

# Board of Studies (BoS) – 2. meeting 2023

8 March 2023

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

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

**Ea Feldfos** (assigned guest, SAP), **Therese Graversen** (guest at no. 3a, BDS), **Stine Due Hansen** (guest at no. 4, SAP), **Helge Pfeiffer** (guest at no. 3b, BSWU), **Dan Witzner** (guest at no. 3b, BSWU), **Louise Meier Carlsen** (guest at item 3b, BSWU), **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP)

Absent: **Saskia Joanna Rauhut** (student, SAT Games), no students elected from BIT yet

## Minutes

### Agenda

#### 1. Approval of agenda

#### 2. Information: Delayed grades

After each exam period, BoS receives an overview of courses where grades were delayed.

*App 1: Grades Delayed Winter 22-23*

#### 3. Approval of Applications for x-form (experimential exams)

Guests: Therese Graversen

*App 2: Application X form SODSE*

*App 3: Application X form exam BDSA*

#### 4. Discussion of recommendations from the project: 'Better conditions for students with functional impairments.' Task force for equality in teaching activities, will present recommendations to the Board of Studies.

Guest: Stine Due Hansen

*App 4: Status and recommendations from the Taskforce for Equality in Teaching Activities*

#### 5. Proposal to change SAT course evaluation practices

*App 5: Proposal to change SAT course evaluation practices*

#### 6. AOB (Any Other Business)

### **Ad 1: Approval of the agenda**

Agenda was approved.

### **Ad 2: Delayed Grades (this item was discussed after item no. 4)**

Ea presented the statement quantifying delayed grades (*App 1*), and mentioned that she had already had a correspondence with Theodor, and that maybe the data in *App 1* would not correspond completely with the data on delayed exams compiled by the students.

Theodor had prepared an Excel sheet with data compiled by students, with numbers indicating more delayed grades than presented in *App 1*. Ea will look into this along with Theodor.

Stine Gotved mentioned that delayed grades seem like a systemic problem, especially with the winter exams. Ea agreed and stated that at least some teachers aren't aware of the logistics surrounding the exams, such as the amount and size of papers needing to be graded. Many exams in a very short amount of time compounds the issue.

Also, in the years 2020-21 there were larger cohorts of students, up to a hundred more students than usual, which significantly adds to the workload.

A manageable digital platform for exam grading is sorely needed, something they use at KUA and other universities and institutions.

ITU is currently waiting for the implementation of "new SIS", which is a huge project that all the other universities also are working on. This stands in the way of doing anything about a digital exam system at this moment in time.

Theodor mentioned that sometimes grades are delivered to students in a course over a period of time, and not all at once, and if this would impact how the numbers are assessed.

Luca asked how serious the numbers are, and what the impact is. Ea stated the number of delayed exams ideally should be 0. And mentioned that the law states that students should have their grade within 4 weeks of handing in the paper/project. This is also important in regard to student's wellbeing, their preparation time for the re-exam, and to SAPs planning and running re-exams.

This topic will be followed up on the next BoS meeting in April.

### **Ad 3: Approval of Applications for x-forms**

#### X-form SODSE

Therese presented the x-form, and reasons for using it. The current form is experienced by many students as very hard. This x-form reduces the number of cases to be discussed, but also reduces the time. The proposal is to try it out and see in a year how the experiences were. The purpose of the x-form is to reduce non-productive time. It is an exam form that compares with exam forms at other universities.

Sofie asked if the exam is without computers or written by hand, it is written by hand (and closed book). The LS comments were brought up and discussed. In the process of the application for the exam it was suggested to use 2,5 hours instead of 2 hours, but Therese noted that this would not be needed, due to the fewer number of cases. Ea added that the suggested change was in line with student feedback.

The x-form was put up for approval and was approved.

### X-form BDSA

Helge presented the x-form, and reasons for using it; The use of two written parts; a project written prior to the exam, and a written exam, should provide a more coherent understanding of the connections between ILOs of the curriculum.

Stine mentioned several “red flags” in the x-form. One of these was that mandatory activities can’t formally be introduced when the course starts, they have to be defined beforehand. Also, it is unclear how alignment is maintained with an oral-only re-exam, as compared to the exam-form with two written parts.

Sofie mentioned that the x-form was discussed in SAT CS, and the students said they already had three written exams in a short amount of time. This x-form would include an extra mandatory assignment, and the students are worried this will significantly increase the workload and pressure on the students.

Theodor commented that from his perspective it reduces pressure by “splitting up” the grading. He was surprised that LS commented that the x-form could create motivation for re-exams (due to re-exams being oral only). While this could be possible, it probably wouldn’t happen, due to the lateness of re-exams at ITU. Also, he does not agree with the LS stance that 9 ILOs are a lot for the ECTS points of the course, since it compares to several other courses.

Theodor also brought up the comments from SAT CS about the issue with many written exams in a short time, but stated that from his experience, this it isn’t unusual.

Helge stated that the proposal for the x-form was to make the written exam more like a check-up on knowing the concepts and background. He was surprised about the connection between ILOs and ECTS and stated that this could be adjusted. He doesn’t think it will make more students seek re-exam, based on experience. He stated that he is definitely not interested in generating higher/more pressure on students. They have a clear focus on aligning coursetime/coursework with the mandatory tasks.

Dan (HoSP, BSWU) stated that he agrees with Helge. He found the arguments for not pressuring the students good. He thinks Helge should manage the amount of ILOS within the ECTS, since he has the insight into the course, and doesn’t think it should be an administrative issue. Louise (co-HoSP, BSWU) commented that she agrees with Dan, and really think this x-form is a better fit for the ILOs.

Theodor supported the x-form from a student perspective.

Sofie asked about the process, if it approved, will it be evaluated? Stine: there is no standard evaluation following the approval of an x-form. She stated that she didn’t see all the “red flags” addressed, but due to the department-wide support suggested it could be approved with the condition of it being evaluated after one year.

Dan asked about the “red flags” Stine mentioned, and she brought up the LS comments, but stated that they had been discussed at that point.

Helge stated that if desired, they will of course evaluate the x-form, but he would probably need to apply again next year, and then the approval-process would bring up the experiences of the past year.

It was also discussed that CS will make sure that structural alignment is not compromised in the oral-only re-exam.

Hanna added that previous discussions at BoS have arrived at the conclusion that 4 hour exams are very long, and maybe not really good exam-forms.

The proposal was brought up for approval. Stine suggested approval under the condition of it being evaluated in a year.

The proposed x-form was approved under the condition that it be evaluated in a year. The exact method of evaluation will be determined later. Helge stated that the application process is a very tough and demanding process.

**Ad 4: Discussion of recommendations from the project: 'Better conditions for students with functional impairments.'**

Stine Due Hansen (Stine D.H. henceforth) presented the recommendations from the Task group for Teaching Activities, that was set up by BoS previously. Stine G. asked if this was a point for discussions or input. Stine D.H. stated that this was for comment and information, and afterwards recommendations will go to EG and HODs.

Stine D.H. presented recommendation one and two:

1. *Improved information flows related to students with impairments in classes/courses*
2. *Updating the Teaching Guide to include cases and inspirational guidance*

Theodor and Stine G. both expressed that the recommendations are good.

Signe asked about particulars in regard to sensitive information. Stine D.H. stated that the recommendation goes towards raising awareness with teachers, without going into particulars about specific cases. As it is today students themselves have to bring up impairments and diagnoses themselves, and this is not comfortable for all students.

Signe stated that it is very difficult to handle if it isn't concrete. Stine D.H. agreed that it is challenging.

Magnus stated that in his experience, teachers have stated that students were welcome to bring it up, so maybe teachers could more clearly state to the students that if they want to, they can tell the teacher and that there are resources at ITU to help them.

Hanna stated that a good place to do this could be in a HoSP talk at the welcome arrangement for new students.

Signe stated that we need to be aware of what is the responsibility of the teacher and what is the responsibility of other actors.

Ea stated that there are SPS, student councilors, and what students could address to teachers could be related more concretely to, for instance, academic issues or specifically towards a particular teaching method or exam form. Probably students shouldn't come out with everything to the teachers.

Stine D.H. presented recommendation three:

*Exploring possible supplementary alternatives to Mandatory Activities (working group)*

There were no comments to this point.

Stine D.H. presented recommendation four:

*Setting up a working group to zoom in on "Group Work"*

Sofie said that at RUC they are really good at this, so maybe it could be a good idea to consult people at RUC.

Signe mentioned how RUC had people responsible for groups and seconded the idea.

Stine D.H. presented recommendation five:

*Pilot testing the effect of sound recordings in teaching*

Stine G. asked if it was a general recommendation, or just for impaired students. Signe commented that this is a difficult discussion.

Stine D.H. presented recommendation six:

*Quiet/break rooms – places to rest*

Theodor stated that at KUA they have a "retreat room" that looks comfortable and quiet. Not just for students with impairments, but for anyone, and maybe this could be a good idea.

#### **Ad 5: Proposal to change SAT course evaluation practices**

This point was delayed until next meeting in April, to have the proper time for discussion.

#### **Ad 6: AOB (Any Other Business)**

No other business.