# Board of Studies (BoS) – 1. meeting 2025

3 February 2025

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Dan Witzner** (faculty, SAT CS), **Vasilis Galis** (faculty, SAT Business), **Marie Lundager Sørensen** (student, SAT BIT), **Kristóf Lénard** (student, SAT Games), **Ayumi Rie Mayer** (directly elected student), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP)

Guests:

Absent:

## Agenda

1. **Approval of agenda**

2. **Election of chair and vice-chair**
   One of the faculty members serves as chair, one of the student members serves as vice-chair of BoS. Faculty members chose the chair, student members chose the vice-chair.

3. **Results from and follow-up on Course Evaluations Autumn 2024**
   As part of the follow-up on course and supervision evaluations, BoS is to discuss the evaluation results based on the reports with scores from supervision evaluations and the course evaluation survey.
   BoS can decide changes within the Board's mandate and make suggestions for changes or actions (on courses or study programmes) to Education Group and/or Executive Management.
   Appendices - Course Evaluation Reports – Autumn 2024

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

## Minutes

### Ad 1

The agenda was approved.

### Ad 2

Hanna was elected chair, and Kristof elected vice chair.

*Ad 3*

Christian introduced the topic, along with information about the delays in the data and report for Autumn 2024. Hanna asked if there was a possibility of having an in-house person with competencies to work on LearnIT. Ea responded, explaining that, previously, there was an in-house team, but management had decided that ITU should not continue with this setup. It was decided to hire the company Moxis to host LearnIT. Moxis is experiencing a number of challenges in regard to various idiosyncratic legacy codings within LearnIT. Also, there is a serious lack of documentation for previous code-work. This all makes it very difficult to fix issues. Ea added that several individuals in Learning Support are quite skilled at navigating LearnIT. Finally, a new employee is joining the Systems Team in SAP, who will help bridge the gap with Moxis.

Hanna mentioned that the current issues are somewhat small, all considering, and that maybe larger issues could present themselves at a later date? Dan added that in-house competencies are very likely to be available at Software Engineering.

There was a broader discussion about the effect of opening up for course evaluations two weeks earlier than usual, and there was a consensus that this was a good idea that definitely had contributed to the quite good response rate. Kristof said that SAT members had played an active role in promoting the evaluations, which probably helped as well. Christian mentioned that in spring, Education and Quality will have a focus on informing and educating students about good evaluation practices, and a code of conduct for free text commentaries.

Vasilis mentioned that the response rates vary a lot from course to course and speculated that maybe students who are dissatisfied with the course are more likely to participate in evaluations. It feels like this could complicate the picture a little bit and opens up for a discussion about what the purpose of the evaluations is. Adding to this, Hanna said that in her experience, courses that are really hard or intense often get poorer evaluation scores, but the students learn what they need to learn in the course.

Dan mentioned that students often experience a lack of knowledge about what happens after they evaluate, who sees the results etc. Marie mentioned that she and Ayumi had experienced several teachers discussing the evaluation results in class, which had helped with understanding the purpose and process of course evaluations.

Dan also mentioned that the phrasing of the evaluation questions could maybe be causing some biases in responses. There was a discussion about the content of the questions. Signe mentioned that previously there were a lot of questions (too many). Dan mentioned that it would be good if the questions were phrased in a way that made them more amenable to operationalization; that they would aid teachers in actually acting upon the responses.

Dan added that there is an experience of students having higher expectations than previously in regard to deliverables from teachers. Maybe there needs to be a kind of alignment of expectations between teachers and students, regarding what teachers ae actually obligated to deliver.

Marie said that it could possibly help with response rates if teachers get access to evaluation results after exams. As it is now, they get access a week after the course evaluation closes.

Hanna mentioned that a lot of their teachers think evaluation results should not be published until after exams and asked if anyone had any reasons why results should be published before exams?

Signe mentioned that you need to have time to make changes to courses, if needed, so it would be quite late to get the results after exams.

Ayumi asked if the free text comments often deal with the topics and/or materials in a course, or if they are more directed towards the style of teaching? Signe answered that it is usually towards the planning and style of teaching. Ea agreed.

Kristof commented that the information available at ITU Student is pretty good, but it should be easier to find.

### *Ad 4*

Hanna asked if people who participated in the meeting online could hear the discussions in the meeting well? Hanna and Dan mentioned that we should have a sound device to get better sound. Christian will ask FM if they have a solution we can use. Ea agreed that improved sound would be good.