

Board of Studies (BoS) – 6. meeting 2024

19 June 2024

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Patrick Bahr** (faculty, SAT CS), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP), **Tiago Fernandes** (student, SAT Games), **Alexander Senderovitz** (directly elected student), **Lena Winther Jensen** (student, SAT CS), **Emil Ulrik Gregersen** (student, SAT BIT)

Guests: **Viktorija Hofbauer** (SAP)

Absent: **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD)

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda

2. Study Environment Action Plan

Viktorija (SAP) will go through the plan during the meeting starting with focus areas 4 and 5, due to lack of time at the last BoS meeting. The goal is to achieve a tentative approval of the action plan.

In the attached PP you will find:

- A new slide with an “Introduction, process 2024, implementation and follow up plan”.
- Two versions of the action plan: One with seven focus areas and one draft with six focus areas (where 4 and 5 are merged).

Appendix 1: Study Environment Action Plan Draft

Appendix 2: Study Environment Action Plan 2024-2028 Backlog

3. Approval: Revisions to Appendix to Curricula

Ea (SAP) presents revisions, additions, and precisions to the existing rules.

Appendix 3: Summary of revisions

Appendix 4: Draft

4. Status on the GAI guidelines

5. AOB (Any Other Business)

Minutes

Ad 1

The agenda was approved.

Ad 2

Viktorija presented the process and the action plan with the revisions and suggested revisions, based on the discussions at the last BoS meeting. Among these suggestions was a draft of a sort of backlog. This backlog can be used when the Board of Studies revisits the plan every 6 months.

Viktorija reminded everyone that this is a very open action plan, due to the ongoing and upcoming organizational changes. Thus, the action plan will be revisited at a BoS meeting in winter.

Viktorija then presented the “Implementation and follow-up plan.”

Among the suggested revisions from the last BoS meeting was to collapse a number of Focus areas. This revision was upheld.

There was also a suggestion to collapse focus area 4 and 5.

Hanna asked if the action plan will be public. Viktorija answered that yes, it will be public. Hanna asked if the plan means, for instance, that all teachers need to improve feedback, since some teachers already give a lot of feedback. Alexander answered that the action plan is about doing even better as well as highlighting what already works. Hanna asked about how it will be communicated? Viktorija and Christian answered that they will make sure it is clearly communicated that this is an overall strategy and action plan, a focus for ITU over the next 4 years.

There was a discussion about the possibility of merging focus areas 4 and 5. Viktorija presented a proposal with the focus areas joined. Hanna asked if it had been considered to collapse focus areas 3 and 4, since students with disabilities are part big part of ensuring good, for instance, group work (and the other focus areas). Aleksander stated that you can also see the areas as quite distinct forms of inclusion. He also stated that, with regards to area 4, discrimination and harassment, it is important to have an ongoing awareness and communication about it, rather than keeping it as part of introductions for new students, as it is experienced right now. Following this discussion, it was decided to keep the 7 new focus areas separate.

Ea noted that in area 5, the language should be amended to “communication about and with disabilities.” Hanna and Tiago suggested renaming area 5 “Supporting special needs of students.” Aleksander suggested “Students requiring additional support”.

Hanna suggested replacing “understanding students with disabilities” with “understanding disabilities”. Tiago added that, if the purpose of the focus area is to increase awareness of students with disabilities, then it is important to include “students” in the title.

There was a discussion about how to formulate the focus area so as not to “put blame on the students (with disabilities)” while remaining somewhat precise. Patrick and Tiago argued that the use of the word disabilities in itself does not cast blame on any students.

Hanna suggested that we add “special needs and disabilities” and revisit language and formulations next time BoS discusses the action plan.

Viktorija presented focus area 6 – optimizing the campus.

Tiago asked why the sanitary facilities are a separate area, rather than part of area 6? Viktorija answered that this was due to the sanitary facilities receiving unprecedented attention in the comments.

Hanna added that better communication about students’ use of rooms and facilities should not be restricted to Emil Holms Kanal, but about all of ITU.

Aleksander noted that the problems with indoor temperatures are ongoing and significant for some students. Viktorija answered that FM is aware of this but there are certain restrictions related to the construction of the building.

There was a discussion about ITU getting better at communicating why certain issues with the building can’t be resolved.

The amended proposal was unanimously approved and will be revisited by BoS in the Autumn semester.

Ad 3

Ea presented the proposed changes to the Appendix to Curricula; Rules and Regulations.

Changes are related to admission and enrollment, Summer University, mandatory activities (making the rules clearer for students, course managers and teachers). Related to mandatory activities, Patrick stated that these new rules are not compatible with how they are currently using mandatory activities. Specifically, that it is not possible for teachers to inform the students if they have passed the mandatory activities before the last week of teaching. Patrick suggested that the last date should relate to the exam date, rather than the last week of teaching.

Ea asked the students present how it would work with mandatory activities related to exams? Lena answered that if it was changed to two weeks prior to exams that could work. Patrick thought that two weeks would be a good idea, but one week is more realistic. Lena answered that while two weeks seems like a long time, it is very constructive with regards to preparing for an exam.

Ea suggested that she prepare two suggested wordings (1 week or 2 weeks) and present them to the HoSPs, and then BoS can look at it again in September.

There were also clarifications and wording changes related to exams and exam variations, projects and theses, final projects, as well as chapter 6: Other Rules and Regulations on Exams.

The clarifications related to sanctions for academic misconduct agreed upon at the last BoS meeting were also included.

The changes, except the changes to mandatory activities, were approved. Mandatory activities will be discussed at the next BoS meeting in September.

Ad 4

Viktoria gave a short status on the GAI guidelines.

Ad 5

No further business.