

Board of Studies (BoS) – 5. meeting 2024

21 May 2024

Present: **Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Patrick Bahr** (faculty, SAT CS), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Tiago Fernandes** (student, SAT Games), **Alexander Senderovitz** (directly elected student), **Lena Winther Jensen** (student, SAT CS)

Guests: **Lise Lawaetz Winkler** (SAP), **Kasper Ørntoft** (SAP)

Absent: **Emil Ulrik Gregersen** (student, SAT BIT), **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games)

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda

2. Discussion of ITU's rules for Academic Misconduct

Based on case work and decisions on exam fraud and plagiarism, SAP would like BoS to discuss amendments to the existing rules.

Appendix 1: Case presentation and draft for Rules for Academic Misconduct

Guest: Kasper Ørntoft Thor, SAP

3. Study Environment Action Plan

Continued discussion from last BoS meeting, now with input from SATs and other parties of interest at ITU. Please see the attached *preliminary draft proposal* for an action plan.

Appendix 2 - Study Environment Action Plan - Draft

Guest: Lise Lawaetz Winkler, SAP

4. Education Portfolio Report

The HoSPs have written their annual Study Programme Reports and discussed them with Education Group and Head of Department at the annual Quality Status meetings.

Subsequently, Dean of Education Support have drafted the Education Portfolio Report 2024 which summarizes 2023 Quality Data and impressions from Study Programme Reports, Quality Status Meetings etc. The report has been discussed within Education Group and Heads of Department. Before the report is discussed with Executive Management, BoS discusses it and writes a statement. The statement must be sent to Executive Management and Education Group by 28th of May. Please prepare by:

- Reading the report (you will get far by reading the Summative Analysis and the Action Plan)
- Considering your feedback on the issues raised and the suggested action points.

Appendix 3: Education Portfolio Report 2024 to BoS

5. AOB (Any Other Business)

Minutes

Ad 1

The agenda was approved.

Ad 2

Kasper presented the proposal. There are currently very limited possibilities for differentiating in sanctions due to academic misconduct.

The proposal aims to introduce a scale, from minor to major, for evaluating the seriousness of cases of academic misconduct, and corresponding appropriate sanctions.

The proposed sanctions are in line with similar sanctions at other universities.

Patrick commented that having this grading scale is a good idea, and asked what the previous practice was. Kasper answered that previously, you would use up an exam attempt, no matter how minor the misconduct was.

Kasper also stated that, currently, misconduct is monitored in an Excel sheet in SAP. Another way would be to log it somehow into the administrative system, STADS. SAP would like to discuss pros and cons with BoS: Is this a good idea, or would it in some way negatively affect the equality of students?

Patrick added that he did not see a problem with registering it in STADS, since it is something that needs to be tracked.

Lena asked if all teachers could see it in STADS? Ea answered that no, only administrative personnel in SAP would be able to see it. Lena answered that if teachers can't see it, she could not see a problem with it. Aleksander added that it is important that confidentiality is assured if information like this is kept in a file on the student. Lena agreed.

The proposal was put to a vote and was unanimously approved.

SAP will incorporate the proposal in Appendix to Curricula for 1 September 2024 that is scheduled for the BoS-meeting in June.

Ad 3

Lise presented the results of the *previous* action plan. Almost all proposed actions and activities have been carried out. She then presented some of the possible effects of these actions. For instance, it seems that reports about stress have decreased, just like the physical environment has been evaluated more positive than it used to be, except for the toilets.

Lise then presented the current status of the action plan and the input from all the stakeholders at ITU. Lise asked for input from BoS on the proposals for the focus areas for the coming action plan.

Signe commented that feedback from teachers to students is something very different from the feedback loop mentioned related to course evaluations. Feedback related to learning is a big subject and she mentioned that there is a risk of the evaluation-feedback topic drowning the learning-feedback topic. Patrick agreed with this.

Tiago commented that it would be a good idea to include “More welcoming physical environment” and “Indoor climate” in the focus area: “Optimizing campus to better accommodate teaching and learning.” This would make it a stronger and more focused area for possible actions.

Alexander mentioned that the language of the plan could be framed in a more inclusive language, framed as something we want to achieve, rather than a problem area. Eg “Creating better environment for students with disabilities” instead of “Students with disabilities”.

Ea suggested that “Students with disabilities” or “inclusion” could also be a sub-area within each focus area of the action plan.

Lise then presented the elaborations of the focus areas.

Alexander suggested trying out a feedback workshop with a small group of TAs, in the “Learning environment” focus area, before implementing it on a larger scale. Lise answered that that is a good idea, and that LS usually do this when developing workshops and the like.

Alexander commented that, in the area “groupwork” it would also be possible to try something out small-scale, like a pilot test. Or that maybe there could be a collection of data and experiences with people trying out different tools.

Ea mentioned that some students are very surprised at the amount of groupwork at ITU, and that maybe there should be some better information about this from the admissions team towards prospective students, so they can be better prepared for it. Signe agreed, and Lise mentioned that Communications could also be involved in this.

Due to lack of time, the discussion was halted here, but will continue at the next Board of Studies meeting in June.

Ad 4

Christian introduced the topic. Lise mentioned that the action plan is a bit different this year, because some of the actions require Executive Management’s approval before they go into the final report.

There were no concrete comments from Board of Studies.

Signe asked why HoSPs are mentioned with regards to Completion. Lise answered that this is because in a comparable action previously, at SWU, HoSP and Co-HoSP were deeply involved in developing actions and ways of addressing various problems relating to completion.

Irina asked about the GAI guidelines, that seem to have been amended in March, but at their study programme they have not been involved in any discussions since before Christmas. It was not immediately clear which changes have been made to the document. Christian will ask Viktoria and the topic will be added to the agenda for the June meeting.

Ad 5

There was no further business.