Board of Studies (BoS) – 4. meeting 2025

9 May 2025

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Dan Witzner** (faculty, SAT CS), **Vasilis Galis** (faculty, SAT Business), **Kristóf Lénard** (student, SAT Games), **Daniel Warutere Poulsen** (student, SAT DD), **Luis Cruz-Filipe** (HoE), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP)

Guests:

Absent: **Ayumi Rie Mayer** (directly elected student), **David Martin Sørensen** (student, SAT CS), **Marie Lundager Sørensen** (student, SAT BIT)

Agenda

1. **Approval of agenda**

2. **Orientation from Executive Management – Change in Terms of Association**
   Appendix 1 - Orientation from Executive Management - ITU Statutes

3. **Discussion on BoS mandate and competences + some technical issues regarding statutory basis**
   Appendix 2 - University Act §18 on Board of Studies
   Appendix 3 - Articles of Association of ITU (Section 14 is about Board of Studies)

4. **GAI Guidelines in the Course Catalogue – status since last meeting**
   Appendix 4 - Generative AI guidelines for teachers and supervisors V3

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

Minutes

Ad 1

The agenda was approved.

Ad 2

Christian introduced the orientation. The orientation was well received by the board.

Ad 3

Kristof initiated the point with a number of "technical" comments to the articles of association.

Hanna suggested starting with section 14 of the articles, which establishes the composition of the Board of Studies. She stated that this needs discussion. Right now, for instance, there is one Board of Studies, but there could be more. Also, the fact that there is an equal number of staff and students on the board signifies that this is one of the areas where student perspectives are especially appreciated. There are a number of practices that are not really discussed, such as the appointment (indirect election) of staff members to BoS. Currently the VIP members, except the directly elected member, are appointed from the SATS, just like the student members. Right now, there is not a directly elected VIP member, since no one put their name forward for the elections. Luis added that, reading the text, the four-year election period that applies to the directly elected VIP, would also apply to the indirectly elected VIP.

Hanna said that it could be possible to encourage the SATs to hold actual elections, rather than appointing members to the board.

Luis stated that at ITU, it seems the Heads of Programme fills the role of the Head of Studies, since ITU does not have someone with that formal title.

The role of approving Heads of Programmes/studies was discussed. The process of appointing Heads of Programmes currently is that Head of Education asks for input to relevant candidates, then discuss them with relevant section heads, and a decision is then made by Head of Education.

Dan asked if, when there is a change in Head of Programme, it is a good idea that the old Head of programme should be involved in the process, this could be an issue if there was some kind of bad blood. Luis answered that the decision is his to make, but he can consult the old Head of Programme.

Hanna mentioned that, regarding course evaluations, at ITU, the BoS never sees the teachers' responses to the course evaluations. This is another area where responsibilities are delegated out of BoS. Kristof mentioned that maybe this would be better in the SATs, since it would be a huge task for BoS to look into teacher reflections from all courses. Signe agreed. Dan stated that, as he understood it, it is easier for BoS to identify consistent quality issues, in course evaluations for instance, and bring them up. Luis did not completely agree, he found these views to be two extremes. On the one hand, delegation can work well, but at the end of the day, it is the responsibility of BoS. Hanna agreed that it needs to be possible to follow up on recommendations from BoS (with regards to course evaluations); if they are indeed followed or not.

Hanna said that the number of SATs is also an issue. If you have, for instance, a single programme in one SAT, then thorough discussions of course evaluations for instance are more feasible than if there are five programmes. Dan answered that at SAT CS, they do discuss all of them, it just takes more time.

Hanna asked the board what is the degree of monitoring BoS wants, when delegating tasks?

Dan asked how information comes from the SATs to BoS with regards to course evaluations, which data is looked at. Hanna answered that SATs and BoS look at the same reports, which is a bit redundant. Luis and Dan noted that it would be better if SATs looked at some reports, and gave some sort of report to BoS who could take a higher-level view on it. Dan stated that it could be interesting for BoS to get higher order data than in the usual reports, for instance to identify trends over time.

Luis said that he didn't see asking Administration to provide more statistics is the way to go. It is already possible with current data to identify problem areas.

It was suggested to include the course evaluation reports from previous semesters when BoS discussed course evaluations.

Approval of amendments to study programmes was discussed. Currently it must go through and be approved by BoS, and then finally approved and co-signed by the Rector. The Rector does have the right to delegate this responsibility.

Ea added that at a later meeting it would be a good idea to discuss curricula; what is a curriculum, what demands are there for a curriculum, and so on. Currently the concept of curricula is very disjointed, and information is found in many different places across ITU's platforms.

Hanna said that in the University Law it is stated that BoS is responsible for planning exams, but this is currently delegated to SAP. It would be possible to involve BoS further in this planning, which could facilitate other dialogues with FM, for instance, about in which ways it is possible to use the rooms and facilities at ITU.

Hanna asked about which items can be brought to the agenda. Are there limits? Luis answered that in principle there is nothing that BoS is not allowed to discuss. They can't decide on everything, but they are allowed to discuss the agendas and issues they find important and relevant.

Hanna finished by suggesting that she and Kristof take lead on making a list of the tasks of BoS that needs to be discussed and decide on whether or not some things need to change from current practice. Ea and Christian will find examples from other universities to present to BoS.

Ad 4

Hanna introduced the topic. Hanna asked if the process is still ongoing? Luis answered that it should be done today (Friday 9th of May). He also added that the Administration had asked him to convey that the timeframe for these changes was very short, and in the future better timing would be much appreciated.

Ad 5

No further business.