FACULTY
OF SOCIAL
SCIENCES

LUND
UNIVERSITY

Evaluation of Master Programmes, including single subject courses on advanced level, in Sociology and Social Anthropology: Statement from external expert group

Assignment and external expert group

The assignment of the external expert group (see composition below) has been to evaluate the Master Programmes, including single subject courses on advanced level, in sociology and social anthropology. The evaluation is based on Lund University's eleven criteria for quality enhancement, with support from the Faculty of Social Sciences' instructions[1]. The assignment includes raising the strengths, challenges and development opportunities of the learning environment and the programmes.

Prior to the evaluation, the expert group were given access to LU Box with a large number of documents from the department and the faculty, including the department's self-assessment and input of students.

On May 17, 2022, a site visit was conducted (see appendix).

---

[1] *Instructions and procedures for programme evaluations by external experts at the Faculty of Social Sciences* (2021-02-04, reg. no STYR 2021/117) and *Instructions for external experts regarding programme evaluation at the Faculty of Social Sciences* (2021-02-04, reg. no STYR 2021/118)

The external expert group:

• Staffan Appelgren, associate professor of Social Anthropology, University of Gothenburg (chair of the expert group)

• Vanessa May, professor of Sociology, University of Manchester

• Linda Soneryd, professor of Sociology, University of Gothenburg

The main strengths and challenges of the programme, and the external expert group's reflections and recommendations

1. That the actual study results correspond to learning outcomes and qualitative targets

It is easy to agree with the identified strengths in the self-assessment under this criterion. The programmes include a variety of assessment forms, both individual and in groups, written and oral and an important feature is learning activities that promote critical and reflexive thinking and independently formulate questions for seeking further knowledge. The oral defence of the Masters' thesis offers good practice in presenting, defending and critiquing scholarly ideas. The programmes work towards striking balances between disciplinary depth and individual profiling, programme collaboration and specialization as well as eligibility and inclusiveness in admissions. From the perspective of this criterion this difficult balancing act often succeeds, but also generates some issues. Underpinning this general picture are undoubtedly the two most significant assets: very competent and committed teaching staff and highly motivated students. This overall impression is confirmed by the students who express a general satisfaction with the study process and results.

A systematic and detailed analysis of the study results of each course have not been possible, but generally the meeting of intended learning outcomes (ILOs) is embedded at the design stage of a course through the syllabus. The variety of assessments that seems typical of core/compulsory courses also indicates that pedagogical aims are driving here, which then feed into meeting ILOs. Students are well prepared in terms of having to attend compulsory seminars, being given clear guidance on how to prepare for lessons and for assessments.

A closer reading of course syllabi suggest that they could be placed more centrally in both the work of overall structuring of the programmes – interlinking courses and ensuring progression – and the design process of each course. Currently, the quality of syllabi varies, but there is evidence of short and general course descriptions as well as vague and general ILOs making them unfit for designing learning activities and assessments.

Furthermore, achieving the desired outcomes are complicated by small and diverse student cohorts and the structural flexibility of the programmes. Currently, these factors reinforce one another to produce challenges to develop learning activities and assessments that meet all students' needs, satisfy students expectations of disciplinary depth, specificity and identity, and giving clear guidance in suitable study paths in a wealth of electives.

2. That the programme focuses on students' learning

Teachers are competent and experienced in their discipline as well as in pedagogy and are continuously developing engaging learning activities. The programmes are well thought through in terms of progression. In addition, the variety of assessment methods means that students with diverse learning styles should be able to achieve success in their degrees. There is also plenty of evidence of encouraging independent learning, given the depth and breadth required in the assessments, which have again been well designed to target different types of learning (theoretical, methodological, research practice). There is evidence of genuinely student-led learning by giving students the responsibility of running seminars and discussions. Seminars and assignments in small groups are learning activities where everyone gets the chance to be active are examples of productive learning environments. However, with a diverse student body where some students are not familiar to this type of learning, there is a need for extra support to make sure no one is left behind.

Both programmes include within their compulsory courses the requirement that students learn to think in a rounded fashion, by having to defend/critique ideas regardless of their own opinions on the matter – this helps develop critical thinking as well as break down some closed-mindedness that we all share. Commendable is the inclusion of teamwork in the degree, as well as presentation skills.

Yet, the self-evaluation pinpoints a set of challenges related to the diverse background of the students. This is not surprising, since the student cantered pedagogy and the active learning environment of the programmes presume a particular academic habitus. Many students come with this, but for those who don't the initial learning curve can be steep, creating a sense of confusion and inability. The challenge identified in the self-evaluation is to provide supporting structures and activities that meet the varying need of the students despite limited resources while at the same time progressing in learning for the whole class. Not only must "weak" students study harder to catch up in the discipline-oriented knowledge, but also spend time (re-)learning the process of learning, including language use. This is an equation without an easy answer.

The short-term benefits of accepting a diverse student body to the programmes risk becoming long-term challenges if the department is not prepared to bear the additional cost of proper supporting structures. On the other hand, one might question if this can/should be 'fixed' at departmental level. Internationalisation of the student body, as one aspect of this, is no doubt a university-level objective, and brings with it predictable challenges. We raise this question since we think individualised 'study skills' approaches are not sufficient here. Addressing this will require extra resourcing (extra support, possibly 'crash courses') and strategic planning, including research into particular pedagogical issues, and how these could be resolved. This should be a problem for faculty or university to sort out, rather than individual departments.

3. That the programme is based on a scientific and/or artistic foundation and proven experience

The overall observation is that both MA-programmes are thoroughly based on scientific foundation and proven experiences. First, the department is a very qualified and internationally recognized research institution, housing excellent thematically organized research environments, numerous externally funded research projects and highly qualified teaching staff with extensive experience of research and actively publishing in international publications, which is confirmed in the RQ20 evaluation.

The documentation shows, and the site visit confirms, how this expertise translates into research-led teaching in the development of curricula, in learning

activities and in assessments of the MA-programmes. There are numerous examples pertaining to the learning activities, course readings, teachers' and supervisors' research expertise (including invited international guests, guest teachers and PhDs discussing their research) etc that proves the sound scientific ground of the programmes. There are also good examples of occasions when students are trained in scientific practices and skills, from critical debate and writing research proposals to independently designing, implementing and defending a research project and providing constructive criticism to a fellow student's thesis.

The self-evaluation singles out the modest participation of MA-students in the department research seminars as a challenge. MA-students during the site visit were not aware of such a possibility and neither did they see a substantial input from international guest researchers and PhD-students. This might have been due to accidental circumstances, but raises the general of how the activities that are planned have the outcomes that were intended.

4. That teaching staff, including supervisors, have appropriate expertise in terms of subject, teaching and learning in higher education and subject teaching as well as other relevant expertise, and that teaching capacity is sufficient

As noted in criterion 3, teaching staff in the MA-programmes, including supervisors, have extensive experience of research in their disciplines and continuously publish in international peer-reviewed journals. They hold PhD degrees in their disciplines and recently teaching staff with competence in both sociology and social anthropology has been hired, which can strengthen the ties between the disciplines and secure the quality of SASAN, as long as it does not infringe on hiring the most qualified staff. The team of thesis supervisors is very strong with the great majority holding associate professor positions.

The formal pedagogic training of the teaching staff centres around a 5-weeks course that is obligatory to all senior lecturers. It's not easy to estimate the levels of actual formal training among the teaching staff based on the documentation, but there is evidence of other paths as well as more extensive formal training both on teaching and supervising. One teacher is appointed "merited teacher", another has been on a committee on teaching excellence at another university.

The overall quality of the competence of teaching staff, both in their discipline and pedagogics, is echoed in the SASAN student evaluation and was confirmed during the site visit. Even if a frustration with the programme as such sometimes shines through, the students are very clear in their appraisal of teachers with praise that should make any teaching team proud.

The department is highlighting and addressing the staffing shortage within SASAN, which we think is a serious issue and needs further consideration. Social anthropology is understaffed by any measure, and there is an unsustainable teaching situation for the three senior lecturers that constitute the core teaching team for both the MA- and the BA-programmes in social anthropology, making SASAN vulnerable to sudden staffing changes. This is also counterproductive to an expansive staffing policy promoting research qualification and targeting broad academic excellence.

While the situation is serious in the case of SASAN, we also want to raise this issue in relationship to SASCO. We did not get a breakdown of workloads, but it seems as though the teaching load is quite high, especially as many of the core modules seem to be team-taught. This means that an individual member of staff might be involved in several courses across the year. We also note that there is a lot of assessment to get through – several per course. The RQ20 evaluation document does point to the fact that teaching staff are finding that their research time is shrinking, due to increased demands of teaching and administration. We think the proposed routine that director of studies ensures that teaching staff has uninterrupted research time is a good start and hope this can be implemented. Beyond the department, we urge the university to pay attention to and resolve this, or it will either see a drop-in research activity or teaching that is not as good quality, which might also lead to loss of good staff members.

5. That the programme is to be relevant for the students and meets the needs of society

The programmes offer flexibility to students to orient their degree for a career both inside and outside academia. In addition to generic academic skills and discipline specific skills that are valued on the general labour market, the rich possibilities for individually tailoring the education through electives, the extent of training in methods and the wealth of methods courses, and the internship and

fieldwork courses are all features of the programmes that contribute to the relevance for both individual students and for society in general.

The level of collaboration with external organisations in the delivery of internships is commendable. We think it is impressive how the programmes involve employers and alumni to ensure preparedness for the labour market. The rich network to actors and organizations outside academia through the Collaboration Council and the appointed Director of Collaboration are both very attractive features in making sure that the programmes meet the needs of society. We understand that these come out of establishing the BA-programmes. There is a great potential in this approach, and we wish that these collaborative initiatives continue to spill over in the revision of the MA-programmes. Currently, the Study Counsellor plays an active and important role through the Coordinated Career Activities Project and the ambitious monthly events with invited alumni guests, which in our experience is not easy to pull off with a high attendance rate. However, we feel that these great initiatives would yield even more productive results if they were more integrated into the everyday teaching activities.

The SASAN student evaluation is rather critical when it comes to this criterion. The students state that the programme "focuses on the tradition of anthropology" and that it "fails to address contemporary issues". We note that some emerging societal issues such as sustainability and decolonisation are not reflected in the programme curricula. This doesn't seem to be a consequence of the research profile of the department but rather due to structural issues slowing down the speed in which new topics are introduced in the programmes.

A case in point is the initial course of SASAN (SANN03), which features research-led teaching, explicitly stating that "the course layout and literature are adapted to the teacher's expertise and research interests". The first course of the programme might not be the ideal place for this approach, given the challenge of a very diverse student body, but should be useful to introduce later in the programmes to incorporate cutting-edge research and emerging societal challenges. Another option is to design the programmes more fully directed towards certain societal issues.

6. That the students and doctoral students have an influence on planning, implementation and follow up of the programme

The department has elaborate structures for student representation in education matters. The current MA-students are not very active in these channels, however. It is unclear why this is so. Similarly, the structures for course evaluation are good. Students are given the opportunity to evaluate courses in writing but often also orally. The respondence rates in the documentation are very low, questioning the value of this practice. This is further indicated in the lack of SASCO students' written input to this evaluation. It is therefore ensuring to see that the department has been successful in increasing respondence rates in the BA-programmes and hope to achieve the same effect in the MA-programmes. We think this is important to follow up as student input should be crucial to the process of revising the programmes.

Moreover, the student barometer document and the SASAN student evaluation indicate that students are not aware of what happens to their feedback in terms of future course development, nor are they aware of their ability to influence departmental issues (the latter perhaps no surprise given the lack of student representatives currently). SASAN students express that they communicate directly to teachers about content, but not in a structural and systematic way.

The lack of student representation in departmental preparatory bodies is a challenge, but it might be attributed to the relatively small cohorts in the programmes as well as to the diverse study paths and extensive individual study (internship and thesis writing) that the programmes offer. High student participation in programme development often comes with a strong sense of belonging that is fostered over time in a united student body with active inter-cohort exchange. With larger cohorts and directed initiatives to build "identity" this might improve.

Lastly, with the experience of the current evaluation in mind we would like to emphasise that we think a student representative in the expert group would have been valuable. We understand that this is due to faculty practice but would like to ask the faculty to reconsider this position.

7. That an appropriate study and learning environment is available to all and includes a well-functioning support system

There seems to be a robust and well-thought-out system for introducing students to the department and the programmes, and for supporting them throughout their studies. The handbook, the mentoring service (we hope to see this in SASAN as well) and library introductions are all good initiatives for a smooth transition into the programme. Support systems at university (including academic support, health, chaplaincy and union) faculty and department level all seems appropriate. At the department level structures for study and career guidance is commendable.

However, the student barometer document would indicate that most students are either not aware of much of this activity, or have not made use of it, which was confirmed during the site visit. This might not be an indication of a problem; it might just be that students have not felt in need of such support. Getting a clear picture of this seems important given the context of a diverse student body and the aim to improve integration and inclusion of international students.

In the SASAN student evaluation the students make a clear distinction between the psycho-social environment which they appreciate, and the physical environment which they feel is lacking, in particular the provisioning of study places. This is echoed in the student barometer document that indicates that students would like to see improvement in terms of ventilation, acoustics and access to power points. Over 30% think internet access is not good.

8. That there is continuous follow up and development of the programme

Continuous development of the MA-programmes during the last few years have affected by the pandemic, the intensive work to develop two new BA-programmes and the postponed hiring of a professor in social anthropology. The response in the student evaluation is short regarding this criterion; they haven't seen much and feel they don't have much input in the process except in conversations with teachers.

Clearly, the department is now picking up the slack. SASAN has made important changes, there is a new routine for course evaluations and the proposal to introduce annual programme evaluations is promising (it could become a burden on staff time, though). One benefit of occasional more in-depth evaluations would be to ensure that the programmes overall represent cutting edge scholarly

work and addresses important societal issues. If the department can engage a student representative from the MA-programmes, that would also be helpful.

This evaluation comes at a point when the department is about to make major revisions of the MA-programmes, so we are convinced that the routines and structures surrounding continuous follow up and development will be reintroduced and enhanced as part of this process.

9. That internationalisation and an international perspective is promoted in the programme

There are numerous ways in which internationalisation and an international perspective is promoted in the programmes. With the switch to English the programmes have been internationalised attracting an increasing number of international students, particularly SASAN. The teaching staff has become increasingly international, and in their research, work, collaborate and publish internationally. There are continuously international exchanges in both research and educational, including two double degree programmes with international university partners. Lastly, there is an appointed Director of Internationalisation.

Internationalisation has also created some challenges. Most notably, the dependency on international applications to the MA-programmes has made them vulnerable, not least during the pandemic, with a very high number of applicants, good number of admitted students, but low number of registered students. Moreover, pedagogic and social challenges come with the diverse student body with varying skillsets in the discipline, in language and in learning culture. As the department has the ambition to attract even more international students it is important to establish the support structures that make this feasible, not to solve short-term problems (student volume) by creating long-term problems.

A general reflection is that rather than asking if internationalisation and an international perspective is promoted a more productive question is to ask what kind of internationalization is promoted, and what is being marginalized and silenced. This question can be raised when it comes to staff (where and how are positions announced?), students (how to recruit internationally?), exchanges and collaboration (what parts of the world do we want to target?) and curricula (what parts of the world are represented and what are not?).

A related question to ask is what the goals of internationalisation are. If they are to raise more revenue for the university, then the university might consider hiring new, international staff. If they are to improve the intellectual quality of work, then the department might wish to consider whether there is anything they would like to do to change how the department might be viewed by prospective students. There is also the history of social anthropology conducting research 'elsewhere', while sociologists tend to address burning issues at home. If sociology feels more 'Swedish', that is perhaps not something that should be changed, given the role that sociology as a discipline plays in society. In other words, sociological research on Swedish issues is vital for the wellbeing of Swedish society.

10. That gender equality and equal opportunities perspectives are integrated in the programme

Gender equality and equal opportunities are part of the work environment policy at the department and there is a specific task force (the JOL-group) working with these issues. There is plenty of expertise regarding equality and equal opportunities at the department, and these issues are taken seriously. Still, as in the case of internationalization, it is worthwhile to continuously scrutinize *how* the MA-programmes are structured in unequal ways. In the reports produced by the task force it is repeatedly stated that the department needs to address the gender inequality in terms of who teaches at what level and in the course literature. We are not sure how these issues are being addressed and what the results has been. The self-evaluation stops at mentioning some of the initiatives, like the JOL-group, the HBTQ-network and the template for reading lists, as well as giving some statistics on men and women in various capacities – we note the gender imbalance at the top level of staff. Given the expertise available at the department we are sure that these complex social issues are worked with in more advanced and nuanced ways.

The SASAN student evaluation express strongly that gender equality is discussed regularly in their courses. At the same time there is a critique of what is termed a focus on "traditional" social anthropology and the reading lists of course sections covering the classics tend to be male dominated.

11. That subject-relevant perspectives on sustainable development are promoted in the programme

The self-evaluation document makes a good case for the existence of social sustainability in the programme, and the work here is commendable. Still, we think there is every reason to think that the MA-programmes would benefit greatly from pushing the issue of environmental sustainability and integrated sustainability further and more explicitly. The self-evaluation indicates that ecological sustainability is currently not an area of strength in research. This might be a field that the department would like to consider strengthening. This could be done through collaboration with other departments or centres at the university. To establish thematically oriented study-paths can be one way to integrate sustainability more fully into the MA-programmes. Ecological or integrated sustainability could be one theme that students can choose from early in the programme, and then follow a study path with recommended courses to get that profile. This would also answer to the SASAN students' request to make the programmes more contemporary and even future oriented.

Summarised views and recommendations

The department has high aspirations for the MA programmes and aims at making them internationally known as programmes that excel in preparing students for doctoral degrees and advanced work tasks outside academia. With very competent and committed teaching staff, highly motivated students, well-functioning supporting structures and progressive leadership, the department clearly has the capacity to live up to its aspirations.

It is commendable to offer two discipline-oriented MA-programmes, one in sociology and one in social anthropology, when most MA-programmes today are thematically organized and interdisciplinary. The programmes offer students deep and broad knowledge and understanding of these two disciplines along with general analytical and methodological skills. This is particularly valuable for students opting for a career in academia but also of great value for students pursuing a career outside academia. When the department now is about to enter a phase of major revisions, after the pandemic and intensive work to develop new BA-programmes, we think it is an excellent opportunity to take stock and

formulate new visions for the MA-programmes to guide the work and we hope that the evaluation and its recommendation can contribute to this process.

First, we want to emphasise the great fortune of being in a position of having two international discipline-specific MA-programmes. This is even more fortunate when considering that we are living in a world facing several crucial global challenges where sociological and anthropological knowledge and competences are of very high relevance. The department, with its collaborative partners, can give a new generation of students valuable tools for analysing and engaging in ongoing global economic, social and ecological processes.

A first step would be to ask the fundamental questions: Why are we doing this? What role do the department want the MA-programmes and their students to play in these developments? How can the MA-programmes be of crucial relevance for the society and to individuals today? And finally; How can we achieve these goals? The answers to these questions can constitute the foundation of new visions for the MA-programmes. These visions should say something about what a MA in sociology and social anthropology is, can and does and what their relevance is in the world today. This should be made explicit and clearly communicated inside and outside the department and guide the work to implement revisions, to decide on what thematic directions to take, to engage with partners outside academia to establish a collaborative network.

Taking these steps will also address the main themes raised by students. They clearly state that they want more discipline-specific knowledge, more concrete analytical and methodological tools for grappling with contemporary issues and be more involved in the development of the programmes. Developing clear visions for the MA-programmes will not only meet these requests, but also have the potential to attract new cohorts of students internationally, in turn solving some of the issues raised in the self-evaluation regarding the number of registered students, level of retention and diversity in previous knowledge among students.

Recent years have been very productive at the department with two new discipline-specific BA-programmes. This has developed an ethos of collaboration between the disciplines and helped establish structures for collaboration with society. During the same time work pressure has doubtlessly

increased, so it is advisable to keep that in mind. Still, our recommendation is to continue building on these experiences and implementing similar collaborative structures within the MA-programmes. We envision two MA-programmes that are both academic and applied, but always open and relevant to the needs of contemporary society; that provide both disciplinary depth and identity as well as thematic and methodological breadth; that are permeated with collaboration, between the programmes, with the Graduate School (and other local departments) and partners outside academia.

Specific recommendations

Work with a similar care for staff welfare, as is being done with student welfare. Growing administrative routines, recent development of two new BA-programmes the COVID pandemic have all require significant input in terms of time and effort from staff. This should be kept in mind when embarking on revisions of the MA-programmes.

Hire more teaching staff in social anthropology. Running high quality discipline-specific programmes at all three cycles, require more teachings staff than 1 professor and 3 senior lecturers.

Develop a long-term **strategy for achieving a better gender-balance** at the top level of staff (professors and associate professors).

Identify the specific competences and skills of the MA graduates in sociology and social anthropology respectively. These need to be clearly formulated among teachers and communicated to students and partners outside academia. This can preferably be done on a national level through the national disciplinary associations.

Systematically work with collaborative and applied perspectives in all parts of the programmes. Rather than "outsourcing" collaboration, career-planning and alumni activities to the Director of Collaboration and the Study Counsellor, they should involve the teaching teams to integrate these perspectives in the pedagogic design and everyday pedagogic activities.

Bring the issue of international internship closer to home (easier said than done). Collaboration needs to be brought closer to the educational core of the

programmes. Personal relations seem crucial in establishing close and living international networks of collaboration between academic and non-academic partners. Leadership, teachers, researchers, student counsellor, alumni and students need all be involved in growing and maintaining this network.

Make internationalisation issues part of the curricula by designing learning activities addressing them. Varying disciplinary competence, learning styles and communicative abilities are not just "problems", but dimensions of everyday social life that students in sociology and social anthropology need to be skilled at analysing and handling.

SASCO and SASAN collaboration can be developed further in terms of the pedagogic environment to develop a set of best practice that can be implemented in both programmes. For example, SASCO and SASAN seem to have different pedagogic approaches in their respective first course with different results.

(Re-) start a pedagogic seminar to draw on the experiences from the new BA-programmes. The transition from free-standing courses to programmes fosters a collaborative mindset working in teaching teams with cohorts of students staying for an extended time at the department, which the MA-programmes can benefit from.

Issues related to **the learning process of the diverse student body** can be approached by making several small adjustments: stricter definition of disciplinary background for eligibility, clearer expectations of crucial competences (independent learning, critical thinking, academic writing and debating), strategic strengthening of supporting structures to meet individual needs.

Base pedagogic development in syllabi and constructive alignment to identify clear ILOs for each course and the learning activities and assessments to meet these goals, dialectically relating each goal to the overall structure of the whole programme and national learning outcomes.

Open the programme structure for introducing emerging research themes at appropriate stages.

Follow-up on the extent **guest researchers and PhD students actually are part of the curricula** and to what extent MA-students participate in these and other research activities, such as research seminars, to ensure the degree of this.

Develop the structure of the MA-thesis writing course, by adopting elements from the PhD-thesis writing process such as a milestone draft seminar, or by organizing writing workshops ("Pomodoro") where MA-students, supervisors, other teachers/researchers and PhD-students are all invited to work on their own writing projects. This generates a professional environment that fosters both writing skills and a sense of community.

Schedule the research seminars to encourage participation of MA-students and discuss seminar "culture" at the department to work towards an including environment. The previously mentioned writing workshops can help in establishing an inclusive academic atmosphere that spills into the prestigious and codified settings of research seminars.

Address the problem of early classics being male dominated by introducing critical feminist literature along with decolonial/postcolonial critiques on these classics.

Develop incentives for students to engage as student representatives. These engagements foster skills that are valuable on the labour market (and should go into CVs and be included in letters of recommendation).

Involve students in the development of courses by communicating how previous years' student feedback has helped shape the content, delivery and modes of assessment.

Follow up on to how students are made aware of various support systems and to what extent this is delivered to gauge the match between student need for support and the availability of and appropriateness of support.

Address issues in the physical environment, in particular the lack of study places.

Appendix: programme for site visit

May 17, 2022, Department of Sociology, Lund University

8.30-9.00   MA-students
Participants: Yannick Deller (SASAN), Laurine Palomba (SASAN) and Linnea Karlsson
(SASCO)

9.10-9.40   PhD-students
Participants: Linn Alenius Wallin (SOC)

9.50-10.40   MA Teaching staff
Participants SASCO: Chares Demetriou, Dalia Abdelhady, Britt-Marie Johansson and
Christopher Swader
Participants SASAN: Tova Höjdestrand, Nina Gren and Ulf Johansson Dahre

10.50-11.20   Director of studies and supervisors, Ph D Programmes
Participants: Sara Eldén (director of studies), David Wästerfors (supervisor SOC), Åsa
Lundqvist (supervisor SOC), Nina Gren (SAN)

11.30-12.00   Study counsellor and student administration
Participants: Susanne Lindberg (admin SASCO + PhD), Christian (admin SASAN) and
Britt-Marie Rönn (study counsellor SASCO and SASAN)

12.00-13.00   Lunch

13.00-14.00   Department and programme leadership
Participants: Lisa Eklund (head of department), Mikael Klintman (vice head of
department with responsibility for research), Mimmi Barmark (director of study
sociology and BA education), Sara Eldén (director of studies Phd programmes), Chares
Demetriou (programme coordinator SASCO), Tova Höjdestrand (programme
coordinator and director of studies SASAN), Magnus Ring (work environment
representative and director of internationalization).

14.10-14.40   Tour of facilities
Participants: Lisa Eklund, Mimmi Barmark and Magnus Ring

14.50-15.50   Expert group work

16.00-16.30   Feedback to department leadership
Participants: Lisa Eklund, Mikael Klintman, Sara Eldén, Mimmi Barmark and Tova
Höjdestrand