

Meeting SAT CS – 09-04-2025

Present:

- Louise Meier Carlsen (Co-HoSP BSWU)
- Michele Coscia (substitute HoSP BDS)
- Luca Maria Aiello (HoSP KDS)

- Malthe Rødsgaard Pabst Lauridsen (KDS)
- David Martin Sørensen (KCS)
- Wiktor Pedrycz (BDS)
- Omid Sabihi Marfavi (KCS)

- Mette Holm Smith (ProCoor BDS/KDS)
- Allette Bjørn Bundgaard (ProCoor SWU/CS)
- Marc Kellaway (ProCoor SD, Secretary SAT CS)
- Luís Cruz-Filipe (Head of Education)

Absent:

- Patrick Bahr (HoSP KSD)
- Marco Carbone (HoSP KCS)
- Dan Witzner Hansen (HoSP BSWU)
- Paolo Tell (guest)
- Julia Bijak (BDS)

Minutes:

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of minutes from meeting 19/3-2025

No comments to the minutes received within the 10 working days period. Minutes approved.

3. Visit from Head of Education Luís Cruz-Filipe

The members of the board and Luís introduced themselves.

4. SAT talk SAT

Luca: What would we like to get out of these meetings? Do we want change something? How do we want to work?

Malthe: My expectation is that I am here to provide knowledge on how to be student on the DS programmes to the head of programmes, and raise the issues I might hear from my peers.

David: I feel the same way, but I also think there is a potential beyond this in developing the programmes, where we can function as a counterpoint to give the student perspective. I think the greatest use of the board could be if we could work together, set some goals and figure out what steps to take together to reach those goals.

Omid: I was recommended to be her by the Student Council. I want to give sparring to whatever subject is brought up.

Wiktor: I believe I'm here to provide insights from my fellow students, make sure the student perspective is remembered in the discussion.

Michele: I think the board is an occasion to show the work we do with the programmes to the students, to acknowledge the issues there might be, and to show how we try to approach them.

Louise: Accountability to the students is important, so it is good to have an institutionally structured way of securing this by having these meetings. But I also like the students to bring up issues they see – it is not your responsibility, but if you see something, you are very welcome to bring it up.

Luca: This is clearly a crucial connection. We want information to flow both ways in relation to planning and development. It is also important to keep the programme coordinators in the loop, as they are also needed to make things work. One thing we have discussed a lot in the past is whether SAT should be more involved in taking more strategic decisions, but this seems to have been transferred now to the education groups with all HoSP and the HoE. So, the question then is – why do we have these meetings?

Mette: As for the programme coordinators, we are here as guests – that is for answering questions and bringing the information on legacy and history into the discussions where needed.

Marc: We also work as sanity check in relation to rules and regulations.

Allette: I agree with Mette and Marc, but in addition to this also find it very important as programme coordinator to hear the discussion and get a feeling of what is in the air.

Luís: We need to discuss whether the current structure is the best structure. The basic structure is defined in the university law, but the actual design is left up to the universities. The one we have at ITU is a common one, with a high-level BoS and lower-level delegations – here SATs – to take the discussions. So, SAT is also the place to have general discussions. We have a forum where HoSP and HoE meet, and also have these discussions, but there are no students in that forum. If something affects the students, we should bring it here too – so we have to figure out how to make this work in the best way.

Louise: One thing we have talked about earlier is, that we shouldn't talk so much about individual courses, but rather focus on broader overall discussions concerning more than one programme.

Luca: I agree – this kind of board, if kept, should be abstracted more. Perhaps split into smaller meetings sometimes.

Omid: I'm thinking when we talk about specificity that it also depends on the context. Perhaps some might want to talk about the kind of the exams we have, but does this cover specific issues with specific exams also?

David: I agree with Lucas' point that it could be efficient to split into smaller meetings sometimes.

Marc: There might be an issue with accountability if we were to have more, and smaller meetings, as we would still need minutes and similar. Unless you just are talking about informal preparation from specific members before a meeting. (I.e. deciding at a meeting that someone should talk together and prepare something for next meeting.)

Mette: Perhaps it would help if we had some sort of chair or a structured planning for upcoming meetings?

5. Students and their understanding of their relation to the university

Louise: I couldn't be at the last SAT meeting and the meeting before but had these suggestions for things we should discuss:

1. Relations between teacher and students. How can we change relationship between lectures and students, become more collegial?

2. How to get students to attend exercise classes and live coding? We know that when students attend this, they also study more outside teaching hours.
3. Education and quality – how to change the students' expectations of perfection in regard to courses?
4. Gender equality in groups - how would you like us to approach this as teachers? Inclusion in general also.

Malthe: Regarding point 3 – what is meant by quality here? It is like the slides? Or teaching styles? Exercises?

Louise: It is all these things, and also the exams. We do have ITU principles, but mistakes will happen sometimes. Also, sometimes things are not errors, but just not perfect. Sometimes slides are made a little too fast due to having too little time. Or a lecturer might turn up at a lecture even though they are sick, because they do not want to cancel.

Omid: I think some of these are closely related – like the relation between students and teachers is related to the expectations of perfection. I think it also is coming from the other end – if you as a teacher are very rigid in your expectations of the students, then the students might also mirror this and expect perfection from you. I think the point on how to get people to attend also is related in some way here. How flexible is the lecturer in relation to contact from the students. And also, in the expectations - how feasible does it seem to complete the exercises? How easy is it to get help? Sometimes people do not show up, because they have given up beforehand.

David: I concur that first three seems very related. A lot of it is about the distance between lecturer and students – sometimes at the big courses the lecturer might seem almost as a person on a screen.

Wiktor: Regarding the point on expectations - I think perhaps teachers should be expected to strive for perfection. Not that things have to be perfect, but teachers should at least listen to feedback about slides or materials or similar.

Omid: I feel personally that some lecturers might give students a hard time if they do not understand an exercise correctly, but often does not also have the flexibility to give to help needed. But I know there also might be difference in how much time the lecturer have available, which might also be a reason.

David: I think this is true, but I also think that we right now are talking a lot about top-down stuff. Some students also come in with their own expectations – they seem themselves as having to be perfect, and so also expect the teachers to be perfect.

Luca: I suggest we put this forward and move it from the diagnostic level to the proposal level, to see if we can make some suggestions. This means we need to turn this into some that is actionable for the head of programmes. Should we extract a few points for this to be fleshed out for next time?

Omid: I also like us to talk about the exam formats. The background for mentioning this is that I am TA for Functional Programming at SWU, where the students are going to test the new format in WISEflow, and as a TA I hear a lot of worries and questions.

Marc: I will invite Ea (the head of the exam team) to the next meeting, as she will be the one to best answer questions on WISEflow. Perhaps you will prepare some points for the discussion that I can share in the agenda and with Ea before the meeting?

Luca: Then we have the other cluster regarding the relationship between students and teachers.

David: I can prepare something together with Louise.

Decision: Luca will chair the meetings for the remainder of the semester. Then we will evaluate after the summer break. Marc plan the agenda together with Luca – will contact him about a week before the agenda goes out.

6. Information from SAT Members

Malthe: No big issues I am aware of, only small stuff re. exams.

David: No specific problems here either.

Omid: Just want we already talked about re. the exam in WISEflow for Functional Programming.

Wiktor: There is an issue with the Applied Statistics course with the mandatory activities.

Michele: I am very aware of issues with the course, but have not been made aware before of this specific issue. I have read the evaluations, and the course is going to be changed next semester. I will also focus my coordination talk with the teachers on MAs. Point taken.

Marc: MA might also be a subject in general for a later meeting.

Malthe: Back during Covid we actually did have mandatories – I am not sure I agree with MAs being an issue.

Michele: The course has changed a lot from when you took it, but again: Point taken that I should look into the MAs.

7. Plans for next meeting

- Marc will invite Ea.
- Omid will prepare questions re. WISEflow.
- David and Louise will prepare for the point on relation between students and teachers.
- MAs in general also, which we will put on the agenda for the June meeting (i.e. we might talk about *what* to talk about at the next meeting.)