



MINUTES OF MEETING

5 FEBRUARY 2026

Forum Board of Studies for the MSc in Global Development

Meeting date 5 February 2026, 14.45 -16.45 PM

Place Room 5.1.16

Campusadministration Søndre

Uddannelse

Uddannelsesudvikling og

kvalitetssikring

Attendees, John Rand, Christian Lund, Anna Isabella Kastberg Andersen, Chatarina Quinn Etoll, Hannah Sofia Braren Lindgren, Anne-Mette Østergaard (Study Counsellor), Susanne Stoltz (Educational Partner)

KAREN BLIXENS PLADS 16, 6A-1-41
2300 KØBENHAVN S

Absent

Atreyee Sen

DIR 35 32 31 60

susanne.stoltz@adm.ku.dk

www.samf.ku.dk

Minute taker

Susanne Stoltz

Agenda and minutes

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

Item 10 was addressed first, as Anne-Mette needed to leave early.

2. Constitution of the new Board

John welcomed the new members of the Study Board and informed the board of its tasks and procedures. Among other points, he emphasised

the importance of regularly checking your KU email, as decisions made between meetings would be handled via email.

SIDE 2 AF 7

Quinn was elected as Vice-Chairperson among the student representatives.

Documents concerning the board can be found here: [Board of Studies for the MSc in Global Development – University of Copenhagen](#)

3. **Plan for the meetings in the study board in the coming semester / John**

The board agreed to meet on **26 March from 2:00–4:00 PM** and on **12 May from 3:00–5:00 PM**.

If necessary, an extraordinary meeting would be convened.

4. **CLOSED DOOR ITEM**

Course evaluation for the courses Global Development: Theories, Facts and Current Issues and Transnational Actors, Networks and Place Making / John

Head of Studies informed the board of the process for and the purpose of the course evaluations. The board discussed the results and the response rates and decided if results call for action and rated the courses.

Transnational Actors, Networks and Place Making (TANP)

Response rate: 53,7%

Suggested rating: B (3,7)

In the free-text comments, students describe the course topics as interesting and the overall structure as clear. Recurrent concerns include a perceived lack of Master's-level academic depth and clearer theoretical framing.

The Study Board noted concerns regarding the organisation and added value of teaching activities, including that some students did not consider attendance necessary if the content could be covered through independent reading.

The Board also discussed issues related to the TA function, and John noted that adjustments to the TA arrangement could be necessary.

Regarding the curriculum, the Board acknowledged that parts of the reading list and examples may appear dated, particularly in relation to digital developments. It was emphasised that older texts can remain relevant when used to explain methodology, while outdated case studies may need to be replaced. The student representatives noted that the

challenge was not primarily a lack of coordination between teachers, but rather overlap in content, where similar material was covered by both teachers. The relevance of the case study portfolio was raised for review.

SIDE 3 AF 7

In addition, several comments referred to text-heavy slides, with requests to receive slides in advance.

As a follow-up, John indicated that he would consult the pedagogical advisers at TEACH, including the possibility of them observing elements of teaching and providing feedback on teaching materials and design.

The course was rated as a clear B course.

Global Development: Theories, Facts and Current Issues

Response rate: 49,06%

Suggested rating: B (4,2)

In the free-text comments, students describe the course as well-structured, inspiring and supported by strong teaching. A few recurring points for improvement appear, including a heavy workload, occasional unclear or time-demanding seminar tasks, and a wish for more text-focused discussion. A small number of students request earlier and more comprehensive Stata support. Some also note a desire for more varied group composition and a slightly more selective reading list. Several highlight the final seminars as particularly effective.

The Study Board noted the very positive personal evaluations of the teachers (Atreyee, John and TA Nanna). It was highlighted that the clarity of Atreyee's guidance on expectations for each teaching session worked particularly well and contrasted with experiences from other courses.

Most of the discussion focused on Stata. It was observed that student preferences vary from year to year regarding the extent of Stata walkthroughs, and the Board agreed that reintroducing extensive in-class walkthroughs at this stage would displace other essential content. Instead, it was emphasised that students should be clear about the expected level of Stata competence before the course begins, as the course cannot lower its level due to downstream programme requirements (e.g., in Global Business).

To support this, John will obtain an overview of the Stata codes introduced in ARMS and adjust the TFC course accordingly for the next cohort. He will also consult Neda regarding the possibility of uploading a note in the Absalon cohort room outlining course expectations in Stata, including a short post-course summary.

The Board discussed options for offering additional support by a PhD

student who could host open office hours for Stata implementation, ideally running alongside ARMS.

SIDE 4 AF 7

It was noted that Stata will remain challenging for some students, but that the goal is to ensure clear expectations and access to guidance without lowering academic level.

The course was rated as a (very good) B course.

5. Master's Reform

The Head of Studies presented the current draft of the proposed Master's reform and informed the board of the process. The model under discussion is expected to result in a programme, where all students begin on the 75-ECTS Master's track, with the possibility of transferring to an employment-based track (EKA) if they secure a business partner by November on 1. semester. The legal basis for this option is still being clarified.

All students would receive SU during the first semester. Students remaining on the 75-ECTS track would continue on SU for the full programme, while students on the EKA track would receive salary from the employer after the first semester. International students on the EKA track would pay a reduced tuition fee.

The new programme starts in 2028, with the final intake on the current two-year Master's programme in 2027.

The reform means that the field trip will no longer form part of the programme, regardless of track; the EKA may instead function as an extended paid internship.

Matchmaking between students and employers is being developed centrally at UCPH. John anticipates that not all students will be able to enter the EKA track due to limited employer capacity.

Concerns were noted regarding student uncertainty about admission and track placement.

6. Annual report of the external examiners' chairmanship /John

The board discussed the outcome of the annual report of the external examiners' chairmanship.

Overall, there is satisfaction with the programme and with the students' performance. Several examiners note that some students find it difficult

to combine qualitative and quantitative methods and analyses based on a short fieldwork period and suggest us consider extending the fieldwork stay to allow more time for collecting both types of data.

One examiner remarks that the interdisciplinary approach sometimes leads to certain academic disciplines being represented only in a very rudimentary way. It may be worth considering the establishment of thesis supervision groups served simultaneously by lecturers from all three disciplines to ensure an appropriate academic level.

Another examiner finds that the learning outcomes for the thesis are too general to guide the awarding of marks. It is suggested that the study regulations include guidance on assessment and grading of the thesis.

The board noted that the programme has already implemented the rule that top grade in the thesis requires integration of both qualitative and quantitative methods.

The board discussed assessment and use of AI. It was mentioned that the faculty leadership is considering moving away from take-home exams in favour of closed-book, oral or pen-and-paper formats.

The student representatives noted that it is not realistic to exclude the use of AI in exams, as it has become a normal part of everyday academic practice. Students should indicate when AI is used, but prohibiting it feels inconsistent with how work is carried out in real life. They also pointed out that unequal use of AI can create fairness issues.

The students stressed that they would not welcome a shift towards exclusively oral examinations, as some become very nervous, and they emphasised the importance of maintaining variation in exam formats. They highlighted that students must be able to write and express themselves academically.

Finally, they underlined that exam preparation is an important learning process, which argues against relying solely on continuous assessment formats.

The board agreed to prepare a formal response to the external examiners, with John and Susanne drafting a proposal for discussion at the next meeting.

Christian encouraged the board to reflect on what, exactly, the programme aims to assess in each exam format.

TEACH may already have an inspiration catalogue for possible exam formats. It would be sensible to build on existing guidance rather than

developing new formats from scratch.

SIDE 6 AF 7

Christian reiterated his recommendation that students write their thesis in groups of two or three, as this often leads to stronger outcomes. Student representatives were encouraged to share this message with their peers.

7. Curriculum (minor changes) / John

The Head of Studies informed the board about the forthcoming ARMS course revision and a new summer school initiative.

The updated ARMS course description is not yet ready but will be presented at the March meeting. It was also noted that Helene from Anthropology will unfortunately no longer be teaching on the course.

The board was briefed on a new summer school to be offered by the programme and open to all Master's students at UCPH. The first run is planned for 2027. The summer school will focus specifically on migration.

8. News from the Students

John encouraged the student representatives to contact their fellow students approximately one week before each meeting and ask: "What issues are currently important to you?" This will ensure that relevant student concerns can be brought forward to the upcoming Study Board meeting.

9. News from the Head of Studies / John

- a. News from the employer panel meeting held in December 2025:
The panel expressed concerns regarding the proposed Master's reform. They also emphasised that any adjustment to the balance between quantitative and qualitative teaching staff should take the overall composition and competencies of the teaching team into account, rather than simply replacing one profile with another.
The panel additionally noted that GD students are not always sufficiently aware of opportunities in the Danish student job market; several private companies also hire English-speaking students, and this could be communicated more clearly.
- b. Graduation Day is scheduled for 19 June 2026.

10. News from the Student Counsellor / Administration / Anne-Mette

- a. Anne-Mette informed the board about recent data on student enquiries and upcoming changes related to the administrative reform.

A new, university-wide telephone number for Study Guidance has been introduced; callers will be directed to the appropriate unit.

The former drop-in guidance service has been discontinued, and the number of bookable appointments has been reduced.

On the positive side, SPS counselling has now been integrated into Study Guidance, and students continue to have good access to guidance via email and phone.

John encouraged the student representatives to remind their peers that Study Guidance should be the first point of contact for any study-related questions. Students are asked to write or call the study guidance team before reaching out to John or Susanne directly. If a matter is urgent, this should be indicated clearly in the email subject line.

11. AOB / John - None