# Board of Studies (BoS) – 3 March 2020

**Present:**     Stine Gotved (faculty, chair), Baki Cakici (faculty, SAT Bus), Jörn Christiansson (faculty, SAT DD), Paolo Burelli (faculty, SAT Games), Theodor Christian Kier (student, SAT CS), Jonathan Jung Johansen (student, SAT Games), Marco Carbone (faculty, SAT CS), Mikala Sofie Skoglund Thomsen (student, SAT Business)

**Absent:**     Dorthe Stadsgaard (secretary, SAP); Sophia Aumüller Wagner (student)

**Guests**:     Lene Rehder (SAP), Aske Kammer (HoSt); Annelise Agertoft (LS); Viktoria Hofbauer (minutes)


## Minutes

1. **Approval of agenda**

   *Stine: BoS is in a difficult situation because we have no students from SAT-DD and Sophia seems to be on leave, which means that all minutes and decisions must be approved per mail.*

   *Jonathan: Could it be an option that the vice-chancellor can appoint one student from SAT-DD?*

   *Stine: not sure about rules. We will continue to look into it. It looks like SAT-DD students are not allowed to join BoS if they are not elected into SAT DD before. However, we are fully manned today and can make decisions.*

   *Stine and Aske: Point 7 must be postponed to the next meeting. Not yet ready from management.*

2. **Approval of minutes from meeting 5 February 2020**
   *Approved*

3. **Delayed grades**
   Theodor has requested the item. In his experience, more than 50 % of grades for written exams are delayed. SAP has provided data for winter exams 2019-20.
   Appendix 1

   *Theodor: Data shows there are a lot of delays, so our impression is correct. Currently, we see consequences of the delays, because students bring stress into the new semester. One point is unclear to me: ITU states on the homepage that grades should be given within four weeks and that the four weeks do not include Christmas. However, the official law states that Christmas is included. What is correct?*
   *Lene R: We follow ITU's rule. ITU is closed during between Christmas and New Year, hence the period cannot be part of the four weeks between exam and grade.*
   *Baki: Why are so many exams in CS delayed?*
   *Lene R: That is due to the type of exams. They use more written exams than the other departments.*
   *Stine: Is this an issue that is discussed in the CS department?*

*Marco: It happens mostly during winter exams, which can be due to Christmas break. There is a lot of collaboration and coordination going on, also with external examiners – sometimes four people need to coordinate, which isn't easy around Christmas where breaks vary in time and length.*

*Stine: It seems to be systematic. The CS department might want to discuss this further.*

*Marco: I will discuss it with Peter and maybe with the department.*

*Aske: Do we have % - numbers for exam forms per department? Maybe the % could show further tendencies?*

*Lene: We have to check this. I will add it to the overview.*

*Marco: We should also keep in mind that this refers only to written exams and not oral exams. We could think about changing more to oral exams to avoid this.*

*Theodor: There are also open questions from students. Some students get the grade faster than others. Do the numbers show the first students that receive their grade or the average delay?*

*Lene: Normally (if it is within the four weeks) we don't give grades on different days. But if they are delayed, we want to get them out as fast as possible.*

*Stine: Let's continue to investigate and start with the CS department.*

*Lene: I will also send the numbers to executive management.*

*Stine: Good, maybe add the % for each department as mentioned.*

### *Decision:*

*Marco brings the issue to Head of CS department on behalf of BoS.*

*Lene R. adds % (exam forms) for each department and forward the overview to Executive Management.*

*SAP makes an overview for Spring exams 2020 and sends it to BoS in August.*

4. **Exam complaint procedure**

   SAT BUSS wishes to raise a concern and asks BoS to discuss whether this should be included as a priority in the exam complaint processes:

   If you fail an exam and file a complaint, the process of handling it is most often too long to be resolved before the re-exam. Thus, for their re-exam students might face an examiner they have filed a complaint towards, while the complaint is still in process. The issue goes for both formal evaluation criteria and for person-to-person uncomfortable situations.

   *Baki: Gives a specific example. Examiners are aware that there is a complaint filed. Suggestion: Using another examiner for re-exam. Students might be afraid of filing a complaint if the same examiners will be used.*

   *Stine: How many complaints are we talking about?*

   *Lene: Maybe a maximum of five per semester. Remember, that it is only students who fail an exam and complain who can do a re-exam immediately. It happens very rarely.*

   *Baki: It has a silencing effect on students.*

   *Jonathan: If it is only 5 students, could it be handled quicker?*

   *Baki: If a student fails an exam and complain in time, could we handle it faster and give the students a chance to go into the re-exam without an open complaint?*

   *Lene: It is a question of resources. Two weeks to handle a complaint and organize a different examiner for the re-exam is not very long.*

   *Baki: Could we delay the re-exam? The main issue is that the complaint-process is still ongoing when going to the re-exam. And we don't want to promise them a different examiner. Would it be possible to push the re-exam?*

   *Paolo: Could it be an option that whoever files a complaint gets an oral exam?*

*Lene R: That is not possible. We cannot allow students to change exam form by filing a complaint.*
*Stine: How can we proceed?*
*Lene R.: I will investigate it and find out if it is a question of time/resources. I will also check the number of incidents.*
*BoS: We do not wish to give students the option of getting a different examiner, changing the exam form, or give them extra time because they file a complaint.*

***Decision:***
*Lene R. will look further into the number of incidents, issues and options. BoS is informed asap.*

5. **Course evaluations autumn 2019 – report**
   Discussion of the course evaluation results based on the report on course-specific questions. Do the results merit immediate action (by BoS or other bodies)? What trends, issues etc. can be identified (if any)? Pay attention to the evaluation of CrossDit.
   Appendix 2
   Guest: Gitte Bang Stald, Course Manager for CrossDit

   *Gitte provided information about the evaluation of CrossDit:*
   *A lot of effort was put into the course. The score is of course not satisfactory. However, before the evaluation came out, we were already taking action. Some comments do surprise us. During the course the teacher-team did not have the impression that we had some of the mentioned issues, but we must remember that evaluations are a more open and direct form. We, the teachers, learned a lot. Only 129 out of 323 students participated in the survey part of the evaluation. That is possible too low. A few students were actually pretty happy with course. It is a problem that we don't know what about 50% of the students think.*
   *We have been looking into the themes and the teacher-team met last week to discuss what to change in the course. Some info:*
   - *All students handed in the mandatory assignments and passed the exam (pass/fail).*
   - *The students worked really hard and put a lot of effort in it and it seems they got a lot out of it too.*

   *What changes are we considering:*
   - *Structure: 4 main teachers with only 2 clusters. Info to students will be better aligned and students get better info*
   - *Critique: too much information and too many guidelines. We will change the structure/way of providing info*
   - *Communication: focus on the scope of the course, its purpose and what we mean by cross-disciplinary work*
   - *What is required from the product should be worked on more*
   - *The team-structure worked well. There were no complains about that and teachers would like to build on the experience*
   - *We want to look at the balance between lectures and project work:*
     - *Suggestions:*
       - *More cluster-work*
       - *More guest presentations/inspiration*

   *Gitte is in the process of writing a report and will share it with BoS.*

*Baki: DIM students, who were in 3 different groups had very different experiences (from good to bad). One experience was that there were too many teachers involved. Another was that not all study programmes were represented in their group.*

*Gitte: The problem is we don't have the same number of students on all programmes. Forming the groups was a handheld process. We did our best to mix the groups as much as possible. We also see a problem in the fact that not all students show up, so we need to be more flexible in groups to be more cross-disciplinary.*

*Paolo: The problems in the course are related to it being mandatory. Whereas e.g. DADIU is voluntary and the student engagement is high.*

*Gitte: Of course, but that is a management decision. I am sure the students are not extremely happy, but I am also sure they learn something and benefit from it.*

*Baki: Should we push for making it an elective?*

*Gitte: We tried it (being voluntarily) in the pilot phase and it did not work. Now we must find out how we can improve the course.*

*Paolo: It sounds biased that everyone passed the exams.*

*Gitte: We need to work on grading. Currently it is pass/not passed, we are considering grading. To introduce grades, teachers from across departments would need to read all papers. We do not have the resources for this. Yes, some students want a grade, but it should be about learning and not getting a grade.*

*Stine: It is nice to hear that you have reflected on the challenges and want to improve the course. We should continue to discuss it.*

*Gitte: A big course should run at least three times before you can really discuss its issues. We take evaluations really seriously and look into all comments. We act on evaluations.*

*Baki: It sounds great from DIM's perspective, but we should consider making it voluntary.*

*Paolo: Yes, we need to have an honest discussion about this. When is the deadline to make such a decision?*

*Stine: That is an important point. We will continue the discussion. We will investigate the deadlines to see when we need to act if we want to make bigger decisions.*

***Decision:*** *Gitte Bang Stald sends her report on CrossDit to BoS for information when it is ready. Discussions of the rest of the course evaluation report is postponed to next BoS meeting.*

6. **Policy for use of course evaluation data**
   Stine and Baki presents their redraft and BoS discuss it. After the meeting, the policy draft must be ready to be sent back to Executive Management.
   Appendix 3

   *Stine and Baki: We looked into the two comments from last time.*
   1. *Issue with "first-time-courses and lower scores" can be interpreted under point 3 – "Institution-wide-factors…"*
   2. *The "Policy Background Info" can now be found on the first page. We want this to represent the more normative explanations for the reason of the policy.*

*Decision:*
*BoS agreed on the draft. Policy is ready to go to executive management for round two. Dorthe sends the draft policy to Executive Management.*

7. **F.Y.I.: New strategic goals of ITU**
   Head of Studies Aske Kammer informs on ITU's updated strategic goals.

   *Moved to next meeting as Executive Management have not yet forwarded the paper.*

8. **Guidelines for cross-departmental/-disciplinary projects – feedback from SAT**
   In autumn 2019, BoS initiated a discussion on the need for such guidelines. SAT were asked to give their input.
   Appendix 5

   *Paolo: It is primarily a discussion of how to protect students if they get an external examiner from a different list of external examiners than their education is allocated to.*
   *Stine: We currently have two different lists of external examiners (IIM and D). However, a lot of external examiners have a CS background even though they are on the other list.*
   *Paolo: What are the legal terms we must follow? Is there space to make changes? Do we have to take examiners from these lists?*
   *Stine: Yes. However, it is not the supervisors who appoint examiners, they provide keywords for SAP who contacts relevant external examiners.*
   *Stine: Could we define the keywords better so SAP can allocate external examiners better?*
   *Marco: Has it ever happened that cross-departmental projects had two external examiners? Could we use two if the students are from two different study programmes/departments? Maybe if we cannot find an external examiner who is on both lists?*
   *Lene R: Do you want one or two external examiners for cross-departmental projects?*
   *Baki: SAT BUSS: Or could the supervisors confirm examiners? So the choice is not only based on the key-words.*
   *Paolo: Yes, can we introduce an extra step?*
   *Marco: Yes, SAP is handlining the process, but could they get feedback from teachers in these cases?*
   *Stine: Can we go with this procedure?*
   *Lene R. So, in cases where we do not have an external examiner who is represented in both "bodies", we could consider this option. We have to check how many external examiners are on both lists.*

   *Decision:*
   *For cross-disciplicary projects, BoS agreed to use one external examiner who is represented on both lists. If that is not possible, teachers want to be consulted on the choice of external examiner. Lene R. from SAP is to implement the decision.*
   *The decision is applicable from autumn 2020. All projects started from autumn 2020 onwards fall within the decision. Students are informed mid-May and early august 2020. Faculty are informed early august 2020.*
   *BoS did not decide if guidelines for cross-disciplinary projects should be made.*

9. **Diversity Officer at ITU**

   ITU no longer has a diversity officer among staff working with student diversity. SAT BUSS asks BoS to initiate the appointment of a new representative for this position. SATBUSS has the following suggestions:
   - A person from Learning Support would be most beneficial for students and staff – they are more reachable and not connected to internal interests as HR.
   - The position could be divided between LS and the Student Councilors.

   *Mikala: SAT-BUSS finds diversity an important area at a university. It is important to have someone working on this issue. We also realized that not a lot of people were aware that a Diversity officer existed – and had resigned.*

   *Baki: There are two sides to this. There is the perspective from a Head of Study Programme: If there is a diversity issue we want to work on, we need someone with knowledge, insight and time to work on it with us. Then there is the student-perspective: Where should they go in case of e.g. sexual harassment?*

   *Lene R: Sexual harassment complaints were never handled by the diversity officer. We have a sexual harassment policy and a committee that handles complaints and cases.*

   *Baki: Okay, but students thought it was the diversity officer because she was in contact with them.*

   *Lene R: ITU has different options and different committees.*

   *Baki: So, the students were not well informed that it was not part of her job. Then we need to communicate better where to direct complaints.*

   *Stine: The diversity officer did not work with student diversity after she was moved to the HR department in July 2019.*

   *Baki: Yes, and we lack someone to focus on student diversity. If we want to bring someone in, for example to teach a seminar or workshop, it looks bad if we bring someone in from HR.*

   *Jonathan: I want to quickly refer to Sophia's written comments regarding this point of the agenda. She supports the appointment of a new diversity Officer and recommends the person has actual knowledge and experience within the field, has a focus on Inclusion and not just Diversity (meaning the focus should not only be to recruit/enroll people from diverse backgrounds, but also making sure that everyone feels included, safe and respected at ITU) and that the concept of diversity is expanded to incorporate all diversity dimensions such as nationality, sexuality & sexual identity, socio-economic background and more.*

   *Stine: Is this issue also discussed in the other SATs?*

   *Paolo: SAT Games has discussed harassment earlier, especially the terms and options of contact person.*

   *Marco: SAT CS has discussed the Code of Conduct before. So has BoS.*

   *Lene R.: In the CoC it was originally stated that Head of Studies should be contact person. In Autumn 2019 it was changed by management to Head of SAP (Lene R.) due to changes in the portfolio of Head of Studies. I have been used as contact by students, so they are aware of that.*

   *Paolo: Have we approved the changes in the CoC in BoS?*

   *Lene R. I think so.*

   *Aske: The students are of course welcome to contact me, but I would forward it to Lene R. as well.*

   *Paolo: The CoC was not discussed in BoS as we are discussing it now. Maybe we should bring it back to BoS to talk about?*

   *Lene R: I am in charge of evaluating the CoC. It is a bit delayed because of all the changes that have happened over the last half a year.*

   *Stine: Should we voice the issue of not having a diversity consultant? Should someone draft some kind of hearing? Or should it be further discussed in SAT?*

*Aske: We used to have a diversity consultant and we don't have one anymore.*

*Stine: Yes, and everyone in the room agrees on it. We share the need. How to proceed with this?*

*Aske: I would be happy to bring it to Executive Management. But it will be more forceful if it is backed by BoS.*

*Stine: Who would like to pitch in on such a document?*

*Baki: I can do it. Are there any guidelines on the format?*

*Stine: I will pitch in as well. Maybe we have to come up with our own format.*

*Jonathan: Maybe Sophia has some input as well.*

*Lene R: I suggest you also talk to the Head of HR as they might be in process of hiring someone in the previous diversity officer's position.*

*Baki: Yes, but this position should not be only anchored in HR.*

*Lene R. It is still relevant to hear what HR's plans are.*

*Stine: We aim to have a written document for the next BoS meeting to discuss.*

*Aske: In the meantime, I will mention it to executive management.*

**Decision:** *Baki and Stine drafts a document on the need for a diversity officer working with student diversity. The draft is discussed at the BoS meeting 31 March 2020.*

10. **AOB**

    **Student representative from SAT BUSS:** To be elected at the SAT meeting 27 Feb.

    **Student representative from SAT DD:** Legal informs, that there is no legal basis for holding an extra election. Thus, SAT DD cannot get students elected until next election in November 2020. This means BoS will not have a student representative from SAT DD this year.

    F.Y.I. the Vice-chancellor can appoint students to SAT.

    *Stine: We touched on this challenge at the beginning of the meeting.*

    *Jörn: Just to follow up - if there is a student from SAT DD who is interested in being a member of SAT and BoS, can (s)he contact the vice chancellor to be appointed?*

    *Stine: I am unsure about the legal stuff.*

    *Lene R: Do you think there is a student that could be interested?*

    *Jörn: Maybe if they have the possibility to share the task.*

    *Lene R.: We will look into it. Dorthe will check this issue again with Legal/ITUs regulations.*

    *Stine: I will also make some "nametags" to make it more visible who represents which group.*

    **Decision:** *Dorthe is asked to look into legal options again.*