



AARHUS UNIVERSITET

Referat

Uddannelsesnævnet for Global Studies (UN-meeting Global studies - February)

25-02-2026 12:15 - 14:00

1467-316

Mødedeltagere:

VIP-representatives: Annette Skovsted Hansen (UN-chair and SN-representative), Birgitte Beck Pristed, Hagen Schulz-Forberg, Vivek Kumar Shukla, Anemone Platz and Christina Fiig.

VIP-observers: Andreas Steen, Thomas Brandt Fibiger.

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

Student observers: Anastasia Sadovskaya

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

Absent: Georg Fischer, 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 28. januar 2026

Referat:

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

Punkt 2: Discussion of draft of study overview and qualification profiles for new academic regulations (12.20-12.50)

We will begin with a short paired discussion with the person next to you, followed by a joint plenary discussion.

Based on the presentation of the material, the degree programme board (UN) discusses the preliminary draft material for the two new academic regulations for the bachelor degree programmes *Global studies* and *Area studies*. UN is asked to assess whether the material complies with the Vice Dean's 'hyrdebrev' (see attachment) and whether there is coherence in the degree programme.

Please note that the study overview for the BA in *Area studies* exists in two versions (both with summer admission). This represents a current dilemma regarding the extent to which the programme should appear as one or two distinct entities. UN is invited to offer its input on this matter. Furthermore, UN is invited to discuss how to ensure that the partially co-taught courses are primarily organised as joint teaching activities (samlæst).

Study overview and "About the degree programme" sections will be on the agenda for the next meeting at the Board of studies in March for discussion.

Appendices:

2.1 Letter from the Vice Dean

2.2 BA in Global Studies study overview

2.3 BA in Global Studies "About the degree programme"

2.4 BA in Area studies Purpose description

2.5 BA in Area studies study overview version 1

2.6 BA in Area studies study overview version 2

Referat:

Annette Skovsted Hansen (ASH) introduced the item and provided an update on the current application process for the BA in Global Studies. She noted that UN has previously discussed the material for the BA in Global Studies, which is now in the process of ministerial approval. Therefore, the focus of the present meeting was the BA in Area Studies.

AHS briefly reviewed the different versions of the study overview for the BA in Area Studies and outlined the dilemmas associated with each version.

Comments from UN on the attached material:

- Student guidance counselor commented on the ECTS load of a specific course. UN discussed whether the allocation should be adjusted.
- A student representative asked whether a translation course would be included in the programme and highlighted translation competencies as a key skill. This could involve translation into Danish or English, or both. ASH noted that one of the planned courses will include a translation component, and that the specific courses have not yet been designed in detail.
- Christina Fiig (CF) emphasised the importance of increasing student attendance and suggested this should be a focus point during the planning of the courses. AHS noted that attendance can also be supported through exam design. AHS further stressed the importance of addressing student loneliness and creating incentives for students to come to campus.
- Thomas Brandt Fibiger (TBF) underlined that the first two semesters are fully shared across the programme to help create a strong social environment.
- A student representative proposed combining a language café with an academic study café as a way to mitigate loneliness and create a sense of community. ASH noted that this aligns with the intended purpose of a learning space with an instructor who can assist when possible.

Discussion of the two study overview versions:

TBF explained the differences between the two proposed study overview versions. The primary difference concerns the placement of the Elective / International subject. AHS elaborated on the potential challenges, including that students may go on exchange at different points in their studies but will still need to follow shared teaching, where exchange experiences can be academically relevant.

AHS then asked UN to indicate which version should be forwarded to the Board of Studies.

- A student representative expressed a preference for version 2, as it appears to include more language instruction. The student also noted that a full year abroad may be challenging for the students who remain in Denmark, as it may create social imbalance. ASH reiterated that co-teaching and learning across programmes are essential features of the design.
- TBF asked UN and the students whether it would be preferable to go abroad for a full year or to split the window for exchange.
- Andreas Steen (AS) also preferred version 2 and noted that students will always return from exchange with varying language levels, regardless of how long they have been abroad. This should be taken into account when designing post-exchange teaching.

- The student guidance counsellor supported this point and also preferred version 2, while emphasising the need to accommodate differing language levels even after exchange.
- ASH noted that version 2 may give the impression of a programme with less internal cohesion, and that additional work may be required to strengthen the programme identity. TBF disagreed and stated that he finds the versions closely aligned.

UN was asked to submit any additional comments on the BA in Area Studies purpose description to Andrea Rask-Bressum (anrb@au.dk) no later than Friday, 27 February.

A student asked about the language of the purpose description. ASH explained that the current working version is in English, but the final legal version will be in Danish.

Punkt 3: Orientations from the students and Fagudvalget (12.50-12.55)

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

Referat:

There were no orientations from the student representatives in UN.

Anastasia, representing Fagudvalget, provided the following announcements:

- Fagudvalget has carried out a poster campaign for GloBAR.
- There is an ongoing effort to recruit new members to Fagudvalget. A planning meeting will be held in March, and classroom visits will take place before Easter. Fagudvalget will also encourage students to sign up as tutors.
- A new type of Friday bar is being planned, with a focus on informing students about the work and purpose of Fagudvalget

Punkt 4: Briefings (12.55 -13.05)

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:

- Morten Holst Zachariasen will serve as department consultant until Easter.

Student guidance:

- February has been a busy month due to several events and the application deadline for Master's programmes.
- U-days were successful, with an increase in visitors across Japan-, China-, and Russian studies.
- The Elective and Master's Fair, held in early February, was also well attended, with significant interest in International Studies.

Degree programmes

- No updates.

Study administration

- The list of UN student representatives on the website has been updated.

Punkt 5: Processing course evaluations (13.05-13.35)

The course evaluations will be discussed as follows:

- **Walk and talk (10 minutes) - Do you notice anything in particular? Any general challenges?**
- **Write down what you discussed in Forms here: [Kursusevalueringer E25 - UN for Globale Studier – Udfyld formular](#) or send to afdelingsleder.globalestudier@cas.au.dk (10 minutes)**
- **Plenary summary (10 minutes)**

Please read the material for your own degree programme, and feel free to look through the rest as well.

According to the Department's guidelines for course evaluation, the Degree programme board (UN) must discuss the final evaluations of courses from the most recent autumn semester (including Project Placement from the most recent spring and autumn semester)

The Head of Department should be actively involved in identifying weaknesses in courses that are negatively evaluated and in facilitating dialogue.

The processing in the UN is based on the teachers' written summaries from the final evaluations as well as additional material.

Please note that the discussion of the course evaluations and the attached documents are confidential.

Next step:

Based on the discussions in UN, the Head of Department must prepare an aggregated summary, which is sent to the Board of Studies via ankrla@au.dk no later than 27. march 2026.

It is the responsibility of the Head of Department to follow up on discussions regarding specific courses and to address courses that generally receive negative evaluations. It is essential that measures are taken to improve the quality of teaching and to address the concerns expressed by students.

Appendices:

- 5.1 Guidelines for course evaluation at IKS
- 5.2 Template for aggregated summary of the UN's summary evaluation memo
- 5.3 BA China studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.4 BA India- and Southasian studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.5 BA Russia studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.6 BA Japan studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.7 MA European studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.8 MA Global and Area studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.9 MA International Studies Final evaluation rappers
- 5.10 Evaluations for Project Placement_students
- 5.11 Evaluations Project Placement_project hosts
- 5.12 IV elective - Power Politics and Participation in the digital age
- 5.13 IV elective - Stainability as a way of life
- 5.14 - 5.21 Brightspace reports for the programmes

Referat:

ASH introduced the item. As the meeting was held online, UN members submitted their comments via Microsoft Forms. ASH will use these in her overall summary as Head of Department. Following this, UN conducted a plenary discussion of the course evaluations.

ASH referred to selected findings from the evaluations, including issues related to ensuring that all students feel safe in the teaching environment.

Comments from UN:

- CF noted that several evaluation comments referred to a specific course. CF encouraged more teachers to draw on the syllabus of this course to ensure greater alignment across the programme.
- Vivek Kumar Shukla (VKS) highlighted a comment concerning the use of the term “safe” and emphasised the need for clearer definitions to avoid confusion among students. ASH asked whether this topic should be revisited at a future meeting. VKS added that some aspects affecting the learning environment lie outside the teacher’s control and therefore should not rest solely on the teacher’s responsibility.

The following topic was suggested for a future UN meeting: Definition of “safe” in the context of a safe teaching environment, as well as possible additional themes arising from the course evaluations. This will be added to the list for possible topics for upcoming meetings.

Punkt 6: How can the upcoming mid-term evaluations be improved (13.40-13.50)

In autumn 2025, SN IKS discussed how the guidelines for mid-term and final course evaluations (see Appendix 1) work in practice. During the discussion, it became clear that mid-term evaluations in particular are not functioning well and, in many cases, do not comply with the new guidelines. UN is therefore asked to discuss how the mid-term evaluation process can be improved, and how the guidelines can be communicated more effectively to both teaching staff and students.

Suggested discussion:

UN discusses how the mid-term evaluation process can be improved, and how the guidelines can be communicated more broadly to both teaching staff and students.

Next step:

SN representatives will bring UN's discussion to the SN IKS meeting in March, where follow-up will take place on how the mid-term evaluation process can be improved and how the guidelines can be communicated more effectively to teaching staff and students.

Appendix 1: Guidelines for Course Evaluation at the School of Culture and Society, 12.06.2024

Appendix 2: Guidance on Conducting Mid-term and Final Course Evaluations under SN IKS

Referat:

UN provided the following comments under this item:

- CF emphasised the importance of managing expectations with students, as only limited changes can be implemented in an ongoing course during mid-term evaluations. CF noted that mid-term evaluations are nevertheless valuable, provided that students are informed about what can realistically be adjusted.
- A student representative highlighted that Menti could be a useful tool for mid-term evaluations, as it allows students to submit questions anonymously. The student also stressed the need for a more streamlined process across courses, including a structured in-class dialogue supported by Menti. The student further suggested electing a student representative in advance, through a democratic process, who should be prepared for their role during evaluations. A student-teacher dialogue may also encourage broader participation.
- ASH noted that many of these elements already appear in the existing guidelines and that the department must ensure adherence to them. ASH also pointed out that anonymity protects students, but the process should likewise take into account how teachers are protected.
- Hagen Schulz-Forberg (HSF) questioned whether the process needs to be as extensive as suggested. He added that students often use mid-term evaluations

primarily to ask about the exam, which can be addressed meaningfully within the current framework.

- VKS stated that he continues to use a previous evaluation format consisting of approximately ten questions followed by a class dialogue. The advantage of this approach is that he, as the teacher, also receives written input.
- AS explained that he uses an “old-school” method in which a paper is circulated for anonymous comments, followed by group discussion among students and then a dialogue with the teacher. AS asked whether teachers could also have the opportunity to evaluate student engagement in the course. A student representative responded that this is a valid point and that mismatched expectations sometimes arise between teachers and students. The student emphasised that teaching should be viewed as a partnership, which is why appointing a student representative is important. Clear expectations should be addressed at the beginning of the course, during the mid-term evaluation, and as early and clearly as possible.

ASH noted that introducing a procedural document and aligning practices across courses would be beneficial. CF supported this.

Birgitte Beck Pristed (BBP) added that such a procedure must allow for flexibility, especially in courses that are co-taught.

ASH reiterated the importance of adjusting expectations during the course when possible.

ASH concluded that the points raised will be forwarded to the Board of Studies, including the need for flexibility and the importance of avoiding an overly burdensome procedure.

Nicolas will participate in the SN meeting in March as the student representative.

Punkt 7: 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.

January	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Constitution of new UN as of 1 February 202X and introduction for new members
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of teaching evaluations from the autumn semester
March	...

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

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

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 new students, including how to organize and coordinate recruitment efforts (suggested at Feb. 2025 meeting, possibly march in relation to new bachelor's degree programmes).
- 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, possibly March 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, possibly March 2026).

Referat:

ASH told the UN that the new study regulations will be discussed again at the coming meetings in the spring. They will be forwarded to the Board of Studies in August.

Punkt 8: AOB (13.55-14.00)

Referat:

A student commented on the language cafés in relation to a possible name change. She noted that the current name is appropriate but that expectations need to be managed, as the existing cafés differ significantly in terms of their content and structure. The student emphasised that the cafés should function as a place for speaking practice.

ASH stated that she will meet with the instructors again to follow up on these points.

HSF proposed two topics for future UN discussions:

1. Internship reports for Master’s students, which have recently undergone changes.
2. Students’ academic skills, which appear to be a structural issue. HSF noted that students entering the Master’s level should be able to produce a bibliography and similar academic tasks.