

# Minutes

## Subject Area Team Business (SATBUSS)

Meeting May 8 2019, 12.15– 13.15 am, room 4A05

Participants: Christopher Gad, Steffen Dalsgaard, Kristina Mituzaitė, Simone Trädgård Jacobsen, Sophia Aumüller Wagner, Stilyan Paleykov, Rikke Budolfson (minutes)

### Agenda

**1. Approval of the agenda**

- a. Agenda was approved

**2. Approval of minutes (*Item 1*)**

- a. *Minutes was approved*

**3. External Review Report - GBI (sent by mail)**

*Presentation to SATBUSS (Steffen) (Item 2)*

Steffen presented an overview of the review process –from the Review Committee’s collection of data, to conducting focus groups with relevant stakeholders and writing up the 5-page long Review Report. The Review Committee reported no major concerns but reported a solid working programme with enthusiastic students and staff.

The Review Committee had three recommendations which from Steffen’s point of view are fluffy and general.

- 1) Global Aspect: This is a known challenge and we need to find out how -and if- we need to address it.
- 2) The Identity of the Programme: Is it as big a problem as the Review Committee thinks it is? Do we need to streamline?
- 3) Improvement Process: The Review Committee’s main concern was with the term “world class” and how it is measured. How do we define quality? Where do we recruit out staff and students from? The number of international staff is also an indicator of quality.

Steffen will have a follow-up meeting with Education Group to discuss these different points before we fill our present headcount.

Steffen need to write a response, a report with action points for dealing with the Review Committee’s concerns in a short-term and long-term perspective. Input from SAT is welcome.

Steffen will also discuss the Review Report with the Employers’ Panel.

**SAT comments:**

How do you measure teaching as performance indicators? Quality in teaching is a fluffy term for students.

The programme performance measures come from the Study Programme Report which is written each year. They may not necessarily be the best performance measures but SAT can discuss these in the next meeting (where Study Programme Report will be on the agenda).

The GBI representative did not see the generic nature of the GBI programme as a problem.

What does “world class” actually mean? Number of students in class? – is that quality or demand?

Grades are not considered a quality indicator at ITU but STÅ can also be an incentive to pass students. Similarly, we have seen a grade inflation in recent years.

We have yet to decide whether the review should be used as an opportunity for making changes, or whether we want to value the stability of the programme given that it overall runs really well.

Quality research feed into the quality of the programme.

A member commented to keep an eye on the gender diversity when recruiting for the open teaching positions. This may or may not also be a concern for the admission to the DIM programme.

**In conclusion**, Steffen will present the Study Programme Report at the next meeting. The concerns and action points from the Review Report will be included in the Study Programme Report.

#### **4. Course Evaluation Spring 2019**

Evaluations for Spring 2019 are not part of the Study Programme Report 2019 which focuses on 2018 data.

##### **GBI:**

Evaluation scores have stabilized around the 4.5 points average. This year it's 4.6 points including a new elective got a 6.0 score (N=6). Excluding electives the average is 4.46 points.

Collaboration with CS on the course Database Use and Design is not working. The course is not aligned with other courses. The course was too challenging and a discussion around level and staffing of the course is needed. Often, CMs from other departments don't show up for coordination meetings but prioritise their own department meetings. There's a move to bring more teaching in to the department.

Others GBI courses are fairly stable. Some known coordination issues to be dealt with.

##### **SAT comments:**

ITU leave it very open for teachers to create course content but often information come very late.

- The current hiring situation make it very difficult to plan 4 semesters ahead. Often new hires start 01 August, which makes sense from a budgetary point of view. Moreover, the intention to have up-to-date research-based course content makes late updates necessary. Work is done to make staff see the programme as a whole and hand over to staff who are coming in.

Technical courses often over-shadow softer courses as they are more demanding.

##### **DIM**

One course is problematic but the rest are fine. Most courses score over 5.0 except Enterprise Architecture. This course has some issues but none gigantic.

One course has been troubled by a high level of conflict relating to communication, handling of plagiarism, mandatory activities and peer-grade. Management censored all comments on the course, a first in the history of ITU. The argument was that there was too many aggressive comments. Such a decision is clearly divisive.

Many students were happy about the course, but it suffered from being understaffed and not dimensioned to the number of registered students. This was also a case of there being different perspectives on what is the use of mandatory activities.

As follow-up on some of the particular issues, Head of Programme will ask the Study Board to discuss principles for the use of mandatory activities. It also needs to be clarified that the use of Peer Grade can never influence the assessment/evaluation of a student.

**SAT comments:**

SAT business expressed concern with the fact that all comments, including positive feedback was censored.

Students who took the time to give feedback were taken aback by the decision to censor the comments. No explanation was given as to why comments were censored. The notice given by the Head of Studies was too broad and not good enough to the students.

The general atmosphere meant that constructive feedback during the course was not well received

There was too much work in the beginning of the semester [for this one course]. Approx. 80% of the readings was due in the first 4 weeks. Final report needs to cite all mandatory activities and reflect on same. This leaves no room for including anything else in the report.

**5. Any Other Business**

None.

23 May 2019/Rikke