Board of Studies (BoS) – 3 February 2022, 11:45-13:00

Present: **Stine Gotved** (directly elected faculty), **Martin Pichlmair** (faculty, SAT Games), **Therese Graversen (**faculty, SAT CS), S**i**gne Louise Yndigegn (faculty, SAT DD), **Baki Cakici** (faculty, SAT Business)

Theodor Christian Kier (directly elected student), **Sofie K. Nielsen (**student, SAT CS), T**homas Flodgaard Kaufmanas (student, SAT DD)**, Khurram Murtaza Kah**n** (student, SAT Business)

Ea Feldfos (assigned guest, SAP), **Pernille Rydén** (assigned guest, Dean of Education)

Lise Lawaetz Winkler (DoE Support, guest for item 7), **Peter Stinus** (student, substitute for Thomas Flodgaard Kaufmanas from SAT DD)

Absent: **Dorthe Stadsgaard** (secretary, SAP), Lise LW handled minutes in Dorthe's absence.
Peter Bech Astrup (student, SAT Games),

Minutes

1. **Approval of agenda**
    Stine suggested to delete agenda point 4 as an exemption committee is already in place (the directly elected VIP, Stine Gotved, and the directly elected student, Theodor Christian Kier). With this change, the agenda was approved.

2. **Introduction by the 2021-chair – Stine Gotved**
    Welcome to new members and a new year in BoS. The former chair (Stine G.) gave a brief introduction to BoS' responsibilities.

3. **Election of chair and vice-chair**
    The former chair, Stine G., introduced the chair and vice-chair roles. Stine Gotved was re-elected chair. Vice-chair will be elected at the next BoS meeting. Students are encouraged to discuss and agree on whom will take the vice-chair position.

4. **Election of a faculty and a student for the Exemption Committee**
    Deleted as representatives in the exemption committee have already been chosen.

5. **Approval of minutes from meeting 15 December 2021**
    Minutes were approved

6. **Results from and follow-up on Course and Supervision Evaluations Autumn 2021**
    Pernille: Response rates have decreased the past four semesters as can be read in the Call of action appendix. This is worrying. I have already had discussions with the Heads of Department and will have a round with all the Heads of Study Programme. It is a problem with many layers. What are the reasons?

How can we make it meaningful for students to evaluate? Are the students victims of survey fatigue? Are the evaluations in competition with other surveys? We must find a way to do evaluations in a smarter way. Students might feel like they are evaluating out of context, periodical evaluations, we need evaluations that are more contextual. There are no easy solutions. Oliver Krancher suggested increasing the number of email notifications to course managers reminding them about the evaluations.

Baki: It is important to understand the context. Two years ago, faculty suggested removing teacher scores from the evaluations, but the former Vice-chancellor overruled that. This means there is no buy-in from faculty.

Martin: We have an ok response rate at Games. I have talked to course managers with low scores: When evaluations did not happen in class, they did not happen at all. Teachers need time to integrate evaluations in their teaching, organically. More emails will not help.

Stine: Can we make it more visible what we use the evaluations for? E.g., that CrossDit has been removed with reference to continuous bad evaluations.

Theodor: I have talked to a lot of students. The students want feedback, and this will increase participation. I am not sure which format the feedback should have. It should be mandatory to evaluate in class. I have not tried to evaluate in class more than once during my time at ITU. Student Council did a survey targeting 1st semester students and reminded them about the official course evaluations as well, so I do not think this influenced response rates negatively.

Thomas: I agree with Martin. Moreover, faculty need to think about how they present the evaluations, they should be presented as something meaningful.

Stine: I have always presented them this way and given students time in class to participate; it does not do the trick (about 50 % response rate).

Pernille: The suggestion to dedicate time in class to evaluate has been sent to Dorthe. But it is not just about rules, it is a culture thing. We need to find out why some people neglect it.

Signe: I do an in-class evaluation, and this competes with the official survey because some students may not fill out the survey because they feel they have already evaluated. I like this dialogue with students.

Baki: the buy-in from teachers are low, teachers use other evaluations than the official one

Pernille: it makes sense with formative evaluation, but we also need the official evaluation to satisfy other external stakeholders. Is this a driver for students?

Theodor: No, I do not think so. Students want to see changes in-house, changes for future students.

Thomas: To some students ITU feels like a conglomerate, students do not know where this information goes.

Stine: Call to action: DoE has the lead.

Theodor: Regarding supervision evaluations; there seems to be a technical error. A lot of people never received the evaluation after handing in BSc and MSc projects. This might be the reason why the response rate is so low.

Thomas: We discussed in SAT DD if students could receive a collective request for all courses instead of several emails, however, this is not possible for the guest course attendants etc.

Baki: individual evaluations of teachers have caused stress.

Ea and Lise will take the issues about the supervision evaluations to SAP to investigate the problem.

7. **Results from Study Environment Assessment survey 2021 and intro to process**
   Lise from DoE Support introduced the reports and some of the overall trends: There are no serious red flags but still issues to pay attention to and aspects to do better on. E.g., feedback and stress questions receiving bad to medium evaluations. Moreover, most indicators have received lower scores compared to 2018 and 2020. During the next months, BoS will discuss data – first in SAT and then in BoS. Please note that we pushed the date for your first discussion in BoS to 30 March based on request from SAT secretaries (changed in the document in the Teams folder but not in the appendix attached to the calendar invitation). In April and May 2022, BoS will discuss, revise, and qualify the existing study environment assessment action plan based on the data and stakeholder feedback.
   Lise and Pernille also pointed out that data (including open answers) are being read, analyzed, and used by DoE and support when planning other initiatives and for qualifying the BEWISE framework etc. Before the March meeting, Lise will try to find time to investigate how ITU performs on some of the survey parameters compared to other universities.

   Thomas: I would be very interested in hearing about ITU in comparison to other universities.

   Stine thanks Lise and DoE Support for the considerate process. **BoS approves of the process**.

8. **Introduction to BEWISE – strategy for a thriving learning environment (and feedback from BoS)**
   Pernille: Talking about student input: we have looked at input from students. The result is the framework BEWISE; an acronym for drivers to secure a thriving learning environment. These are drivers for reflection. We do a lot of things already. BEWISE is a tool for discussions across courses and study programmes. It is for open interpretation, it is something everybody should do, not something the management should do. This awareness and mind-set take a long time to embody. We have made a dogme video for internal use. Is it meaningful to you? Is it easy to remember? A tool for transparent dialogue.

   Baki: the faculty perspective is: Does this require work and where should the time for this work come from? Moreover, we need text and not just a video.

   Thomas: I have a written document with feedback from SAT DD: It is an idealistic strategy, we see a need for a more pragmatic one, e.g. concerning resources as Baki mentioned. Is the perspective academically founded? There are some references in part of the strategy, this should be reflected in the

text. SAT DD found the idea of empowerment challenging to administer and to navigate. This should be elaborated (Thomas will send Pernille the comments from SAT DD).

Stine: I must admit the video made me laugh because of the auto-generated texting, video is not the right format.

Therese: My question is: In what way is this faculty-empowering? I only see the student perspective, we are doing a lot for students already. You must be careful what you communicate, do not impose any more workload and stress on Heads of Study Programme and teachers.

Pernille: The way you construct your teaching, balanced learning – this is not new, not an ad on. The awareness of creating a balance is new. You already contribute and that is just cool. Some Heads of Study Programme were worried about the support driver: Does it mean we must pamper students? No, we need to find the right balance. These are spectacles to look at it with, strategy is not just something you do.

Therese: I think that students will watch this video and interpret this another way.

Pernille: It is a perspective to help us reflect on the best design, we interpret things differently.

Baki: I understand that some people are already doing it, but some people do not or need to do more. What should teachers do less?

Signe: I agree with what has been said, a teacher perspective is missing.

Thomas: I am happy with the intention to use the framework to open the discussion, because we were afraid that decisions had already been taken. E.g., striving to balance online and onsite sounds to us like a step towards hybrid teaching rather than going back to how it was before covid.

Pernille: No, that is not what balanced learning is, but this is all explained in the text version. There are things that we must act on. I do not like the interpretation of this as a zero-sum game, if I do something here... I cannot do something here. No, these are investments that might pay off in the long run. Workload and other issues – we need to pay attention to this like we do in the action plan and elsewhere.

Thomas: We need to have the issues, such as Balanced learning, elaborated.

Baki: You talk about investments: With faculty the capital is time, and we are broke – out of resources, that is what I am trying to highlight.

Pernille: There are external demands about assessments of the study environment and other things. If there is no room for development as Baki says, this is serious business for a university.

Signe: Faculty feels pressured and cannot separate external requirements from others.

Pernille: Thanks for giving your honest opinions. Maybe the video is not the right medium. There are many things to discuss. Attention to workload for faculty is the core message of the discussion today.

Stine: For who and how needs to be discussed.

Therese: It must be acknowledged and disseminated that we are already doing a lot of things. It seems ungrateful not to appreciate the tremendous work faculty does.

9. **AOB (Any other business)**
Baki announced that he is stepping down as Head of KDIM from end of March 2022, which means he will not be member of SAT and BoS either. Baki thanked BoS for being one of the most fun and honest discussion fora at ITU. Stine thanked Baki for his contributions.