

# Board of Studies (BoS) – 6. Meeting 2026

19 June 2026

Present: **Laurens Boer** (faculty, SAT DD), **Nicholas A. M. Maurer** (student, SAT Games), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Ea Feldfos** (SAP), **Oscar Rode** (student, SAT DDIT), **Marco Carbone** (faculty, SAT CS), **Karl Werder** (faculty, SAT Business)

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

Absent: **Vytautas Davidavicius** (student, SAT BIT), **Rune K. L. Nielsen** (faculty, SAT Games), **Melica Sarvghad** (directly elected student), **Viktor Horváth** (student, SAT CS)

## Agenda

### 1. Approval of agenda

### 2. Approval: Generative AI Guidelines

*App 1 - Generative AI Guidelines for Students, Spring 2027*

*App 2 - Generative AI guidelines for teachers, Spring 2027*

### 3. Discussion: Course Evaluations

*App 3 – Course Evaluation Report – Spring 2026*

### 4. Discussion: Teaching Award

*Appendix to follow*

### 5. Discussion: Mandatory Activities and Reexams

Across ITU rules and practices, there is uncertainty about how to handle non-approved mandatory activities in relation to reexam registration. Head of Education, Learning Support and SAP will initiate a discussion in BoS on this meeting, followed by discussions in the Educational Management Committee and Subject Area Teams in September-October 2026. Area Manager Ea Feldfos, SAP will outline the issues and the proposed amendment to ITU rules.

*App 4 - Mandatory activities and registration for reexams*

### 6. AOB (Any Other Business)

# Minutes

## **Ad 1**

The agenda was approved.

## **Ad 2**

The very few changes to the guidelines were presented by Luis. The changes were made on the basis of discussions with various stakeholders. Among other things, it was specified that rules may differ between mandatory activities and exams.

Laurens asked if there are opportunities to make changes in the Autumn? Ea answered that until the middle of October, it will be possible to make changes. Ea added that there are a number of typos in the document that probably should be corrected.

Karl asked if it is possible in the future to also make some suggestions for students formulated in a more positive language, maybe adding some explanations about why the guidelines are made. Also, maybe it should be included in the guidelines that they will be revised continuously.

Luis answered that the guidelines are formulated agnostically, on purpose. This is to have a neutral stance on GAI. Also, Luis would encourage the Board of Studies to take charge of revising the guidelines when they find it necessary.

Karl asked if it would not be impossible in the future to completely eliminate the use of AI on a course? Marco answered that it is fine to use it properly in the courses, but if allowed in exams it should be a part of the assessment. If using AI is part of a learning outcome, then it is fine to have it at exams.

Laurens stated that he would like to add to the guidelines for the students that the use of AI is also appreciated, within the bounds of proper academic use. To make the phrasing a bit more positive, rather than overly restrictive.

Luis added that a lot of students and faculty are quite against encouraging it, due to, among other things, the environmental cost.

The item was put to a vote. It was unanimously approved, with the addendum that BoS keep up revising the documents.

## **Ad 3**

Christian gave an update on the status of the course evaluations. The technical issues are resolved, and course evaluations should continue to function in LearnIT.

No SATs had comments on course evaluations for the BoS yet. Course evaluations will be an item at the next BoS meeting.

## **Ad 4 (Closed)**

**Ad 5**

Ea introduced the topic which concerns uncertainties at ITU about how to handle non-approved mandatory activities in relation to reexam registration

Karl said that this would be something that should be discussed at a Semester Workshop.

Ea added that for Learning Support, they do not recommend mandatory activities due to stress and workload. Marco added that there are courses, for instance with industry collaboration, where they have mandatory activities that cannot be completed at a later point. In this case, students would have to take the course again, if they cannot complete the mandatory activities.

Luis added that mandatory activities in many instances is a suboptimal solution to a more general problem; namely that some students “ignore” the course during the semester and focus on the exam at the end of the course instead.

Karl asked if this creates an environment where the first fail delays them up to a year. Luis answered that yes, there is that risk, but it is an acceptable risk.

The Board agreed to go ahead with hearings in the SATs.

**Ad 6**

Luis informed BoS of an upcoming process for revising the course evaluations. This process should work towards a more complete way of doing course evaluations, including teacher perspectives, rather than a one-sided student evaluation. The Board of studies will be involved in the process, since they own course evaluations, alongside the rector. Both the format, frequency and content will be subjects for this process.