Board of Studies (BoS) – 5. meeting 2023

22 May 2023

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games)**, Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business), **Luca Aiello** (faculty, SAT CS), **Sofie Kramshøi Nielsen** (student, SAT CS), **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Theodor Christian Kier** (directly elected student), **Saskia Joanna Rauhut** (student, SAT Games), **Fie Crusell Pedersen** (students, SAT BIT), **Pernille Rydén** (assigned guest, Dean of Education), **Ea Feldfos** (assigned guest, SAP), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP)

Absent: **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD)

Agenda

1. **Approval of agenda**

2. **Education Portfolio Report 2023**
   The HoSPs have written their annual Study Programme Reports and discussed it with Education Group and Head of Department at the annual Quality Status meeting.
   Subsequently, Dean of Education & Support have drafted the Education Portfolio Report 2023 which summarizes 2022 Quality Data and impressions from Study Programme Reports, Quality Status Meetings etc. The report has been discussed within Education Group and Heads of Department. In the report, 4 action points responding to quality issues are presented.
   Before the report is discussed with Executive Management, BoS discuss it and writes a statement. The statement must be sent to Executive Management and Education Group by 30th of May.
   Please prepare by:
   - Reading the report (you will get far by reading the Summative Analysis and the Action Plan)
   - Considering your feedback to the issues raised and the suggested action points
   Dean of Education Pernille Rydén frames the report.
   Appendix 1: Education Portfolio Report 2023

3. **Appendix to Curricula: Proposal for new exam variations**
   Appendix 2: New examination Variation
   Appendix 3: New exam variations, extract of Appendix to curricula

4. **Status on GDPR Awareness Course**

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

MINUTES

Ad 1

Sofie was chair in the meeting. Point 4 was postponed till the next meeting.

Ad 2

Luca asked about the action points in the Education Portfolio Report (EPR hereafter); if some issues (from Study Programme Reports) are not carried forward into the action points of the EPR, does this mean nothing gets done about it? In particular, there is no action point addressing gender equality. Here Luca mentioned a number of potential actions towards addressing gender imbalances. He also mentioned that it would probably be a good idea to revise the way potential biases are addressed among faculty. As an example, he mentioned the current gender equality workshops, that at some instances have been experienced as distinctly counterproductive, and asked if maybe another way forward could be used?

Pernille mentioned that this problematic is probably something that should be addressed to the Diversity and Inclusion Committee, since its implications reach beyond the education level. Regarding the workshops, Pernille stated that obviously these cannot solve the issues in and of themselves, but that they are intended as a way of starting the conversation about the topic. And experiences with the workshops of course will be discussed and taken note of.

Luca again asked about what happens if there is no action point about a problematic in the EPR?

Ea and Pernille mentioned the Strategic Framework Contract, where gender diversity is a part of Strategic Goal 1, so there is an overall focus and accountability connected to the issue at ITU.

Luca mentioned that putting wellbeing and retention as interconnected issues in the same action point (Action #3) runs the risk of diminishing both issues. Pernille said that EG has made several attempts to discuss and address the issue (at CS).

Irina asked about Action #2 ("increasing students' awareness of ITU research…"). She mentioned that there are several factors that seem to be pulling in the opposite direction. For instance, at her programme, they are told to use more DVIPs, which wouldn't further knowledge about ITU research, and there are several other factors are working against that action point.

Sofie followed up by asking, what is going to be done concretely about the issue? In her experience there is not a lot of connection between students and researchers. And most students have no insight into the research being done by researchers who are not their teachers. This should probably be addressed.

Pernille stated that there are many approaches, and that the issue is not just a matter of knowing about or being involved with research. The Action seeks to expand the concept of Research Based Learning, such as it is described in the BeWise strategy. There is also ongoing work towards compiling a sort of catalogue of concrete examples.

Sofie asked about the Closed Actions, in particular Closed Action #7 about course evaluations. She stated that from a student perspective there is no indication of what is concretely being done, or has been done, addressing this issue.

Pernille responded that it is a long process of enacting a cultural change by sharing best practices. That the action is closed does not mean the matter is done with. There is a continuing focus on improving communication back to students about what is being done on the basis of course evaluations. She added that course evaluations are being taken very seriously at several levels at ITU, and both quantitative and qualitative data are discussed and used in the assurance and development of the quality of the programmes.

Hanna mentioned that, relating to ChatGPT and generative AI, we could emphasize the local specialized competences that we actually have at the ITU, and asked why it was not an action point. Pernille responded that there are several initiatives going on, both at ITU and across the University Sector. It is not an action point in the EPR, because the issue is broader and more far reaching. As such, it is something that must go into the project governance model to find the best ways of meeting the challenges.

Hanna asked about the teachers not completing the competence program; if we know ´the reasons why they have not completed them. Pernille listed several possible reasons, among them there has been a restructuring of LS, also previously a lack of resources, and even a few teachers not finding it relevant. There can be many reasons for not doing it, and the formulation is maybe a bit hard in the report.

Theodor had a comment about the formulations concerning course evaluation response rates (page 12). He could not at all recognize the mentioned initiatives and mentioned an alternative way that some teachers had done it, that was experienced as much better and more inclusive than on the other courses.

Pernille responded that it is important to know if there are competing evaluations going on at the same time.

Magnus asked if there are actual, concrete rules about how to use generative AI; is there a rule set that is implemented. Pernille responded that there are some overall guidelines agreed upon with the other universities. It is very difficult to make general rules across all the programmes because they are so different. ITU is trying to handle it at course level, which is the best way right now.

Ea added that when it comes to exams, Generative AI should be handled like an "aid", alongside other aids, that are allowed, or not allowed.

Pernille added that it is not just an "aid", it is actually equivalent to co-creating with a partner. This complicates things a lot.

Theodor had some further questions for the report. On page 5, it was not BoS that initiated the project about lowering the course requirements, it was originally a student initiative. This is important in order to recognize the influence of the student population.

He then added that it seems problematic that student wellbeing is only mentioned in connection with student retention rates. This seems very transactional and detached. Student wellbeing is an important topic in and of itself.

Ad 3

Ea introduced the "appendix to curricula". She mentioned that ITU as of now has two sets of variations for most exam forms: Groups OR individual, but many ITU's group exams are conducted as a mixture of individual and group exam forms. This is not allowed from a legal perspective. The proposal will introduce a

third exam variation for mixed exams, thus allowing course managers to let students choose between individual and group exams, where the intended learning outcomes leave room for flexibility. This will hopefully be possible from spring 2024, but maybe it will be autumn.

The proposal was approved.

Ad 4

Postponed till next meeting.

Ad 5

Theodor had spoken with other students, and they were wondering if ITU has ever considered Saturday exams. Could this be a way of helping ITU in scheduling the exams?

Ea mentioned that students at other universities do not like Saturday or Sunday exams.

Saskia Johanna mentioned that we should not forget students who have children!

Pernille added that this could hamper diversity and inclusion initiatives. And mentioned that she was at DTU when they did this experiment, and everyone but Executive Management hated it. She also mentioned that we have some problems with stress and a high workload, so we need to be careful.

Ea mentioned that they always try to schedule the exams with at least five days between them. She will talk to Marc and Alette to see if maybe something about the principles could be communicated.