

Board of Studies (BoS) – 2. Meeting 2026

4 March 2026

Present: **Laurens Boer** (faculty, SAT DD), **Luis Cruz-Filipe** (HoE), **Marco Carbone** (faculty, SAT CS), **Karl Werder** (faculty, SAT Business), **Rune K. L. Nielsen** (faculty, SAT Games), **Nicholas A. M. Maurer** (student, SAT Games), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Viktor Horváth** (student, SAT CS), **Oscar Rode** (student, SAT DDIT), **Melica Sarvghad** (directly elected student)

Guests: **Viktoria Hofbauer** (EQ/SAP)

Absent: **Vytautas Davidavicius** (student, SAT BIT),

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda

2. Status and discussion: Course evaluations

Christian will provide a status on Course Evaluations for Autumn '25 and Spring '26. Luis will initiate a discussion about course evaluations going forward.

3. Discussion: ITU Teaching award

Viktoria Hofbauer will lead a discussion about revisions to ITUs internal teaching award.

4. Discussion: Responsibilities and roles of the Board of Studies and SATs

Laurens will lead a discussion about the roles and responsibilities of the BoS and SATs.

5. AOB (Any Other Business)

Minutes

Ad 1

The agenda was approved. Items 2 and 3 swapped places.

Ad 2

Christian gave a status on course evaluation. Unfortunately, quantitative data from Autumn 2025 won't be usable. They were corrupted as part of the technical issues with LearnIT. Laurens asked if the numbers cannot be used at all, because they look possibly correct for KDDIT. Luis answered that they will not be part of the Quality Status Meetings, since there is no way to check if the numbers are actually correct, and this has been decided by Per (Rector).

Luis then started the discussion about course evaluations going forward. He mentioned that many teachers experience the evaluations as a kind of popularity contest, where they are mainly judged by a number, with quantitative thresholds that are probably not very meaningful for the individual teacher. There is a widespread wish to look at a better way to do course evaluations. Since BoS owns course evaluations, Luis asked BoS if they can support that he starts the work on a proposal for a new way of doing course evaluations. Karl asked if there are any well-known and concrete, better ways of doing it? Luis stated that there are different ways of doing it at other universities. There are also other ways of following up course evaluations, and better ways of involving teachers in a more constructive way.

Oscar asked if the course evaluation is identical for every course, and would it be sensible to allow for some varieties between courses, seeing as they are quite difficult. Luis answered that that could be sensible, but it is also very resource intensive, but it is certainly a possibility that can be explored.

Melica added that there is a rumor that many students don't fill out the evaluations, because they don't have a feeling that anything happens with the results. Luis answered that that is something that should be addressed going forward as well.

The Board of Studies agreed that Luis should start working on a proposal

Ad 3

Viktor presented the topic: the ITU Teaching Award. So far, ITUs teaching award has been closely attached to the National Teaching Award. This means that ITUs award winners have been largely determined by UFM (Ministry of Higher Education and Science) criteria, just like there have been minimal student involvement. Thus, it is suggested to work with a new process for ITUs internal teaching award.

In the new process, nominations are open to all students and faculty. Individual teachers and teaching teams can be evaluated. Nominations must be connected to courses taught in the previous two semesters. Finally, nominations will not be anonymous. Based on these nominations, each SAT makes a shortlist of nominees, including justifications for nominations, then BoS evaluates and prioritize a final list of candidates, before the Teaching Price Committee makes a final choice.

Rune chatted (online participation) that the national prize is primarily decided by ITU staff with input from students, maybe the local prize should primarily be decided by students with minimal input from staff (i.e., 'management' and teachers)?

Viktor asked if students can nominate teachers or teaching teams, what does that mean? Viktoria answered that if, for instance, a course is co-taught, it would be possible to nominate the teaching team, rather than just individual teachers. Karl asked why submissions cannot be anonymous? Viktoria answered that that is to make sure that the same students cannot nominate the same teacher several times. The name of the person submitting the nomination will not be published anywhere. Karl asked why the Board of Studies should be involved. Luis answered that BoS is responsible for the quality of educational programmes and thus should be involved. Luis clarified that BoS prioritizes a list of candidates, but it is the committee that makes the actual decision as to who wins. Nicholas added that, since the final committee only has one student, it is good that BoS is involved since there are several student voices there. Laurens asked about the timeline; you nominate a teacher you had one or two semesters prior, which makes it somewhat distant. Would it be possible to include current

teachers? Luis answered that it is difficult to include ongoing courses, since, by nature, that course will not be complete at the point of nomination.

Karl asked if there are some guidelines for BoS on how to prioritize the list? Luis answered that there is a wish for flexibility, and good teaching can be many things, so they don't want to have a very rigid set of principles. But SATs have to make arguments for why a particular teacher is nominated.

Viktorija added that the new process will be evaluated at a later point, where the particulars can be discussed.

Ad 4

Laurens started the discussion about the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Studies, and pointing out what is mandated by (University) law. A number of responsibilities have been delegated to SAP previously, and maybe that should not be the case anymore.

The topics that need clarifying include Dispensations, Scheduling & Exams, and Thesis Descriptions.

Laurens also presented an annual wheel for BoS activities over the year. This model was based on previous years. He also stated that we need to have a more formal description of both these responsibilities and the annual wheel.

Everyone agreed that documents like this would be very helpful, especially for new members. Laurens will keep working on the documents, discuss them with Luis, and get back to BoS later.

Ad 5

The student members agreed to discuss among themselves who will take up the role of co-chair of BoS. They decided that Oscar will take up the mantle.