



MINUTES

21. MAJ 2026

Forum Study Board Meeting

Date 17th April 2026

Room 16.1.62

Minute taker Jeanette Sporon-Fiedler

Campusadministration Sødre
Uddannelse
Uddannelsesudvikling og
kvalitetssikring

KAREN BLIXENS PLADS 16
KØBENHAVN S

DIR 35 33 45 05

sxn232@adm.ku.dk

REF: JSF

SAG: [SAGSNR.]

DOK.NR.: [DOKUMENTNR.]

Uddannelsespartner for Sociologi

Present

Bertram Frederik Kjær Johansen, Rebekka Eltang Lynbech, August Møller Roesen, Nicoline Nielsen, Halfdan Temple, Lasse Suonperä Liebst, Sidsel Kirstine Harder, Mengni Chen, Andrew Christopher Herman, Thomas Laumark Hansen, Jens Roesdahl Lange and Jeanette Sporon-Fiedler

Absent

Cassandra Rita Hillersborg, Troels Claus Baagland, Hanne Kraak and Signe Staun Kelly

Agenda

Ad 1) Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved.

Ad 2) Approval of minutes from last study board meeting on 17th April 2026

The minutes from the previous Study Board meeting were approved.

Ad 3) Group formation process for the 3rd semester

August Møller Roesen outlined the process for group formation in the 3rd semester. It was stated that, as a general rule, the groups are formed by the class instructors on the basis of topics. The purpose is to ensure that all students are placed in a group and that no one feels left behind.

It was also clarified that it would not be possible to change group or class afterwards.

The Study Board also discussed how information about group formation in the 1st semester can best be communicated to the students.

Ad 4) Review of the Student Environment Survey (SMU)

Thomas Laumark Hansen presented the results of the small-scale Student Environment Survey (SMU), which was described as a temperature check. It was noted that the two reports have different response rates, and that 40% of sociology students responded to the survey.

Overall, the survey did not give rise to alarming concerns, apart from a few issues relating to the physical study environment.

The Study Board then discussed existing and possible initiatives to strengthen the study environment, well-being, and inclusion. It was emphasized that positive initiatives are already under way, but also that several further initiatives still need to be developed and implemented.

Among the initiatives mentioned were office hours, where students can stop by to discuss both academic and academic-social issues, as well as efforts related to the challenges identified in the well-being report, including group formation and student associations.

The value of increased dialogue and more social activities was also highlighted, including graduation events, morning meetings for new students, and other initiatives that can strengthen students' sense of belonging to the programme.

It was also highlighted in the discussion that sociology is experienced as a study environment with a helpful culture, but that some students may still be reluctant to participate actively in class. Among other things, the need for safe settings, stronger communities across groups, and more academic and social activities was pointed out.

Students' concerns about job opportunities and relevant student jobs were also discussed. It was emphasized that sociology students do find employment, but that there is still room to clarify the different career paths to which the programme can lead.

SIDE 3 AF 5

Ad 5) Quality assurance in Sociology

Lasse Suonperä Liebst presented the work on quality assurance in Sociology and invited the Study Board to provide input on the core values and priorities.

The discussion included, among other things, wishes to reintroduce integrated examinations and an oral BA defence, as well as a more precise clarification of the programme's academic goals and expectations.

Challenges relating to active participation in class, the need for stronger academic and social communities, and better communication across year groups and between the BA and MA programmes were also pointed out.

In addition, questions were raised about exam pressure, the need for better coordination among instructors at the semester level, more concrete evaluation questions, and the appropriate timing of evaluations before exams.

Finally, it was noted that methodology electives may influence students' choice of methodological competencies and, in some cases, lead to perceptions of overlap in the syllabus. These viewpoints will be included in the continued quality assurance work.

Ad 6) Exemption application

The exemption application was approved. In this connection, the Study Board also discussed whether it is possible to have SPS support staff present in, for example, a supervision room. It was mentioned that students with special, documented circumstances should be encouraged to get in touch, and that this can be made clearer in communication to students.

Ad 7) New pensum rules for master students taking an undergraduate elective

The item was postponed until the next meeting.

Ad 8) Status of the merger between Department of Sociology and

Department of Anthropology

SIDE 4 AF 5

There was no significant new information to report regarding the merger between the Department of Sociology and the Department of Anthropology. However, possible opportunities for joint teaching were discussed, for example in philosophy of science or disciplinary history.

It was emphasized that some students are concerned about the study environment and active participation in teaching. As a possible model, a combination of shared lectures and smaller sociology classes was mentioned, which could support the academic environment. The possibility of a joint course in the 1st semester was also pointed out.

The Study Board emphasized the importance of paying attention to course content, literature, learning objectives, and competencies in any coordination with Anthropology, so that the academic profiles remain clear.

In connection with this, it was also noted that it is important to focus on how the different theoretical traditions are applied and communicated in teaching.

Ad 9) Briefing from the head of Study

There were no separate items under the briefing from the Head of Studies.

Ad 10) Briefing from chair of the Study Board

There were no separate items under the briefing from the Chair of the Study Board.

Ad 11) Briefing from deputy chair of the Study Board

The students reported on discussions concerning the criminology programme. It was mentioned that there is still limited awareness of the programme and that the combination of academic perspectives from sociology, anthropology, and law gave rise to methodological discussion.

Among other things, it was highlighted that there are cultural differences between students from Law and SAMF, but also that the project work format makes it possible to draw on instructors from both faculties. The discussion ended with agreement among the students.

Ad 12) Briefing from the student guidance

Student Guidance reported that there are many bookings from sociology students. On that basis, consideration was given to whether the students could be reached more appropriately through other forms of information and contact.

SIDE 5 AF 5

Ad 13) Any other business

The next meeting will be held on 19 June from 10:00 to 12:00.

/JSF 26.05.2026