

# Board of Studies (BoS) – 6. meeting 2025

18 June 2025

- Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Vasilis Galis** (faculty, SAT Business), **Kristóf Lénard** (student, SAT Games), **Luis Cruz-Filipe** (HoE), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **David Martin Sørensen** (student, SAT CS), **Daniel Warutere Poulsen** (student, SAT DD)
- Guests: **Camilla Zhu** (Learning Support), **Mads V. Hedegaard** (SAP/EQ), **Viktoria Hofbauer** (SAP/EQ)
- Absent: **Dan Witzner** (faculty, SAT CS), **Marie Lundager Sørensen** (student, SAT BIT), **Ayumi Rie Mayer** (directly elected student)

## Agenda

1. **Approval of agenda**
2. **Course Evaluations – Spring 2025**  
*Appendix 1 – Course Evaluation Report – Spring 2025*
3. **Status on Study Environment Action Plan**  
*Appendix 2 – Study Environment Assessment Action Plan 2024-2028 - June 2025*  
*Appendix 3 - Study Environment Assessment Action Plan 2024-2028 Backlog*  
*Guests: Viktoria Hofbauer (Education and Quality)*
4. **GenAI Declaration – a discussion about possibilities**  
*Appendix 4- Generative AI - BoS 18.06.25*  
*Guests: Mads V. Hedegaard (Education and Quality) and Camilla Zhu (Learning Support)*
5. **Guidelines on GAI in the Course Catalogue Spring 2026**  
*Guests: Mads V. Hedegaard (Education and Quality)*
6. **Approval: Revisions to Appendix to Curricula**  
Ea (SAP) presents revisions, additions, and precisions to the existing rules.  
*Appendix 5: Upcoming changes to Appendix to the Curricula*  
*Appendix 6: Draft*
7. **AOB (Any Other Business)**

# Minutes

## **Ad 1**

The agenda was approved.

## **Ad 2**

Hanna opened the topic.

Daniel said that it generally looks very positive but wondered at some of the 15 ECTS courses that had very low response rates, since they are usually higher on these courses.

Kristof commented that response rates are usually lower in spring, this is normal. Also, not a small number of the courses on did not achieve the 4.5 standard, which is concerning, and the SATs should look into this. There doesn't seem to be structural problems on any of the programmes as such.

Luis asked about discussions in SATs. Most programmes have some courses with very low scores, how are these addressed at the SATs. No one had concrete answers.

Hanna asked if it is common to systematically conduct mid-term evaluations? Daniel answered yes, they usually have midterm evaluations on the courses in his Programme.

Hanna mentioned that on the low scoring courses at Games, most of these were tied up with issues with teachers being away a lot and not available.

David said that on one of their courses, which scored quite low, maybe this had to do with the teachers' way of sharing course materials, since they did not use LearnIT.

Hanna added that maybe not all teachers are aware of the follow-up protocols after course evaluations. At BDDIT, Signe said that she speaks with all teachers about evaluations, no matter what the scores of the evaluations are.

Luis said that many of the courses that have low scores are known for this, and mostly this is not due to the teachers, but more to do with the curriculum contents of the courses, particularly on courses students experience as being hard or difficult.

## **Ad 3**

Viktorija presented the half-yearly status of the study environment action plan, and the process going forward.

Viktorija asked if there were any comments, or any suggestions for the process.

1: Kristof said that in the update, LS suggests extending the feedback workshop for TAs, and that BoS should support this as well, because the feedback from TAs is very important. Daniel added that what he, as a TA, hears a lot from students, is that it is particularly from the teachers that students wish to get feedback.

Signe answered that while the action point goes towards TA feedback, it seems that teacher feedback should be recognized in this action point. Luis added that even if teachers have many students, there

are many ways of providing feedback, and it should be feasible to do so. He added that TAs should assist teachers with very specific tasks, and maybe feedback is not one of these tasks.

Signe added that maybe we need to open up a discussion about what feedback is, and what different ways of giving feedback can do.

Ea asked if the point is for LS to facilitate dialogues on the programmes, about what feedback is.

Luis answered that he would like for this initiative to start with the Education Management Committee.

2: This was already partly discussed, but the point also touches on feedback to the students about the results of, and actions based on, course evaluations.

3: There was a discussion of mixed gender groups. Luis said that in this area there is probably room for some cultural work. Hanna added that probably, there are a lot of best practices already at work at ITU that we could learn from.

4: Viktoria said that there is a new action plan for diversity, equity, and inclusion addressing some of the issues with communication. Kristof mentioned that maybe tutors aren't the best to introduce this subject to students, maybe it should be Study and Career Guidance. Luis answered that it is important to remember that tutors are peers, which gives them different and maybe better ways of communicating with students about these matters.

5: No comments, no new information yet. Daniel mentioned that not all students would be willing to wear the Sunflower, because it is not really known what the effects of doing it could be.

Vasilis added that the whole idea of the sunflower is very problematic. It shifts responsibility from the institution, and it maybe even stigmatizes individuals. Luis answered that the point of the Sunflower is to signal that it is OK to initiate a discussion about it.

Ea added that in SAP, they received no instructions about how teachers and fellow students are expected to deal with students wearing the sunflower in terms of rights and requirements in teaching, exams, student group work situations. It is also unclear what students wearing the sunflower can expect from ITU as an institution. A university is a different setup than the meetings between staff and customers in an airport.

Daniel added that it is positive that Sunflower opens up the possibility of having a discussion about these matters, and maybe some students, TAs or tutors could be role-models in this regard.

6-7: Signe asked if these initiatives were just closed or if maybe BoS could invite FM to a meeting and discuss the matters. BoS agreed to invite FM to a future meeting.

#### **Ad 4**

Mads introduced the declaration. At this moment it is mostly an idea, and the project group would like input from BoS as to whether a declaration like this is something ITU should move on with. Other universities are doing this, should ITU do it as well?

Kristof said that the general concept is good, and it seems like a good idea when other universities do it as well. But maybe it is not a good idea with a big document that students need to fill out. Also, there is a risk of over-administration, if teachers have to deal with this also.

Signe asked how a teacher should handle a declaration like this, what if students don't fill out the declaration? This needs some attention; what is the purpose of this declaration? Mads answered that it is a part of keeping students focused on the importance of these matters. Signe answered that it needs to be very clear if teachers or anyone else have some responsibilities in relation to a declaration like this.

Luis said that he had difficulty seeing the point of this declaration. He added that the fact that many universities have declarations like this could also be an overreaction from them, rather than an indicator of the right way to go. We need to keep some responsibilities with the students. They are already quite well informed about what they are allowed to do or not.

Camilla answered that the idea about the declaration was also to help teachers as an example of something they could tell students in relation to preparation papers. Luis said that this is another thing, if declarations are used in this way it seems like a good idea. Ea mentioned that maybe a good idea could be to have some sort of safe place, where students could get feedback on whether or not their use of GAI is OK or not. Because right now students are very scared to even ask about it, which definitely doesn't help communicating about it.

Luis added that rules alone don't solve these issues. There needs to be a discussion with students about why they shouldn't use GAI, in instances where it is not a good idea to do so.

It was agreed that the project group move forward with the declaration and provide examples of how to work with it.

#### **Ad 5**

The last time this was discussed, it was a short-term solution. It needs to be decided whether this practice should continue.

Hanna said that since HoPs have not yet talked with teachers about this they would only be able to comment on the matter as individual teachers and HoPs. Signe added that at BDDIT had discussed it at a semester workshop and there was a discussion, and there were many questions about it.

Luis suggested that BoS agrees to proceed with the same solution next time and then have time to discuss it properly. Signe added that teachers need some kind of assistance with this.

The Board decided to keep the practice for now, and make sure there is support for teachers. It will be evaluated next year.

#### **Ad 6**

Ea briefly presented the revisions. They were briefly discussed and approved.

#### **Ad 7**

No further business.