

Present: Stine Gotved, Marco Carbone, Jörn Messeter, Christopher Gad, Paolo Burelli, Martin Pichlmair, Sophia Aumüller Wagner, Kristina Mituzaitė, Theodor Christian Kier, Emilie Hvashøj Pedersen, Mark Hyslop Graham, Stilyan Petrov, Nanna Sidelmann.

Absent:

Guests: Lene Rehder (SAP), Dorthe Stadsgaard (SAP),

Agenda

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved

2. Approval of the Minutes

Kristina: I have one comment. It is not clear from the Minutes who has the decision-making competence when it comes to the handling of Credit transfer- applications.

Nanna: It is the Study board. I will correct it.

3. The use of mandatory activities at ITU - decision

For decision:

In 2015 a set of guidelines on mandatory activities was decided by the Study board. The guidelines and the use of mandatory activities was discussed at meetings 6 May and 27 June.

SAT groups, Head of Programmes and Student counsel have been asked to give input. Based on the discussions in Spring, Stine Gotved has created a suggestion for a new set of guidelines.

Please see the document attached. Att. 1.

The Study board is to decide, whether to approve or reject the suggestion.

In att. 1, Stine recapped the discussion and gathered a suggestion for some new principles.

The suggestion is to have the following principles regarding mandatory activities:

1. It is optional to plan with mandatory activities, and there have to be an explicit pedagogical reason
2. A mandatory activity is to be a one-time occurrence (not a series)
3. Giving feedback to the students is part of a mandatory activity
4. It must be transparent to students whether their mandatory work is passed or not, and it have to be communicated in a timely manner.
5. Students must be given the possibility for a "second attempt" at the mandatory activity before the final exam.

I suggest this to be combined with a third bullet in the Please note-section:

- Mandatory activities cannot entail peer grading, peer evaluation or peer feedback

Stine:

Since the recap, LS made a suggestion: that formative peer feedback should be possible

Christopher:

This might end up being very confusing. The distinction between feedback and an assessment is not always clear. We might end up in situations - as it has happened – where it is not clear what the role of the student really is. Several members from the Study agreed to this.

Annelise:

In the suggestion from LS, it says, that teachers and TAs can make an assessment. This is not correct and will be corrected. Teaching assistants are not allowed to do any kinds of assessment.

Sophia:

There are different nuances to this. It is done in various ways. Sometimes the students take part in approval of the assignments.

Christopher:

We don't want to exclude peer grading – but it should not be used in mandatory assignments.

Martin:

We should not remove peer feedback completely. Some times it is part of the mandatory activities to give feedback, for example when presenting something in class. But it must not relate to the assessment.

Stine:

My suggestion for new mandatory activity guidelines will be to allow peer feedback as such, but distinguish it clearly from any kind of assessment. I will make the final writing before the next meeting.

Mike:

I am glad to see it out. There are worries from student counsel, that the new principles might not change a lot. It is important to look at how this will be implemented.

Christopher:

We need some sort of quality check in the course description.

Stine:

We need to remember, that even as we have challenge with too many mandatory activities, the Study board decided that not to get rid of the assignments as such. I will make the final draft and present it on the 24 September.

Christopher:

It must be clear, that the students have the right to second attempt. We agree on this, and there is time to implement this for spring 2020. Until then it must be communicated, that this is the recommendation from the Study board

4. IT Study Environment Issues and meetings with Student council - decision

Dorthe Stadsgaard and Henrik Bidstrup suggest to have the responsibility for student input moved from Student Council to the Study board.

It is to be decided, whether or not the responsibility is to move from Student Council to the Study board.

See att. 2

Dorthe: It is the responsibility of the Student Council to meet with the IT-department in relation to Study Environmental issues. For a long time the Student Council has not shown up to those meetings. To secure student involvement the proposal is to transfer the responsibility to the Board of Studies.

Mike:

I don't know why they haven't shown up but they want to take on the responsibility now.

Stine:

I don't find this is a responsibility for the Study board.

Theodor:

Maybe the SATs would be a good idea?

The Study board agreed to see if the student council can make it work for the next semester and discuss it again, if it doesn't.

5. Information and status on ITUs Evaluation portfolio

Dorthe Stadsgaard will give a status on the course and project evaluations.

See att. 3

Dorthe: Based on a meeting with executive management, two questions regarding the teachers have been added to the course evaluations. For the executive management, it was mandatory to have questions regarding the teachers.

The final questionnaire will be:

Questions to be answered once per course:

- 1. Overall, I benefitted from the course.*
- 2. The course was organized in a way that helped me learn.*

Questions to be answered once per teacher:

- 1. The teacher's teaching aided my learning.*
- 2. The teacher created an inclusive learning environment.*

The Study board asked for an explanation in regard to the two last questions that are added since the presentation.

Stine: This is a compromise. We are still focusing on the teachers' methods, not the teacher as such. The executive management finds that the mandate for the evaluation project was to develop a model, where questions regarding the teachers was included.

Dorthe: The plan is to run a pilot on a master course on ILM where the exams are already in October. Thus, we can fix bugs before the semesters' full course evaluations take place.

Kristina: It might get to personal for the teachers. We should focus on the Code of Conduct.

Mike and Sophia: We should make an objection to this. Students will not be willing to sit here, if they can't get any influence.

Christopher: Who will make the final decision?

Dorthe: It is unclear, what happens, if the Study board does not agree on this model for evaluations.

Many members express frustration about the process.

Sophia: What are the possibilities. We should take this further?

Christopher: No other Universities evaluates like that.

Sophia: We could invite them?

Stine: I will invite executive management for the next meeting. Please prepare questions in advance.

6. Information on the national teaching prize

This is an opportunity for the Study board to comment on the 10 names shortlisted for the national teaching prize.

See att. 4.

Stine:

This is an ongoing process. 10 teachers will be shortlisted, and two candidates (one woman, one man) will be nominated to the national prize. But the list is not ready yet. . The Study board is not to make any decisions here; we can make comments and I will mail out the list in a few days. The process will somehow be connected to ITUS own teaching prize.

7. Approval of a new Appendix to the Curriculum

As a consequence of some changes to the relevant acts for students at Universities, the appendix to the Curriculum has been changed accordingly. The Study board must approve the new appendix.

The form of exams used at ITU have been updated (Chapter 5). Rules regarding right to admission has been changes. Now students finishing their bachelor degree after 1 January 2019, can use their right to admission up to three years after having finished their bachelor degree (before it was only in direct admission after having obtained the degree) (Chapter 3).

Other minor changes have been made.

See the appendix as att. 5.

Decision:

No members of the Study board objected to the approval of the appendix. The appendix was approved and SAP will make sure, that all necessary things are communicated.

8. New members/participants to the Study board

Stine: I will be stepping down as Head of Studies during the Fall. I will definitely miss being a part of the Study board.

Christopher: Baki Cakici will take over as Head of Programme from 15 September. I expect him to be at the next meeting.

Nanna: I will no longer be secretary to the Study board after 1 October, since I will be moving to the Personnel department.

9. Any other business