



Summary course evaluation report

Academic year 2023-24

Degree programme(s):	MSc Security Risk Management
Head of Studies:	Anders Esmark

All ECTS-generating study activities are evaluated at each pass

Are there any courses or other ECTS-generating study activities that haven't been evaluated, and if so, why?	No.
Are there any courses or other ECTS-generating study activities that haven't been rated due to no or too few responses to the evaluation? If so, what have the Study Board done to ensure the quality of the study activity?	No, but it should be noted that the elective course 'Norms/contestation in regional and global security' (autumn semester) has a response rate of 23%.

Response rates

Autumn	
Response rate, Autumn Semester courses	41,8%
Response rate, Autumn semester Bachelor's Project	N/A
Response rate, Autumn semester Master's Thesis	N/A
Response rate, Autumn semester Academic Internship	N/A
Response rate, Autumn semester Master's Project	N/A
Response rate, last year, Autumn Semester:	23,9%
Spring	
Response rate, Spring Semester courses:	43,3%
Response rate, Spring semester Bachelor's Project	N/A
Response rate, Spring semester Master's Thesis	24%
Response rate, Spring semester Academic Internship	17%
Response rate, Spring semester Master's Project	N/A
Response rate, last year, Spring Semester:	36,7%
Target response rate: 50 %	
Does Head of Studies regularly encourage lecturers to evaluate during teaching hours?	The course evaluation system automatically generates mails to encourage the students to evaluate the courses. SRM teachers are also included on the mailing lists for Political Science staff and will thus receive mails from the Political Science HoS about evaluation windows. The SRM HoS also reminds lecturers about the

	option to evaluate within teaching hours more informally.s
Does the Head of Studies encourage lecturers to inform new students on which changes have been made to their courses compared to last year, and why.	No significant changes. Also, it is not entirely clear why students would benefit from knowing about previous iterations of the course (if that is indeed what is suggested here). Lecturers are certainly encouraged to communicate their ideas about the present version of the course clearly at the beginning.
If the response rates do not meet the target: Briefly elaborate on what initiatives Head of Studies, Study Board and lecturers have implemented to increase the response rates in the future:	The response rate has improved significantly for both semesters. No major initiatives planned, but the SRM HoS will continue the dialogue with individual teachers.

Processing of the course evaluations

Distribution of the evaluations in the categories A, B and C	Number, autumn	Number, spring
Category-A assessment Category-A assessments are given when evaluations are particularly good, for example when lecturers have taken exemplary initiatives and positive experience has been gained from which other teachers or course elements can benefit.	1	1
Category-B assessment Category-B assessments are given when standards are satisfactory. The communication of the result to the lecturer may still be accompanied by suggested improvements and adjustments, but it is basically up to the lecturer to introduce initiatives.	5	2
Category-C assessment Category-C assessments are given when one or more aspects of the degree programme are so problematic that improvements must be made, supervised by the programme management and/or the departmental management (depending on the nature of the problem(s)). Category-C assessments can also be given if other aspects of a subject element than the teaching as such need to be adjusted, e.g. the course content, requirements in relation to the academic background of participants, the academic level or the extent of the teaching.	1	0

Reflect on the response rates and the distribution of teaching evaluations in the categories A, B and C:
As noted, the response rates have improved significantly for both semesters and are above 40%. This is considered satisfactory, and additional steps have to be considered against the already rather intensive efforts to make students fill out evaluations. The response rate for the master thesis is particularly low, and the SRM HoS will focus on this together with the supervisors (and the PolSci HoS) in upcoming semesters.
The distribution of grades is viewed as satisfactory and on par with comparable programs. However, the C-rated course clearly merits attention (see below)
What positive experiences have been gained in the A category? Are there any of these experiences which can serve as inspiration for other courses?
Qualitative comments and feedback from students in the study board suggests that it is the engaging and entertaining style of the course teacher that singles out the A-rated course in the autumn semester (the teacher will receive the DPS teaching prize for the efforts). For the A-rated course in the spring semester, the feedback points more toward topicality, clear focus, the rich knowledge of the teacher and incorporation of guest lectures from professionals.
Briefly comment on what characterize the evaluations of the B-rated courses. What works well in these courses, and what can be improved?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obligatory courses are generally commended for being topical and clearly focused - Students generally appreciate a mix of formats (lectures, discussions, exercises and group work) - The use of casework and lectures from professionals is highly appreciated (although some comments about distribution and balance can also be found) - Ongoing communication from the lecturer, availability and practicalities such as belated uploading of slides also feature prominently (and makes up a significant portion of negative qualitative comments)
Which items of improvement has been identified in the category C courses? What adjustments and other follow-up initiatives have been or will be implemented as a result of the course evaluations?
Three issues have been identified through evaluations and follow-up in the study board: 1) the course effectively combined a full 'traditional' course <i>and</i> demanding casework on real-life cases presented by professionals – this balance has been adjusted by reducing course curriculum and attuning it better to the casework 2) the feedback sessions on the casework has been restructured to focus more on connecting course literature and cases (and thus leaving case-specific feedback to the case-holders) 3) more sessions have been dedicated to presentation of the course literature
Has Head of Studies implemented any competence development initiatives as a consequence to the processing of the course evaluations?
There are no such initiatives or programs dedicated specifically to SRM, as they fall under the purview of the management of the DPS (where SRM staff is employed). However, there is a continuous and very smooth dialogue between the SRM HoS and DPS management about this and all other matters pertaining to SRM activities.
According to the UCPH guidelines for course evaluations and publication of course evaluation reports, Head of Studies is responsible for informing Head(s) of Department(s)/Center Director ⁱ on the results of the course evaluations. Does Head of Studies inform the Head(s) of Department(s) Center Director on the results of the course evaluations and other notable circumstances related to the teaching of a course?
Principally through orientation in combination with submission of the overall program reports.

ⁱ There is no Head of Department at the Copenhagen Center for Social Data Science (SODAS). The Director of SODAS is acting as Head of Department in the course evaluation report process.