

Board of Studies – 18 December 2019

- Present:** Stine Gotved (faculty, chair), Baki Cakici (faculty, SAT Bus), Marco Carbone (faculty, SAT CS), Paolo Burelli (faculty, SAT Games), Theodor Christian Kier (student, SAT CS), Mark Hyslop Graham (student, SAT Games), Dorthe Stadsgaard (secretary, SAP)
- Absent:** Jörn Christiansson (faculty, SAT DD), Stilyan Petrov (student, SAT Bus), Emilie Hvashøj Pedersen (student, SAT DD), Sophia Aumüller Wagner (student, SAT Bus), Kristina Mituzaitė (student, vice-chair), Annelise Agertoft (LS)
- Guests:** Lene Rehder (SAP), Aske Kammer (HoSt), Tove Pedersen (SAP), Viktoria Hofbauer (SAP)

Minutes

1. Approval of agenda

Approved

2. Approval of minutes from meeting 25 November 2019

Approved

3. Removal of legal claim for B-DDIT graduates to enter Games

Valid for students from intake 2020 and forwards. SAT BUS and SAT Games have approved.

Appendix 1 and 2

Viktoria Hofbauer participates

Viktoria introduced the appendices. The change will only apply to students who are not yet enrolled.

Paolo: The change will have a long tail – it will only really take effect in about 6 years...

*All members present agreed to the proposal. Remaining BoS members were asked to agree/disagree via e-mail. They all agreed to the proposal. Hence, BoS has **approved** to remove the legal claim for B-DDIT graduates to enter Games.*

4. Report from the Exemption Sub Committee

The Exemption Sub Committee informs of recent decisions. The Committee also wants to discuss its future practice.

Appendix 3

Tove Pedersen (SAP) participates

Stine: The committee was established to deal with comments from UFM that too many exemptions were decided administratively and not by BoS. The committee has consisted of Mark, Stine and Tove. We have handled 50 cases since March 2019.

Tove: The statistics are: Additional exam attempts = 18 cases, registration requirements = 16 cases (tilmeldingskrav), cancellation of exam attempt = 7 cases, submission deadline (thesis) = 5 cases, first year exam = 2 cases, maximum study time = 2 cases.

Stine: We have discussed each case and established a precedence for decision making. We have accommodated most of the applications. The rule of thumb has been to agree unless we feel the applicant is trying to deceive us. It is in our interest to allow students to progress and graduate.

Mike: We did see some patterns, and going forward they could feed into BoS discussions, e.g. concerning conditions for students with some kind of mental illness.

Stine: We have also seen several cases concerning a specific course. That made us investigate it to identify potential structural issues. It also made us look into future courses with a potential for the same issues. We identified two such courses (running in Spring 2020). We are trying to be proactive to prevent the issues before they arise. The biggest difficulty for the committee has been to find out if the applicant's documentation is sufficient.

Mark: We did not feel deceived in any of the cases. We have given a few rejections where we did not have a legal basis to grant an exemption.

Stine: Next year, Mark leaves BoS and a new student must be appointed to the committee.

Mark: The student should understand Danish as much documentation is in Danish.

Paolo: We should put it on the agenda for our first meeting in 2020.

BoS thanked Mark, Tove and Stine for a job well done.

Dorthe puts electing a new student to the committee on the agenda for 5 February 2020.

5. Evaluation reports: Final projects, other projects, study programmes

Students who handed in a final or other project between May to October 2019 have been asked to evaluate the project process. Students who submitted their final project between Nov 2018 and Oct 2019 have also been asked to evaluate their study programme.

Appendix 4, 5 and 6

Dorthe: BoS is to decide if they find reason to act immediately based on the evaluation reports.

Baki: I noticed that the comments were not anonymized in the evaluation reports.

Dorthe: That was my mistake! I forgot and I apologize.

Marco: Are these evaluations part of the changes in our evaluation portfolio?

Dorthe: Yes, this is the last time we evaluate projects this way. From 2020, we will handle the evaluations ourselves using a short questionnaire focusing on supervision and learning process.

Mark: Will the programme evaluation be continued?

Dorthe: No. The response rate has continuously been low and we want to slim the evaluation portfolio. In the future we will rely on UFM's Uddannelseszoom for graduates, combined with more detailed statistics on graduates and regular group interviews with graduates.

Mark: Will Heads of Study Programme be able to select graduates for interviews in the new system?

Dorthe: The idea is to talk to a selected group of graduates from the same pool as the latest Uddannelseszoom survey included. However, if there are reasons to do so, I do not see why a Head of Study Programme cannot chose to include other groups as well, e.g. some who graduated 5-10 years ago, women or graduates who are self-employed.

*Present members of BoS found no reason to act right now. Everybody are happy the evaluation system is changing. Absent members reported by e-mail that they do not find reason to act immediately. Hence, BoS **agree not to recommend immediate action.***

6. Should we have specific guidelines for cross-disciplinary projects? Input from SAT

SAT representatives have consulted their SAT. SAT CS and BUS have sent written comments.

Appendix 7

Baki: SAT BUS: We would want supervisors from all programmes/departments involved in a cross-disciplinary project or a supervisor that cover all areas involved. And then let the supervisors figure out the guidelines for the project – and chose the right external examiner.

Marco: SAT CS agrees. This is pretty much what we already do within the CS department. It seems each programme is assigned to a corps of external examiners. We suggest relevant censors for the cross-disciplinary projects and SAP choses between them. We could also decide to use two censors.

Lene: It is legal to use two censors. But expensive.

Baki: In our corps of external censors we have to use keywords when making requests. That can still work with SAT BUS' suggestion.

Stine: There are two different challenges: A) Should we have guidelines for cross-disciplinary projects? B) How do we chose the external examiner for such projects? I would like to ask SAP to tell us what is possible concerning choosing external examiners for cross-disciplinary projects.

Baki: BIT department allocate supervisors and distribute the task evenly among faculty. Faculty do not have room for cross-disciplinary projects from other departments.

Stine: I think we have solved that in DD department – the students carry their ECTS with them.

Marco: How about choosing project topics?

Baki: Right now, while we are understaffed in BIT department, we supervise process more than topic-close. It is always a bit like this in BIT because topics show great variety.

Marco: It is easier in CS department. Our problem is that we give complete freedom to choose topics and supervisor. We are discussing how we can make sure to at least somewhat even out the supervision task between faculty.

Stine: At DD we matched about 50 % of the students to the supervisor they asked for. We have information on how many projects the individual supervisor should cover. Our system works quite well.

Baki: Should our different ways of distributing supervisors play into the guidelines?

Stine: The two or three cross-disciplinary projects we had at DD had already done most of the work themselves (finding supervisors).

Baki: if we make guidelines, students need to be made aware of the different ways of allocating supervisors.

Stine: We should make it possible to write cross-disciplinary projects. More work on this item is needed. I think we should task HoSt with it.

Aske: I accept the task.

Decision: *Head of Studies is responsible for working on a solution for making cross-disciplinary projects possible (supervision, external examiner, guidelines).*

7. Draft policy for use of evaluation data (courses and supervision)

At the BoS meeting 24 September 2019, BoS and vice chancellor Martin Zachariasen agreed that BoS should draft a policy for how we use evaluation data at ITU. Karina Christensen and Dorthe Stadsgaard, who are implementing the revised evaluation system for courses and supervision, have included a suggestion for a policy in the description of the processes for evaluations of courses and supervision. BoS is asked to read and discuss the policy part of the appendices.

Appendix 8 and 9

Dorthe presented the documents, adding a principle requested by the Education Group and Heads of Department: That comments are anonymised when used by faculty in e.g. teaching portfolio, applications for funding, jobs etc.

Marco: If teachers are to anonymise data before using it in other contexts, please give guidelines for what that means and how to do it.

Stine: Looking at the principles for use of data, you seem to say the same several times in different ways. Perhaps it can be drawn together.

Dorthe: It is actually on purpose in order to cover different angles and points of departure.

Paolo: I agree with saying the same thing several times.

Baki: it is good to have guidelines for use of data. But what if data are misused? And what about the consequences of misuse? These principles seem vague enough to possibly be misused. E.g. to sanction

teachers who get bad evaluations several times in a row. To put it bluntly: Can teacher evaluations be used to hire and fire teachers?

Stine: What is the next step?

Dorthe: Is the policy draft ready to be passed on to Executive Management?

BoS agreed that Baki will take the lead in drafting version 2 of the policy. He will make a separate document in owncloud for this purpose. All BoS members are asked to access the document and insert their comments before 21 January 2020.

The draft policy was **sent to Executive Management** 22 January 2020.

Comments on the process part of the documents:

Mark: Course evaluations, Differentiated access, page 5. I find it important that students are able to see past evaluations of courses. And comments from all students (anonymized) on the course.

Dorthe: I will put this forward to the project group and management.

8. FYI: Revised Terms of Reference for Employers' Panels

Stine Gotved headed a process during 2019 to revitalize our Programme-specific Employers' Panels. As a result, the Terms of Reference have been revised. They take effect from January 2020.

Appendix 10

No comments.

9. FYI: Quality Policy 2020

Executive Management finalized and signed our Quality Policy 2020 on 25 November 2019.

Appendix 11.

No comments.

10. Any other business

a) Election of new members

Stine: Do we have information on new members of BoS?

Marco: I expect to share my post with Søren Debois in 2020.

b) Guidelines for mandatory activities

Paolo: I have been approached by a number of teachers complaining about the new guidelines for mandatory activities. The issues is about what TA's are allowed to do.

Stine: TA's are not allowed to grade.

Aske: I am working on an e-mail for faculty. We may have found a solution, a change of wording that settles the issue.

c) Student evaluations

Marco: Evaluations: the amount of evaluations is huge and students spend a lot of time evaluating. Can we discuss this at some point?

Dorthe: I will put it on the agenda early next year.

d) Relocation to DR Byen

Baki: Please put relocation on the agenda for 5 February 2020.