

## Uddannelsesnævnet for Global Studies (UN-meeting Global studies - March)

25-03-2026 12:15 - 14:00

1467-316

---

Meeting participants:

VIP-representatives: Annette Skovsted Hansen (UN-chair and SN-representative), Georg Fischer, Vivek Kumar Shukla, Anemone Platz and Christina Fiig.

VIP-observers: Andreas Steen

Student representatives: Sofie Lambertsen, Mathias Søgaard Dybdal og Nicholas Martin.

Other observers: Student guidance IHO, Morten Holst Zachariasen (department coordinator) and Andrea Rask-Bressum (SNUK).

Absent: Birgitte Beck Pristed, Hagen Schulz-Forberg, Jakob Hoffmann Holm, Peter Nikolaj Yushkov Christensen, Marcus Bøgelund Lauridsen

## **Punkt 1: Approval of agenda and follow up from the minutes from last meeting (12.15-12.20)**

UN approves the agenda and follow up on the last meeting.

*Appendix:*

1.1 Minutes UN meeting Global Studies February 25 2026

### **Referat:**

UN approved the agenda. There was no follow up from the last meeting.

## **Punkt 2: Orientations from the students and Fagudvalget (12.20-12.25)**

The student members inform about discussions in "Fagudvalget", student events etc.

### **Referat:**

Fagudvalget plans to organize a karaoke bar event in early April in collaboration with GloBARL.

There were no additional orientations from the students.

## **Punkt 3: Briefings (12.25 -12.35)**

3.1 News from the Board of Studies

- *Link to [agenda and minutes](#).*

3.2 News from the Head of Department

- Orientation about new department consultant (until march)

3.3 News from the student guidance

3.4 News from the degree programmes

3.5 News from the study administration

UN members are asked to read the briefings (if anything is written or attached to the agenda) before the meeting. At the meeting the UN members can ask questions to the briefings.

Download the agenda as a PDF and you will be able to click on the links.

### **Referat:**

**Head of Department:**

Work is ongoing on the course descriptions for the development of new BA programs, including exam designs, and related elements. At the next UN meeting, UN is expected to be able to discuss a draft of the course descriptions.

Annette Skovsted Hansen (ASH) encouraged Fagudvalget to host an event where a broader group of students can provide input to the new study regulations course descriptions. She invited Fagudvalget to contact her to coordinate such a meeting.

**Board of Studies:**

ASH referred to the published agenda and minutes available via the provided links.

**Student guidance:**

Student guidance did not attend this meeting.

**Degree programmes**

- Anemone Platz (AP) reported that the Japan Bowl event organized by Jiro Tomioka was held successfully. The event had more than 300 visitors this year.
- Vivek Kumar Shukla (VKS) reported that the Holi event has been held.
- Georg Fischer (GF) mentioned that for all MA programmes, the focus is currently on securing internship placements for the autumn semester. An information event on internships was recently held with a high number of students participating. The event was recorded and will be made available on Brightspace.
- Christina Fiig (CF) reported that European studies is undergoing an evaluation process.

No additional briefings.

**Punkt 4: Orientation on upcoming degree programme evaluations (12.35-12.45)**

The Degree programme board (UN) will be informed about which programmes are to be evaluated this year in accordance with the rotation plan.

The evaluations relate to (1) the Master's degree in European Studies, (2) the Bachelor's degrees in Japan studies, China studies, Russian studies, and Arabic and Islamic studies, and (3) the suspended Bachelor's degrees in Brazilian studies and India and South Asia studies.

**European Studies:**

The Master's degree in European Studies will be evaluated in 2026. As the programme is being restructured into a 75 ECTS Master's programme, the evaluation will be closely

linked to the development work on the new programme. Data and input from the evaluation will be used in the redesign process.

*The degree programme board will be involved later in the evaluation of this particular programme.*

**Bachelor's degrees in Japan studies, China studies, Russian studies, and Arabic and Islamic studies:**

These programmes will be evaluated as a joint process. *The degree programme board will discuss this evaluation at this meeting.*

**Bachelor's degrees in Brazilian studies and India and South Asia studies:**

The two suspended programmes will not undergo a full evaluation. Instead, a short document will be prepared describing the remaining students, their progression, and planned completion paths.

Appendices:

1: Rotation plan 2026-2030

2. Powerpoint on evaluations (highlights elements in the proces, but each proces may vary)

**Referat:**

ASH informed UN about the upcoming degree programme evaluations.

UN briefly discussed the evaluation format and how the evaluations can be used most appropriately in relation to the on-going development work.

**Punkt 5: Presentation of evaluation focus and input to degree programme evaluation (item for discussion) (12.45-13.00)**

The Head of Department briefs UN on the evaluation focus that was agreed at the kick-off meeting for the programme evaluation of Japan studies, China studies, Russian studies, and Arabic and Islamic studies with the Head of Studies and collects the committee's input on this.

UN discusses whether there are general experiences or trends from the department's other programmes that should be included in the analytical work when preparing the evaluation report and the preliminary action plan.

*Next steps:*

The Head of Department uses the input from UN in the continued analytical work and in the preparation of the evaluation report and the preliminary action plan.

**Referat:**

UN discussed possible areas of focus for the upcoming evaluations, including European studies.

CF suggested that student attendance should be included as a relevant evaluation point.

ASH noted that attendance could be incorporated under the theme of *motivational learning environments* within the programme evaluations.

A student commented that students are more motivated to attend when they clearly understand the relevance of a course. When the consequences of missing classes are evident, attendance typically increases. He referred to language classes as an example, where students quickly fall behind, if they miss one or more sessions.

ASH asked what factors make students view attendance as necessary, and what role the examination plays in this context.

Students expressed that they feel more accountable when instructors ask questions at the beginning of class that must be answered during the session. They also noted that clear links between teaching activities and the exam contribute positively to motivation.

ASH further asked whether feeling accountable to a group influences attendance. The students responded that it is difficult to identify a single determining factor. They again pointed to the motivational value of completing small, ongoing tasks during the course.

AP stated that class culture plays an important role. She also noted that this is a university setting, and students attend of their own choice; therefore, the extent to which attendance should be actively encouraged requires further consideration. She suggested that the discussion on attendance should involve a broader group of teachers and students. Nicolas Martin Schmidt (NMS) agreed and proposed raising the topic in the Board of Studies to gather insights from other departments. CF also supported bringing the issue to the Board of Studies and to the Vice-dean.

Andreas Steen (AS) suggested strengthening attendance culture from the first semester, noting that reliance solely on examinations as a motivator is not ideal.

VKS remarked that the matter forms part of a broader discussion about what motivates students to participate in their education.

ASH outlined the following next steps:

1. The issue should be raised in the Board of Studies.
2. A larger forum of students should be involved in discussing how to emphasise that the degree programme is a full-time commitment, and how to gather a wider range of student perspectives. She highlighted that study intensity is an important theme with political attention and potential implications for programmes with low intensity.

AP emphasised that mutual respect among students and toward teachers is a key element and should be included as a theme.

GF noted that programmes should be structured to give students a greater sense of ownership. He suggested that MA courses with around 60 students should be divided into smaller, more specialised teaching formats aligned with student interests.

ASH also highlighted the study start, study environment, and study intensity as cross-cutting themes in the degree programme evaluations.

## **Punkt 6: Input to list of external experts for the degree programme evaluation (item for discussion) (13.00-13.10)**

The Head of Department presents ideas for potential external experts who may be invited to the programme evaluation meeting in the fall for Japan studies, China studies, Russian studies, and Arabic and Islamic studies. At least one academic expert and one employer representative participate in the meeting, and a total of 3–4 external experts will take part in the meeting.

UN is asked to discuss the different ideas for external experts before a final list is submitted to the Head of School for approval.

### Employer comments on evaluation report:

The Degree programme board will also discuss which employers from the school's or departments employer panel should be offered the chance to provide a *written* comment on the evaluation report, which will be presented at the evaluation meeting. Possible employers could come from the [Employer Board](#)

### *Next steps:*

The Head of Department compiles the input from the UN and submits a final list to the Head of School for approval no later than May 1st.

## **Referat:**

ASH introduced the item and outlined the framework for the degree programme evaluations. External experts will participate in the evaluations and provide input to the degree programmes.

UN contributed the following suggestions:

- A student proposed inviting an employer representative from an embassy. This could be either a representative from a Danish embassy abroad or, for example, from the Japanese Embassy in Denmark, as such profiles are relevant across the area studies programmes.

- CF suggested an employer representative from the Armed Forces. UN discussed this and agreed that such expertise would be relevant, particularly in relation to understanding language in diplomatic and foreign-policy contexts.
- CF further suggested involving representatives from larger companies. AS proposed LEGO as a potential example.
- A student proposed inviting representatives from the United Nations.

ASH thanked UN for the input.

## **Punkt 7: Midterm evaluation procedure – Follow-up from previous UN discussion (13.10-13.25)**

At the UN meeting on 25 February, several perspectives were presented under item 6 concerning mid-term evaluations. Members of the Degree programme board expressed interest in returning to the topic and considering a procedural document to support greater consistency across courses.

Therefore, UN will discuss if a short procedural document containing 3–5 core questions to be used for midterm evaluations across Global Studies should be implemented.

If so, UN will discuss which questions should be included in the procedural document.

Appendix 1: Guidelines for conducting mid-term and final course evaluations SN IKS

Appendix 2: Guidelines for Course Evaluation at the School of Culture and Society

12.06.2024

***Additional material: Summary from Head of department***

### **Referat:**

NMS introduced the item and referred to the UN's previous discussion on midterm evaluations. He then asked UN for input on whether a procedural document for midterm evaluations should be developed, and what such a document might contain.

UN provided the following input:

- CF noted that she often asks students about the distribution of teaching time and the structure of group work. She emphasised that only limited changes can be made at the midterm point, and that aligning expectations with students is therefore important.
- AS expressed reservations about developing a formal document. He pointed out that many guidelines already exist and stated his preference for a more informal format that allows teachers and students to discuss the course in dialogue.
- AP agreed with AS but added that it could still be helpful for teachers to have a set of questions to initiate discussion with students.
- ASH referred to a previous document focused on identifying what should be maintained in a course and what could be changed in the future. She noted that it is beneficial for teachers to receive positive feedback first, and therefore the evaluation should begin with what students think works well.
- CF emphasised that a procedural document could help ensure that instructors actually conduct midterm evaluations.

- AP further noted that the purpose of midterm evaluations should also include what both teachers and students wish to change collectively. The focus should not only be on what teachers should do differently. If a procedural document is created, this aspect should be included.
- VKS stated that there are advantages and disadvantages to having a general procedural document. He described his own approach to midterm evaluations, centred on three questions: What works well? What should be different? What needs improvement? VKS underlined that the process should be determined by the individual teacher and the students, who can jointly decide what works best for their context. He suggested discussing this within the first weeks of teaching.

ASH concluded that it may be useful to prepare a small set of optional questions that teachers can rely on if needed, but such a document should not be mandatory.

### **Course evaluation summaries:**

ASH informed UN of her summaries, as Head of Department, of the most recent course evaluations. These summaries will be forwarded to the Board of Studies and the Head of Studies.

She asked UN for input on the summaries for the BA and MA programmes. UN made the following remarks:

- AS noted that the BA summary included specific programme names. He asked whether these should be removed.  
ASH confirmed that these references would be removed in favour of a more general formulation.
- CF suggested that the point regarding coordination between programmes and courses should also be included in the summary for the MA programmes.
- CF also asked whether artificial intelligence should be mentioned.  
ASH stated that AI could indeed be relevant, but it had not appeared in the evaluations on which the summaries are based.

UN then briefly discussed guidelines on Generativ AI, including both the AU guidelines and the GAI guidelines developed within Global Studies. These were touched upon at a previous meeting. A student asked whether tools used for proofreading count as AI and whether their use must be declared. Several UN members expressed a need for clearer guidance on what students are required to declare, and what they are not, in Global Studies' own guidelines.

## **Punkt 8: Handling of less favourable course evaluations (item for discussion) (13.25-13.40)**

UN will discuss how the department handles less favourable course evaluations. The item is placed on the agenda in March, as SN at IKS will discuss the topic in April. The purpose of the discussions in UN and SN is to establish a shared overview of existing practices and to identify any need for developing procedures.

*The UN will discuss:*

- how departments currently handle less favourable course evaluations,
- whether procedures exist, or whether there is a need to develop such procedures.

- which experiences and good practices may beneficially be passed on to SN.

*Process at the meeting:*

1. *Nicolas Martin Schmidt introduces the item*
2. *Annette Skovsted Hansen explains the current practice*
3. *Teachers discuss in a separate group; students discuss in a separate group.*

*Next steps:*

The SN representatives will bring the discussion and any key points from UN to SN's meeting in April.

Appendix 1: Politik for kursusevaluering på Arts 04.09.2023 (Danish only)

Appendix 2: Guidelines for Course Evaluation at the School of Culture and Society  
12.06.2024

## **Referat:**

NMS introduced the item.

ASH provided a brief explanation of the current procedure for handling less favourable course evaluations. She noted that responses differ depending on whether the issue concerns a single course or reflects a broader, systemic challenge. General issues can be discussed in the UN, while matters related to a specific course or teacher are addressed directly by the Head of Department in dialogue with the individual concerned.

AP inquired about how it is determined whether an issue requires follow-up action. The UN discussed this question. It was clarified that both the Head of Department and the Head of Studies share responsibility for assessing whether action is necessary.

UN discussed the topic in two groups and summarised the key points in plenary:

- It is difficult to identify new approaches beyond current procedures. The students in UN agreed that it remains appropriate for concrete cases to be handled by the Head of Department, while broader, cross-cutting issues should be addressed in the UN.
- It was also noted that increased alignment between teachers may be necessary to avoid unintended overlap within the programmes. Strengthening coordination among teachers was highlighted as an important measure.

## **Punkt 9: Applications for the Activity Fund (item for discussion) (13.40-13.50)**

The Degree programme board has the option to allocate funds for special activities across the department's programmes. The current practice is that the deadline for submitting applications is in November for activities in the spring semester, and in May for activities in the autumn semester.

The Degree programme board will discuss whether this practice should be changed so that applications can be submitted and processed on an ongoing basis. **The deadline for submitting an application to the departmental consultant should then be 14 days before a UN meeting, allowing the chairmanship to include it when planning the meetings.**

## **Referat:**

ASH introduced the item.

The purpose of the proposed changes is to make the application process for the activity fund more flexible.

A suggestion was made to introduce two deadlines per semester (instead of the current single deadline) and to divide the budget accordingly to ensure that funds are available throughout the period.

UN noted the importance of maintaining the opportunity to discuss applications collectively at UN meetings, where several applications can be reviewed at the same time.

Decision: UN agreed that the two existing deadlines (May and November) should remain the primary ones, but that a portion of the budget could be reserved for ongoing applications. Thus, there will continue to be two deadlines per academic year, one per semester, but applications may also be submitted between these deadlines when opportunities arise. Applications for ongoing consideration must be submitted no later than 14 days before a scheduled UN meeting.

UN further agreed that, at each of the two main deadlines, the amount to be reserved for ongoing applications should be discussed, at least for the coming year while the new process is being tested. This is to ensure that sufficient funds remain available for the rolling application option.

## **Punkt 10: Meeting schedule and suggested items for upcoming meetings (13.50-13.55)**

### **Meeting schedule with recurring agenda items:**

*Please note that additional items will be added to the agenda continuously. Some items may also be moved to a different meeting.*

*Items about the upcoming processes for the development of academic regulations are not included in the schedule.*

<b>January</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Constitution of new UN as of 1 February 202X and introduction for new members</li></ul>
----------------	---

<b>February</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of teaching evaluations from the autumn semester</li> </ul>
<b>March</b>	...
<b>April</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Status Review and update of action plan</li> </ul>
<b>May</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Status Review and update of action plans</li> <li>• Annual report from the co-examiners</li> <li>• Approval of the programme for study start and the introduction trip (hyttetur)</li> <li>• Applications for the Activity Fund for the fall semester (applications should be received before the meeting)</li> </ul>
<b>June</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summer University courses (possible item for the meeting in May, if June meeting is cancelled)</li> </ul>
<b>July</b>	<i>(no meeting)</i>
<b>August</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN election</li> <li>• Possible reporting from or planning of meeting with the employer forum/panel</li> </ul>
<b>September</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN election</li> <li>• Evaluation of study start and the introduction trip (hyttetur)</li> <li>• Review of teaching evaluations from the spring semester</li> </ul>

<b>October</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN election</li> <li>• Status on action plan (Annual Status Review)</li> <li>• Discussion of results from DIM (conducted every two years)</li> <li>• Possible prioritization of IV courses for the following autumn and spring semester</li> <li>• Processing of changes to current academic regulations.</li> </ul>
<b>November</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications for the Activity Fund for the spring semester (applications should be received before the meeting).</li> </ul>
<b>December</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning of meeting dates</li> <li>• Possible reporting from or planning of meeting with the employer forum/panel</li> </ul>

**Suggested items for upcoming UN meetings:**

- Discussion about theory and methods in teaching and syllabus
- Feedback culture
- Discussion about how to align more with the demands of the labour market (also in relation to new educational structure and the KA-reform) (Possibly in the fall, as suggested at April 2025 meeting).
- Further discussion on the use of task cards (suggested at Feb. 2025 meeting).
- Discussion on recruitment of news students, including how to organize and coordinate recruitment efforts (suggested at Feb. 2025 meeting, possibly spring 2026).

- Discussion on active measures to prevent derogatory or offensive comments/behavior (suggested at April 2025 meeting).
  - Focuspoint: Code of conduct
- Follow up on action plan (Annual Status Review).
- Discussion of a coordinated plan and shared calendar/overview for internship-related processes (initially discussed at the meeting in June 2025).
- Discussion of the topic “teachers’ safe space” as a counterpart to student course evaluations, which include questions related to this area (suggested January 2026).
- Results from survey on student preferences regarding cabin trip (suggested January 2026).
- Discussion on how best to provide new students with information and an introduction to exams and academic practices (suggested January 2026).
- Review of guidelines regarding generative AI at GS more thoroughly (suggested January 2026).

### **Referat:**

UN reviewed the list. Nothing new was added.

### **Punkt 11: AOB (13.55-14.00)**

### **Referat:**

Nothing to the item.