



SRM Study Board

MINUTES

30 MARCH 2026

Forum SRM Study Board

Meeting held March 27th, 2026 – 13:30-15:00

Place Online, Teams

Minute taker Louise Lund Liebmann

**Campus Administration South
Education**

KAREN BLIXENS PLADS 16
KØBENHAVN S

DIR 45 35 33 39 71

Present

Jonathan Luke Austin (Head of Studies, Chairperson), Kevin Jon Heller (Professor), Anne Sofie Vendelbo Kristiansen (student, deputy Chairperson), Aimee Bolt (student), Troels Claus Baagland (study programme advisor), Nina Stenvang Holmsgaard (student guidance, online) and Louise Lund Liebmann (educational partner)

lou@adm.ku.dk

Appendices

1. Meeting minutes of February 25th, 2026
2. Results from SRM course evaluations, academic internships and MA theses, fall 2025
3. ABC course categorizations and case memo
4. SRM Graduate Survey 2025
5. SRM key study data results 2025

Agenda

PAGE 2 OF 7

Closed item

Ad 1) Exemption application (forwarded)

Open items

Ad 2) Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

Ad 3) Approval of meeting minutes of 25.02.2026 (appendix 1)

The minutes were approved.

Ad 4) Course evaluations, autumn semester 2025

- a. The Study Board discussed the result of the summary report of the evaluations to, if necessary, implement plans of action to rectify any unsatisfactory conditions.
(Appendix 2)

Security Studies: Comments suggest the course to be poorly structured, too low-level for a master's programme, and overly focused on critiques rather than core security theories. Many felt the classes added little beyond the readings and did not provide a clearer understanding of security studies.

Risk analysis: Comments consistently praised the lecturers for being engaging, clear, and receptive to feedback, and many valued the interactive elements and real-world connections. Practical issues such as unclear Absalon organisation and skipped classes (with external lecturers) were also recurring themes.

Head of Studies will send a note to course coordinators reminding them that if an external lecturer cancels a class, then they must conduct the class in their place.

Organization and Risk: Comments found the course concept strong and the content valuable, but they consistently highlighted structural and organisational issues. Many pointed to uneven case quality.

Knowledge and Methods: Comments suggest the course to be highly engaging, discussion-driven, and intellectually stimulating, praising the lecturer for creating an open, creative, and inclusive learning environment. Several noted, however, that the course could benefit from clearer structure, a stronger link between lectures and readings, and more concrete methodological tools to complement the reflective and debate-oriented format.

Risk and civilisational collapse: Overall, feedback reflects strong appreciation for the lecturer's enthusiasm and openness, paired with a desire for clearer structure and more concrete guidance.

The student representatives remarked that in general there's a lot of interesting courses available to SRM students.

The Board did not have any comments or suggestions regarding the summary evaluation report for MA theses and POF as the underlying data is insufficient.

- b. The Board decided to categorize the Security Studies-course as a C-course since the evaluation comments suggest as much. The measures to fix the key problems are already in place from other conversations and complaints. (Appendix 3).
- c. The response rate was 21,2% at SRM (SAMF: 45,9%) for the course evaluation. At the Faculty of Social Sciences, the accepted rate of response is 50 %. The Head of Studies suggested that reminders to course coordinators reminding them to remind students to respond to the survey as reminders have not been sent. Head of Studies will, with assistance from the Educational Partner, try to rectify this in the future to improve the response rates. In addition, during study start the student guidance should remind SRM students to link their KU-email to their personal email account immediately to avoid missing the chance to respond the survey in question.

Ad 5)**Head of Studies presents results from the SRM Graduate Survey 2025 (appendix 4)**

PAGE 4 OF 7

Head of Studies presented key results from the SRM graduate survey 2025. The results are based on a very small respondent group (14 graduates) and paints a mixed but overall positive picture of employment outcomes and general academic skill development. Almost all respondents are in permanent employment, typically secured through job advertisements rather than networks. Graduates report strong abilities in critical thinking, analysis, and acquiring new knowledge, but they also highlight clear gaps between what the programme taught and what their jobs require, especially in applying theoretical methods and working with real-life problems.

The programme is seen as only moderately useful for preparing students for the labour market, and many felt that the transition into work was challenging, often because they struggled to communicate their skills or found that their job made limited use of what they had learned. Practical experience – student jobs and internships – was far more important for securing employment than the degree itself. Lecturers' academic competence is rated very highly, while pedagogical skills receive more modest evaluations. Overall, the survey suggests strong academic foundations but a need for clearer practical alignment and stronger support for job readiness.

In the Board's discussion it was noted that there are very few student positions available for non-Danish speakers, which makes it difficult to gain practical experience during the study period if internships (POF) are indeed cancelled as planned in terms of the MA-reform. It was noted that graduates rate their ability to communicate orally as quite low. It was suggested to introduce more oral exams to improve this skill.

Ad 6)**Head of Studies presents key study data results (appendix 5)**

Head of Studies went through the report and stated that overall, the data portrays a programme with strong student retention, timely completion, and excellent employment outcomes. One area where the programme does not fully meet the standard is academic staff coverage (VIP-dækningsgrad), which falls below the required level in 2025 (0.83 vs. a

minimum of 0.90), though previous years were compliant. Teaching-hour requirements are fully met across all semesters, with 8 hours per week in the first two semesters and appropriately reduced hours in thesis-heavy semesters.

PAGE 5 OF 7

It was suggested that the too low standard in academic staff coverage has to do with the shortage of DPS staff. It was noted that the key study data results from Political Science do indeed point to the same problem.

Head of Studies will talk the matter through with Head of Studies from Political Science.

Ad 7) News from the Student Services

The Student Guidance Service provided a status on information about data regarding inquiries in the study guidance.

As the memo was not forwarded before the meeting, Nina forwarded it to all attendees after presenting the main results. She noted that it's a mistake that the memo states 2024 instead of 2025.

The memo provides an overview of the activities and developments in Study Guidance at the Faculty of Social Sciences (SAMF) during 2024–2025. It outlines the types and volume of student inquiries, changes introduced by the administrative reform, and new responsibilities taken on by the unit.

Study Guidance serves as the main contact point for students seeking help with well-being, study planning, exemptions, credit transfer, administrative issues, and general study-related questions. Students can reach the service via email, phone, or booked appointments. In 2025, phone availability was expanded to 10 hours per week, and guidance sessions were offered across all study programmes, with the number adjusted according to demand.

As part of the administrative reform, Study Guidance services were streamlined across the UCPH, including a shared phone number and unified opening hours. SAMF's former drop-in service was discontinued, and responsibility for SPS (Special

Educational Support) assessment meetings was transferred from the central SPS unit to faculty-level Study Guidance. SAMF began conducting these assessments in August 2025. Due to reduced staffing and the new SPS responsibilities, fewer regular guidance sessions were available in 2025, though new advisors were hired later in the year, with capacity expected to increase in 2026.

In 2025, Study Guidance received 12,819 emails and 7,000 recorded phone calls (data available from April onward). Demand peaked around course registration periods and semester starts. A total of 1,106 booked guidance sessions were held, excluding SPS meetings and other special cases. August was dedicated entirely to SPS assessments.

A new unified inquiry registration system was introduced on 1 March 2025, enabling all Study Guidance units to record detailed data on inquiry types, student categories, study programmes, communication channels, and time spent. This system provides improved insights for resource planning and strategic development. A cross-faculty working group is exploring how to use this data for management and future initiatives.

Ad 8) News from the head of the Study Board

Head of Studies reported that the programme wish to set up an SRM alumni portal. At the moment, SRM are part of the general pool with Political Science. Louise has provided Head of Studies with contact points to get the work started.

Head of Studies reported that the programme would like to extend the advertising of the programme to prospective students but is not sure who to contact. Louise has provided Head of Studies with contact points to get the work started.

Ad 9) News from the student representatives

A student representative had visited the study funding meeting and suggested, inspired by fellow students from the Psychology Programme, to frame the internship (POF) as mandatory (as equivalent to clinical training in Psychology, Dentistry and Medicine) to keep internships in the SRM programme after the MA-reform. It was clarified that clinical training is not the same as internships (POF).

Ad 10) **Any Other Business**
Nothing to add.