

# Agenda

## 1. Approval of the agenda

## 2. Welcome

Welcome to new members of the Study board. Election of a vice chairman (among students). Rules on the decision-making competence of the Study Board. See Att. 1, art. 14 and 15. Any wishes concerning the agenda – relevant input on the format?

## 3. The handling of exemptions at ITU

The handling of applications (exemptions) at ITU. A follow up on the decision from November 2018 and the election of members to the subcommittee. See Att. 2 and 3.

## 4. Evaluation

Information on Evaluation reports from Fall 2019. See Att. 4-8.

## 5. Any other business

### Re 2 Welcome

The Study board made a presentation round.

Kristina Mituzaitė was elected vice chairman.

Nanna informed the Study board, that at least 3 faculty members and three student members need to be present for the Study board to be able to make decisions. If not enough members are present at a meeting, a preliminary decision will be made and it will be sent out for approval after the meeting.

There was a wish for the Agenda to be a bit more clear. For instance to use bullet-form for sub-items. Nanna will look into that.

*Decision made:*

*Kristina Mituzaitė was elected vice chairman of the Study board.*

### Re 1 Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved. Two members asked to add items under “ Any other business”.

### Re 3 The handling of exemptions at ITU

Nanna: In November 2018 a new way of handling applications of exemptions was decided by the Study board.

Such applications has – in most cases – been handled by the administration up until now.

At the Study board meeting in November it was decided, that if ITU receives an application from a student, that is not a routine-decision ( for instance if he/she applies for exemptions from several set of rules or it has to do with a student with a long case history ) it will be handled by a subcommittee consisting of one faculty from the study board (the chairman) and one student from the Study board (the vice chairman).

Now the task for the Study board is to elect members to the subcommittee.

The Chairman of the Study board is born member of the committee.

Student Affairs and Programmes will prepare all relevant documents, prepare all cases, write the decisions and make sure, that the members are familiar with basic rules on case-handling (Acts on Public Administration) and specific rules in relevant legislation.

Theodor:

Will the decision be taken by the subcommittee only?

Nanna: Yes.

Stine: Decisions that are of major importance or more complicated than others may be discussed by the Study board itself.

Meetings in the subcommittee will be held each 3 week. An last around 1,5 hours.

The Study board was asked who wants to participate ( Students and Faculty)?

No members volunteered. Those who are interested, should sent Nanna a message after the meeting.

*Decision:*

*No members were elected. Those who wish to participate will contact Nanna after the meeting.*

*Update: Mike Hyslop Graham has contacted Nanna and asked to become part of the sub-committee.*

#### **Re 4 Evaluation**

Kristina:

The evaluations are not done at the right time a year. We have not finished our exams at the time.

And the grading criteria is not clear.

Sometimes it feels as if the students are not treated equally. But they don't want to complain.

Christopher:

We don't have time to give feedback on written exams.

What you get is not very useful.

We don't have time to give feedback that is useful as part of the exam.

Kristina:

For instance a 10 – how would you weigh the written part/the oral part?

Christopher:

It is a combination of both. Unless it says something specific for that certain exam.

Sophia:

The problem is, that we don't know the basic rules on grading.

Paolo B:

It is the role of the external examiner to make sure, that the students are treated equally and that all rules are followed.

Christopher:

If you feel that you are not treated in a fair manner, there is a complaint system. As Head of Programmes we see the complaints and are able to react.

Stine:

It is another issue if you don't want to complain.

Some of the problem can be solved with explaining the criteria, the weight and the learning goals.

Annelise:

At ITU we have two teachers seminars, where grading is a part of the programme.

And then you have info in "Teaching guide" etc.

Jörn:

What are we expected to do as programme based on evaluation reports?

Lene R:

Based on the low response rate for evaluations, a group has been settled to figure out how to evaluate at ITU.

When should you act? That is for the Study board to decide.

Christopher:

Not only quantitative but also qualitative evaluations will be part of the new evaluation portfolio.

Stine: The problems should be solved with the new portfolio.

*Decision:*

*No immediate action will be taken right now.*

## **Re 5 Any other business**

### **A delay in the grading**

Theodor:

There seems to be a delay on the grades for many exams this winter. There are examples of students that have had their grade and some that have not – at the same course.

Many from the software programmes.

It seem that the students only have one week warning before they must hand-in for their re-exams.

Lene:

If the grades are delayed, the re-exam deadline will be postponed too.

*Decision:*

*SAP and Marco should investigate and figure out what the problem is.*

### **Cross – disciplinary project**

Marco:

We have had some students, who wish to be exempted from the cross- disciplinary project because they have already co-worked with students at other Programmes. They argue that the cooperation will cover the area.

Christopher:

The description of the learning goals makes it hard to argue, that it is not possible.

That is something we can work on.

Stine:

Is the definition of cross- disciplinary cooperation too general?

Kristina:

We work with many with different backgrounds.

Sophia:

But it is completely different to work with others from other programmes.

Paolo:

In general, who makes the decisions regarding the cross-disciplinary project?

Lene R:

That is not all clear. We will get back to you.

*Decision:*

*It was decided that the Study board must decide how to handle these applications in the future.*

*Marco will provide some further information before the next meeting.*

*Update:*

*The Cross disciplinary project is owned by the Head of studies and not the Programmes. Therefore it is the Head of studies that handle the applications on credit transfer and not the Head of Programmes on behalf of the SAT groups.*