Board of Studies (BoS) – 9 October 2019
Minutes

Present: Jörn Christiansson, Baki Cakici, Paolo Burelli (had to leave halfway through the meeting), Mark Hyslop Graham, Dorthe Stadsgaard (secretary).

Absent: Emilie Hvashøj Pedersen, Sophia Aumüller Wagner, Theodor Christian Kier, Marco Carbone, Stine Gotved, Annelise Agertoft, Stilyan Petrov

Guests: Lene Rehder, Aske Kammer, Karina G. Christensen (SAP), Anna E. Thomsen (SAP)

1. **Approval of agenda**
   Approved

2. **Approval of Minutes from 24 September 2019**
   Approved

3. **New Head of Studies**
   Associate Professor Aske Kammer asks BoS to recommend him as Head of Studies (HoSt) from 1 November 2019.
   Executive Management has accepted Aske Kammer as new Head of Studies, but an official recommendation from BoS is needed.
   Once appointed, Aske will allocate three days a week to the position. He will get a HoSt office in SAP (3D) and keep his faculty office in 5D.

   Not enough students were present at the meeting to make a decision. All members who were present agreed to recommend Aske Kammer as Head of Studies. The rest of the members are consulted via the draft minutes.
   All members who replied to the draft minutes supported Aske Kammer as Head of Studies. Dorthe sent BoS' recommendation to Executive Management 24 October 2019.

4. **Election of new chairperson for Board of Studies**
   Executive Management has decided that Head of Studies is not a member of Board of Studies. It takes effect from 1 October 2019. BoS must elect a chairperson among faculty.

   BoS has 10 members; Five faculty and five students. Four faculty and student members are elected to BoS via SAT, one faculty and student member are elected to BoS directly. Any of the faculty members can chair BoS, any of the students can be vice-chair.

   All members who were present wish to ask Stine Gotved to continue chairing the BoS (Stine continues to be a member of BoS throughout 2020). As Stine was not present, the BoS will discuss a new chair/decide to continue with Stine at the next meeting (1 November 2019).

5. **Goals and learning outcomes for projects and final projects**
   ITU has one set of project goals that applies to all study programmes and all types of projects. There are benefits as well as challenges to this. It is proposed to adjust the first project goal to establish a connection to the curriculum of the programmes.

Appendix 1-3.
Anna E. Thomsen participates.

Anna: First, a correction to the text in appendix 2; part of a sentence has fallen out (underlined): "However, it also leads to problems <u>when assessing final projects</u>." *The idea is to establish two set of goals, one for final projects, one for other projects.*

Baki: The proposed changes are an improvement, but from SAT BUSS' point of view the goals still focus too much on students having to work on a problem. Also, they still make assessment of cross-departmental projects difficult.

Jörn: Can we adjust goals at programme level?

Anna: No, not as long as BoS wishes to have a common set of goals

Jörn: My SAT also have a problem with the word problem. Could we write research problem instead of just problem?

Baki: The word solution is also a problem. Could we write answer instead? Then it does not imply that there is a set solution. Answer could be changed to resolution (later sentence).

Paolo: Yes to avoiding the terms problem and answer.

Mike: I agree.

Jörn: What about other projects, also smaller ones students do to earn missing credits?

Anna: We propose to keep them as they are. At least for now. Only making changes to final project goals now.

Mike: Could we have some sort of goals for cross-disciplinary projects?

Baki: We should discuss this at a future meeting.

BoS members present propose to replace the word 'problem' with 'research problem' and 'solution' with 'resolution'.
Not enough members are present for BoS to make a decision – input will be collected from the remaining members via the minutes, Dorthe will then inform Anna.
Changes must be in place by 1 December 2019.
Not enough members gave their input when consulted on the minutes. The item was put on the agenda again 1-11-2019.
Dorthe will put guidelines for cross-disciplinary projects on the agenda for a future meeting.

6. **Project sizes and examination syllabus**
   Rules and recommendations concerning the size and examination syllabus (pensum) for projects and exam assignments have not been updated for a while. SAT has given their input.
   Appendix 4-6.
   Karina G. Christensen participates.

Karina: I have not yet seen the feedback from the SATs (Dorthe will forward it after the meeting).

Mike: Games is pretty much in line with the suggestion. Official guidelines are less important than supervisor – student agreement; size and syllabus depends on the project.

Baki: We like our current formulation (SAT BUSS).

Jörn: SAT DD – we have made a suggestion. We made a table, which is in the appendix. The presentation can probably help making it clearer.

Karina: I will have a look at all the feedback and make a suggestion.

Aske: SAT DD – as long as you have agreement among supervisors on a programme there are no issues. If not, students get confused etc. We want to standardize within programmes in my department.

Baki: Having both a page range and the possibility for reduction is difficult to administer.

Mike: Games – a ball-park range works for Games.

All SAT must be absolutely concrete about each individual programme's needs/wants. Dorthe informs the SAT Secretaries. The item will be put on the BoS agenda again asap.

7. **Evaluation of Code of Conduct**
   ITU's Code of Conduct is up for evaluation during autumn 2019. BoS is to discuss the evaluation method and approach. Lene Rehder will introduce.
   Appendix 7.

   Lene: *The Code of Conduct was approved in aug 2019. The evaluation was never discussed; how to do it, expectations etc. I am looking for input and ideas on how to do the evaluation.*

   Baki: *It would be good to know about cases where the code of conduct was insufficient/did not help. And cases where it has had an effect. We should have a guest who can tell us about this and the day-to-day challenges of working with the code when cases appear.*

   Lene: *We could ask Stine Gotved and the Student Council to inform us. Cases will be presented generically to ensure anonymity.*

   Baki: *They could point to formulations, statements ect. that works/do not work.*

   Lene: *We could also ask the Safety Board to give their feedback on their experiences with the code of conduct. And have a session where we ask random students e.g. in the canteen.*

   Mike: *Student Council do info-breakfasts – perhaps that's a way to get info from students.*

   Mike: *The policies tell about where the students can go, but not a lot on how they get info/results back. Could that deter people from speaking up?!*

   Lene thanked BoS for ideas and input. She will continue working on designing an evaluation.

8. **Mandatory activities – input from Programme Coordinators**
   The Programme Coordinators have a few suggestions to how we formulate text on mandatory activities on Teaching Guide.
   Appendix 8.

   Baki: *The paper and suggestions are ok, but by making sure students are not grading each other we have created a kind of threatening language… as a CM you barely dare ask students to give each other feedback.*

   Lene: *Have you thought about not doing it on mandatory activities – making some mandatory activities non-mandatory to allow for student feedback?*

   Baki: *Then I would see this formulation as more problematic – it is very valuable for the students to see each other's work.*

   Mike: *Could BoS take a look at all mandatory activities? Mandatory activities are messing with exams.*

   Lene: *We have an overview of all programmes, their courses and mandatory activities for spring and autumn 2019. That could be a starting point.*

   Mike: *We could look at the number of mandatory activities by course, programme and semester. Next step; what kinds of activities are they? To discuss what they are, what they should be and how we should use them at ITU.*

   Baki: *Sounds good.*

   The suggestions from the Programme Coordinators were approved.
   Dorthe will put 'overview of mandatory activities' on the agenda asap and get hold of the overview (from Viktoria Hofbauer).

9. **AOB**
   a. New library concept – pro-rector requests a real consultation of ITU students. E.g. via an open meeting facilitated by Student Council where students can comment on the proposed concept (which will have to be distributed along with the invitation to the meeting).
   Comments so far: 1. Students must have easy access to course literature/examination syllabus, 2. Board games should be kept at ITU, e.g. in Analog.
   Appendix 9-10.

   BoS decided to write the chair of Student Council and ask them to organize and carry out an open consultation of students.