

Minutes from TB Study Board meeting - April 2026

Date:	30-04-2026	Time: 12.30-15.00
Location:	AAL: RDB14 3.368 KBH: ACM15 2.001h (Gemini meeting room) Online via Teams	
Minute-taker:	Study Board Secretary Janni Rise Frellsen	

Name	Role	Attendance
Study Board members (voting right)		
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	Absent - Mandate to Maj-Britt
Andrés F. Valderrama Pineda (AVP)	VIP representative SD	Absent - Mandate to Søsser
Søsser Brodersen (SB)	Head of Study Programme BD/SD	Present online
Mette Simonsen Abildgaard (MSA)	VIP representative for Dept. of Communication and Culture (CPH)	Absent
Anna Mathilde Erlang Dahlmann (AMED)	Student representative BD/SD	Present
Olivia Reffstrup Thor (ORT)	Study Board Deeputy 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	Present online
José Alexander Garrido Martínez (AGM)	Student representative TAN CPH	Present
Observers (no voting right)		
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	Absent
Astrid Oberborbeck Andersen (AOA)	VIP representative for Dept. of Communication and Culture (AAL)	Absent
Versellis Elledi Earnest-DeYoung (VED)	Student representative BD/SD	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
5. Semester planning
6. Action plan – status 1st quarter
7. Yearly account from Engineering external examiners corps
8. Student case – regarding a re-examination
9. Drop-out rates & drop-out reasons
10. Any other business

Minutes

1. Approval of agenda and minutes from previous meeting			
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 March 2026		
Quality:	Formality		
Discussion:	The minutes from the March study board meeting and today's meeting agenda were approved without any comments. 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 and from Jeppe to Maj-Britt.		

2. Information from chairperson, secretary and others			
Timeframe:	12.35 – 12.50	Responsible:	MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	<p><i>a. News from chairperson</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Standard documentation for English abilities for studies abroad for our bachelor students (avoid English test expenses).</i> • <i>Censornet is updated with the new external examiners.</i> • <i>New AAU Moodle template for the autumn. Study secretaries are currently working on this.</i> <p><i>b. News from Head of education and teachers</i></p> <p><i>c. News from student study councillors</i></p> <p><i>d. News from student representatives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Status regarding teacher of the year?</i> 		
Appendix:	-		
Quality:	-		

<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>a. Maj-Britt mentioned that she, following the Study Board’s discussion at the previous meeting regarding students’ inquiries about verification of their English language proficiency in connection with a study abroad, has discussed this item with the Head of Studies and the Chair of the PL Study Board. They were also positive about us confirming that English level B is an entry requirement for our bachelor’s degree programmes, and that English level B according to the Danish Ministry of Education corresponds to CEFR level B2, which is the level most universities require students to document to avoid having to take an English test. Thus, a standard document, which the study secretaries can fill out, sign and stamp, is now available for students needing this kind of documentation.</p> <p>CensorNet has now been updated with the examiners who have been appointed as external examiners in the engineering examiners’ corps for the new appointment period from April 2026 to March 2030.</p> <p>The Study Administration is currently in the process of implementing the new Moodle template, which Maj-Britt briefly informed about at the last meeting, in our study programmes’ course and semester Moodle rooms, so that it will be ready for use from the autumn semester 2026. Maj-Britt encouraged everyone to provide feedback on the new Moodle template if there are any comments once it is in use.</p> <p>b. Tom reported that this week he hosted one of the TAN events for which he had been granted funding from the Study Board. It was a visit by the Colombian NGO DakotaLab, who would like to offer our students the opportunity to undertake a project-oriented study with them. It was a very good event, but unfortunately with very low student attendance. It appears that several students were not aware that the event was taking place, which sparked a discussion about how we can best communicate events and activities to our students. Typically, the programmes’ joint rooms in Moodle are used, to which all students in a programme are enrolled by default. However, it seems that not all students pay attention to emails from these rooms and therefore miss information about relevant activities. Some students even claim that they do not receive these emails at all, although this should not be the case. An alternative option is to ask the study secretary to set up a shared email address for all students of the semester, which semester coordinators and teachers can use to contact the students directly. Tom will contact TAN study secretary Ursula to have such a mail address created.</p> <p>Søsser mentioned that she has had a meeting with BD/SD student guidance counsellor Mette regarding the creation of separate Moodle rooms about studying abroad for BD and SD, instead of the current shared Moodle room on this topic for all our study programmes. In this way, the information, requirements and guidance in the individual Moodle rooms can be made more study programme specific.</p>
--------------------	--

	<p>Tom and Søsser reported that they have been part of a very good and productive meeting about the new AI Theory of Science course, and they are very positive about the creation of this course. Søsser added that in relation to BD, proposals have already been put forward on how the course can be incorporated into the study programme. Tom will prepare the minutes of this meeting.</p> <p>c. No news from the student study councilors.</p> <p>d. Olivia provided a status update on the process of selecting Teacher of the Year. She explained that she has already received some teacher nominations from students, but that she will make sure a reminder is sent out so that, hopefully, we will receive even more nominations.</p>
Conclusion:	Relevant information from study board members and observers was shared.

3. Follow-up status		
Timeframe:	12.50 – 12.55	Responsible: MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	<p><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 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></p>	
Appendix:	Appendix 3 – Updated action list	
Quality:	Follow-up and execution of decisions and initiatives	
Discussion:	<p>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. Also, everyone should make sure to check the list and take care of any items they are responsible for.</p>	
Conclusion:	<p>There were no comments on the action list. Janni and Maj-Britt will continue handling and following up on the items on the list in their regular working meetings.</p>	

4. Employability panel meeting		
Timeframe:	12.55 – 13.10	Responsible: HSP
Presentation:	<p><i>The Head of study programmes present their proposal for agendas at the meeting. A new member of the TAN employability panel has been appointed.</i></p>	
Appendix:	-	
Quality:	Related to quality area 6 - employability	

<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>The Head of Study Programmes presented the agendas for the programme-specific parts of the employability panel meeting on May 27, 2026:</p> <p>For BD/SD, the focus of the meeting will be the revision of the curriculum for the MSc in Sustainable Design, with the following agenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome 2. The revision process, presented by Søsser 3. Input from lecturers and other research groups – what is open for discussion? Presented by Søsser 4. Discussion exercise: validation of current considerations and idea generation regarding potential gaps 5. Summary, including agreement on an additional meeting to approve the proposal for a new curriculum <p>Tom subsequently presented agenda items for the TAN meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome by Head of Study Programme Tom Børsen 2. New teaching formats within Techno-Anthropology <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continuing education (see links: Efteruddannelse - Aalborg Universitet, Vurdering af digital sundhedsteknologi - Aalborg Universitet)) b. Teaching in other bachelor's and master's programmes c. Other possibilities? 3. How to increase the number of applicants for the bachelor's programme? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. New title and/or revised content? (see links: Teknoantropologi - Bachelor - Aalborg Universitet, Studieordning for bacheloruddannelsen i teknoantropologi, 2022, Aalborg) b. Improved PR? (Presentation by Study Board Chair Maj-Britt Quitzau or a representant from the AAU communication department) 4. Employment (in English) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Event featuring thesis presentations by student Fabian b. LinkedIn strategy presented by External Lecturer Rabbi 5. Any other business <p>Tom will send the agenda to Janni, who will update the meeting invitation accordingly. In addition, Rabbi will be invited to the meeting.</p> <p>Janni will forward the agendas to Head of Studies so that he is informed about the topics for the individual meetings.</p>
--------------------	---

	<p>Jeppe and Kristina are unfortunately unable to attend the employability panel meeting, so there will be no representatives from TAN Aalborg present. Maj-Britt may travel to Aalborg, but if she does not, we will offer external member Dianne the option to participate in the meeting online instead of attending alone on campus in Aalborg.</p> <p>The employability panels need to be updated, as several internal members have changed since the last approval. In addition, TAN has a new external member who must also be officially approved. Janni will send updated overviews of the new employability panels to the Head of Department and Head of Studies for approval, after which they will be forwarded to the Vice Dean.</p> <p>There are considerations about identifying additional external members for the TAN employability panels, for example from Netcompany, where several of our graduates are employed. Tom and Jeppe will have a talk about it and possibly reach out to potential candidates and invite them to the employability panel meeting.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>Agendas for the individual programme-specific parts of the employability panel meeting were presented. Janni will send overviews of the new employability panels to the Head of Department and Head of Studies for approval. Tom and Jeppe will identify additional potential candidates for the TAN employability panel.</p>

5. Semester planning		
Timeframe:	13.10 – 13.25	Responsible: MBQ/HSP
Presentation:	<p><i>The semester planning for autumn 2026 will soon begin. The study secretaries will send an initiating e-mail in May. An examination catalogue for PLAN is hopefully ready to be shared. HSP should remind semester coordinators of awareness about examination distribution and formats as well as ensuring the appropriate amount of teaching within the modules.</i></p>	
Appendix:	-	
Quality:	Relevant to quality area 2 – development and operation of studies	
Discussion:	<p>The planning of the Autumn 2026 semester is about to start, and the study administration will send out information to the semester coordinators soon.</p> <p>Some of the student representatives expressed frustration about limited opportunities to influence exam scheduling and planning, citing a lack of constructive dialogue with semester coordinators. Thus, the importance of planning meetings with student attendance was emphasized. As the study administration no longer automatically notifies students about the opportunity to attend planning meetings, it is up to the semester coordinators to find student representatives for these meetings. Søsser</p>	

suggested that the semester coordinators should have the study secretaries send out meeting invitations to students, while the study board student representatives should encourage their fellow students to participate. The Study Board has also previously discussed the possibility of being proactive and appointing student representatives at the start of the semester or at a steering group meeting, so that they are already identified and can easily be invited to a planning meeting.

Søsser brought up a need for better alignment between the study administration and the economy department, particularly regarding staffing and semester planning. She suggested that the semester planning should precede staffing to avoid unnecessary stress and recommended a ten-day delay between the initiation of the two processes.

In relation to the planning of the BD semesters, Versellies noted that splitting the technical courses into blocks, rather than overlapping them, was well received by students at her semester. Søsser confirmed that the block structure would continue in future semesters at BD and encouraged student participation in planning meetings to ensure that such preferences are considered.

Emilie and Rune raised concerns about the placement of the exams during their semesters, as the exams in their experience conflicted with project work and caused stress, and they would prefer to have some (more) exams pushed to January/June. On the other hand, Anna Mathilde was very positive about the structure at BD with the distribution of the exams throughout the semester. Thus, the comments reflect that preferences vary significantly from semester to semester, which is why we do not wish to introduce fixed guidelines that apply to everyone.

Instead, the semester coordinators must make sure to carefully reflect on exam placement and ensure good coordination of the semester's various modules and exams (such as avoiding exams in the last month before project submission and pushing some exams to January/June if this is most suitable for the structure of the given semester). Søsser described her use of an Excel file as a tool to visualise the semester schedule, including exams and activities, and stressed the importance of student approval before finalising plans.

Anna Mathilde suggested having more written exams with physical attendance on campus instead of group work assignments with oral examinations, as the latter mentioned are very time-consuming for the students. Written exams with physical attendance, however, are very administratively demanding in terms of booking of rooms, exam

invigilators and IT support, as well as the review of samples among the exam papers.

Thus, it would be beneficial with a study board discussion of the different types of examinations, their advantages and disadvantages, and which courses and learning objectives they are best suited for.

As a further help for choosing among the different exam formats, a working group established by the Strategic Education Council (DSUR) has developed and launched a new digital exam catalogue. This catalogue provides lecturers with a comprehensive overview of assessment formats at AAU, along with concrete examples to support greater variation in examinations. The exam catalogue can be found here: [eksamenskatalog](#)

In addition, the study administration at PLAN is working on a hands-on exam catalogue aimed at informing lecturers about exam formats and what they need to be aware of and consider when selecting the different formats. The study administration is currently clarifying how this catalogue can best be communicated and used, after which it will be launched.

Reg. the identified ongoing challenges in communication and process, including busy schedules, unclear procedures, and difficulties involving students, it was agreed that it is important to address these challenges. The semester coordinators are responsible for, and should prioritize, that planning meetings are held, and that student representatives are given the opportunity to participate in them and give input.

The semester coordinator may advantageously use a template such as the one mentioned by Søsner as a tool to create a better overview of the semester's activities and their scheduling.

Students who find that the semester coordinator is not responsive to their feedback and input regarding the coordination of the semester are encouraged to contact the Head of Study Programme.

Overall, it is of great importance for the Study Board that, in planning the semesters, attention is given both to choosing the right examination forms and to the distribution of exams throughout the semester.

Heads of Study Programmes are asked to ensure that the responsibility for and importance of good coordination of the semester's various activities and the exam distribution and choice of exam formats is communicated to the semester coordinators, for example in connection with a teaching meeting.

Conclusion:	<p>The Study Board discussed semester planning, exam scheduling, and coordination between study secretaries, semester coordinators, and students, highlighting issues with exam distribution, block structure, and the need for improved dialogue and involvement of students in planning meetings.</p> <p>Maj-Britt will bring Sørssers' suggestion regarding improved coordination of the processes for semester planning and staffing to the Head of Studies.</p> <p>Heads of Study Programmes will emphasize the importance of ensuring thorough coordination of semester activities to the semester coordinators.</p> <p>The Study Board will make sure follow-up on the identified initiatives to improve the process and assess whether further action is needed.</p>
-------------	--

6. Action plan – status 1st quarter	
Timeframe:	13.25 – 13.45 Responsible: MBQ/HSP
Presentation:	<i>We have received the summary of quality meetings about the update of the action plan. We will go through the updates and discuss if some of the actions for 2026 need to be adjusted. We will also discuss how we can ensure that we follow up on the actions in the plan.</i>
Appendix:	Appendix 6 – Updated action plan for each education and summary from the quality meeting about the action plan for 2025.
Quality:	Related to all quality areas.
Discussion:	<p>A quality status meeting was held in February, and based on this, some changes have been made to the action plan for the Study Board's programmes. Maj-Britt did a review of the action plan items, noting which were closed, ongoing, or required reopening:</p> <p>MPBL Item no. 1.20 – (responsible: Study Board Chair): a new task has been added – discussion of the marketing plan for MPBL. Maj-Britt will follow up with Aida, who is the programme coordinator.</p> <p>TAN + BD/SD Item no. 1.17 (responsible: Head of Studies): Development and implementation of a concept for the master's programme study start. The item has been reopened, and a new task has been added: to arrange a meeting on the new organisation of the master's programme study start.</p> <p>Item no. 2.25 (responsible: Study Board Chair): Integrating the technical courses into the programmes. No new tasks, but the semester evaluations should be closely monitored; this can be added as a task if a "reminder" is desired.</p> <p>For BD/SD, Sørsser is working extensively on the integration, so it would be meaningful to add these specific actions to the plan as</p>

	<p>documentation. Maj-Britt will transfer responsibility status to Søsner in the Quality Platform so she can update it.</p> <p>Regarding TAN, Rabbi has been hired as a new lecturer to handle the technical courses, as ES is no longer able to take on this task. Tom is in dialogue with both the new lecturer and the students, and follow-up takes place at steering group meetings. As a new lecturer, Rabbi should complete a teaching/PBL course. These actions should also be documented in the Quality Platform, where Maj-Britt will register Tom as responsible. Maj-Britt and Tom will agree with themselves who will do the registration in the Quality Platform.</p> <p>Item no. 6.11 (responsible: Study Board Chair): Supporting students' employability. The task regarding conducting academic discussions on how to support students has been closed. Responsibility for raising awareness of TAN in Northern Jutland has shifted from Kristina C. to Jeppe. The Head of Studies will plan employability-related activities with Marianne/Kristina, and new initiatives will subsequently be added to the action plan.</p> <p>TAN</p> <p>Item no. 1.19 (responsible: Study Board Chair): Develop targeted recruitment initiatives for students for TAN Aalborg BSc. This effort is extremely important, and it should be considered whether additional actions should be initiated (e.g. there has been discussion about the use of social media). Furthermore, it is relevant to reflect on what we want the future of Techno-Anthropology to be.</p> <p>BD/SD</p> <p>Item no. 2.22 (responsible: Study Board Chair): Revision of the curriculum for the SD master's programme. The extensive work carried out by Anna Mathilde in reviewing various materials from minutes and semester evaluations must be registered in the Quality Platform. A new task regarding collecting input from the "quality track" to be included in the revision has been added (responsible: quality employee).</p> <p>Regarding AAU's overall quality system, Maj-Britt explained that TB-SN is currently in the sixth and final year of AAU's six-year quality cycle, and that we must therefore initiate the comprehensive programme evaluation that concludes a cycle. The quality evaluation will involve reviewing all data and action plans. Line V. will initiate the process in June, with teachers, heads of study programmes and external partners participating in the data analysis and evaluation.</p>
<p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Maj-Britt will ensure that updates to the action plan are made and, by agreement, transfer responsibility for specific tasks in the Quality Platform to the Heads of Study Programmes.</p>

Break

7. Yearly account from Engineering external examiners corps	
Timeframe:	14.00 – 14.10 Responsible: MBQ/JRF
Presentation:	<i>We have received the yearly account from the Engineering external examiners corps. The yearly account is discussed and a letter of feedback formulated on behalf of the study board.</i>
Appendix:	Appendix 7 – Yearly account and proposed letter.
Quality:	Related to quality area 2.
Discussion:	<p>We have received the annual report 2024–2025 from the national External Examiner Corps for Engineering Programmes, and Maj-Britt reviewed the key themes in the report as well as the draft response she has prepared.</p> <p>Regarding the collaboration with AAU, the examiner chairmanship notes that it is functioning well and that the examiners’ feedback has generally been positive.</p> <p>The examiner chairmanship also addresses some general challenges:</p> <p>Lack of implementation of the new examiner IT system leads to varying ‘manual’ processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant variation in universities’ compliance with appointment procedures • Too few examiner feedback reports <p>Challenges in appointments and utilisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gender composition still does not meet the requirements • A need to utilise the broader corps rather than relying on ad hoc or supplementary appointments <p>With regard to the appointment of examiners for exams, the examiner chairmanship highlights a challenge in that some examiners are used extensively while a large group is hardly used at all. It is also noted that there is still considerable variation in how universities select examiners for exams. According to the Executive Order on External Examiners, the examiner chairmanship and the educational institutions must collaborate on the allocation of examiners. Institutions are therefore encouraged to submit lists of planned exams and examiners so that the chairmanship can ensure that the requirements for examiner allocation are met.</p> <p>In her response to the examiner chairmanship, Maj-Britt has described our procedure for selecting examiners. Here, the supervisor suggests 3–5 possible examiners for an exam, after which the study secretary selects one of these and makes the agreement with the examiner. The rationale</p>

	<p>behind this procedure is to ensure that the supervisor does not use the same examiner each time, while also ensuring the selection of an examiner with relevant academic expertise. With this procedure we do not ensure the use of the broader corps, but Søsser pointed out that we ensure the use of the examiners we have nominated ourselves.</p> <p>Søsser additionally noted that, for BD/SD, they have categorised the examiners we have nominated according to which semesters we wish to use them for. In this way, we ensure examiner expertise relevant to the individual semesters, while also preventing students from encountering the same examiners semester after semester. A similar categorisation could advantageously be introduced for Techno-Anthropology.</p> <p>Regarding the lack of feedback from examiners after exams, Maj-Britt mentions in her response that, in the study administration’s initial email to examiners, we have emphasised the importance of completing the feedback report. As suggested last year, a possible solution could be to make completion of the feedback report form a requirement for the payment of examiner fees.</p> <p>In her response, Maj-Britt also notes that we are pleased with the dialogue we have had with the examiner chairmanship, where we have, among other things, discussed the addition of thematic keywords that could make it easier for us to identify examiners aligned with the academic profile of our programmes, including “Techno-Anthropology”. It has also worked well to add examiners who cover the need for assessment within techno-anthropological expertise to the engineering examiner corps.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>The Study Board reviewed the key themes in the annual report from the examiner chairmanship and approved Maj-Britt’s draft response. Maj-Britt will send the response, including Søsser’s comment, noting that our appointment procedure ensures broad use of all examiners we have nominated for appointment.</p>

8. Student case – regarding a re-examination		
Timeframe:	14.10 – 14.30	Responsible: JRF/MBQ
Presentation:	<p><i>Case about a student that needs to take a course exam after their master’s thesis and for this reason wants to rush the exam to get finished. However, the student has already used 4 attempts. TB-SN can allow to have an exam outside of the ordinary exam periods, but then all students lacking this exam should be invited. Several students are lacking this course exam and several of them have also already used several attempts. Our practice is usually to not grant an extraordinary exam when students could benefit from waiting and following the course when they have few attempts left. Important to consider the academic</i></p>	

	<i>perspective in terms of whether it is sensible that the student uses yet another attempt without proper academic support. Are we doing the student a disservice? TB-SN should discuss this student case and clarify what criteria have to be fulfilled to allow for this kind of re-examination.</i>
Appendix:	-
Quality:	-
Discussion:	<p>The Study Board expects to receive an inquiry from a student who is missing only one 5 ECTS course module to complete their degree in Techno-Anthropology. The exam in this module is not offered until the winter exam period 2026/2027, and the student therefore wishes to be granted an extraordinary reexam in the module before summer 2026. According to the 'Joint Rules for Course and Exam Registration at Aalborg University', the Study Board may choose to offer a reexam for students outside the ordinary examination period but is not obliged to do so. Normally, the Study Board only offers this if it is considered academically justifiable.</p> <p>In the case of the student in question, this is his fifth exam attempt which means that the student has already been granted two additional attempts in the module and has only one attempt remaining. Furthermore, it is assumed that several years have passed since the student last attended the course teaching, and it is therefore recommended that the student re-enrolls on the course to ensure the best possible conditions for passing the exam on the fifth attempt. Furthermore, if the Study Board chooses to offer one student the opportunity for an extraordinary exam, other students in the same situation must also be offered this opportunity. In relation to the specific course module, there are several students who would need to receive such an offer.</p> <p>Based on these circumstances, the Study Board does not consider it academically appropriate to offer an extraordinary reexam. However, the Study Board will of course assess the inquiry and the reasons provided once it is received. Unless new, unforeseen arguments are presented, Maj-Britt and Janni are authorised to process the inquiry on behalf of the Study Board.</p>
Conclusion:	<p>The Study Board had a general discussion on the circumstances under which we wish to offer students an extraordinary reexam outside the ordinary examination period. There was agreement that academic quality should be given the highest priority, and that, generally, if a student has only one examination attempt remaining in a module, they should be encouraged to retake the course to ensure the best possible chance of passing the exam. Maj-Britt and Janni will process the expected inquiry from the student in accordance with the principles agreed upon by the Study Board.</p>

9. Drop-out rates & drop-out reasons

Timeframe:	14.30 – 14.50	Responsible: MBQ/UL
Presentation:	<i>The Study Board considers 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 9 – Document with link to drop-out rate status & overview of drop-out reasons	
Quality:	Quality area 1 & 2	
Discussion:	<p>The study board reviewed the dropout rates in the overview, and apart from TAN AAL, which has been red for some time now, these are still in the green category. However, BD stands at 12.5% and is gradually approaching the yellow zone. Versellies added that there are also some students in BD2 who have recently dropped out and who may not yet be reflected in the overview. Consequently, Maj-Britt asked Søsser to monitor the figures, and if they increase too much, we will need to consider possible measures.</p> <p>The Study Board has also received an overview of the students' reasons for withdrawal, which provides insight into why we have lost students. Maj-Britt encouraged the Heads of Study Programmes to take a closer look at these, to assess whether there are any indications of a need for action.</p>	
Conclusion:	Søsser will monitor the development of BD's dropout rates. Heads of Study Programmes are encouraged to review the students' reasons for withdrawal within their respective programmes.	

10. Any other business		
Timeframe:	14.50 - 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:	<p>There was a discussion about the next study board meeting which is scheduled for 28 May. However, it was agreed that this date is not ideal, as the employability panel meeting takes place the day before, and several of our student representatives are to hand in their semester project the day after. Thus, the study board wished for a new date to be found.</p>	
Conclusion:	Janni will send out a Doodle with suggestions for alternative dates for the May study board meeting so we can agree on a new date.	

Action List – TB–SN Meetings 2026

Last updated 22-4-2026

Urgent item

Important item

Less important item (follow-up)

Completed items

- Maj-Britt has shared the suggestions for agendas for employability panel meetings at the coordination meeting with Head of Studies and Poul.
- The new members for the employment panels have been agreed upon. Janni has invited those and prepared approval by the vice-dean.
- Janni is currently sending out the responses to semester coordinators regarding the semester evaluations.
- Maj-Britt is coordinating with Tom to call for a meeting regarding the red evaluation of one of the TAN8 courses.
- Ursula has informed students about TB-SN grants for this spring.
- Maj-Britt has discussed the possibility for documenting English proficiency with the Head of Study and the PL chair. The document from Janni was approved.
- Maj-Britt has forwarded examples of bad support from the central communication to the Head of studies.

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.