three years and become the 2nd legal representative. This is weird. Also for an individual member to be the 2nd legal representative? This is also weird. tropEd is a network of institutions so the Ex Officio and legal representative should have an institutional support.

NC: agrees with BB. The Ex Officio was not part of the EC but was added in one of the statutes reforms to keep the knowledge across years and the real business of the network such as course accreditation and students representation.

AM: some very experienced members can be individual members and part of the EC. But maybe we need another discussion on that?

JP: there is a scientific argument for not keeping legal representation with one person only: to have good practice and an extra person who sees and checks the work. We should close the discussion for now and contemplate to take the decision.

ML: the WG will take care of elaborating the four options and share that before the GA.

GF: it would be good to condense it to two options.

BB: we should definitely have more than two options, at least three.

Updates from Students Satellite by SM and AA

SM and AA gave a presentation, where they reported feedback from the student representatives' discussion. They mentioned the benefits of studying in the network, the summary of their previous activities, and the latest updates from their group. They also talked about what they need from the GA. Their presentation was followed by a Q&A:

AA: we specifically ask the GA to have at least one student representative by institution. We are now five representatives from three institutions. Not everyone is being involved and represented. So we would like to ask the institution representatives to reach out to students, to know about the students body, and share our activities. An example is the webinars that we have organized: the secretariat did the dissemination about them but not all institution representatives forwarded the information.

JP: we should all make efforts to advertise the activities of the student representatives. JP mentioned again the tropEd summer school on global health to AA and SM and asked them to attend at least its first session, as student representatives, in order to share their experience as tropEd students with the attendees. She asked them to get in direct touch with her.

AM: is it possible to have the presentation of AA and SM and make the list of representatives available on the website?

RK: we cannot place such information on the website, but the presentation and the list will be shared on the drive.

GF: it is a crucial suggestion by JP regarding the summer school. What are the future perceptions of the students' body? What are the current plans and dreams of the students who started this master studies? Mobility and getting a degree with less expenses are examples of perspectives of the students before. What are the perspectives now? It will be good to have further insights on that. Maybe there will be an opportunity to discuss and elaborate on that during the summer school. What do you think about that?

AA: we will be happy to share our experiences. Not sure whom of the student representatives will be able to attend the first session, based on availability, but for sure one or two student representatives will be there to share their experiences.

JP: it is also an invitation for institution representatives: check if you have any tropEd engaged student who would attend the summer school and share his/her experience.

AA: we have two points that require response from the GA: 1) the students WG- are there any updates?; 2) Kara platform: what are the latest updates? How soon and how quickly can we start using the platform? We are aware of its importance and we do not want to use social media as platform.

RR: Rafik is trying to deal/respond to our concerns regarding privacy, data protection, and if the data is based/ saved in Europe. He is working on a new privacy policy. He will try to finish

that soon and include all the details. The link to use the platform is ready but it is best to hold it until Rafik finishes and circulates the privacy policy and the information on shifting the server from the US to the EU.

JP: couldn't the students start using the platform already? Can they use the link to just give back recommendations and feedback?

RR: even if it is just a trial, I would not like to put Rafik or the platform at any risk especially that the majority of tropEd students are in the EU. Regarding the WG, we met only once but the students were meeting between themselves.

Learning Experiences within tropEd: ISGlobal and Umea Collaboration by ML and NC

ML gave a presentation about the collaboration experience that took place between Umea University and ISGlobal. ML and NC shared their reflections from visiting each other's institutions. According to NC, these visits allowed opportunities for discussions, which were not/ cannot be done in depth during the GAs. The discussions were not only about courses accreditation but also about administrative and alumni activities. JP found such collaboration very nice and encouraging and suggested to do a similar thing on ChatGPT as an example. GF asked about the cost efficiency of such collaborations (funding and agenda allocation). ML explained that no big funds were needed. She also said that such events are a kind of an investment, especially for the people who work on the administration level- the people doing the backstage work- who are encouraged when having such events for them. YA described the collaboration as a good investment and experience that allow the employees of both institutions to understand how things work. RR had a conversation before with Govert about Erasmus+ funds, which can be used by the network for mobility purposes. UCL used these funds to visit ISGlobal before. Maybe the same type of funds can be used by tropEd students and faculties? GF found the collaboration between Umea and ISGlobal a very good example that allows bilateral cooperation and exchange and increases the interest about the network and its different institutions.

Upcoming Events by NC

- ECTMIH 2023 from 20 to 23 November: tropEd abstract 'Higher education teaching and learning in times of COVID-19: Lessons learnt in terms of equity and environmental sustainability' was not accepted.
- Participation of the network in the CUGH 2023 in Washington DC, through a session on: Global health teaching and collaboration similarities and differences: a dialogue among Europe, the UK and the US. RR commented that it was a very well attended session that raised different questions and discussions. It was a good experience where the differences between the US and EU on global health were highlighted. RR and NC will have a short editorial on this matter.

Location of Summer and Fall 2024 GAs by GF

Mexico would like to host either the summer or the fall GA of 2024. GF will communicate with the corresponding institution representative in order to know which dates will be the most suitable. BB said that ITM is happy to host one of the upcoming GAs and that the fall GA of 2024 might be an option but the ones of 2025 will be more preferable.

Closing Remarks by Acting President JP.

Closing of Day 3 of the GA.

