

Board of Studies (BoS) – 1. meeting 2024

9 February 2024

Present: **Hanna Wirman** (faculty, SAT Games), **Irina Papazu** (faculty, SAT Business), **Signe Louise Yndigegn** (faculty, SAT DD), **Patrick Bahr** (faculty, SAT CS), **Pernille Rydén** (assigned guest, Dean of Education), **Ea Feldfos** (assigned guest, SAP), **Alexander Senderovitz** (directly elected student), **Emil Ulrik Gregersen** (student, SAT BIT), **Magnus Borum Green** (student, SAT DD), **Lena Winther Jensen** (student, SAT CS) **Christian Balslev van Randwijk** (secretary to BoS, SAP),

Guests:

Absent: **Tiago Fernandes** (student, SAT Games)

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda

2. Election of chair and vice-chair

One of the faculty members serves as chair, one of the student members serves as vice-chair of BoS. Faculty members chose the chair, student members chose the vice-chair.

3. Results from and follow-up on Course and Supervision Evaluations Autumn 2023

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 course evaluation survey.

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.
Appendix 1 - Course Evaluation Report – Autumn 2023

4. Orientation: Myths about the +/- 10% "rule" for written submissions

5. Orientation: Danish Student Survey

6. AOB (Any Other Business)

Minutes

Ad 1

There was a short round of introductions, and the agenda was approved.

Ad 2

Christian and Ea introduced the item, and the role of chair and co-chair.

Alexander was elected co-chair of the board by the students.

No faculty members put their name forward for the role of chair, so it was not possible to elect a chair for the board. The matter will be deferred to the next meeting.

Hanna acted as chair for this meeting.

Ad 3

The low response rates on evaluations were discussed. Magnus mentioned that previously, DAK activity committee campaigned on the issue, which probably contributed to higher response rates.

There was a discussion about pushing the dates of the course evaluations to opening two weeks earlier. Signe mentioned that it is important that the evaluations take place at the right time, when students are present. Patrick added that in some courses, the students are in “project-mode” in the last half of the semester, and thus not in class.

Irina mentioned that possibly some teachers did not allow time in class to evaluate.

Alexander asked how we can make sure that teachers follow the best practice suggestions from ITU? Pernille answered that it is a matter of culture, and thus of finding ways of evaluations making sense, and creating value, also for teachers, as well as good feedback to students about how evaluations are used. Alexander added that follow-up on evaluations is really important for student engagement, and a good response rate.

Magnus said that in his classes the lecturers gave feedback on what was changed based on previous evaluations. Alexander had this experience too, and it fostered a really good dialogue and response rate.

Hanna suggested that generally there could be better visibility about evaluations in LearnIT, maybe in the course template.

Christian will talk with LS about it and see if there are possibilities in this regard.

Emil suggested that maybe it could be possible that course evaluations show up in time-edit calendars for students.

Ad 4

Irina said that several teachers at DIM had bad experiences in the last exam period, and described the problem with the so-called myth, and that there is no legal ground for +/-10% on written exams.

Ea described the rules, and how they are described in the appendix to curricula.

Irina added that the webpage on ITU Student seems very confusing, with many layers of rules and not a clear structure.

Ea suggested moving a number of items from the webpage into the curricula, rather than the page at ITU Student.

Ea suggested talking to programme coordinators about getting some of these things done.

Currently the rules are outlined by the course manager, and there is no general ITU rule allowing +/-10%.

Magnus pointed out that many students *think* the +/-10% is a general rule, and it needs to be communicated quite clearly to students that this is not a general rule.

It was also discussed that some students think that they don't have to be explicit about who wrote what in a group project, but they do have to be quite specific about this.

Ad 5

Christian briefly informed about the process leading up to developing the Study Environment Action Plan. More to follow on next BoS meeting.

Ad 6

No further business.