

Board of Studies (BoS) – 15 December 2021, 11:30-12:45

- Present: Stine Gotved (chair, directly elected faculty), Martin Pichlmair (faculty, SAT Games), Patrick Bahr (faculty, SAT CS), Signe Louise Yndigegn (faculty, SAT DD), Baki Cakici (faculty, SAT Buss)
- Annamaya Halskov-Jensen (student, SAT Games), Theodor Christian Kier (student, SAT CS), Thomas Flodgaard Kaufmanas (student, SAT DD)
- Ea Feldfos (assigned guest, SAP), Dorthe Stadsgaard (secretary, SAP), Pernille Rydén (assigned guest, Dean of Education)
- Absent: Mads Christiansen (student, SAT Business), Alexander Lytton (student, SAT Business),
- From 15. December 2021, Ea Feldfos replaces Lene Rehder as SAP's assigned guest.*

Minutes

Prologue

Stine: This is the last meeting of the year and as chair of BoS I would like to thank all members for their service during 2021. It has been a pleasure working with you.

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of minutes from meeting 22 November 2021

Members had trouble locating the draft minutes in Teams. Dorthe apologized for having forgotten to attach them to the calendar invite and instructing on where to find them in Teams (agenda and minutes are now located under a separate tab called Agenda and Appendices). BoS agreed that Dorthe sends out the draft minutes from this and last meeting asap this week whereafter BoS will approve them in writing.

3. Information: The Exemption Committee reports from the past months' cases

Stine: The committee has only had one meeting during the Autumn semester. The committee handles cases where SAP is in doubt, or a principled discussion is needed. Because we have continued to be somewhat in COVID19-mode, SAP handles most of the applications for exemptions. Ea: As has been the policy throughout the COVID19 period, SAP grant most applications for exemptions.

Stine: I have a suggestion for the membership of the Exemption Committee. As it is, BoS' chair and vice-chair are the members. I think we should change it to the two directly elected BoS-members. When we discussed if the committee should have more members, the argument for not making the committee bigger was that the members must represent all students and not a single SAT or study programme. Making this change would mean tasking the directly elected student with this.

Decision: *A decision on Stine's suggestion on committee membership was not made at the meeting.*

4. Exemption Committee – taskforce

Ea: This is not a decision item, rather we want to give you a status. As discussed in BoS earlier this year, some exemption cases require in-depth knowledge of the study programme concerned and the committee (with its three members) does not necessarily possess this. We experience more and more cases where an intimate knowledge of the study programme is needed. And we get more and more students with special needs, e.g. concerning exams. The last year has seen many initiatives in society to offer more help to students with special needs, it is a societal focus area. It generates a lot of didactic discussions, logistic challenges etc. to make sure we treat all students equally (which more and more often means not treating them the same). I think ITU needs time to learn from other institutions. A taskforce within the area of special needs has been established. So far it has members from SAP and faculty. We would very much like student members as well – the student voice is key to establishing the right handling of the special needs area. Another option is to consult Student Council throughout the process.

Thomas: Also, it is important to have a taskforce without too much change in members.

Stine: That concern was primarily related to the Exemption Committee due to legislation. This is a separate taskforce more concerned with exams etc.

Ea: We are waiting on a report with recommendations for the special needs area. The report is made by a national working group established by the Danish Agency for Higher Education and Science. The group includes participants from higher education institutions, student organisations, the Student Counselling Service (the national one funded by the Ministry of Higher Education and Science) etc. The ITU taskforce expects to be able to give BoS some recommendations in June 2022.

Stine: Concerning the participants in the ITU taskforce I wonder why nobody from the DoE Support are included.

Ea: We coordinate closely with DoE Support.

Pernille: I would like to add that management is also working with these issues at the political level in RUP (the Educational Policy Committee under Universities Denmark, the organization of the eight Danish universities working to enhance their cooperation, visibility, and impact).

Conclusion: *The taskforce will use Student Council as a sounding board and get back to BoS with recommendations in June 2022.*

5. Decision: Changes to appendix on exam forms

Ea: Department CS would like to introduce a two-hour version of an exam form that is currently four hours. The exam form as such already exists but not with a two-hour version.

Stine: What is the reasoning behind adding the two-hour version to the exam form?

Ea: I have discussed it with the Course Manager as two hours is a very short time, and experiences show that many students spend the first approximately 20 minutes of a written exam in some state of mild panic and trying to get an overview of the assignment. The Course Manager maintains the students can do enough within two hours for the examiners to make an assessment and give a grade. The Head of Study Programme has been consulted and backs the proposal.

Stine: Has Learning Support been consulted?

Pernille: Choosing an exam form – and implementing new exam forms and/or versions – must always be based on a quality argument. The exam form must always be the best possible for the course contents and intended learning outcomes.

Ea: Learning Support has not been consulted. The Course Manager experiences getting enough material from students within two hours to be able to assess their level.

Stine: I do not think we are ready to make this decision. A quality assessment of the suggested two-hour version must be made.

Pernille: We must also consider it from a student perspective. I support experimenting with new ways of conducting exams but changing exam form/introducing new exam forms must always be based on improving quality and learning.

Stine: Currently no written exam can be under three hours. We need to examine why we have the three-hour lower limit. If it is based on substantiated concerns for quality and learning, I do not support introducing a two-hour version.

Conclusion: *BoS is not ready to decide on the proposal to introduce a two-hour version of this exam form. Learning Support must be consulted, and the viewpoint of students included.*

Baki: I would like to introduce an exam form-related topic: ITU's exam forms have a complicated naming/numbering system. It is difficult for teachers to remember and work with and with new variations and versions being added, the naming/numbering becomes more and more cryptical.

Ea: This was one of the first things I noticed when I came to ITU two years ago. I agree that something should be done. We must have a system to distinguish between different types of exam forms, but the naming/numbering can definitely be improved.

Patrick: I have no problem with the names. I do not give the students the official name of their exam but a description of what their exam form entails.

Ea: I will be happy to work on this. would anybody like to participate?

No BoS member volunteered.

Conclusion: *BoS recommend carrying out a renaming project in 2022 run by SAP Exam Team involving faculty.*

6. Consultation on Quality Policy 2022

Dorthe: The main change compared to the Quality Policy 2021 is that Development Goals belonging to the Strategic Framework Contract between ITU and the Ministry have been taken out. The current contract expires 31 December 2021, and the new contract has not yet been negotiated (negotiations began in Autumn 2021 but the Ministry has postponed them to February 2022). Other than that, Education Group and Executive Management (and me as quality Coordinator) agreed not to make too many changes while we are still undergoing institutional accreditation.

Thomas: I wonder why we include PQD on female students on BDS and BSWU (page 4). I thought we were moving towards a broader agenda concerning diversity.

Dorthe: We are. This is a case of me forgetting to take out that sentence on that page – thanks for discovering it. I will remove it before the Quality Policy is finalized and signed.

Martin: we note that the threshold has been lowered, but it was not based on data.

Stine: I find the definition of Robustness problematic. We all know that while ITU may have two faculty member within an area, they may not have the time to teach all classes within this area.

Actual robustness is different from the robustness included the Quality Policy. Als, I find that DVIP should be defined as part of faculty. We use them to teach specialisations but they are not allowed to supervise theses. This is incoherent to me. All DVIP are not the same, perhaps we could distinguish between them (e.g. so that those with a Ph.D. and/or a research-like position could be allowed to supervise).

Pernille: I agree, and we are working on to reconceptualize what research-based education at ITU means and entails.

Martin: Lowering the threshold score on course evaluations to 4.5 has had an interesting side effect. The threshold score has been changed retroactively in Qlik, so now some courses that were previously considered having a quality issue are now above minimum score. This is not to criticize the decision to lower the threshold score, just an observation and a comment on unintended consequences.

Dorthe: It was a decision made by the administration to avoid a situation where evaluation data from autumn 2019 through spring 2021 had to be stored in a separate app in Qlik Sense (ITU's data warehouse). We already have a separate place for course evaluation results from before autumn 2019. The argument was that the new evaluation system had only been in place for four semesters and the lowering of the score was a consequence of adjustments made to the system once it had been in function for a while.

BoS' statement on the Quality Policy 2022:

BoS supports the decision to take out development goals stemming from the Strategic Framework Contract 2018-2021.

BoS backs the decision not to make bigger changes to the Quality Policy on this side of the Institutional Accreditation.

BoS asks for the definitions of robustness and DVIP (and what DVIP are allowed to be used for) to be reconsidered and explored.

7. Information: Requirements for progression - a student driven project in spring 2022

Thomas: Status is that the project will be a student project during spring semester 2022. Me and a fellow student will use it as a co-design project of 7.5 ECTS (with Signe as our supervisor). There will be three encounters (workshops) with relevant stakeholders and we will attempt to include and understand the needs and wants of all sides (requirements of the law, the student perspective, the teacher perspective, the administrative perspective etc.) Some of you will be invited to the workshops.

Dorthe: SAP asks to be involved/consulted when we get closer to making decisions (if not sooner). The administrative systems, processes and procedures must be able to support the changes BoS decides to make to requirements for progression. Thus, it is valuable to include SAP in the discussions along the way (e.g. those who work with course registrations and STADS).

Thomas: Naturally, that is part of the co-design set-up.

8. AOB (Any Other Business)

a. National teaching prize 2022:

Pernille: The internal ITU teaching prize has been postponed to next year's annual party.

Dorthe: BoS is asked to comment on the list of nominees. I will send an email to you on Friday 17 December with the list of nominees. They have been nominated by Heads of Department and Heads of Study Programme. please get back to me by Monday morning 20 December.

b. SAT Business IT (Baki)

SAT BUS has discussed a question about introducing the academic quarter at ITU. Some faculty would like to do this. SAT CS does not agree while SAT DD agrees. What does BoS think?

Stine: This is to do with students having enough time to get in and out of lecture rooms, does it not?

Baki: It think it stems from this.

Stine: Did we not task somebody with finding out if time edit can handle this (schedule classes to finish 10 minutes earlier)?

Signe: Instead of stopping ten minutes earlier we could begin a bit later.

Baki: The argument seems to be that more people are familiar with the academic quarter than with having to stop earlier.

Martin: The academic quarter is quite common throughout Europe. Students in SAT Games have expressed fear the culture will be sloppier (will people show up on time etc.). however, it could make a psychological difference in class; it might be easier to start later than stop earlier.

Theodor: The members of CS SAT did not agree on this. some are in favor others against introducing the academic quarter.

Signe: We were told stopping ten minutes earlier is a rule we must implement.

Stine: I think it has been in place for years. Will someone lign up the arguments in favor and against?

Decision: *Dorthe puts a discussion-item on arguments in favor of and against introducing the academic quarter on the agenda for the meeting in March 2022. Dorthe will ask all SAT to list arguments (in favor and against) and send them to BoS in writing.*

- c. *Ea: I would like to inform, that as of today Lene R is replaced by me as assigned guest from SAP (unless items on the agenda require Lene's presence).*