

Board of Studies (BoS) – 24 June 2021, 12:30-13:45

- Present: Stine Gotved (chair, directly elected faculty), Baki Cakici (faculty, SAT Buss), Martin Pichlmair (faculty, SAT Games),
Theodor Christian Kier (student, SAT CS), Emil Vogt Sørensen (student, SAT DD), Thomas Flodgaard Kaufmanas (student, SAT DD), Mads Christiansen (student, SAT Business)
Pernille Rydén (assigned guest, Dean of Education), Ea Feldfos (SAP, replacing assigned guest Lene Rehder), Dorthe Stadsgaard (secretary, SAP)
- Absent: Marco Carbone (faculty, SAT CS), Signe Louise Yndigegn (faculty, SAT DD), Lene Rehder (assigned guest, SAP), Annamaya Halskov-Jensen (student, SAT Games), Daniel Kirsch Kromann (directly elected student), Alexander Lytton (student, SAT Business), Alex Dalum (student, SAT Business)

Minutes

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of minutes from meeting 31 May 2021

The minutes were approved.

3. Info and decision: Update from BoS' exemption committee and appointment of more committee members

Stine: For the past half year, the exemption committee has not had any cases. Because of the wide possibilities for exemptions due to COVID19, SAP has handled all cases. I hope ITU will keep being so flexible concerning exemptions in the future.

SAP suggests that we make the exemption committee bigger and asks for a broader representation of study programmes. The revised executive orders concerning exams etc. mean the committee will cover a wider area of responsibilities. Also, treating applications for exemptions often require a detailed insight into the specific study programme. Mads and I are in doubt as we know BoS members are busy enough as it is. Perhaps we could elect alternates who can be included in the committee's work as needed.

Baki: Does it need to be BoS members? Or could we draw on other faculty members?

Stine: Yes, it must be BoS members, deciding on exemptions is BoS' responsibility. The alternative to the present subcommittee is that BoS treats all cases at BoS meetings. I agree that there is an issue concerning resources.

Pernille: Perhaps we could make the committee a forum where BoS members can step in and out and contribute when they have time, and their competences are needed.

Stine: It is an interesting idea, but we would run the risk of having no one with time to do the work when decisions must be made. Also, it is difficult to step in and out because it is important to know the rules and past decisions to ensure consistency.

Ea: The background for SAP's suggestion to widen the committee is that there are new rules for handling exemptions and making decisions for students with special circumstances. There is a growing need for committee members with a detailed knowledge of each study programme.

Thomas: If it is because we need more programme-specific competences in the committee it is not a solution to just add one or two more members.

Pernille: You could rotate instead of having a standing committee.

Stine: I suggest keeping a committee and making membership fixed for a year. Looking at BoS' resources, we cannot have a bigger committee. Instead of making the committee bigger, it should be linked to the task force on mandatory activities and special needs that is to be established in Autumn 2021. I would like to invite BoS members to participate in the taskforce. The task force should be up and running during Autumn 2021. Would anyone volunteer to draft a mandate and description for the task force?

Ea: SAP will be happy to outline the needs and framework. We can discuss it during Autumn 2021 and implement in Spring 2022. I would like someone to spar with. Perhaps the Exemption Committee?

Stine: I would be happy to participate.

Decision: *BoS keeps the Exemption Committee as it is but supplements with a taskforce. Ea takes the lead in drafting a framework for the Exemption Committee and the taskforce and putting it to BoS in Autumn 2021. Stine is involved by Ea.*

4. Info: Changes to the cyclical Quality Assurance processes

Dorthe: The annual cycle for quality assurance processes has been changed. The main changes are that the annual reports (including action plans) made by Heads of Study Programme (Study Programme Report) and Education Group (Education Portfolio Report) have been moved up to be written and discussed as early in the calendar year. The purpose is to treat and use Primary Quality Data from the previous calendar year as soon as possible.

The changes take effect from 2022. Some changes are implemented in 2021 to make it possible for all to take effect next year, e.g. Programme Reviews so the 2021-reviews are timed to the Study Programme Report in 2022.

From next year, SAT will be consulted on Study Programme Reports during February (instead of June), and BoS will make their statement on Education Portfolio Report in May (instead of October).

Baki: When making the changes, was the frequency of Employers' Panel meetings discussed? And what about the concept for Graduate Dialogue, was that discussed?

Dorthe: No, the frequency and annual amount of meetings with the Employers' Panel was not discussed.

Stine. The second Employers' Panel meeting is freer in its set-up and contents and can be organized as e.g. a workshop, a site-visit, a lecture or something else. I remember when changing the concept, the panels did not want only one meeting a year.

Dorthe: Concerning the concept for Graduate Dialogue, I have promised to do some sort of evaluation of the way we do it now that we have tried it one. I have not yet had the time to do it, but it is on my to-do list for after the summer holidays.

Baki: I still feel frequency should be up for discussion. And for Graduate Dialogue; I would like to go further than an evaluation of how it went, I do not feel HoSP has been consulted on the concept.

Stine: One of the last things I did as HoSt was a project – and report – on revitalizing Employers' Panels.

Pernille: Meetings should be fruitful for all parties involved, so I would like to know more.

Martin: I appreciate having two meetings with the Employers' Panel a year and would not want any less.

Decision: *Dean of Education and Heads of Study Programme will discuss Employers' Panels, the needs, wants, set-up etc. The Dean has the lead.*

5. Decision: Addition to Appendix to Curriculum, chapter 5: take-home and online exams

Ea: Three terms with online exams and discussions with faculty, external examiners, Course Managers etc. have resulted in suggestions for two new exam forms/variations:

- A44 (3-, 4- or 5-hour online exam with online invigilation, no group exam)*
- C33 (3-, 4- or 5-hour online exam with random fraud control after exam if the Course Manager wants it, no group exam).*

The project group wants to make comprehensive guidelines for how we do online exams at ITU. Perhaps BoS must see the guidelines.

Stine: Do you have anyone in the group who has practical experiences with online teaching and exams?

Ea: Yes, Head of Department Peter Sestoft.

Pernille: Will ITU become so flexible that different students on the same course can be offered different exam forms? E.g. due to special circumstances.

Ea: I hope so.

Stine: Concerning A44, how are invigilators able to check if students are cheating?

Ea: You can be asked to share your screen.

Theodor: I have experienced random fraud control. It has been very quick and smooth. I was called up on Zoom by the course manager and asked to explain some things and some of my answers from the exam. If you have not cheated, it is not a burden.

Mads: Students who want to cheat will find a way to do so. Online exams from home and on-site exams are very different concerning cheating. I have heard from many students that knowing they could be called up at any given time during an online exam added an extra layer of stress.

Martin: Should we have a process for deciding if an online exam form is the right one for the course or if there is a better suited exam form? I have concerns making online exams a standard exam form.

Ea: We could use A42 as the standard exam form and A44 as a possibility, e.g. an exemption for some students.

Baki: My first worry is like Martins. We should oversee the use of online exams as the decided exam form on a course. It puts the responsibility on students to have the right equipment, a proper room etc. I do not find that right.

Ea: There are a lot of things we need to discuss when making the guidelines for when to use an online exam.

Thomas: Will it be a matter of what most students on the course want? Then we will not show consideration for all students, whether they prefer online or on-site.

Martin: I think it needs a lot of thought before we make online exams an option. I am critical.

Stine: To sum up, BoS is critical towards adding online exams as standard exam forms. Can BoS say no?

Ea: We are still in full pandemic-exemption-mode and no one knows what the Autumn 2021 will bring COVID19-wise. BoS could discuss it again in August/September. Bos needs to approve if the changes are to be approved.

Stine: Faculty from Department of Computer Science need to be represented when BoS discuss it again. Please include the critical comments and bring it back to BoS in August/September (the first meeting after the summer break).

Baki: The objections seem to focus on A44, so perhaps that is the one we need to discuss after summer.

Stine: To sum up: Present BoS members have reservations towards making online exam forms part of the exam form portfolio. Also, BoS wants to include Dept. of CS representatives in the discussions before making a decision.

Decision: *BoS cannot approve the proposal. Ea returns with a redraft at the first meeting in Autumn semester 2021.*

6. Info and discussion: Student Council

Theodor: There are six new people in the Student Council board, I have been elected vice-president. We really want to make Student Council an active player at ITU, and you should expect major changes. We have booked meetings with Dean of Education, the vice-chancellor, FM, and IT to discuss how we can cooperate etc. If BoS have ideas or suggestions for activities and focus areas, I am more than happy to hear them.

Pernille. Thank you to all students involved in this!

Martin: If you would like to visit the study programmes, I am happy to give you some time.

Theodor: We aim to be much more visible in general.

Thomas: Congratulations, well done. I have a suggestion concerning student well-being. Students who started at ITU in September 2020 have a hard time feeling part of the university as they have hardly been on campus yet. Let us do something about that.

Theodor: We have funds to do activities, they could be utilized.

Baki: Congratulations from me as well. All Heads of Study Programme write a welcome letter to new students, we could mention Student Council. Can you send us a brief pitch about Student Council that we and faculty can use when talking to students?

Ea: Congratulations. Since you have funds, could year groups apply to Stud Council for a freshers' trip or something similar? To facilitate reboarding of students.

7. AOB (Any Other Business)

Dorthe: Early next week, I will invite you to the Autumn meetings. Faculty members: Please make sure your schedules are as updated as possible (teaching, conferences etc.).

Martin: Associate Professor Hanna Wirman will be co-Head of Study Programme for MSc Games from Autumn 2021. I will continue as BoS member.