

Board of Studies (BoS) – 11 March 2021

- Present:** Stine Gotved (chair, directly elected faculty), Martin Pichlmair (faculty, SAT Games), Signe Louise Yndigegn (faculty, SAT DD), Baki Cakici (faculty, SAT Bus), Marco Carbone (faculty, SAT CS)
- Mads Christiansen (student, SAT Business), Emil Vogt Sørensen (student, SAT DD), Theodor Christian Kier (student, SAT CS), Daniel Kirsch Kromann (directly elected student)
- Lene Rehder (assigned guest, SAP), Pernille Rydén (assigned guest, Dean of Education), Dorthe Stadsgaard (secretary, SAP)
- Guests:** Lise Lawaetz Winkler (Dean of Education Support), Stine Due Hansen (SAP), Björn Thór Jónsson (Deputy Head of Department of Computer Science)
- Absent:** Annamaya Halskov-Jensen (student, SAT Games), Alexander Lytton (student, SAT Business), Alex Dalum (student, SAT Business), Thomas Flodgaard Kaufmanas (student, SAT DD)

Minutes

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of minutes from meeting 12 February 2021

The minutes were approved.

3. ITU Strategy

In February, BoS discussed its input to the draft ITU Strategy 2022-2025 and forwarded input to Executive Management in writing. BoS agreed to invite the Vice-Chancellor to the March-meeting to learn more about the thoughts, ideas, and ambitions behind the draft strategy and discuss the strategy's contents.

Appendix 1: Draft ITU Strategy 2022-2025

Appendix 2: BoS input to draft ITU strategy 23-02-2021

Guest: Martin Zachariasen

Stine: At the last meeting BoS made a written statement to Executive Management with our comments and input to the draft strategy. We decided to invite the vice-chancellor for this meeting to discuss the draft strategy further.

Martin Z: Thank you for your comments to the draft strategy, they are very valuable. We (Executive Management) are now revising the draft strategy taking input from all stakeholders into account. I am pleased to see, BoS is ambitious on ITUs behalf.

Concerning "Deliver high quality education and research" you make fair comments and I think we will revise the goal. The idea is that the quality of our research must remain at least at the height it is today, even as we grow. Growth can lead to issues with quality, so growth and quality assurance must be connected.

Concerning “increasing the volume of female students” I agree that it might be badly phrased in the draft. We will work on that. Perhaps we can use a phrase along the lines of “Achieve an even better gender balance on all our programmes.”. The goal and its intentions stands, though.

Baki: concerning the goal on our relationship with the industry, we are uncomfortable posing ourselves only as input to the industry. We should also be influencing the industry, not only reacting to their needs and wants.

Martin Z: Thank you for this comment, we are looking into the way it is phrased.

A frequent comment from stakeholders is that we should address the green agenda as well. We are discussing how to approach this.

Marco: Concerning research and rankings, have you also considered ranking for teaching/teaching quality?

Martin Z: We have discussed it but are retracting on the phrase concerning ranking. We would like ITU’s research to be more visible, that is what matters. Thus, in the second draft strategy we might not write all that much about ranking. I am aware that some rankings include teaching.

Martin P: ITU’s position concerning research; we are not in a bad place being the small, specialized university that we are. We have several pillars of high-quality research. Could they make it into the strategy?

Martin Z: We have discussed it, and the pillars are most definitely there. They are also rather diverse, and it is not easy to find the good way to communicate the strengths etc. with the level of diversity.

Pernille: If we want to be a niche university, we have to articulate this.

Martin: The draft strategy is being revised as we speak. Then, we will do two rounds with ITU-managers followed by a consultation of the Board of Directors in April. Then staff, including BoS, will be consulted again.

4. Evaluation of evaluation system for courses and supervision

In 2020, BoS and the Vice-Chancellor agreed to do an evaluation of the evaluation system for courses and supervision (the new system which was implemented in Autumn 2019 and Spring 2020). The Quality Coordinator (Dorthe Stadsgaard) has put together a proposal and asks BoS and the Vice-chancellor to discuss it and decide the process and timing.

Appendix 3: Eval of Eval - proposal for design and process – v1

Guest: Martin Zachariasen

Stine: We are to decide what to focus on in the evaluation and if we can do it before summer 2021.

Baki: What is BoS’ mandate? Can BoS decide to make changes? Or can BoS only make recommendations to Executive Management?

As I see it there might be a link between the number of questions and evaluation elements per course and the low response rate.

Martin Z: Executive Management and Heads of Department decided to add questions relating to individual teachers. I also remember a discussion on how evaluation results on individual teachers is handled – this should be in the evaluation to find out if there have been any issues. Both teachers and managers should be asked about this.

Stine: Can we make any changes to the evaluation or can Executive Management overrule BoS anytime?

Martin Z: Ultimately, Executive Management makes the decision to make changes or not. We are not looking for a big change to the evaluation current system. However, if there are serious issues, it should be possible to make changes. BoS can make recommendations for changes.

Signe: I think that all elements in the evaluation system for courses and supervision should be included in the evaluation of evaluations.

Stine: Would anybody like to be part of the project group?

Marco: Will BoS be asked for feedback?

Dorthe: Yes.

Martin Z: DoE must be included in meetings etc. on this whenever I am.

Baki: BoS' mandate seems unchanged; we can only make recommendations. So, I do not see how BoS can allocate resources to this.

Martin Z: Adjustments to the evaluation system depends on the issues uncovered.

Pernille: It is important that it is not a pseudo process.

Martin Z: If there are major issues, we will definitely look into making changes.

Signe: I would like to be involved in the process.

Theodor: So would I.

Dorthe: Thank you so much, I will get in touch with you asap.

Decision: *BoS (and the Vice-chancellor) agreed to the proposed design and process for the evaluation of course and supervision evaluations. Signe and Theodor volunteered to be part of the project group.*

5. Study Environment Assessment

BoS continues the discussion of results from the Study Environment Assessment and moves closer to an Action Plan. Stakeholders have sent their input to BoS and Dean of Education Support, and the latter have drafted an Action Plan, including appointment of people/functions responsible for Action Points. BoS discuss the proposal (adds/subtracts/redefines/elaborates action points) and Dean of Education Support continues to work on the Action Plan after the meeting. BoS decides if stakeholders should be consulted on the draft Action Plan between the March and April meetings or between the April and May meetings.

The Action Plan must consider that the survey runs again in Autumn 2021 after which the Action Plan must be adjusted based on the new set of data.

Appendix 4: Reading Guide BoS StuEnviAss March 2021

Appendix 5: Suggested themes and subthemes BoS StuEnivAss March 2021

Appendix 6: Draft Action Plan BoS StuEnviAss March 2021

Appendix 7: Stakeholder input raw data BoS StuEnviAss March 2021

Guest: Lise Lawaetz Winkler (Dean of Education Support), Björn Thór Jónsson (Deputy Head of Department of Computer Science), Stine Due Hansen (Head of Study Guidance)

Lise: I have prepared a few slides to introduce the draft action plan. The feedback from stakeholders was diverse and specific to a smaller og larger degree. It showed that some stakeholders are already taking initiatives locally where an issue is specific to their area of responsibility. I have categorized the input and suggest three themes:

- a. Wellbeing*
- b. Learning Environment*
- c. Physical Environment.*

Some themes already include specific actions, others are more on headline level.

Pernille: The themes are connected. Please do not see them as separate but as interconnected.

Stine D: Concerning wellbeing the Study and Career Guidance propose several activities to improve wellbeing. They build on research and can be implemented soon. We expect them to have an effect.

Pernille: How will you ensure that the students who need it the most will participate in the activities?

Stine D: That is a good point. They use the activities on University of Southern Denmark (SDU). On some SDU study programmes/departments the activities are mandatory and here they appear to be effective. Where they are not mandatory, they are less successful. It would be very nice if it could become mandatory at ITU.

Mads: I think the activities would work better when the students have already started at the university. When they know a bit about what attending university is.

Baki: I would be very careful implementing mandatory activities aimed at well-being – it could have the opposite effect.

Signe: We are discussing on-boarding on some of our study programmes, perhaps the activities can be joined.

Bjørn: My main concern is workload and time spent studying. I think we should work on aligning expectations more so new students know what is expected of them.

Theodor: Students know about the workload per ECTS-point. But I have experienced that some teachers do not. It is my impression that students work less at the moment (COVID19-lockdown).

Bjørn: Both faculty and students need to understand workload and what is expected/can be expected better.

Pernille: We can only give general guidelines. How much you need to work on your studies and topics will always differ from person to person.

Stine: Remember that self-reported figures on e.g. time spent on an activity should always be treated with care.

Lise: It seems you agree on the themes. How do we proceed from here? We can consult stakeholders and people appointed as responsible for initiatives/action points before the next BoS meeting or I can continue working on the draft action plan and then we consult stakeholders in April?

Pernille: Could we upload the draft action plan on the Bos Team for members to be able to comment on it before next meeting?

Stine: That is a good idea. And let us discuss it further at our next meeting before consulting stakeholders.

Decision: *The draft Action Plan is uploaded to BoS' Team for members to comment on. BoS continues discussions on the draft Action Plan 6 April. Stakeholders and people appointed as responsible for action points are consulted after the BoS meeting 6 April.*

6. Results from and follow-up on Course and Supervision Evaluations Autumn semester 2020

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 survey part of course evaluations.

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.

SAT have not forwarded suggestions for changes that need BoS' approval.

Appendix 8: Report on course evaluations 2020-2

Appendix 9: Report on supervision evaluations 2020-2

Baki: The response rate is very low this time! Whatever actions come out of the evaluations it can only be guesswork that they will address the right issues – the response rate is too low for us to know what the issues really are.

Theodor: SAT CS has discussed what we could do to increase response rate. A suggestion is to allocate time to participate during lectures.

Stine: That has been the recommendation for years. and I have practiced it for years, but even so, I have never raised the response rate above 45 %.

Marco: The problem is much bigger, because it lies with the evaluation system, I think (Baki agrees).

Pernille: Mind you, that low response rates are not an ITU problem, there is an all-round evaluation fatigue in society, unfortunately.

Baki: I am disillusioned with raising response rates without changing the evaluation system.

Theodor: My BSc project is about how to get more data from students without them having to do more.

Pernille: The new evaluation system is not really all that different from the old one.

Marco: I agree. The only real change is that the last part has been split into two; a survey and a qualitative in-class evaluation.

Signe: I agree with Marco. And unfortunately, the final evaluation in class does not really appear in the report and follow-up process.

Pernille: the in-class evaluation part gives the teachers something, and that is the main thing.

Decision: *BoS has not received suggestions for changes from SAT or other stakeholders. BoS itself did not propose changes or initiatives based on the course and supervision evaluations. The evaluation of evaluations project will take the comments made on this item into account.*

7. FYI: Delayed grades, winter exams 2020-21

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

Appendix 10: Delayed grades Winter exams 2020-2021 (*the appendix is uploaded appr. 9 March*)

Stine: The overview shows that delayed grades are systematic in some places.

Lene R: The issue unfortunately continues. In SAP, we have made sure deadlines are communicated clearly to external examiners and faculty. To be fair, many exams were moved around this semester due to COVID19-restrictions.

Marco: Have you looked at differences between exams held before Christmas 2020 compared to after Christmas? The holidays might play into delays.

Lene R.: We could investigate it. However, the period given to grade exams factor in the holidays.

Stine: BoS will keep following this.

8. FYI: Quality Policy 2021

This year's Quality Policy was approved by Executive Management 23 December 2020. Board of Studies was consulted on the draft in November 2020.

Appendix 11: Quality Policy 2021

9. AOB (Any Other Business)