



*May be freely distributed
Final*

Aalborg University
Fredrik Bajers Vej 7K
9220 Aalborg East

Case Officer:
Melanie Rosendahl
Telephone: 99402462
Email: rosendahl@ikl.aau.dk

Date: 11-06-2025
Case No.: 2025-017-04347

Minutes from the meeting in **Study Board for International and Cross-Cultural Studies** on June 11, 2025

Participants

Chair of Study Board, Aase Voldgaard Larsen (AVL)

Vice Chair of Study Board (student representative), Marie Lykke Pedersen (MLP)

Program Coordinator: Culture, Communication and Globalization - CCG, Julia Zhukova Klausen (JZK) Study

Program Coordinator: Language and International Studies English – LISE, Ben Dorfman (BD)

Program Coordinator: Language and International Studies Spanish - SIS, Ana Maria Macias Garcia (AMMG)

Program Coordinator: Tourism, Laura James (LJ)

Study board secretary, study secretary CCG and minute taker, Melanie Rosendahl (MR)

Observers

Head of studies and deputy head of education, Morten Ziethen (MZ)

Study team manager and specialist, Susanne Hald (SH)

Student representatives

International Business Communication, English - SIV, Marie Lykke Pedersen (MLP)

Optional participation

Study secretary: International Business Communication English BA – SIV, Majken Nørgaard Jensen (MNJ)

Study secretary: International Business Communication English KA – SIV, Kristinna D. Svendsen (KDS)

Study secretary: Language and International Studies English – LISE, Jamie Pedersen (JP)

Study secretary: Language and International Studies Spanish - SIS, Helle Gjerløv Møller (HGM)

Study secretary: Tourism, Majken Nørgaard Jensen (MNJ)

Cancellations

Program Coordinator: International Business Communication English - SIV, Lise-Lotte Holmgreen LLH)

Student representatives:

Language and International Studie, English – LISE, Emma-Luna Löwe Jensen (ELLJ)

Culture, Communication and Globalization - CCG, Aleksandra Zofia Kopacz (AZK)

Language and International Studies Spanish – SIS, Kane Jacob Nielsen (KJN)

Tourism, Mark Aldwin Aga Castañeda (MAAC)



Agenda	Attachments
<p>1. Approval of the agenda and minutes from the previous meeting March 19</p> <p>The present study board approves the agenda, and AVL concludes, that the board has a quorum. Minutes from the previous meeting have been approved by mail.</p>	
<p>2. Follow-up on items approved at the previous Study Board meeting</p> <p>We have a few follow-ups from the last meeting in March:</p> <p>2.1. Application for Funds for G-AI Survey Among Students</p> <p>SNFP, in agreement with the study board, has submitted an application to the Head of studies and deputy head of education, Morten Ziethen, for funds to conduct a G-AI survey among students in our programs.</p> <p>As a result, assoc. prof. Kristine Bundgaard has formulated questions for such a survey, which were sent out to all students at the Department of Culture and Learning (IKL) before Easter.</p> <p>In addition to informing the programs, the survey will also be used in the planning of AI workshops for IKL instructors in the fall.</p> <p>2.2. Curriculum changes</p> <p>The requests for curriculum changes at the programs SIV and LISE approved by the Study Board at the last meeting and submitted to the Education Law Secretariat (Uddannelsesjura) have been approved - however, for some of the elective courses, we have only received preliminary indications that they will be approved.</p>	
<p>3. Approval of minutes from Program Council (Uddannelsesråd: UR) meetings, including recommendations to the Study Board</p> <p>We need to approve the minutes of the UR meetings, including the recommendations received from the five URs.</p> <p>The present members approve each Program Council meeting minutes.</p> <p>The five UKs will briefly present the recommendations from their Program Council meetings that they wish to highlight.</p> <p>Every study board member reads the minutes, so it is not necessary to go through each Program Council meeting minute in detail.</p> <p>CCG by JZK: No recommendations.</p> <p>Tourism by LJ: No recommendations.</p> <p>LISE by BD: Focus on how to handle projects and communication but it does not need any discussion by the Study Board.</p>	<p>ATTACHMENTS</p> <p>Minutes from the Program Council Meetings (UR meetings):</p> <p>3a LISE</p> <p>3b SIS Spanish</p> <p>3c SIV</p> <p>3d Tourism</p> <p>3e CCG</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>Evaluation plan for educations at IKL</p>



SIS by AMMG: No recommendations.

SIV by AVL: A few recommendations that do not need any discussion by the Study Board.

The study board approves the Program Council meeting minutes from all study programs (3a-3e).

Concerning the specific topics that the Study Board must address under this item on the agenda, AVL highlights the following:

- Follow-up on delayed students in Spring 2025:
All programs have effectively followed up on delayed students. The secretary does a great job following up closely on all students.
- Education Zoom for Spring 2025:
LISE, SIV, CCG and Tourism do live up to the numbers of hours required in Uddannelseszoom (Education Zoom). SIS Spanish and Tourism (Copenhagen) are not required to report hours as they are either being shut down or put on hold.
- Status on the study programs' part of the action plan:
All programs have done a status on their part of the action plan – and all programs are focusing on the initiatives they have planned in the action plan.
- Updated budgets, semester plans, and funding allocations (Kronebevillinger):
All programs have updated the budgets, semester plans and funding allocations for the rest of the year 2025, and some budgets are very tight.
- Course and semester evaluations for Fall 2024 (including a brief discussion of the new evaluation format):

All programs have discussed the course and semester evaluations at the Program Council meetings and how to handle specific situations.

Most evaluations were quite positive. In the few cases where they were not, the Program Council has agreed on how the situation must be handled.

Discussion about the new format:

One advantage is that students only must fill out one survey.

Some questions are not translated right, and some questions are not specific enough, LJ will send the questions with comments to SH.

The students are confused about the questions, whether it's related to general matters, the semester, the courses, internship projects or semester projects. JZK suggests giving more explanations to each question.



	<p>The questions have been translated by a professional, and it's always a struggle to find questions that all students understand.</p> <p>The one evaluation has contributed to more useful answers regarding the student's wellbeing.</p> <p>It's the first time ever at CCG, where there's been no qualified answers in the evaluation, which makes the reading of the evaluations difficult.</p> <p>Comments on the time of sending out the evaluations:</p> <p>One disadvantage is that the course evaluation takes place a long time after the courses finish, so it's difficult for the students to remember how they evaluate the specific courses, and the students might not give the evaluation enough attention during the time of their project writing.</p> <p>The midterm evaluations are a part of the evaluation tool.</p> <p>The teachers are fond of the informal evaluation and would like to keep this, because they can ask for clarifications.</p> <p>To the midterm evaluations it can be personal, on the digital evaluations the students can be honest about challenges because it's anonymous.</p>	
4.	<p>Reorganization at The Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH)</p> <p>The Study Board has provided input in April on the Dean's plan for reorganizing the faculty. There is an overall plan for the reorganization. We need to discuss the implications of the reorganization for our Study Board. The new organization is scheduled to take effect on January 1, 2026.</p> <p>AVL outlines and highlights the following decisions, that we know of: We have received the information that our department is going to merge with the Department of Communication and Psychology to a new large HUM-department, so far named Department 1.</p> <p>We don't know yet if some programs are going to be moved; Tourism has expressed the wish to move to AAU Business School. The Dean has said that there will be a dialogue with the programs wishing to move and the Department after the summer break, but we don't know more than that.</p> <p>The big question is, also, which new Head of Department we will have. The Dean will choose between the two current heads in June.</p> <p>MZ: Investigations will be concerning if research groups can be moved from one department to another department, and if so the educations and administration support are expected to follow.</p>	<p>ATTACHMENTS</p> <p>4.1 Survey - Input for the future organization of SSH, Survey input til fremtidens organiserings SSH</p> <p>4.2 <i>We expect an attachment from the 'New organization of the faculty' meeting June 2 with the dean's 'final decision'.</i></p>



	<p>The dean has mentioned that the study boards are not facing any changes unless the head of the department decides so later.</p> <p>BD: It must be acknowledged that the SSH reorganization is stressful on the education administration.</p> <p>AVL: In the survey response from the Study Board, we have expressed a strong wish to keep the administration as it is very close to study programs, VIP and students – and with the competent and effective secretaries that we have now.</p>	
5.	<p>Survey on AI in the education</p> <p>A survey on the students' use of and thoughts about AI has been conducted among all students at IKL, as mentioned in item 2.1.</p> <p>The response rate was low, ranging from 4 to 15%, but the respondents provided very comprehensive, engaged, and reflective answers.</p> <p>We need to discuss the results for our programs, including whether actions must be taken based on the results. The five UKs will briefly present the results for their programs and their potential discussions with the respective Digitalization VIPs.</p> <p>LISE: Hanne Tange SIV: Mia Thyregod Rasmussen CCG: Anne Grethe Julius Pedersen Tourism: Laura James</p> <p>BD: The number of comments surprises as well as the focus on the environmental impact and the easy way to cheat.</p> <p>LJ adds that the answers address the insecurity and skepticism about how to use AI right as a student.</p> <p>There's much insecurity about using AI for exams and that's a problem.</p> <p>AVL comments, that the censors have evaluated the oral project exams at AAU very positively in the annual report from the Censor Chairmanship and expressed the opinion that written take-home assignments will be phased out in the long term.</p> <p>MZ understands that a task force at AAU is looking at exams and AI matters.</p> <p>AVL: The amount of text the respondents have written in the survey is surprisingly positive, and they have reflected quite a lot on AI and the use or non-use in their study activities.</p> <p>Some of them have quite strong opinions. Their opinions go from some students thinking that we should use AI much more, teach more about the use and allow it much more, because it's out there and being used anyway by students – to other students at the opposite side of the scale where they don't want AI to be used at all in the programs and don't want to use it themselves for ethical, academic, environmental or other reasons.</p>	<p>ATTACHMENTS</p> <p>5.1 Report IKL student's use of G-AI May 2025, rapport IKL studerendes brug af generativ AI, maj 2025</p>



	<p>So, we need to think about it and balance what we think is the right thing to do in our programs.</p> <p>JZK: Supervising includes informing the students, if the supervisor notes work that is obviously created by AI. But if it's become an obligation to the supervisors, it is a different approach, which must be clarified. The problem is that the supervisor cannot prove, that the work is created by AI, and then the perfect academic writing leads to a perfect evaluation.</p> <p>LJ: The exams are a huge challenge and what to focus on being right and wrong e.g. on prompting, plagiarism etc.</p> <p>AMMG supports, that the same discussion is taking place at other universities in Denmark.</p> <p>In DSUR (Det Strategiske Uddannelsesråd) where all the vice deans and vice rector discuss matters of relevance for the study programs, IAS PBL has proposed to take some common activities regarding AI, e.g. one "AI Theme Day" for students and one for teachers, as well as common master slides for telling students about AI, more information to students and teachers about AI and a survey about AI for all students (and all teachers) on AI.</p> <p>MZ says that all departments probably have their own master slides etc. by now.</p>	
6. Messages	<p>6.1 Education Zoom</p> <p>The programs LISE, SIV, CCG, and Tourism (Aalborg) have submitted their hourly reports to Education Zoom, and all meet the minimum hourly requirements.</p> <p>Students in the bachelor's program must be offered at least 120 hours of teaching and 30 hours of supervision, totaling 150 hours. In the master's program, students must be offered at least 90 hours of teaching and 20 hours of supervision, totaling 110 hours. All three minimum hourly requirements for each educational level must be met.</p> <p>SIS Spanish and Tourism (Copenhagen) are not required to report hours as they are either being phased out or put on hold.</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>Annual Consultation on Admission Requirements for master's</p> <p>The programs SIV, CCG, and Tourism have received the annual consultation on admission requirements.</p> <p>6.3.</p> <p>Number of study places 2025</p> <p>We have received the number of BA study places for 2025.</p> <p>LISE loses 9 places, decreasing from 59 to 50 places.</p> <p>SIV loses 2 places, decreasing from 40 to 38.</p> <p>The reason is lower admissions last year and expectations for the number of</p>	<p>ATTACHMENTS</p> <p>6.3.</p> <p>Indmeldte ændringsønsker (Submitted change requests)</p>



	<p>applicants this year.</p> <p>Head of studies and deputy head of education Morten Ziethen describes it as follows: "The faculty has now initiated the new practice, where on the one hand, it is given how many study places the faculty has in total, but on the other hand, the distribution of study places across the faculty's programs is approached as a more dynamic process, where each year, places can be slightly redistributed between programs based on application patterns and thus expectations of how the faculty can best utilize its study places overall."</p> <p>AVL asks if the board is familiar with the website where the number of applicants can be seen.</p> <p>BD requests for the information to be sent to the faculty staff, so that all employees are aware of the applicant situation in their program.</p> <p>AVL will ask the department about the link to AAU Interne nøgletal (the AAU Internal Key Figures).</p>	
7.	<p>AOB</p> <p>AVL: The next meeting is October 23. and please contact us if you have any items for the next meeting that the study board must include on the agenda.</p>	