# Board of Studies (BoS) – 3. meeting 2023

11 April 2023

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games)**, Luca Aiello** (faculty, SAT CS)**, Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business)

**Sofie Kramshøi Nielsen** (student, SAT CS), **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Theodor Christian Kier** (directly elected student), **Saskia Joanna Rauhut** (student, SAT Games)

**Pernille Rydén** (assigned guest, Dean of Education), **Ea Feldfos** (assigned guest, SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP)

Absent: No students elected from BIT yet

# Minutes

## Agenda

1. **Approval of agenda**

2. **A short message about Stine Gotved's departure as chair**

3. **Proposal to change SAT course evaluation practices**
   *App 1: Proposal to change SAT course evaluation practices.*

4. **Follow-up on delayed grades**
   SAP has looked into the overview gathered by the student representatives and made revisions to the grade statistics for Winter 2022-23
   *App 2: Case statement follow-up on grades delayed*
   *App 3: 20230411 Grades delayed Winter 2022-23*

5. **AOB (Any Other Business)**

***Ad 1***

The agenda was approved, Theodor was elected as acting chair of the Board for this meeting.

***Ad 2***

Pernille briefly touched on the situation about Stine not continuing at ITU, and thus not continuing as chair of BoS.

***Ad 3***

Sofie presented the proposal from the students/SATs about proposed changes to evaluation practices.

The proposal is based on the experiences of students, who feel that there is too much variation in how the programmes follow up on the results from course evaluations. The proposal would require the HoSPs to provide written material to the SATs, about the results of the evaluations, including written comments, and the actions proposed based on the results of the course evaluations.

Theodor added that it is not the intention of increasing the workload of the HoSPs. And asked about this issue.

Luca commented that previously, some concerns have been raised about privacy issues with regards to discussing results of evaluations, especially written comments. Thus, maybe it could be a good idea to reflect on how the students' concerns could be met without producing written material for the SATs.

Pernille added that in the Study Program Reports there is no demand to propose action points for every score that is a breach. Also, she raised some concern about HoSP workload in relation to the proposal.

Hanna added that the proposal doesn't vary a lot from what they are doing at Games presently, but that it is important to remember the rights of the teachers as well, and that if the results of teachers' evaluations are discussed, the relevant teachers should at least be present for the discussion.

Theodor mentioned previous discussions about not making written comments from course evaluations public, particularly in the case of comments that are very rude or touch on matters that are not suited for course evaluations and/or public discussions.

Sofie stated that relating to written comments, there is a difference in discussing the comments in a closed forum such as SATs, compared to a public discussion. Also, that they are not actually asking for the entire set of written comments, but more a summary of the results, and which actions would be taken. She added that it was difficult for students to see what the written comments are good for, if they are not accessible.

Signe added that the comments indeed are taken into account and discussed, and that these discussions are not limited to a very small group, but include HoSPs, Course managers and HoDs. Signe enquired into the students' reasons for the desired insight.

Pernille asked about how the HoSPs are actually following up on course evaluations. Do they, for instance, have confidential one-to-ones with teachers, or how they are doing it.

Hanna added that that is exactly how they are doing it.

Magnus stated that it is not a matter of students not believing that work is being done on the basis of course evaluations, but that some insight would aid the students in the SATs to be better advocates for participation in course evaluations. He added that maybe the central issue is a matter of how students get to know about what is going on, in the follow-up to course evaluations.

Signe added that it maybe is a matter of better feedback to the students about the processes.

Sofie added that a central issue is, how they are supposed in the SATs to work with and discuss the results, if they don't have better insight into the processes going on, and about the basis for proposed actions.

Sofie mentioned a concrete example where there was no insight into results, or discussions about why actions were not taken. This was mentioned as an example of when things are working badly, which obviously isn't always the case.

Pernille asked about the level of influence the students are seeking; is it a matter of informing the SATs about the work processes or is it a matter of the students having actual influence on proposed actions.

Theodor answered that, probably, it is a matter of transparency. That many students don't hear what evaluations are good for and are wondering why they are even evaluating if they don't know what is done with the results.

Sofie seconded the matter of transparency.

Hanna stated that they always have the students' interests at heart. But, also, the roles and tasks of SATs are not clear and are not collected in any single document. Also, what are the rules about confidentiality? All this uncertainty does not make it easy. She added that the students have a relation to the teachers they evaluate, and thus, discussions are best held to a more general level in public, but of course there is a need for transparency.

Theodor mentioned that at the onboarding session for students to Sats and BoS, they had a very good discussion about confidentiality.

Sofie added that, what is written in the comments by the students is already known among them, because they share their opinions, so the information is already "in the wild". She restated that the matter is really about getting insight into what measures and actions are made on the basis of evaluations.

Luca asked if a written statement to SATs does not run the risk of opening a box of second order implications that may backfire. Written documents are hard to contain, and the downsides of this probably outweigh the upsides. He added that the time currently spent at SAT meetings on course evaluations is too little, and that he completely understands this, and that communication needs to be improved.

Sofie stated that the proposal should probably be discussed further, and maybe adjusted.

Magnus stated that most of what is in the proposal is already policy (or best practice) but is not followed. He suggested that maybe we should have a look at how things are formulated at ITU-student.

Signe mentioned that knowing that everyone can read the personal comments would probably make teachers nervous. Sofie restated that she is not arguing for access to the actual comments, but for a discussion of results.

Pernille stated that the question is, how can we assure the psychological safety of teachers, while being open about actions based on evaluations. It is very important that teachers are allowed to fail, without being hung out to dry. And restated that what is important is feedback to students.

Luca followed up with a suggestion that, for instance, a mandatory, certain amount of time be spent on course evaluations at SAT meetings, rather than a written product.

Sofie asked about possible changes to formulations in the proposal. To which Luca responded that he still doesn't think a written product is the solution to the problem with transparency.

Sofie reiterated the questions about why HoSPs wouldn't feel comfortable writing about what they are going to do. Luca replied that in some instances the issues at hand are, or become, very personal, and that it depends on the nature of the problem.

Signe added that written formats can quickly become very rigid.

Pernille said that one thing is information from HoSPs to students, another is information from students to HoSPs; how can students help qualify decisions? Signe replied that they already get lots of information from students during the year.

Luca suggested having a dedicated SAT meeting solely about evaluations.

Ea suggested that a compromise could be that BoS makes suggestions about how to discuss evaluation discussions in the SATs.

Sofie stated that having a dedicated meeting to course evaluations twice a year could be a good start to solve the issues.

Ea suggested that maybe the SAT secretaries could look into how the meetings are planned, and if there is some way to plan with mandatory time and/or meetings. Christian will plan a meeting with them about this.

Theodor stated that a good point could be to discuss in the SAT how they are going to move forward, practically, and locally.

Sofie restated that there needs to be some kind of lasting result of this discussion, something that does not just go away when new members step in; that there is some tangible outcome of the meeting.

***Ad 4***

Ea presented the students' stocktaking of delayed grades, and thus revised the follow-up on late grades. She stated that individual courses are not presented to BoS individually, due to confidentiality issues.

Ea will make sure that all the delayed grades will be included next time. Also, apparently there has been some kind of issue with LearnIT not using the Danish week-system, which led to further delays, because LearnIT miscalculated the grading period from 4 to 5 weeks.

A lot of delays are also caused by needing to make corrections, especially due to examiners' possibly incomplete understanding of the rules for non-approved grades.

Pernille asked about why ITU doesn't have a digital exam system. Ea told the history about this, and that originally it was decided that ITU should develop LearnIT in this direction. It is not currently feasible to change this, due to the somewhat imminent arrival of "Nyt SIS" and having no knowledge about the particulars of that platform.

Theodor asked about the issue with some students, from the same class getting their grades at different times. Ea stated that they don't "sit on" data but release them when they get them.

***Ad 5***

Theodor mentioned that he had had a meeting with other students. They had discussed the distribution of grades and it seemed like maybe there are department specific differences. There is no clear indication about if or why this could be the case.