

The Study Board  
Security Risk Management  
Department of Political Science



FEBRUARY 2023

## MINUTES

**Forum** Study Board for Security Risk Management

**Meeting date** 17 February 2023

**Place** 4.2.26

### **Present:**

Hannah-Sofie Springer (online), Kevin Jon Heller, Anders Esmark, Emma Hviid Kristensen, Kira Milkah Poulsen, Sarah J. Goetz.

### **Attendees:**

Ditte Marie Arbjern (Student Counselor) and Sidse Gutfeld Overbeck Ærstrøm (Programme Coordinator).

## **Agenda**

### **1) Approval of agenda / Anders**

The agenda was approved.

### **2) Approval of minutes / Anders**

Minutes was approved.

### **3) Constitution of the new board / Anders**

3.1 Everybody introduced themselves.

3.2 Anders' appointment as Head of Studies expires 1 March 2023. Luckily for the board, Anders has decided to offer himself for re-election as Head of Studies (HoS). The board should decide whether to support his nomination.

ØSTER FARIMAGSGADE 5  
1353 COPENHAGEN K

TLF 35 32 46 00

DIR 35 32 87 94

SAE@SAMF.KU.DK

**Decision:** The board approves of the renomination of Anders Esmark as HoS for Security Risk Management.

PAGE 2 OF 7

3.3 The SB must elect a vice-chairperson from among the student members. The vice-chairperson participates in the organisation of the SB's work by helping the chairperson in the organisation of the board's work.

**Decision:** Hannah and Kira join the board as full representatives, and Kira was elected as vice-chair of the Study Board.

3.4 The SB must set up a sub-committee for credit transfer and exemptions. The sub-committee has until now consisted of Anders and Thomas (former student representative in the board).

**Decision:** Anders would like to continue, and the board approves of this. Emma suggested herself as the student representative of the sub-committee, and the board supports this suggestion.

3.5 The SB must approve the rules of procedure (Annex 1).

**Decision:** the board approves the rules of procedure.

#### **4) Plan for the work of the Study Board in the coming semester/year / Anders**

4.1 Planning of the SB meetings for the spring semester

**Decision:** Anders suggested that the board meets two to three times per semester – once in April and, if necessary, also in June. The board agreed to have the next meeting April 28 from 15.00-17.00.

4.2 Overview of items with which the SB will work in the year to come. (Annex 2).

None.

4.3 Adjustment of this annual cycle if there is a change in the frequency of meetings.

**Decision:** Adjustments of the annual cycle are made in accordance with the frequency of meetings.

#### **5) Curriculum (CUR) / Anders**

5.1 Briefing: Status of approval of new curricula and major curricula changes applicable from 1 September of the current year February (with entry into force from 1 September of the current year).

- Approval of electives for fall 2023 and spring 2024 (Annex 3). Anders informed the board that the department has gone from planning the electives on semester in advance to now plan the electives one year in advance.

**Decision:** The board approved of the following five electives – three courses for fall 2023 and two courses for spring 2024:

PAGE 3 OF 7

Fall 2023:

- 1) *Norms and Contestation in Regional and Global Security*, Cornelia Baciuc from the Department of Political Science. This is a new course.
- 2) *Policy and Governance for Global Catastrophic and Existential Risk*, Hin-yan Liu from the Department of Law. It's a tried and tested course but it's still uncertain if Hin-yan is available to teach the course.
- 3) *Algorithmic Governance*, Sune Holm and other relevant staff from IFRO. This course could also be of interest for students of SDS.

Spring 2024:

- 1) *Intelligence*. It is still uncertain, who will teach this course, but the course has been run before.
- 2) *The politics of Cybersecurity: Strategy, Governance and Practice*, Tobias Liebetrau from the Department of Political Science.

Anders informed the board that the electives are open to other students at the Department of Political Science, but the students at SRM have a prior claim to the electives. Students from other SAMF departments may also be accepted.

Emma noted that many students find it difficult to know both how to choose electives but also what else is possible in the Mobility Window. Ditte agrees to this and she's planning a joint event with Global Development. She furthermore encouraged the students to keep themselves informed at KUNet.

Anders added that SRM students are also eligible for signing up for:

- 1) Electives offered at the Department of Political Science.
- 2) Preapproved electives at other departments at SAMF. Anders will preapprove electives, and only electives of relevance to the SRM profile will be possible to sign up for at KU Self-service.

5.2 The preliminary work with ideas for new curricula/major changes is commenced (valid from 1 September of the coming year).

**6) Course evaluations, autumn semester, block 1 and 2 / Anders**

6.1 Analysis of the course evaluations: The SB must go through the result of the summary report of the evaluations and if necessary, implement plans of action to rectify any unsatisfactory conditions. (Annex 4).

Anders has made a summary of the evaluations and the general observations are as follows:

**Response rate**

The response rates are too low. The aim is 40% response rate, but the reality is that the response rate is between 15-27%. The board highlighted that the evaluation form was in Danish and hence, difficult for the international students to complete. The board discussed what else can be done to improve the response rate. The following ideas were brought up:

- 1) Allocation of time for the evaluation during classes.
- 2) Student driven event to qualify the evaluation and to make sure that students allocate the time for the evaluation.
- 3) Student representatives could contribute by reminding their fellow students to do the evaluation.

6.2 Approval of rating: The Head of Studies (HoS) has made a

**Ratings of the courses**

Accepting the response rates as they are, the evaluation is satisfactory for all courses. All courses are rated as B-courses and there are no red flags.

**Security Studies**

The evaluation of the course has improved, but it's still difficult to both challenge and meet needs of the student with very different degrees.

The student representatives suggested that it could be of great help, if the students were made aware of basic knowledge before starting their studies, and maybe they could even receive information on how to better prepare for the programme prior to study start.

### **Risk Analysis**

The qualitative comments suggest that the cohesiveness of the course could be improved. Ditte pointed out, that both teachers and students can make use of the Pedagogical Consultants to create structure and cohesion – both in lectures, but also in the written exams.

### **Organisation and Risk**

The students asked for a better integration between literature and case work.

### **Knowledge and Methods**

The course is being rated very positively, mainly because of Jonathan and his approach and structure.

**Conclusion:** The course evaluation has been presented to and discussed by the board and the result of the evaluation was found acceptable. The ratings suggested by the HoS was approved by the board and all courses were rated as B-courses.

## **7) Programme report / Anders**

7.1 The HoS informs the Study Board about the coming programme report (deadline for submission of the report is 15 May 2023).

**Briefing:** Anders informed the board that the process of the programme report has begun, and Anders will brief the board on the report at the next SB meeting. Anders noted that the HoS is responsible for the report process, but a discussion about the report can be made in the board. The report is being elaborated once a year and it is of essential importance to the quality of the programme. Anders has had a meeting with Tea Maltesen who is responsible for the programme report process on a faculty level, and most findings are good.

- 8) Discussion:** The Rector has asked all study boards to consider the option of giving UCPH students the opportunity to orally defend their thesis. At this point, this is not the case at SRM. The board should discuss if and how the board should meet the recommendation (annex 5).

The student side acknowledged that the oral defense could have a symbolic value but did not attach major importance to it.

Anders stated that an oral defense is costly, and resources for censor travel and accommodation should be weighed against other potential uses of greater benefit. Currently the students are given a thorough written evaluation of the thesis, and an oral defense will in all likelihood be at the cost of the written evaluation. The oral defense also reduces flexibility considerably when it comes to planning—and this goes for both the students, scientific staff and the administration of the programme., This also means that the most qualified censors will probably be less willing to accept censoring offers if it involves travelling and fixed dates for an oral defense Kevin added that an oral defense of the master thesis is practically unknown internationally and furthermore detracts from the value of the Phd defense. Both staff and the student representatives pointed out that many of the international students are less accustomed to sit oral exams. Hence, an oral defense might not be suitable nor the preferred exam form for an international student and for the last exam of their studies. Moreover, many have already started their career at the time of handing in the thesis and will not be invested in an oral defense.

**Conclusion:** The board does not wish to implement an oral defense of the thesis. It remains unclear if the Rector wishes to make implementation mandatory, but in this case the position of the board is that it will be in the form of an optional oral defense, which will then take the place of the written assessment.

## 9) Briefing from the Vice Chairperson / the students

8.1 Orientation: A brief resumé of what work has been done in the SB the last year.

Hannah highlighted that the work of the board in regard to course evaluation has been an important contribution to the programme. She also noted that the latest revision of the curriculum was made in the board and hence, as a student representative you have a great impact on the development of the programme. Gathering feedback from the fellow students has been of great importance to the student representatives' work in the board.

Emma noted that the communication with the new students should be optimised, and Ditte proposed, that this could be an item on the next SB meeting 28 April 2023.

## 10) Briefing from the Student Guidance / Ditte

10.1 Discussion on a future Graduation Day.

Ditte briefed the board on the students' interest in a Graduation Ceremony. Ida Seljesæter and Hannah-Sofie Springer are trying to organise the ceremony and Sidse and Ditte has informed them on, how the administration can be of help to them. The students are planning to have the event on a Friday afternoon or during a weekend – this is to accommodate family and friends of the students, who might have to travel to Denmark to participate in the event. For now, the date is set for Saturday 24 June and Ditte and Sidse has made the students aware, that they will not be able to help in weekends, but they can, however, help with the booking of a room. Anders informed the students that if they wish to invite the Dean or the Vice-dean, this should be done well in advance.

10.2 Orientation: News from Student Services (autumn 2022), (Annex 6).

### **Statistics on enquiries**

The faculty centralisation has made it possible for the Student Guidance to collect data on the enquiries from all students at SAMF. The data shows that SRM students rarely use the Student Guidance, and if the numbers don't go up, it'll backfire. Message to the student representatives and their fellow students: use the Student Guidance; pass by the drop-in, send them a message, or call them.

### **Targeted Guidance – pilot project**

The Student Guidance team has developed a targeted guidance pilot project. The Student Guidance has reached out to students who they find in risk for dropping out. The project has been received well and it will continue in the future.

### **Students with disabilities**

A survey shows that more than 20% of the students at SAMF have one or more functional impairments. The survey also shows that 52% of them are not aware that they can get special educational support. On this background the Student Guidance has raised awareness about special educational support, and the message is, that if you have a physical or psychological disabilities, contact the Student Guidance. They can help you.

## **11) AOB/Anders (5 min.)**

No other business.

Best regards

**Sidse Gutfeld Overbeck Ærstrøm**  
Programme Coordinator