



18 FEBRUARY 2021

## MINUTES

**Forum** The Study Board for Security Risk Management

**Date of Meeting** 15 February 2021

**Venue** Zoom Meeting

**Minutes taken  
by** Troels Claus Baagland

**Present:** Anders Esmark (AE), Ben Rosamond (BR), Kevin Jon Heller (KJH), Solveig Kirstine Bennike Bennedsen (SKBB) and Johanna Huifang Li (JHL) and Troels Claus Baagland (TCB)

**Absent:** None

### Agenda:

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of meeting 12 January 2021
3. Approval of the Rules of Procedure for the SRM study board
4. Information in relation to the Program Evaluation
5. Discussion of focus points for revision of the program curriculum
6. Discussion of focus points for improvement of the Study Environment
7. Information from students
8. Information for the Head of Studies/Head of Study Board
9. Any other business

ØSTER FARIMAGSGADE 5  
1353 COPENHAGEN K

TLF 35 32 33 66  
DIR 35 32 33 68

tcb@samf.ku.dk

REF: TCB

**1) Approval of Agenda**

Approved.

**2) Approval of minutes of meeting 12 January 2021**

Minutes approved.

**3) Approval of the Rules of Procedure for the SRM study board**

The rules were approved.

**4) Information in relation to the Program Evaluation**

AE gave a brief summary of the BA profile for incoming students 2018-2019. He estimated that approximately 50 percent has a background from IR. The second largest group has a BA in political science. He mentioned that the remaining group consisted of students with a large variety of study backgrounds. Among the topics mentioned were development studies, criminology, sociology, general social science etc.

AE mentioned that students with a BA in business have become less prominent since SRM was launched. SKBB emphasized that there is still a number of students with this background and emphasized the demand for SRM candidates among private companies.

KJH asked if the IR policy focus was equally prevalent in the applicant pool or if it was reflecting the admission decisions.

AE stated that his impression is that IR is also most prevalent among applicants, but emphasized that more solid information would be needed to fully answer the question.

AE reported that the particular attention given to the financial sector as a job market in the evaluation report is not fully supported by best available data on student careers after graduation (the Graduate Survey from 2019). He said that the SRM-candidates are going both to the public and private sector, but with a huge job diversity in general.

JHL remarked that the focus on the financial sector in the evaluation report seems to be the result of a somewhat narrow and pessimistic view of the job market for SRM students at odds with the reality. AE agreed that the job market is broad and diverse, but emphasized that the evaluation report mentions legitimate concerns about political opposition to study tracks with a high proportion of international students.

**5) Discussion of focus points for revision of the program curriculum**

AE stated that the evaluation report highlights progression and student expectations as the main focus points. He stated that these pointed to two key issues: that students seem to expect a more practice-oriented program than SRM actually is designed to deliver and the balance between the IR/security studies on the one hand and management/organization on the other.

JHL said that SRM students expected a distinct SRM program, but the program to a large degree incorporates traditional elements from IR and political science. The latter is particularly pronounced for the elective courses where SRM and political science students are mixed.

AE emphasized that some of the electives are targeted primarily to SRM students (with preference given to SRM students), but the composition of elective courses vary from semester to semester.

SKBB mentioned that there is a delicate balance with the fee inflow of political sciences students and the study environment for SRM-students. She would expect more progression in a class with only SRM students.

AE pointed out, that the first semester is quite dense with only compulsory courses without electives. Maybe the compulsory courses should be more evenly distributed throughout the program to ensure a better study environment. Also, he said, that there is a resource problem in regard to how many SRM courses that can be offered.

KJH encouraged creating a certain flow for the students, e.g. helping them to cluster around certain elective courses.

With regard to students expecting a more practice-oriented program, AE said that the primary competencies within the department are academic and research-oriented, not focused on practical application.

JHL said that in reality the students get security & risk studies, and not so much “management”. She encouraged to stick to the original title of the program, and that is to combine security & risk studies with management. This, she said, is what makes SRM different from other studies.

KJH stated that graduates studies should not be about practical skills, and he emphasized that it is “not good to do things halfway”.

JLG warned against a conclusion where SRM studies were fully IR studies because it is assumed that students come for that only – the program should not be too one-sided (which is the Copenhagen School approach).

JLH and SKBB encouraged to do a survey among the students to have an idea about their wishes, and what they came for.

AE stated that he would look into doing such a survey in connection with his own teaching.

AE said that the discussion at the meeting should only be considered as an initial discussion. However, he concluded the discussion showed commitment to strengthening and developing SRM's current profile rather than focusing solely on IR/security studies. He also concluded that there was little support for simply making the program more practical, but steps taken to match student expectations in this respect should involve both revision of the program and better communication to prospective students. He also repeated that future revisions should look at both obligatory courses, which are key to both progression and study environment, as well as the potential for further development of electives.

#### **6) Discussion of focus points for improvement of the Study Environment**

AE said that the study board's role should be defined at the coming meetings. Foremost the work should focus on study environment, study program, teaching and evaluation.

AE encouraged JHL and SKBB to make people aware that a SRM study board has now been established, and that they could now bring up their concerns here.

#### **7) Information from students**

JHL mentioned that there were some confusion in general among students, about administrative things such as course registration, and where to find grades. She felt that the students did not feel prepared since it was not enough with the 50 minutes on-line introduction given by the Study Advisory after a course lecture and at the welcome day. She encouraged to inform more about such practical things, since knowledge about that can't be taken for granted in regard to non-Danish students.

#### **8) Information from the Head of Studies/Chairman of Study Board**

AE was drawing attention to appendix 6 -7 about student well-being initiatives and teaching during COVID-19. He encouraged the students to look more into the appendices, and consider if some of the suggestions could be of relevance for the study board.

BR - gave a brief overview of the in-take process of new SRM students. He mentioned that the next deadline for EU/EAA applicants is 1 March.

BR also mentioned that he would encourage SRM teachers to meet on a regular basis and ultimately to establish a teacher forum. This, he thought, would increase the teaching quality, since the content of the courses could

be discussed in such a forum - to ensure progression and to prevent overlaps.

SIDE 5 AF 5

BR also mentioned that Karen Lund Petersen were leaving the department, and new recruitment would be necessary in the coming years.

**9) Other business**

Nothing.