

# Minutes from TB Study Board meeting - March 2026

Date:	27-03-2026	Time: 12.30-15.00
Location:	AAL: RDB14 4.307 KBH: ACM15 2.001h (Gemini meeting room) Online via Teams	
Minute-taker:	Study Board Secretary Janni Rise Frellsen	

Name	Role	Attendance
<b>Study Board members (voting right)</b>		
Maj-Britt Quitzau (MBQ)	Study Board Chair and VIP representative	Present
Lars Botin (LB)	VIP representative TAN CPH	Absent
Jeppe Eriksen (JE)	Head of Study Programme TAN AAL	Present
Andrés F. Valderrama Pineda (AVP)	VIP representative SD	Absent - mandate to Søsser
Søsser Brodersen (SB)	Head of Study Programme BD/SD	Present
Mette Simonsen Abildgaard (MSA)	VIP representative for Dept. of Communication and Culture (CPH)	Present
Anna Mathilde Erlang Dahlmann (AMED)	Student representative BD/SD	Absent
Olivia Reffstrup Thor (ORT)	Study Board Deputy Chair and student representative BD/SD	Present
Hans-Peder Gørtz Andersen (HPA)	Student representative and student study councillor TAN AAL	Present
Rune Holmgaard Andersen (RHA)	Student representative and student study councillor TAN CPH	Present
Emilie Vitved Vesterager (EVV)	Student representative TAN AAL	Absent
José Alexander Garrido Martínez (AGM)	Student representative TAN CPH	Absent
<b>Observers (no voting right)</b>		
Janni Rise Frellsen (JRF)	Study Board Secretary	Present
Tom Holmgaard Børsen (THB)	Head of Study Programme TAN CPH	Present
Mette Brinch Rømer (MBR)	Student study councillor BD-SD	Present
Astrid Oberborbeck Andersen (AOA)	VIP representative for Dept. of Communication and Culture (AAL)	Absent
Versellis Elledi Earnest-DeYoung (VED)	Student representative BD/SD	Absent
Kristina Tornbjerg Eriksen (KTE)	Carreer VIP TAN AAL	Present

## Abbreviations:

TB-SN: Study Board for Techno-Anthropology and Sustainable Design

BD: Bachelor in Sustainable Design

SD: Master in Sustainable Design

TAN: Bachelor & Master in Techno-Anthropology

MPBL: Master in Problem-Based Learning in Engineering and Science

BDx/SDx/TANx/MPBLx: Semester in the programme (e.g., BD2 is second semester of the BD programme)

AAL: Aalborg campus

CPH: Copenhagen campus

HS: Head of Studies

HSP: Head of Study Programme

## Agenda

1. Approval of agenda and minutes from previous meeting
2. Information from chairperson, secretary and others
3. Follow-up status
4. Employability panel meeting + update of panels
5. Autumn 2025 semester evaluations
6. Study board funds
7. Action plan – status 1st. quarter
8. Delayed students
9. Statement concerning students' English language skills
10. Yearly account from the Engineering external examiners corps
11. Drop-out rates & drop-out reasons
12. Any other business

## Minutes

<b>1. Approval of agenda and minutes from previous meeting</b>			
Timeframe:	12.30 – 12.35	Responsible:	MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	<i>The agenda is approved and it is confirmed whether the Study Board has enough representatives to make decisions. Minutes from previous meeting are reviewed and approved.</i>		
Appendix:	Appendix 1 – Minutes from TB-SN-meeting in February 2026		
Quality:	Formality		
Discussion:	The minutes of the February study board meeting and today's meeting agenda were approved. As some of the meeting participants had to leave the meeting early, the order of some agenda items was changed. Søsser had an item for 'Any other business' concerning the central communications department, which was added to the agenda. The Study Board was deemed quorate, as a majority of members were present or represented by proxy.		
Conclusion:	Today's meeting agenda and the minutes of the most recent Study Board meeting were approved. The Study Board was confirmed to be quorate with a mandate from Andrés to Søsser.		

<b>2. Information from chairperson, secretary and others</b>			
Timeframe:	12.35 – 12.50	Responsible:	MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	<i>a. News from chairperson</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Application numbers from 'Kvote 2' (bachelors)</i></li> <li>• <i>Inputs from general meeting with prorector</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Moodle updates.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><a href="https://www.moodle.aau.dk/course/view.php?id=36036">https://www.moodle.aau.dk/course/view.php?id=36036</a></p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. <i>We will be called into meetings about the implementation of the master's reform (only SD) when it is our turn.</i></li> <li>iii. <i>Communication has changed their campaign focus and developed some general campaigns. They showed an example – they are good, but also mainly representing mainstream educations. Focus on IT + engineering.</i></li> <li>iv. <i>ITS will conduct some onboarding events for students during study start through 45 min. Modules. Sounds promising.</i></li> <li>v. <i>Two AI webinars for VIP: 19/5 13-13.50 and 21/5 13-13.50. Will make general material.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. <i>News from Head of education and teachers</i></li> <li>c. <i>News from student study councillors</i></li> <li>d. <i>News from student representatives</i></li> </ul>
Appendix:	-
Quality:	-
Discussion:	<p>a. Maj-Britt provided a status update on the preliminary application numbers for our bachelor's programmes (Quota 2). With 17 applications for TAN AAL, there are more applicants this year compared to last year; however, none of these are first-priority applications. Regarding BD, we have received 41 applications, of which 12 are first-priority applications. Thus, once again there is an increase in the total number of applications, but a decrease in first-priority applications. We welcome the increase in application numbers, but the decline in first-priority applications unfortunately makes it difficult to rely on the numbers, so we will have to wait and see where we end up in terms of the number of admitted students.</p> <p>Maj-Britt has attended a meeting with the Vice-Rector and provided an update. The launch of a Moodle update is planned, with a university-wide effort to implement a common template that, among other things, improves aesthetics and includes a better calendar function. The template has already been implemented in several programmes, and it will soon be our turn.</p> <p>At the meeting, the Vice-Rector also informed about the implementation of the master's programme reform, which is relevant for us in relation to Sustainable Design. We are part of the final implementation phase and will be contacted by the working group regarding the specific implementation for our programme.</p> <p>The new AAU marketing video was also shown at the meeting. Unfortunately, it is a highly thematic campaign with a focus on AAU's strong engineering programmes, and the video therefore does not include programmes from other academic areas. For us, it is only relevant for SD and not TAN, which is very unfortunate.</p>

	<p>For TAN, however, it has been approved to launch a campaign on our own TAN Instagram profile featuring short marketing videos that will run until the application deadline in July. We also hope to produce tote bags for distribution to TAN students, similar to those for the BD/SD students. Regarding marketing more generally, Maj-Britt also mentioned that our new Head of Studies, Kristian, has had a meeting with the communications department, where he got the impression that they are in the process of changing direction in their marketing approach, recognizing the need to highlight what makes AAU unique rather than continuing with the current very generic marketing.</p> <p>ITS will arrange onboarding events for new students during the first week after the study start in September. In addition, two AI webinars for academic staff (VIP) will be held on May 19 and May 21.</p> <p>b. Tom and Jeppe reported that, together with Frederik and the Head of Studies, they are in the process of developing a formative course across programmes focusing on AI, philosophy of science, and ethics. In addition, the inclusion of GDPR and data management could also be relevant. The format will likely resemble the ProLab model and micros, and the aim is for the course to include both general elements and elements tailored to the individual programme contexts. Tom and Jeppe therefore wish to engage in close dialogue with the study programme environments, and Jens Stissing was mentioned as a relevant sparring partner.</p> <p>Søsser briefly mentioned that BD/SD have received tote bags, which will be distributed to the students after Easter.</p> <p>Tom informed the study board that he held a lecturers' meeting yesterday. In relation to that he raised the issue of the need for an overview of the items he, as Head of Study Programme, is required to follow up on and communicate to the study programme environment from the Study Board. The current procedure is that such items are marked in green in the minutes and added to the action plan. Søsser suggested that we might consider circulating these items after each study board meeting instead of only including them in the minutes. We will discuss a possible alternative procedure to ensure that everyone follows up on their assigned responsibilities as effectively as possible.</p> <p>c. HP reported that the Open House event at the AAL-campus went very well.</p> <p>d. No news.</p>
Conclusion:	-

<b>3. Follow-up status</b>		
Timeframe:	12.50 – 12.55	Responsible: MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	<i>The action list contains an ongoing overview and status of important follow-up points from the Study Board meetings. The list helps ensure that we follow up on all items. Before each meeting, the list is updated by</i>	

	<i>the chair of the Study Board. Members of the Study Board are encouraged to monitor the status continuously and provide comments if faster follow-up or additional focus on certain points is needed. The updated action list is inserted at the bottom of the minutes for each Study Board meeting.</i>
Appendix:	Appendix 3 – Updated action list
Quality:	Follow-up and execution of decisions and initiatives
Discussion:	The action list has been updated since the last meeting, and the items on it are being addressed on an ongoing basis. As usual, the Study Board members were encouraged to raise any items for which handling should be expedited.
Conclusion:	There were no comments on the action list. Janni and Maj-Britt are planning to have their next working meeting during the month of April.

<b>4. Employability panel meeting + update of panels</b>	
Timeframe:	12.55 – 13.10   Responsible: MBQ/JFR
Presentation:	<i>Information about the planned date for meetings with the employability panels is shared (27-5 at 16-19 - not final yet!). Same format as last year with a common part across study programmes and campuses and then an individual part for each study. Discussion about topics relevant to discuss in the common part. Head of study programmes are encouraged to start planning the meetings – we would like to hear about the agendas at our meeting in May. Discuss who the members of the panels are in order to consider updates of these. With regards to TAN CPH – should it be Tom or Lars? KVIPs who are responsible for employability have been invited to provide inputs or participate in the TB-SN meeting.</i>
Appendix:	Appendix 4 – Overview of employability panel members
Quality:	Related to quality area 6 - employability
Discussion:	Some internal changes have taken place in the employability panels due to the appointment of a new Head of Studies. In connection with the transition from programme coordinators to Heads of Study Programme, some replacements have also been made. Consequently, we need to update our overviews of employability panel members and submit these for approval by the Vice-Dean. The following internal changes will be made: TAN: Pernille Scholdan Bertelsen will be replaced by the new Head of Studies, Kristian Borch. Christian Nøhr will be replaced by Kristina Tornbjerg Eriksen in the role of Career VIP for TAN AAL. SD: Pernille Scholdan Bertelsen will be replaced by the new Head of Studies, Kristian Borch. Signe Pedersen and Per Richard Hansen will step down from the panel. With regard to external members, TAN needs to find a replacement for Ditte Brøgger. Tom, Maurizio, Jeppe, and Kristina will identify potential candidates and inquire about their interest in serving as external

	<p>members of the TAN employability panel. New external members must be reported to Janni by the end of April so that Janni can submit both internal and external changes in the panels for approval by the Head of Studies and the Vice-Dean - prior to this year's employability panel meeting on May 27, 2026.</p> <p>The Head of Studies has requested input for the agenda for the joint part of the employability panel meeting. Suggested topics included AI and a discussion with the employability panel members on which competencies (e.g. in relation to ethics and data) are important for our students to acquire. These topics will also be highly relevant as input for the formative course. Maj-Britt and Janni will ensure that the topics are forwarded to the Head of Studies.</p> <p>In addition, the Heads of Study Programme were asked to initiate the preparation of agendas for their respective programme-specific parts of the employability panel meeting so that these can be presented at the next study board meeting. The individual agendas will also be submitted to the Head of Studies for approval.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Janni will ensure that the changes to our employability panel are submitted for approval by the Head of Studies and the Vice-Dean, respectively. Maj-Britt and Janni will forward the Study Board's proposed agenda items for the joint part of the employability panel meeting to the Head of Studies. The Heads of Study Programme will each prepare an agenda for their programme-specific part of the employability panel meeting and present these at the April study board meeting.</p>

5. Autumn 2025 semester evaluations		
Timeframe:	13.10 – 13.40	Responsible: MBQ
Presentation:	<p><i>The semester evaluations for autumn 2025 are discussed. Each Head of study, teacher and student representatives are expected to go through the evaluations for their own studies (both bachelor and masters). Comments can be noted in the overview. The Head of Studies or the representative of the programme in the study board is expected to present the key conclusions from the evaluations. The need for initiatives and follow up is discussed on the basis of the evaluations.</i></p>	
Appendix:	Appendix 5 – Semester evaluations & overview sheet	
Quality:	Relevant to quality area 2 – development and operation of studies	
Discussion:	<p>The semester evaluations for E25 were reviewed and discussed.</p> <p><b>TAN CPH</b></p> <p>With regard to TAN Copenhagen, Tom mentioned that the focus was on the semesters that will still be offered; therefore, the evaluation of TAN5, which was offered for the last time in E25, was not reviewed in depth.</p> <p><b>TAN7 CPH:</b></p> <p>The Digital Anthropology course has received a positive evaluation, and we will therefore continue the course along the same lines. However, once we no longer admit our own bachelor graduates to the master's</p>	

programme but only applicants from other educational institutions, we should consider making some adjustments in relation to the ethnographic competencies taught at the study programme, as these will probably not be as evident among these applicants.

The Framing course has gone from a very positive evaluation to a very negative one, and since neither the content nor the format of the course has been changed, the reason for this is interpreted as being due to poor chemistry between the lecturer and the students. As the course is rated red, there must be a follow-up meeting, and Maj-Britt and Tom will therefore ensure that a meeting about the course is planned. Tom recommends an oral exam for the course.

There is a desire for more focus on the study start, which the Head of Studies has promised will be implemented going forward. It is difficult to recruit tutors, as the older students are typically engaged in project-oriented studies in external organisations. Thus, it is important that the recruitment of tutors is prioritised. It is also important to plan some social events - preferably also during the semester.

In addition, a new semester coordinator must be found for TAN7, and in relation to this Tom would like a good combination of experience and youth and suggested Lars or Pernille together with Rabbi as coordinators for the semester.

The semester status seminar was not well attended, and several students found the atmosphere at the seminar less pleasant and were left with a feeling of not doing well enough with their projects. The status seminar should therefore be handled differently in the future.

**TAN9 CPH:**

The seminars held during the semester receive good evaluations, and the students express that they appreciate them. However, attendance has not been particularly high, which is why Tom has pointed out that students must prioritise showing up. The students have expressed a wish to do a shorter project report (e.g. 15 pages per person) this semester so that they can focus more on the project-oriented study itself. Tom will review the learning objectives in relation to the possibility for a reduction of the project report scope, to ensure that these are still met. Alternatively, some learning objectives may possibly be adjusted.

There is still a perceived need for a clear academic identity among the students.

**TAN AAL**

Jeppe then took over and reviewed the evaluations for TAN Aalborg. In this connection, he pointed out that there is a very large difference between the student groups at the bachelor's and master's programmes, and consequently also a significant difference in the issues that are relevant and discussed within the two programmes.

**TAN1 AAL:**

Only four students enrolled in the new cohort, and two of them

subsequently dropped out. This has resulted in challenges in several respects. Despite this, the students have had a good experience, supported by excellent tutors and students from other semesters, and they have developed strong relationships both with each other and with the programme. Overall, the students were relatively satisfied with all courses in the semester.

However, there was a challenge related to expectations of and learning outcomes from the anthropology course, which we should ensure is addressed and followed up on.

Regarding the socio-technical course, it was noted that the case studies were somewhat too technical and therefore felt less relevant for techno-anthropologists.

As for the PBL course, students felt that they had learned useful PBL tools, but since they were grouped with students from other programmes, they experienced that the academic content did not quite fit. We therefore need to follow up on how and with whom the course will run next time to ensure its academic relevance for our students.

TAN3 AAL:

The semester's group formation process worked well. It was more structured than usual due to challenges within the semester. There is a general issue with students not attending classes. Due to the need for increased peace and quiet among several students at the semester, priority was given to allocating suitable, calm group workspaces, which the students greatly appreciated. As an experiment, a joint status seminar was held for TAN1 and TAN3 AAL, which, according to the semester coordinator, worked very well.

There was high satisfaction with the VEMTA course, which the students felt aligned very well with the project module. In contrast, the IRA course was perceived as very technical and more difficult to link to the project.

TAN5 AAL:

Overall, there was a reasonable level of satisfaction with the courses, and the project groups functioned well. The only negative point raised was that there was too much online teaching in the Portfolio course. This was due to illness among the teaching staff, but the students eventually became very tired of the many online sessions. It is therefore important that, in similar situations in the future, we are proactive and ensure a better solution.

TAN7 AAL:

There have been challenges related to the social study environment, partly due to the students' differing backgrounds, cultures, and expectations. Several good initiatives and events were organised, but attendance was low, and greater engagement from the students would be welcome. In relation to the project, group formation worked well, but students' experiences of the project ranged from very positive to very negative, due to challenges in group dynamics—possibly again caused

by the significant differences in culture and background. The semester coordinator should place even greater focus on these differences and the challenges they may create, so that we are better prepared and can address them proactively. Perhaps the PBL group can help articulate these issues to the students.

Regarding the technical course, there were both positive and negative responses concerning the level. The Framing course could function better, and it is perceived as difficult to find a balance between addressing the students' diverse backgrounds from a theoretical perspective.

Teaching and exam planning during the semester did not work optimally, and this should be given attention going forward.

TAN9 AAL:

Many students are engaged in a project-oriented study in an external company during this semester, which is very positive. The seminars/workshops are considered to be good, but many students do not attend, which is unfortunate, as these serve both academic and social purposes. Some students struggle with loneliness during the semester, and the seminars help maintain contact and a sense of belonging. An additional option could be to establish online semester groups with ongoing, regular meetings to help maintain academic and social connections.

Several students find the process of finding an external company for a project-oriented placement challenging and require more support from the semester coordinator. International students often lack a network in Denmark and therefore need help establishing contacts with companies. The semester coordinator may request assistance from the research groups in this regard. Søsser mentioned that at SD they have a LinkedIn group where they contact alumni in employment to ask whether their workplaces need interns, thereby helping current students. TAN already has a LinkedIn profile and could advantageously do the same.

Jeppe also noted that the transition from TAN9 to TAN10 can be difficult for students, as TAN9 is highly reflective, while TAN10 requires a more academic approach. Efforts should therefore be made to strengthen the connection between these semesters.

**BD/SD**

**BD1:**

The semester coordinator highlighted four points of attention:

- Very low response rate: Based on her experience in BD3, Søsser suggested that the semester coordinator could be present while students complete the semester evaluation, and that scheduled teaching or activities immediately afterwards could help ensure attendance on campus. This model could be recommended more generally to increase response rates.

- Matematiske modeller: A new lecturer was appointed and needed time to establish structure, appropriate academic level, and a suitable exam format.
- The Mechanics course received a positive evaluation considering its technical nature. There are ongoing considerations regarding better integration of the course with the project.
- PBL course: Received the lowest evaluation of the semester. Students found it unclear where the boundary lies between this course and the Engineering Design course, especially since Signe gave lectures in both. This distinction should therefore be clarified.

**BD3:**

With 31 responses out of 34 possible, the response rate was high, which is very positive. Overall, the three technical courses have improved and are now rated yellow rather than red, representing positive progress.

The Prototype course presented some challenges due to being taught jointly by two departments (PLAN and CREATE), but there is a good dialogue on how to improve this.

In Signalprogramming og simuleringer, there was confusion regarding the exam format, which is understandable as this was only clarified during the semester due to a new hackathon format, which required formal approval. There was also confusion regarding the syllabus, which the lecturers will ensure does not happen again.

In Bæredygtige materialer, students requested more regular problem-solving exercises rather than lectures alone, which the lecturer will take into consideration.

Regarding well-being, four students reported having had negative experiences in their project group. Unfortunately, this was not communicated during the semester, making it impossible to address at the time. There was also criticism that the small canteen is not open in the mornings.

**BD5:**

A reasonable response rate, with 13 responses out of 20 possible.

Students complained about a lack of response and follow-up on reports made to building support, which Head of Studies should address in relation to the study environment.

There was a request for two teaching-free days to accommodate student employment, but this is not possible, as it would overly compress teaching. Furthermore, it is not possible to take students' employment into account during scheduling, which is already challenging. Regarding the semester's courses, students expressed a wish for better coherence between them.

Better coordination of exam scheduling must also be ensured. For example, a 72-hour exam was scheduled over a weekend, resulting in dissatisfaction and subsequent changes, which was unfortunate.

SD1:

There were 10 responses out of 35 possible, which is relatively low. 40% of students stated that the academic level of the semester was not acceptable.

Students requested information about the study start earlier than August 15. It is also important that tutors are available to support new students, especially during the first week. Søsser offered to help identify tutors from higher semesters if there are challenges. She simply needs to be informed and involved.

There were some challenges during the semester due to Jens being on parental leave, resulting in a new research assistant partially acting as semester coordinator without the adequate support.

Regarding group formation, too many students ended up in groups with fellow students they had already worked with during their bachelor's degree. Søsser therefore offered to assist with group formation, as she has insight into previous bachelor group compositions.

Students reported significant variation in supervisor quality and availability, which is critical and will be followed up on.

- DFS course: Students appreciated the course and the individual sessions but found them disconnected due to the involvement of many external lecturers with different areas of expertise. Greater coherence should therefore be ensured when the course runs for the final time next year. There was also uncertainty regarding the exam assignment.

- DiO: This course has traditionally been very popular, but this time several students felt it was poor due to content being delivered too late and a weak alignment between the course and the project.

- PSS: There was previously a desire for the groups in this course to differ from the project groups, but now students wish to retain the same group structure. There were reports of contradictory information from lecturers, which is problematic. However, these lecturers will not teach the course going forward, as the course structure will be changed, and more external guest lecturers will be included.

SD3:

There is a desire for greater clarity regarding project requirements and supervision. A clear alignment of expectations should therefore be established regarding what students can expect and are entitled to.

The project-oriented studies in external companies should preferably be completed by early January rather than at the end of the month, allowing students time to focus on their exams. Søsser will ensure that a document about this matter is prepared and distributed to the companies. Additionally, this document could also be placed in the new shared Moodle room for project-oriented studies so that everyone can benefit from it.

BD4:

	<p>The Study Board did not receive the BD4 semester evaluation when evaluations of the spring 2025 semester were discussed in the autumn. We have now received it, and the evaluation was therefore handled retrospectively. There were 13 responses out of 21 possible, which is considered reasonable.</p> <p>Assistant student teachers were involved in both the project and the LCA course with great success, and the practice has been continued in the current spring semester. Regarding the theory course, students requested a more concrete demonstration of how to use the different theories rather than just reviewing them.</p> <p>There is a need for a clearer distinction between the project and the support course, as the latter did not have a course plan. We will make sure that a course plan will be available going forward.</p> <p>Students also found it very positive that the LCA course now carries 10 ECTS instead of 5, as this better reflects the workload involved.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Overall, the evaluations were satisfactory. There was only one course rated red within TAN. There are some general challenges related to the programmes' technical courses. For the master's programmes, there are challenges related to the study start and the integration of students with very diverse backgrounds, as well as certain aspects related to the project-oriented studies in external organisations in the third semester. <b>Janni will ensure that feedback is sent to the respective semester coordinators</b> regarding the Study Board's approval of and comments on the evaluations.</p>

Break

<b>6. Study board funds</b>		
Timeframe:	13.50 – 14.05	Responsible: MBQ/ORT
Presentation:	<p><i>Maj-Britt informs about the distribution of TB-SN funds that she and Olivia have agreed upon. The same criteria as the following years have been followed. This semester the applications exceeded tremendously the funds that we had. We have prioritized that most students got a small contribution. We have underlined that shorter trips in AAL is juxtaposed to the principle of not granting funds for public transportation in Greater Copenhagen.</i></p>	
Appendix:	Appendix 6 – Overview of application and distribution of funds	
Quality:	Related to quality area 2 – development and operation of studies	
Discussion:	<p>Maj-Britt and Olivia have reviewed the applications received for the Study Board's F26 funds and have allocated the funds among them. We received a very large number of applications requesting a total amount that was significantly higher than the funds available, which has meant that it has not been possible to meet all requests and needs. The general approach has therefore been that Maj-Britt and Olivia have sought to accommodate all applications with a smaller amount, except for</p>	

	<p>applications that were very unclearly formulated or concerned very small sums.</p> <p>In addition, we have chosen to allocate slightly more funding than is strictly available, as experience shows that not all allocated amounts end up being used.</p> <p>There was a discussion about whether the guidelines should specify that funding is not granted for minor expenses such as the purchase of snacks or shorter transport within the Capital Region, as such applications are typically not prioritised. However, it was agreed not to include this, as we would still like to grant funding for such minor expenses if resources allow.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Ursula from the study administration will ensure that all students receive feedback on their applications for the Study Board's F26 funds and will inform those students who have been awarded funding about the procedure for reimbursement of expenses.</p>

<b>7. Action plan – status 1st. quarter</b>		
Timeframe:	14.05 – 14.15	Responsible: MBQ
Presentation:	<i>Overview of the action plan for each education for 2026 after the quality status meetings. Discuss if the items in the action plan are appropriate and outline expectations and roles for follow-up.</i>	
Appendix:	Appendix 7 – Action plan overview	
Quality:	Related to all quality areas	
Discussion:	-	
Conclusion	This item was postponed to a forthcoming study board meeting, as we have not yet received the minutes from the quality status meeting, which are of significant relevance for this item. We expect the item to be discussed at the study board meeting in April.	

<b>8. Delayed students</b>		
Timeframe:	14.05 – 14.15	Responsible: JRF
Presentation:	<i>Janni provides an overview over delayed students in order to assess if there are critical challenges that we need to address.</i>	
Appendix:	Appendix 8 – Overview of delayed students	
Quality:	Related to quality areas 1 and 2 – recruitment and retention	
Discussion:	<p>Each semester, the study board secretary follows up on students who have fallen behind in their studies and assesses whether there is a need to contact them. In the spring semester, the focus is on students in their first year of study.</p> <p>Students who are more than 5 ECTS behind receive an email offering them the opportunity to contact the student guidance counsellor for support and advice (yellow email). Students who are 15 ECTS or more behind receive an invitation to a voluntary meeting with Janni, where they are likewise offered support and guidance (red email).</p>	

	In connection with the spring 2026 semester follow-up, Janni has contacted five students (three yellow emails and two red emails), which is fewer than in the previous years. In addition, she has forwarded contact information for 24 students across different semesters to the Study and Well-being Guidance follow-up initiative, through which students are contacted on our behalf.
Conclusion:	Due to time constraints at today's meeting and a wish to prioritise other agenda items, this item was not reviewed in detail. Instead, Janni encouraged the study board members to review the appendix individually and to notify her if they identify any points requiring attention and thus a need for discussion and possible action. Should this be the case, the item will be added to the agenda of a forthcoming study board meeting.

<b>9. Statement concerning students' English language skills</b>	
Timeframe:	14.15 – 14.30      Responsible: JRF
Presentation:	<i>The study administration has, in connection with students preparing for a semester abroad, received inquiries requesting confirmation from us that their English language skills meet a certain standard. The study board will discuss whether the study administration should issue such documents for students enrolled in a Danish-taught bachelor's programme.</i>
Appendix:	Appendix 9 – Documentation of English language skills
Quality:	-
Discussion:	As an increasing number of our students choose to spend a semester at a university abroad, we receive enquiries from several students who wish to obtain confirmation that their English language proficiency is at a certain level so that they do not need to take an English language test. As all of our cannot make individual assessments of our students' English language proficiency. However, there was agreement within the Study Board that we would like to prepare a document stating that admission to our bachelor's programmes requires English level B, and that, according to the Danish Ministry of Education, this corresponds to CEFR level B2. For some host universities, such a document will constitute sufficient documentation of an applicant's English language proficiency, meaning that the applicant will not be required to take an English test.
Conclusion:	The Study Board would like to offer to document that admission to our bachelor's programmes requires English level B and that this, according to the Danish Ministry of Education, corresponds to CEFR level B2. Janni will prepare a draft of such a document, which <b>Maj-Britt will bring to the next coordination meeting with the Head of Studies and the Chair of the PL Study Board</b> , who will hopefully support the use of such a document for all of our bachelor's programmes.

<b>10. Yearly account from the Engineering external examiners corps</b>		
Timeframe:	14.30 – 14.40	Responsible: MBQ
Presentation:	<i>The Study Board has received the yearly account from the Engineering external examiners corps. The yearly account is read and discussed. MBQ has formulated a suggestion for a response to them, which is updated based on the given comments at the meeting.</i>	
Appendix:	Appendix 10 – Yearly account	
Quality:	Related to quality area 5	
Discussion:	-	
Conclusion:	Due to time constraints at today's meeting, this item was postponed until the next study board meeting.	

<b>11. Drop-out rates &amp; drop-out reasons</b>		
Timeframe:	14.40 – 14.55	Responsible: MBQ/UL
Presentation:	<i>The Study Board consider the drop-out rates for each education in the last period. Obligatory item. We have received overview of drop-out reasons, which is discussed in order to assess the need for follow-up.</i>	
Appendix:	Appendix 11 – Document with link to drop-out rate status & overview of drop-out reasons	
Quality:	Quality area 1 & 2	
Discussion:	-	
Conclusion:	Regarding the drop-out figures, there is not much new since the last meeting; however, we have received a document outlining the students' reasons for withdrawing, which we would like to review in more detail. Due to time constraints at today's meeting, this item was therefore postponed until the next study board meeting. <b>Maj-Britt and Janni will look into whether a more user-friendly appendix can be prepared.</b>	

<b>12. Any other business</b>		
Timeframe:	14.55 - 15.00	Responsible: All
Presentation:	<i>The participants at the Study Board meeting are invited to share information and points of attention relevant to the Study Board's study programmes. No formal decisions can be made under this item.</i>	
Appendix:	-	
Quality:	-	
Discussion:	Søsser would like to raise criticism of the services and level of support provided by the central communications department, which do not meet expectations. There are several examples of this, both in relation to the research groups (changes to the names of research group members) and the study programmes (a request to change a photo was overlooked). Maj-Britt noted that the Head of Studies is already addressing the issue, but that we could potentially provide him with some concrete examples. In addition, student guidance counsellor Mette raised the issue of a door at the Student Hub that is currently not permitted for use but which the	

	students would like to use. However, Søsser explained that although the door was previously in use, the fire authorities do not permit its use, meaning that it is not possible to reopen it.
Conclusion:	Maj-Britt will forward specific examples of poor service from the central communications department to the Head of Studies.

## Action List – TB–SN Meetings 2026

Last updated 14-02-2026

Urgent item

Important item

Less important item (follow-up)

### Completed items

- Janni has informed the TECH faculty about the election of Olivia as vice chair of the TB-SN study board. Maj-Britt has invited Olivia for the meetings with the pro-dean and pro-rector.
- Maj-Britt has added the master study start and group formation as items for a workshop TB-SN meeting in the spring on our plan for TB-SN meetings.
- Olivia has been in contact with Toke about teacher of the year and has initiated the process.
- Janni has sent out invitations for the agreed TB-SN meetings.

### Items for Others to Follow Up On

- Mette and Astrid will prepare a proposal for changing the external examiner setup for the TAN5 portfolio course – moving it to the TAN3 anthropology course. (Reminder sent 3-2-2026.)
- Lars/Tom will inform the TAN Copenhagen semester coordinators regarding follow-up on the action plan concerning challenges with workload and well-being.
- Tom and Jeppe will follow up on the yellow evaluations for TAN to ensure that the semester coordinators are aware of the challenges.
- Tom and Jeppe will follow up on student workload for TAN BSc Copenhagen on 4th, 5th, and 6th semester. Semester coordinators must be informed.

## Items for Janni and Maj-Britt to Follow Up On

- MBQ and JFR will follow up on monitoring the student workload to compare patterns in the semester evaluations with the numbers from the larger survey.
- MBQ and JRF will follow up on drop-out data and compare it to last year.
- MBQ and JRF will follow up on whether students exceeding the prescribed study time are international or Danish students – for both BD and TAN.
- MBQ and Janni will explore options for better supporting the transition to the Master's programme via Moodle and during the 5th semester.
- Maj-Britt and Janni will prepare a draft of guidelines for handling students' reported challenges, including cases of "free-riders."
- Janni and Maj-Britt will prepare feedback to AUB regarding Generative AI.
- Janni and Maj-Britt will follow up on the POF forms concerning the low reported response rates.
- Follow up on exam results for TAN MSc Aalborg to see whether they remain low.
- We will investigate whether there are existing guidelines on what a project must include, and if not, consider whether such guidelines should be developed (related to challenges with USB students and their knowledge of project requirements).
- Maj-Britt will follow up on the workshop on group formation – see the June minutes for specific names under the action plan.
- Janni will investigate where inspiration for exam formats is located and distribute it.
- Janni will bring the suggestion of including the exam format in the overview on the exam pages to the study team meeting.
- Maj-Britt will organise a meeting with programme directors and student representatives during the autumn to establish a working group addressing the challenges (both academic and administrative) related to the increasing number of students applying for pre-approval of credit transfers and going on exchange during the bachelor programmes.
- Maj-Britt and Janni will contact Educational Law regarding guidance on cases involving long-term illness (August 2025 meeting) and input for creating good practice guidelines. We will then discuss this at a study board meeting and decide on overarching principles for the study board's handling of such cases. (Email sent to the study board chairs for experience sharing on 3-2-2026.)
- Maj-Britt will initiate the establishment of a working group with Mette Brixen, Tom Børsen, student representatives, and a representative from the UCPBL group concerning the reformulation and improvement of the evaluation of students' experiences with PBL

principles in the semester evaluations. (Added to the agenda for the coordination meeting on 27-2-2026.)

- Maj-Britt will schedule a meeting on the “red thread” in TAN.
- Maj-Britt will raise the challenge regarding the technical integration in DRU and how it could be approached.