

# Board of Studies (BoS) – 1. meeting 2023

7 February 2023

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Luca Aiello** (faculty, SAT CS), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Stine Gotved** (directly elected faculty), **Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business)

**Sofie Kramshøi Nielsen** (student, SAT CS), **Saskia Joanna Rauhut** (student, SAT Games), **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Theodor Christian Kier** (directly elected student)

**Ea Feldfos** (assigned guest, SAP), **Pernille Rydén** (assigned guest, Dean of Education), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP)

Absent: No students elected from BIT yet.

## Agenda

### 1. Approval of agenda

### 2. Introduction by the 2022-chair Stine Gotved

Welcome to new members and a new year in BoS.

### 3. Election of chair and vice-chair

One of the faculty members serve as chair, one of the student members serve a vice-chair of BoS. Faculty members chose the chair, student members chose the vice-chair.

### 4. Results from and follow-up on Course and Supervision Evaluations Autumn 2022

As part of the follow-up on course and supervision evaluations, BoS is to discuss the evaluation results based on the reports with scores from supervision evaluations and the course evaluation survey.

BoS can decide changes within the Board's mandate and make suggestions for changes or actions (on courses or study programmes) to Education Group and/or Executive Management.

Appendix 1 - Course Evaluation Report – Autumn 2022

### 5. Update on project: Changing the registration requirement to 22.5 ECTS

*The Board of Studies has recommended that students' registration requirements be changed from 30 to 22.5 ECTS. SAP will give an update on the project.*

Appendix 2 - Changing reg req to 22,5 ECTS\_Status III for BoS

Guest: Project manager Ea Feldfos, SAP

### 6. Decision: Approval of new articles on the registration requirement

*Following the new registration requirement, the relevant articles in the Appendix to Curricula have been revised. BoS is asked to approve the changes. The changes will take effect from 1 February 2023.*

Appendix 3 - Draft for reg req in Appendix to Curricula Jan 2023

Guest: Ea Feldfos, SAP

### 7. AOB (Any Other Business)

# Minutes

## **Ad 1**

No comments, agenda was approved.

## **Ad 2**

Stine introduced the organization to the new members of BoS, as well as introducing the members of BoS and guest participants in the meeting. Stine pointed to the fact that there have been a lot of changes among the members over the last couple of years.

Stine described the work and responsibilities of the chair and vice-chair, as well as the meeting structure and frequency and the roles and responsibilities of the work in BoS.

Stine then described the rules and procedures for making decisions at BoS meetings, such as the number of people present necessary for making decisions. In cases of not enough people being present, those present will make recommendations towards decisions, and those not present will have a week to agree or not agree to the recommended decisions.

Following this, Pernille introduced the ongoing work with decision-making structures and agencies at ITU. This work is ongoing and seeks to map a path towards decision-making organizational structures that are both agile and transparent.

## **Ad 3**

Stine was proposed, and accepted, to continue acting as chair. The student members will discuss later and elect a vice-chair before next meeting.

## **Ad 4**

Pernille briefly introduced the results of the fall course evaluations, highlighting the continued high response rate. Another point of attention was how to improve the constructive dialogue about potential problems or problematics at the teaching level.

There are slight improvements across the board, but it is recommended for each study programme to explore the numbers more thoroughly.

Magnus directed the attention towards the importance of teachers pointing to changes made to courses or methods due to previous evaluations. This practice will probably secure a better response rate, since it immediately highlights the purpose and constructive nature of course evaluations. It is not currently practiced on every study programme, but it is one of the *best practices* recommended.

Sofie mentioned a practice from KU, where the students get more information about evaluation results than is current practice at ITU. For instance, they get access to free text comments. Sofie suggested that maybe more detailed information about evaluation results made available to students, and more

information about changes made to courses due to (poor) evaluations of courses would ensure better commitment and transparency.

Theodor noted that a practice resembling this used to be in place at ITU, but it was changed, due to, among other things, teachers experiencing a feeling of being overexposed.

To this Sofie added that she was not advocating for past practices, but primarily for better information to students about measures taken due to (poor) course evaluations.

Stine pointed to the fact that historically the evaluations were more expansive, and maybe that led to the more slimmed-down practice that is currently in place.

Signe and Theodor pointed to the fact that these things are already discussed in SAT meetings.

Theodor said that he had heard of no teachers on CS informing about changes made due to course evaluations. And only some teachers take time out of classes to do the evaluations.

Sofie reiterated that her comments are not about changing everything, but about giving access to more details to students; That students seek a greater degree of transparency into which actions HoSPs take on the background of course evaluation results.

Hanna mentioned that in Sweden they have greater transparency about evaluation results, but they have a corps of “sweepers” that remove comments that are offensive or against good conduct. This allows for a greater transparency about free text comments from evaluations.

Hanna also raised the issue that some free text comments can be very personal, and/or can be important in the professional development of individual teachers, which requires the person to be present to discuss it in a professional and proper manner, and that maybe SATs are not a good venue for such discussions.

Ea mentioned that, at KU, used to have (maybe still do?) a structure around the Boards of Studies, a committee of sorts with students involved, that had access to the free text comments and were able to browse them and know their content, thus getting a greater insight into the data.

Pernille reiterated that it is part of the Quality Policy that some of these measures should be taken, but currently there are no sanctions for not doing it. It is a delicate balance; a “stick approach” may have a negative impact, thus a “carrot approach” is probably the way forward, but also more difficult and work intensive.

Hanna directed the attention towards confidentiality issues making full transparency difficult.

Signe mentioned that maybe there are different cultures surrounding, among other things, course evaluations at different departments. To this, Pernille suggested maybe presenting good practices from one department to other departments.

Sofie would like to see such good practices as requirements; ie that HoSPs are required to explain these things at SAT meetings. Pernille would like to reduce redundancy and improve efficiency, so discussions don't have to happen in the same way several times, and in several fora.

Pernille and Christian will discuss if perhaps a better “pipeline” for discussions and transparency about the results of course evaluations could be constructed.

### **Ad 5**

Ea introduces the process, history, and background of the project ("Changing the registration requirement"). Ea then updated on the progression of the project. The project is taking effect right now in the spring semester. Currently, SAP is working on information for HoSPs about effects on registrations, exemptions, and queries from students.

Ea shortly explained the effects and working of the project, what is changing for whom?

Since last update, Education Group have discussed limitations to the project. The project is about flexibility, the limitation is only for 1-st year students having to start out with 30 ECTS. New master students are allowed to do the reduces 22.5 ECTS.

Plans for next semester: Working on changing the registrations in STADS, so students can do it themselves, rather than having to e-mail SAP and have them de-register them from courses, as the situation is now.

They want to give the HoSPs some data 4-5 weeks into the semester; what happened? How many students chose to reduce? To discuss the practices going forward.

Pernille is very interested in seeing if this new practice is going to have an impact on student well-being. Maybe giving students the option of explaining why they choose to de-register? Not for the purpose of surveillance, but to gather knowledge about the backgrounds for their decisions. This should be an optional feature in the process, and it can be a sensitive matter so it needs to be handled delicately.

Ea mentioned that the student counselors were very ready to discuss the process with students, but not many students took advantage of this opportunity, and maybe didn't need to discuss it. From a SAP standpoint this has been a very smooth implementation.

### **Ad 6**

Ea presented a detail that needs to be changed (changes to the *Appendix to Curricula*) due to the aforementioned project. Ea described the proposed changes.

This was taken up for approval. It was approved unanimously.

### **Ad 7**

Theodor had an info-point concerning the issues concerning the affair with the Security exam. He told that the incident has changed the atmosphere among BSWU students to the worse, and that CS students have an experience of having a harder time at it than other students. They are feeling let down by ITU as an institution. This is not a bad atmosphere or sentiment directed towards teachers, but rather the institution of ITU.

Sofie supported this sentiment. Some students felt that they don't know where to complain, and that maybe this could be explained to students more effectively.

Ea pointed to the fact that there is a page on the website, and maybe this page could be moved to a better, more efficient location on the site.

Apparently, students complained about it at the time of the exam, but there was no way or time to change it on the day. Ea explained that such an extensive case has not happened at ITU before, so management had to reach out to other universities for precedent. As such, it was a difficult situation for students but certainly also for ITU. It is a very serious case that is still being processed.

Sofie mentioned that at SD they have experienced problems with questions at exams, and their experience is much better. Problems have been solved on the day because the person who have made the exam, the course manager, have been available. It worked very well at these experiences.

Ea will give an overview of how ITU will follow up on the case, probably in May.