

# Board of Studies (BoS) – 11. meeting 2025

26 November 2025

Present: **Laurens Boer** (chair, faculty, SAT DD), **Luis Cruz-Filipe** (HoE), **Rune Christian L. Nielsen** (faculty, SAT Games), **Vasilis Galis** (faculty, SAT Business), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Enrico Giuseppe Aiello** (student, SAT Games), **Luca M Aiello** (faculty, SAT CS), **Nanna Bøhm Andersen** (student, SAT Business), **David Martin Sørensen** (student, SAT CS), **Ayumi Rie Mayer** (directly elected student)

Guests:

Absent: **Daniel Warutere Poulsen** (student, SAT DD), **Enrico Giuseppe Aiello** (student, SAT Games)

## Agenda

### 1. Approval of agenda

2. **Information:** To leverage the new exam system Wiseflow, ITU needs to split the current exam type (A22) Written exam on premises with restrictions into three formats:

- 1) **(A22) Written exam with restrictions** – Students upload answers in various file formats.
- 2) **(L) Lockdown Browser** – Students answer exam questions in a locked browser without access to apps or the internet.
- 3) **(M) Multiple Choice** – Students answer questions in Wiseflow's multiple-choice module.

### 3. Discussion and approval: Generative AI Guidelines

The Generative AI Guidelines for students and teachers have been amended and should be discussed and voted on at the Board of Studies. These guidelines are to have effect in Spring 2026. They will be amended again, and go before BoS, before Autumn 2026.

*App 1: Generative AI Guidelines for Students, Spring 2026*

*App 2: generative AI Guidelines for Teachers, Spring 2026*

### 4. National Teaching Award 2026 (Closed Item)

It is again time to nominate two teachers for the national teaching award (Undervisningsprisen). Heads of Programmes have suggested five teachers. At the BoS meeting, we kindly ask for input to the suggested teachers from the student representatives.

**Please treat the list of names as strictly confidential material!**

Further process: Head of Education, based on input from BoS and Learning Support, will choose the two candidates (one female, and one male) ITU is nominating.

*App 3: Teacher Award Nomination Sheet (please keep this document in strict confidence)*

#### **5. Discussion: Responsibilities of Board of Studies**

Following the last meeting of the Board of Studies, Luis and Laurens have met and discussed the division of responsibilities between BoS, SATs, and Education management Committee. Luis and Laurens will facilitate further discussion of this theme.

#### **6. AOB (Any Other Business)**

## Minutes

### **Ad 1**

The agenda was approved

### **Ad 2**

Ea updated on the status of written exams in Wiseflow. Current written exam type A22 needs to be split into three formats: Restrictions with regards to particular file formats, the possibility of students answering questions in a locked browser with no internet connection, but also the possibility to better support different written exam forms, such as Multiple Choice.

Laurens asked if students will know when they start the course what kind of written exam it is? Ea answered that yes, it will be specified somewhere in the course description.

Next step: Approval of Shared Curriculum at the BoS meeting in December, for implementation on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026.

### **Ad 3**

The new guidelines will be posted, if approved, so there is somewhere to direct students and teachers if they are in doubt about the rules for using Generative AI.

Laurens asked if the guidelines should have some legal status, should they be named guidelines or rules? David answered that they are more guidelines, rather than actual rules, but at some point, they should probably become actual rules. Ea added that we have academic misconduct rules in legal instances.

Laurens asked if there was some definition of what counts as generative AI? David answered that it depends on how it is used and for what, since some programmes, such as Grammarly, use AI to some extent, but not to generate actual content, just focusing on grammar.

Maybe the next version of the guidelines should include a list of programs that count as GenAI, or that at least specifies to which extent these programs can be used.

Rune added that in Theses, grammar and spelling are part of the assessment, so Generative AI should not be used for grammar and language in this case.

Ayumi stated that in the Guidelines for Teachers, they jump from point 2 to 4, which should be corrected.

Ayumi asked if we know how other universities use guidelines for GenAI? The project group looked at it previously. Laurens suggested talking to the censors about this.

The guidelines were put to a vote and were unanimously approved. Christian will let the group know (also about the numbers in the appendix).

#### **Ad 4**

Closed point.

#### **Ad 5**

Laurens introduced the topic and distributed a list with legal responsibilities related to three organs: BoS, SAT, and EMC.

Merit: Falls under the purview of BoS but has been delegated to SAP.

Dispensation: Falls under the purview of BoS but has been delegated to SAP.

Scheduling and Exams: Falls under the purview of BoS but has been delegated to HoPs.

Thesis Description: Falls under the purview of BoS but has been delegated to HoPs and SAP.

Course Evaluations: Discussed in SAT and BoS.

Action plans: ITU action plans are discussed in BoS, programme specific action plans are discussed in EMC.

Curriculum Changes: Falls under the purview of BoS, with input from SATs

Applications: Falls under the purview of EMC.

Quality Policy: Falls under the purview of EMC (and UM).

This overall description is meant to inform where each topic is currently treated. Ea added that her team is very aware that they are doing a lot with regards to Merit, Dispensations, and Applications, and are working on a draft of a way to include BoS in this work.

The desired output is an annual wheel and a more structured overview of responsibilities

## **Ad 6**

Laurens asked if the agenda for this meeting was better than before. How extensive does it need to be going forward? David answered that the current level of information was satisfactory. Luca agreed. Additionally, the agenda should include information on who put forward the agenda point, and what actions need to be taken.

David said that they had discussed in SAT that TAs play a role in how students see a teacher, that they thus have influence on the relationship between teachers and students. This could probably lead to issues if TAs publicly express frustration or dissatisfaction with a teacher. Maybe BoS should discuss how to address this potential issue.

Vasilis stated that we should be careful not to overregulate relationships.

David stated that on some programmes it is quite prevalent that TAs express opinions, directly or indirectly, about the teachers to the students.

Ayumi suggested that rather than rules, BoS could make a statement or recommendation about this. Nanna added that it could probably be a good idea to make recommendations about the working relationship between teachers and TAs.

Luis stated that, at the outset, regardless of how frustrated with a teacher you may be as a TA, you should not publicly say or display this frustration.

Ea asked how BoS should proceed with this? David answered that they had not arrived at a solution. But maybe BoS could make suggestions.

Vasilis stated that he is generally skeptical about disciplinary measures or recommendations to teachers, it would be better to find out who has the definition prerogative of these problems, who has the authority to influence TAs.

Ea added that ITU actually has a Code of Conduct for how to behave.

Nanna added that often TAs will sympathize with students, since they are students themselves, and they also play a role in this regard. But they should never talk derogatively about teachers.

If more concrete suggestions for dealing with this matter are presented, they will be discussed further in BoS.