Board of Studies (BoS) – 5. meeting 2025

28 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), **Luis Cruz-Filipe** (HoE), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Marie Lundager Sørensen** (student, SAT BIT), **David Martin Sørensen** (student, SAT CS), **Ayumi Rie Mayer** (directly elected student)

Guests: **Annelise Agertoft** (Learning Support/SAP), **Jakob Tonn-Petersen** (Learning Support)

Absent: **Daniel Warutere Poulsen** (student, SAT DD)

Agenda

1. **Approval of agenda**

2. **Education Portfolio Report 2025**
   The HoSPs have written their annual Study Programme Reports and discussed them with Education Group at the annual Quality Status meetings.
   Subsequently, Education and Quality have drafted the Education Portfolio Report 2025 which summarizes 2024 Quality Data and impressions from Study Programme Reports, Quality Status Meetings etc. The report has been discussed and qualified with Education Group.
   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 3rd of June. 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 1 – Education Portfolio Report 2025

3. **Communication about Mandatory Activities and Exams**
   Guests: Annelise Agertoft & Jakob Tonn-Petersen from Learning Support

4. **Orientation: Institutional Plan for Implementing New MSc Programmes**
   By Friday 23rd of May ITU must deliver a plan for the ways in which ITU expects to implement new MSc programmes as a result of the Educational Reform. This is a short orientation about this plan.

5. **Discussion about Random Fraud Selection in relation to exams**

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

Minutes

Ad 1

The agenda was approved with the slight change of items 3 and 5 treated first.

Ad 2

Christian and Luis introduced the subject.

Luis mentioned that one issue that is currently a part of the action plan is unemployment on some programmes which can have a broader effect on ITU in various ways. Another issue is that some programmes are understaffed to various degrees.

Signe commented that the Action point 4: VIP/DVIP is a very important action point, also with emphasis on hiring.

Kristof stated that the action plan is good, with many relevant initiatives. An important point on VIP/DVIP is not just to increase the amount of VIPs teaching, but also to increase the amount of DVIPs teaching on courses where there are no DVIPs teaching. He added that the data quality gained from the Danish Student Survey, with regards to student workload, is very poor.

Luis answered that, even though the question in the survey is lacking in many ways, these data are reported by students, and used by the ministry, so we have to treat them seriously.

Hanna stated that one thing executive management could do is to lobby on how the statistics are used by the ministry. For instance, for some graduates who go into entrepreneurial careers the current way of looking at these numbers is not the most adequate.

Hanna will propose a statement on the report for executive management and get feedback on it from the rest of BoS.

Ad 3

Dan introduced the topic: Communication about mandatory activities in relation to exams, and the responsibilities of course managers in relation to this. He said that, in some instances the course manager becomes framed as "the bad person" who denies students the ability to take an exam, even though they haven't completed the mandatory activities. Dan suggested that course managers should have a discussion with SAP about how to proceed.

Hanna asked if the issue is that the rules aren't followed?

Annelise answered that currently the rules are followed, but maybe it is more of a communication issue.

Ea stated that mandatory activities are closely related to teaching and learning in courses, thus, SAP cannot make decisions on this matter, it is up to the course manager to make a qualified decision.

Dan said that the issue is probably one of SAP and the course manager having a discussion about a particular course, before answering students about possible exemptions.

Ea asked if Dan suggested that SAP confirm what the course manager has decided? Dan said yes.

Luis stated that he couldn't see an actual problem. These matters are not SAPs decisions; it is the responsibility of the course manager. SAP is essentially posed a question they are not empowered to answer.

Hanna said that maybe it should be communicated to students that in these matters it is the decision of the course manager.

Kristof asked if it is SAP that can decide on granting exemptions. Ea answered that it is the mandate of the course manager, unless it relates to illness or something like that and then the student would probably have to apply for an exemption from the exam attempt or the like.

Signe commented that students constantly ask whether or not decisions like these can be changed by one of the actors. Maybe clearer and broader communication with students is needed.

Luis asked how it is that course managers have the power to give exemptions? Exemptions from exam forms can only be given by the head of studies.

Annelise answered that mandatory activities are not a part of the exams. It is a pedagogical activity that is mandatory. They are prerequisites for exam participation, and thus not part of the exam itself.

Hanna summed up the item, that course managers had the experience that students maybe didn't accept decisions made by them, and sought second opinions from SAP, and of course there should be alignment in communication to students between course managers and SAP.

Ea will follow up with the SAP front team and see if any clarification of the rules is needed.

Ad 4

Luis briefly introduced the topic; that all higher education institutions had to deliver a plan to the Ministry that shows how they will implement new MSc programmes within the framework of the University Reform. When there is a more complete plan, it will be fine for BoS to discuss it.

Ad 5

Hanna introduced the topic and said that it is an important issue to discuss; establishing how uncertainties and questions about matters like these are addressed.

In this instance, the uncertainty should probably have been addressed to the Head of Programme, not in a widely circulated email. The concrete case has at this point been dealt with, but maybe there are questions related to it.

Ayumi asked if maybe Random Fraud Control should be described in the course description (which was not the case in this instance).

Luis answered that, whatever ITUs rules are, they cannot contradict the university law. The reason to have ITU rules is to have an alignment of expectations. And by the University Law, it is within the purview of Head of Programme (as Head of Studies) to make this decision.

Ayumi answered that this should probably be better communicated to students, so they understand the justification for the action.

Kristof stated that most students don't even know what Random Fraud Control is, which will probably confuse a lot of students. He added that the Board of Studies should be involved in and have oversight over decisions like this.

Dan stated that we are probably only in the beginning of these issues, with a look towards possible issues related to the use of GAI and so on.

Hanna said that we need some way of dealing with these force majeure situations, and the Board of Studies seem like a cumbersome entity to do this.

Ayumi stated that it seems the rules for Random Fraud Control state that if you can't attend the control, it is assumed that you are in noncompliance. This is an issue if students for some legitimate reason cannot attend the control.

Ea clarified that Random Fraud Control is only done on a small percentage of students attending a particular exam. And cases like the one Ayumi mentioned are extremely rare. If a student cannot attend, there will be a hearing with SAP about why the student wasn't able to attend.

Ayumi stated that it could seem like it would be easy for students to make up excuses for not attending Fraud Control.

Luis clarified that, even though you are "more" suspected of possibly cheating if you don't attend the control, you will always have a hearing and be able to explain yourself, so he didn't see a big problem with current practices.

It was agreed that information about this should be present in the course description.

Luis commented that it seems like there is a bit of a misunderstanding about the roles in these issues. The university act is quite explicit that the head of studies has the ability to make decisions about this, because you cannot expect the Board of Studies to be able to make quick decisions in matters like these. The right person to consult is the Head of Programme.

Hanna asked if BoS is comfortable with not interfering in the decisions of the Heads of Programmes in these matters. Everyone agreed that BoS would like to be *informed* about matters like this and discuss procedures if necessary. In urgent matters it could be discussed by the Chair and Co-Chair of BoS, who would bring it to the BoS later.

Ayumi asked who will follow up on descriptions on ITU Student. Ea answered that SAP will look into it.

Ad 6

Kristof mentioned that, in the future, he would like BoS to discuss how they communicate with students.