Summary course evaluation report

Basic Information

Degree programme(s):	*Security Risk Management*
Head of Studies:	*Jonathan Luke Austin*
Period:	*Academic Year 2024-2025*

Response rates

Autumn	
Response rate, Autumn Semester courses	38%
Response rate, Autumn semester Master's Thesis	N/A
Response rate, Autumn semester Academic Internship	24,17%
Response rate, last year, Autumn Semester	41,8%
Spring	
Response rate, Spring Semester courses	21,4%
Response rate, Spring semester Master's Thesis	N/A
Response rate, Spring semester Academic Internship	17,9%
Response rate, last year, Spring Semester	43,3%

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.	*3 courses*	*0*
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.	*4 courses*	*2 courses.*

Distribution of the evaluations in the categories A, B and C	Number, autumn	Number, spring
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.	0	*1*

Head of Studies' comment

This report will be published on samf.ku.dk (must not contain sensitive personal information, including specific course titles, names, etc.). The Head of Studies' comment should not exceed 3 pages.

At SAMF, all ECTS-awarding study activities are evaluated at each iteration. Are there any courses or other ECTS-awarding study activities for which evaluation forms have not been sent out by mistake?
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.
Does Head of Studies encourage lecturers to evaluate during teaching hours?
Yes. Though the response rate remains low, and so special attention on improving response rates will be placed on this going forward (starting Autumn semester 2025).
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?
The new Head of Studies plans to carry out this procedure going forward (2025 –). The rationale is to give students an appreciation of continued curriculum development in response to the earlier feedback of their peers (therefore hopefully also increasing motivation to evaluate classes).
SAMF's target response rate is 50 %[1]. If the response rates do not meet the target: Briefly elaborate on what initiatives Head of Studies, Study Board, Head of Department and/or lecturers have implemented to increase the response rates in the future:

---

[1] The target response rate applies to courses, bachelor's projects, master's theses, academic internship, and master's projects.

To improve response rates, strong encouragement to dedicate class time to the evaluation will be made to teach lecturer. More, the HoS will directly communicate this to students in good time to increase the response rate, also stressing the importance of the evaluations for the program.

Briefly comment on the trends and fluctuations in response rates:

It is notable that the response rate is considerably lower in the Spring semester. This may reflect student fatigue as the year progresses, as well as perhaps the HoS encouraging people in the autumn semester to evaluate more than in the spring semester.

Reflect on the distribution of teaching evaluations in the categories A, B and C:

The distribution across the year is encouraging (30% A courses, 60% B Courses, and 10% C courses). This represents a qualitative improvement across the program over the years.

What positive experiences have been gained in the A category? Are there any of these experiences which can serve as inspiration for other courses?

A-rated courses were praised for the inspiring, yet rigorous nature of the teaching provided. Mention of a consistent structure for the courses was also praised, balancing workload and critical thinking, as well as creative teaching methods. While courses vary in their ability to integrate all of these elements, coherent structure and balance could be a core inspiration going forward.

Briefly comment on what characterize the evaluations of the B-rated courses. What works well in these courses, and what can be improved?

B-rated courses were generally also praised for being rigorous and inspiring, as well as incorporating important material. In general, critiques that could lead to improvement relate to the structure of the courses, instructor responsiveness, and related issues.

What key points are highlighted by the evaluations of the courses in category C? What adjustments or follow-up initiatives are planned to address these key points?

The only Category C course in the program is a co-taught (5 lecturers) compulsory course. The key issue with the course relates to the number of lecturers involved and the perceived lack of coordination between the lecturers, rather than the quality of teaching of any individual lecturer. HoS are in dialogue with the course coordinator regarding how to enhance the structure and coherence of the course and avoid redundancy from electives. Changes are expected to be implemented as of 2026.

What competence development initiatives have been or will be implemented?

See above.

Head of Studies is responsible for informing Head(s) of Department(s)/Center Director[2] on the results of the course evaluations. Does Head of Studies inform the Head(s) of Department(s)

---

[2] 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.

Center Director on the results of the course evaluations and other notable circumstances related to the teaching of a course[3]?
Yes.

---

[3] For example, exceptionally coherent courses, special efforts by the lecturer with learning and teaching materials, experiments with new teaching methods, surprising pass rates, dropout rates, or grades.