

## **Programme evaluation of PhD education in Political Science: Statement from the external expert group**

### **Assignment and external expert group**

The assignment of the external expert group (see composition below) was to evaluate the PhD education in Political Science. The evaluation was based on Lund University's eleven criteria for quality enhancement, with support from the Faculty of Social Sciences' instructions<sup>1</sup>. The assignment included raising the strengths, challenges and development opportunities of the learning environment and the programme/programmes.

Prior to the evaluation, the expert group had 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/doctoral students.

The expert group conducted a site visit February 26-27, 2020 (see the program in appendix).

The composition of the external expert group was:

- Professor PerOla Öberg, Uppsala University (chair of the expert group)
- Professor Åsa von Schoultz, University of Helsinki
- Professor Ellen Immergut, European University Institute & Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (on leave)

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

The department of political science provided the necessary conditions to perform the evaluation according to the instructions. The required documents have been available in due time and the site visit was well organized. The department has been

---

<sup>1</sup> *Instructions and procedures for programme evaluations by external experts at the Faculty of Social Sciences (2019-09-19, reg. no STYR 2019/1232) and Instructions for external experts regarding programme evaluation at the Faculty of Social Sciences (2019-09-19, reg. no STYR 2019/1262)*

very helpful in providing all requested additional documents, and has sincerely and honestly answered questions from the expert group. Even though there have been practical restrictions that must be taken into account, for example that the short site visit makes it possible to talk to only a limited number of staff and students, the expert group is satisfied with conditions for the evaluation process and has been able to form a well-founded opinion on how the program works.

Based on the available information, our overall assessment is that the PhD program in Political Science at Lund University works excellently. The supervising capacity in most areas is of a very high international standard, the organization and the management of the program is very good, and the collegial involvement and attention to all parts of the program, in combination with an openness to further improvement is impressive. The tendencies for specialization and fragmentation prevalent at many political science departments elsewhere, have so far not affected the PhD program to a large extent. These pivotal factors are to be considered as strengths of the program, and constitute a foundation for a productive and encouraging environment for PhD students, as well as for high quality learning outcomes.

The department provided the expert group with a very informative self-assessment that in itself mirrors the well-organized program and illustrates a capacity for self-reflection. In this document, the department has identified some areas for improvement, which we agree that the department should continue to consider, for example potential vulnerability in supervisor capacities in the future, and risk of imbalances in the management structure. We will however not repeat all these important self-reflections. Furthermore, we will not repeat all the detailed information provided in the self-assessment on how the program is organized. Our overall conclusion is that everything works well, or very well. Instead the expert group wants to emphasize aspects that we recommend the department to further deliberate over, in order to fine-tune the program. First, we will share our reflections following the recommended structure of the evaluation. We end with a summary of our recommendations.

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

The instructions for the expert group is that it should not evaluate actual study results as expressed, for example, in the quality of dissertations. It is clear, however, from the alumni survey and from other knowledge available, that the program provides students with skills that make them well equipped for life after the program. The department has educated several top-level researchers as well as civil servants in other occupations. Almost all alumnus report that their current assignments correspond to their level of education. There is, however, less satisfaction with the relevance of the course offer, which we comment more on below in the report.

The department has an explicitly and shared strategy to educate generalists that in addition to produce high quality dissertations based on specialist knowledge, should be able to understand different theoretical perspectives and methods. This policy permeates strategic discussions at the department regarding the program, and is important for the cohesiveness of the program based on inclusive procedures involving all of the department staff. Hence, management and staff discuss and design the courses, seminars and processes that support the students in their work on the dissertation in relation to stipulated learning targets.

The throughput of the program is excellent. Since 2010, 37 candidates have received a doctoral degree. The average gross time to graduation is 6.5 years, but the net time is significantly lower with an average of 4.67 years. These numbers clearly indicate the efficiency, and perhaps of the competitiveness, of the program. The threshold for admittance is very high, and those doctoral candidates that enter the program tend to be highly motivated and ambitious. Clearly, the program is organized in a way that allows the students to fulfill their ambitions and there are processes in place to handle challenges that may arise over the course of the four to five years.

The conclusion is that the political science department should be able to systematically compare itself and compete with other top-ranked departments in the Nordic countries or even at top-European level. However, the management does not have a clear target for benchmarking. We encourage the department to discuss whether a benchmarking process where it explicitly compares itself with and targets itself to achieve the quality at other top-universities in Europe would be helpful in ambitions to retain or strengthening its position.

## **2. That the programme focuses on students'/doctoral students' learning**

The external expert group is convinced that students' learning is in focus of the program, and not for example senior researchers own carriers. The collegial engagement and responsibility for admittance of applicants to the program, the organization of the program, assignment of supervisors, as well as evaluation processes of ongoing work permeates that attitude. In addition, the department uses the individual study plan in a more active way than many other departments, which also emphasizes a focus on the students' learning.

The programme's courses and requirements do indeed focus on the key learning objectives for PhD Researchers in Political Science. The external expert group is however surprised that this attitude, and the inclusive discussions about the program, have not resulted in a well thought out policy for course offers. The department has already started to reflect over this situation and have set up a working group with the assignment to make suggestions regarding the course structure. This group has an important task. As of now, it is not very clear how the department has organized the first year, why certain courses are mandatory, or when and why the (non-mandatory) reading courses should be included in the program. It is unclear or a matter of disagreements within faculty whether the reading courses should add to students general or special skills. In addition, faculty and students agree that courses taken jointly with students from other departments are a waste of time. The department could disseminate relevant knowledge on these subjects more efficiently, such as within activities organized by the introductory team. The external expert group concludes that there is room for improvement in this regard. The department should discuss a clear vision for the course offer, especially for year one. One option to consider is to have a first year with mandatory courses that includes broad courses on theory and methods, and still provide time for students to prepare their research plan in an organized way. The external expert group recommends that the department include the current methods courses in a mandatory block in year one, but also to consider to complement these courses with a theory course. What are now optional courses, often in the form of reading courses, could be included as work on the dissertation unless there is a clear idea for the current organization of the program. This would mean that the department could encourage students to take

additional courses, organize reading groups or write review papers on prior research that supports the thesis without students getting credits for it. Rather, it would be considered as necessary work on the dissertation and therefore included in the 180 hp credit for the thesis. One of the advantages would be that such additional work would not have to be artificially formalized and adjusted to specific credits that the student need for the exam, but adapted to what is required to write a good thesis.

The compulsory methods course is very broad, covering methods ranging from interpretative approaches used in Political Theory and discourse analysis to quantitative statistical analyses. This broad and diverse approach is in line with the department's commitment to training generalists in Political Science and its dedication to a pluralism in theory, substance, and methods. The faculty recognizes that such a course is only a starting point and must be supplemented with opportunities for more specialized and in-depth training.

The applied methods course responds to the particular needs of each cohort of researchers and allows them to pursue tailor-made hands-on methods training. Furthermore, researchers are encouraged to apply to summer and winter schools, and to participate in regional and Sweden-wide doctoral research training activities. The assessment committee also supports such activities and views regional networks—e.g. with Copenhagen or Aarhus—as promising for in-depth methods and theoretical enrichment activities.

Further, the committee supports the department's initiative to develop a mandatory theory course, given in the first semester of the programme. A broad theory course, giving students an introduction to and an overview of different theoretical perspectives in Political Science, can further strengthen the pluralistic ambition of the programme. Moreover, by organizing it in the course in the first semester, it can contribute to a more coherent and structured first year, and give less emphasis to the courses provided by the Faculty.

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

The well-organized program that involves many faculty members which themselves produces top-class research guarantees a program based on scientific foundation. In addition, the department has several advisory bodies were active researcher discuss important aspects of the program. The many theoretical and methodological perspectives at the department imply that students find themselves embedded in ongoing discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches. In addition, all students participate in continuous discussions and seminars at the department, with vast opportunities to present preliminary findings and receive comments on drafts.

The different milestones are pivotal for control, and development of the scientific quality of the theses. The students present their drafts three times during the program. These occasions are points of evaluation, but students still find them constructive and helpful and that it contributes to less, rather than more stress. Students present a research plan at a seminar with participation from faculty members after their first year, and this is followed by a presentation of a second draft when the thesis is slightly more than half way. Not only specialists within the field participates in these seminars. After the seminar, the supervisors generally have a follow-up meeting with

the student where they together discuss and draw conclusions from the discussion, and decide whether input from seminar participants should affect the overall structure and content of the thesis. These procedures seem to work very well since faculty members collegially participates in the seminars and because supervisors—at least based on information available to the expert group—willingly do their job.

The expert group understand that it is important to be careful and not damage valuable norms by introducing unnecessary formal regulations. Still, the department should be aware that this procedure might come under stress in the future. Hence, in order to make sure that the milestones continue to function as the quality controls, and as guarantees for a program based on scientific foundation, the expert group encourage the department to consider formalizing instructions for these procedures. As of now, it is sometimes unclear to faculty members and students if the conclusion from the seminar is to proceed as intended or if adjustments are necessary. Formalised meetings after the halfway seminar could include a (more) formal decision on whether the student is entitled to a rise in salary, and involve the Director of PhD studies to provide in-depth knowledge of the situation.

The expert group recommends reconsideration of the procedures for the other milestones as well. The procedure after the seminar on the research proposal could include collegial decisions on whether the proposal is accepted without revisions or not, and if ethical reviews are needed. These decisions should then be clearly communicated to the student. The procedure for the internal examination in the final stage of the program can be more specified. There seem to be a general agreement over what a dissertation “ready for defence” implies, and the expert group has not noticed any problems in this regard. Still, this formulation might be interpreted in various ways by faculty members now or in the future. Is a thesis *not* ready for defence when it is easy to improve it, even though it would pass as it is? A clarification or definition of this would assure that supervisors treat all PhDs in a similar fashion, and that they are not left out to a particular faculty member’s interpretation of the instruction.

#### **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**

The capacity for supervising and teaching is very good. As emphasized before, the scientific quality of a significant share of the staff is by international standards very high. All supervisors are at least *docent*, and they are all active researchers. The department can assign qualified supervisors to all students even though the admittance procedure is not primarily based on matching students with supervising capacity, but to admit students to the program that have novel ideas too. Based on the information available to the expert group, the students seems overall satisfied with supervisors.

There seems however to be some clouds on the horizon. Some sub-subjects at the department have traditionally attracted more students, and there are tendencies of fragility in other parts that may cause problems in the future. The department could reflect more seriously about its research profile and possible gaps in order to provide strategic guidance to future recruitment of faculty and researchers. Another aspect to consider is if the department should open up the opportunity to assign more than

two supervisors to student if there are specific needs for expertise that the other two supervisors are lacking.

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

The external expert group has not evaluated the content or the focus of dissertations. A clear impression is however that the political science department at Lund University engages with important issues of our time and as such contributes to the needs of society.

The expert group noted, however, that—in parallel to other political science departments at the larger universities—most PhDs prefer to continue their career within academia. This is, for example displayed clearly in the alumni survey. The political science departments have a responsibility to help supply organizations also outside academia with well-educated staff to “meet the needs of society”. The department have already taken steps to inform their students about alternative careers for example within international organisations or public administration, but the department also acknowledges that these activities can be improved. The expert group encourages the department to explore novel and more efficient ways to inform students about alternative careers.

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

The students can influence their situation in several different ways, especially through their local association of PhD students and by representation in the department board. The overall impression is that the management, faculty members and administration are willing to listen, and are responsive to arguments put forward by the students. As also indicated in the alumni survey report, students can influence assignments of supervisors, their choice of theme for the thesis, as well as their organisation of everyday work.

There are, however, some room for improvement when it comes to the transparency needed for students to use their channels for influence efficiently. The students find some processes less transparent than desired, for example decisions about resources for expenses, how the department assigns supervisors to students, and procedures for changing supervisors.

To some extent, this situation is due to an information deficit that the department needs address. Some, but not all processes are formalised on paper in detail, see for example about milestones above. In addition, many of the documents that regulate the program are not easy to find and are therefore unknown, at least to Phd students. The expert group wants to highlight that these instructions are useful, and that their existence shows that the program is well organised in details. This includes several of the important and useful documents provided to the expert group, for example “Policy for Project PhD Students”, “Doktorander som inte blir klara i tid – stöd och åtgärder”, Guidelines for Monographs/compilation theses”, and “Riktlinjer hållpunktsseminarier”. At the same time, the expert group recommends that the department merge all relevant instructions to one coherent document and make that document easily available to all.

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

The students are well equipped with office space including computer facilities etcetera from day one. Based on the work environment survey, students in general appear to be satisfied with the physical work environment. First year students share an office. This seems generally unproblematic (and necessary due to scarcity of offices). At the same time, the department should consider if it is possible to provide office spaces for students that *temporarily* need to focus on specific tasks in a secluded and quiet space.

The organization overseeing the work environment is adequate with a clear division of responsibilities formalized in a specific document (dated 2019-12-10). While the deputy Head of Department is responsible for issues related to employment (that is HR-issues), the Director of PhD studies handles issues related to the actual program (such as advice the students regarding courses). This division runs the risk of being unclear to students regarding where they should turn in certain issues or that some aspects of the program fall between the cracks. However, in this case it seems that the communication between persons in different roles work well and that it instead gives students more possibilities to discuss potential problems and guarantees that the department don't neglect work environment issues. The individuals in liable positions seems to be competent, dedicated and properly supported by the department management.

The department calls students and actively encourage them to participate in yearly employee review talks that seems well-organized and aimed at capturing also more sensitive issues such as how students experience supervising. The department has a strong support system focused in particular on reducing and helping doctoral researchers to cope with stress, such as taking advantage of their right to sickness and parental leaves. The department's policy is to inform students that they should take a sick leave if they cannot perform their job due to health issues. This is important since students otherwise might find themselves in a situation later when they are out of funding before they have finished their thesis. While long-term sick leave was a problem some years ago indicating structural problems with the program, the situation now is better with few cases of sick leave related to the program. However, general stress is still an issue, but the department have initiates several measures to actively mitigate the problem. It is particularly worth mentioning that the department deals explicitly with, and openly discuss, common problems for PhD students such as writer's block and procrastination that in other environments might be hidden problems since it is often deeply personal and therefore sensitive.

The department provides significant language instruction and encourages the integration of non-Swedish students into departmental life. As emphasized by the students and recognized by the department management, this is however still a challenge to the department. Given that the working language is English, the problem relates more to social integration than to conditions to take advantage of the education on the program. There seems to be confusion over whether all communication is in English or not. While the management say it is, the students still points out that this is not the case.

The Department helps researchers to apply for financial support for attending conferences and external courses, as well as carrying out research, including from the generously financed Fahlbeckska stiftelsen. In addition, each researcher is provided with funds (Skr 40 000) for these purposes. Students connected to external projects have an advantage compared to other students. However, this potential inequality is mitigated by the fact that when other sources are inadequate, the department steps in to fill the gap. Exactly how this process works is not totally transparent which is a matter of discussion amongst students.

The department should clarify the need for balance between teaching and research for doctoral candidates, and provide more structured mentoring and introduction to teaching for doctoral researchers. All teachers are included in teaching teams where some mentoring for unexperienced teachers take place, which is very good and important. The expert group has not been able to investigate how well this works in practice, but have reasons to believe that it varies some between teaching groups. As students have attended many classes themselves, they might join the current courses even without prior teaching experience. They would profit from hearing about the problems encountered by others. Furthermore, if a course or workshop on teaching were to be offered to first year researchers (possibly even as part of the induction seminar), there might be less of a push for teaching experience at this very early stage when the development of the research plan should take higher priority. The expert group recommend the department to include a discussion over the policy for students teaching during year one at the same time as it reconsiders the structure of courses during year one.

It is not entirely clear to the students how the department assign teaching tasks, which has spurred a discussion about whether there are back doors to teaching for some students creating inequalities. In spite of efforts to clarify the situation, the students still find it difficult to overview teaching opportunities. According to the department management, this is mainly a matter of information deficit. The director of undergrad studies is in charge of distribution and organization of teaching and is entitled to take all decisions about teaching assignments, exactly in order to avoid the problems raised. The expert group encourage continued exchange of views where it is in particular important for the department management to explain the difficulties associated with the planning of teaching that in fact all faculty might experience. However, it is also important that students can contribute with information to identify the reasons for their worries in spite of a clear division of labor and available information about teaching possibilities. The department should also consider if liable persons pay enough attention to teaching assignments and students teaching performances in follow-up talks with supervisors, with Director of PhD studies, and in the employment reviews. An important source of uncertainty identified by the expert group may be the fact that the department houses more than one subject, and that the Peace and Conflict unit assigns teaching through a parallel organization. The department should make sure that it implements the same principles for all students independent of whether they teach political science or peace and conflict. Otherwise, the department might treat students unequal and principles aimed to help students, such as that they should not be assigned to heavy teaching, might be difficult to implement.

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

As should be clear from comments under other headings, there are manifold ways in which the program is continuously evaluated. Standard course evaluations, the different milestones, and the employment review talks are important components for feedbacks.

In addition, supervisors meet yearly to review the status of all students on the program. It is the expert groups understanding that these meetings work well with opportunities to discuss also sensitive details (although not too personal) in an inclusive, collegial way.

The initiative taken by the department to perform an alumni survey, the ambitious interviews with peers responsible for PhD programs at other universities, as well as the preparatory work with the self-evaluation document, all clearly indicates that the department is willing and has the ability to engage in serious self-reflection.

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

The degree of internationalisation in the programme is very high. Most supervisors have international networks and address their research primarily or exclusively to an international audience. All recently admitted and currently active students write their dissertations in English and present drafts at international conferences. A specific program for visiting PhD students contribute to scholarly exchanges with possibilities for students to build international networks with their peers that might in the future have important positions at other universities. The working language at the department is English, which means that seminars and teaching is in English. Hence, the departments research and PhD program is in every sense internationally oriented (and it would be overkill to promote an international perspective more). It might instead be important to question whether the department should promote a Swedish perspective (more) in order to have students contributing to Swedish debates and prepare for work in Swedish organizations (too) outside academia.

The clearest indicator of the internationalization is the large number of non-Swedish applicants and the number of non-Swedish recruitments. Over the last five years, the international share of both applicants and accepted students has increased significantly, and in the previous intake in 2019, only one out of five accepted students had Swedish citizenship. And while many of the international students that are granted admission to the programme have a degree from a Swedish university, this is far from the rule; since 2016, 9 out of 20 accepted applicants, had a degree from a foreign university. Internationalisation is also apparent within the programme, where students are encouraged to (and do) take courses abroad, participate in international conferences and to spend a period as guest researcher at a university abroad.

While the programme clearly excels when it comes to internationalization, it also appears to be a source of tension in the working environment. As is noted in the self-assessment, the working language of the programme is English, but the inflow of doctoral students with a non-Swedish background also has an impact on the language policy of the department at large. In order to integrate the English-speaking students in the working environment there is a constant need for adaption, at informal, as well as formal occasions. Our impression is that the department takes these language

related issues seriously, and strive towards a situation in which all doctoral students have the same possibilities for taking part in decision-making, teaching and to be socially included. We acknowledged that this is not an easy task, but encourage the department to continue to work on these issues, and to see to it that all doctoral candidates, irrespectively of their language, are provided with equal opportunities.

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

The department has a very active committee for gender equality, integration and equal treatment that critically scrutinizes the program and gives recommendations in which the students are also involved. The committee has initiated ambitious plans for equal opportunity work at the department, adopted by the board. The plan includes evaluation tools for research and teaching that is well adapted to university functions and is therefore used. The instrument consists of questions that all employees need to ask themselves when they perform teaching (and other) tasks. The management explicitly support the work of the committee and faculty members acknowledge it without resistance or suspicion that observers often find elsewhere. This have for example spurred an inclusive debate on gendered course literature where the department board has taken decisions that teachers need to take gender balance into account when course literature is selected.

There is gender balance among supervisors and there seems not to be any obvious gendered pattern in how supervisors and students collaborate; many supervisor teams consist of both a male and a female, and there are several examples of male students supervised by two female supervisors. This balance mirrors also in teaching assignments on PhD level, since students meet teachers of both genders at their mandatory courses the first year.

The gender balance in the programme can be considered very good. Since 2012, 15 of the 31 accepted students has been men. There is however a tendency towards another skewed gender distribution than we historically have seen at the department, with 9 out of 12 accepted students being women in the last three rounds of applications.

The conclusion is that the department has well integrated gender equality and equal opportunity issues into the program. As emphasized above, integrating non-Swedish speakers, especially socially, is still a challenge to the department.

According to the information provided, female students take longer parental leave compared to male students, a pattern well known in the current society and not significant to the department. Still, since there are reasons to believe that transformation costs when returning to work relates to the time of leave, this fact produces inequality between women and men. This is due to norms and other circumstances and the department may contribute to deliberation about this situation, but changes are most likely not to happen in a near future. Therefore, the expert group encourages the department to discuss if there are reasons to better support students that return from parental leave for example by providing extra time for repatriating to work. This can be important for all students, but also mitigate a gender inequality that have direct impact on conditions to perform on the program.

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

The department does not have an explicit strategy to implement sustainable development issues in the program. Research on environmental issues does however have a strong presence at the department, which indicates that this is a perspective that students will meet in many forms as integrated parts of the program, and which makes plans and strategies redundant. Furthermore, some students are connected to one of the two graduate schools that focus on environmental issues, and the department offer courses specializing on environmental policy.

### Summarised evaluation and recommendations

The external expert group wants to emphasize once more that the PhD program at the department of political science at Lund University works excellently. The high quality of supervising and the collegial care of the program and of PhD students is impressive. The department has a clear division of labour connected to responsibilities and there are standard procedures that regulates most important parts of the program. Still, the expert group believe that there is room for improvements even at this level of high-quality performance. Well aware of the fact that the department most likely already solidly deliberated over most aspects of the program and have decides against some of our recommendations for good reasons, we still recommend the department to consider or reconsider the following suggestions:

- Base discussions over future strategies on explicit benchmarking with other top-performing departments in the Nordic countries or central Europe
- Work out a well thought out policy for mandatory and elective courses and how year one on the program should be organised
- Consider a policy for students' teaching during year one, and how it can be combined with courses and activities of the introductory team
- Consider including a mandatory theory course
- Reconsider to have the faculty level courses included in the program
- Reconsider how reading courses are used and if they should be included in the program or considered in-depth learning as part of work on the thesis
- Consider collaboration with other universities in Sweden and/or abroad for courses where this might work
- Formalize several unwritten procedures, such as how milestones are followed-up, what decision that should be communicated and how, in order to make procedures more transparent and avoid unequal treatment of students
- Consider if some of the regulations that are formalized needs to be more informative, such as guidelines for internal "examination"
- Consider if all these regulations should and can be merged into one document easily available for students and faculty members
- Consider if there are better ways to give students career advices for careers outside academia

- Prepare students better for teaching and help them to prepare for teaching in time-efficient and reasonable ways in order to prevent stress
- Consider a better coordination between the organisation of teaching assignments for students teaching political science and students teaching peace and conflict research
- Consider ways to provide more structured mentoring for students teaching
- Assure that teaching assignments and teaching performances by students are included in follow-up talks at the department, e.g. in order to counteract misunderstandings about the procedures
- Consider ways to mitigate gender inequalities related to parental leaves, for example providing additional paid time on the program in relation to the time of absence

## Appendix: programme for site visit

### **Program för platsbesök av bedömagruppen för utvärderingen av forskarutbildningen i statsvetenskap 26-27 februari 2020**

Språk: engelska

*26 februari*

Eget möte i bedömagruppen

*Lunch*

13.00 Institutionsledningen (prefekt Björn Badersten och studierektor Douglas Brommesson)

14.15 Arbetsmiljöfrågor (biträdande prefekt Lisa Strömbom, skyddsombud Magdalena Bexell och ordförande i JLM-gruppen Ted Svensson)

15.15 Kaffe

15.30 Intervju med doktorandgrupp (Jana Wrangle, Barbara Magalhaes Teixeira, Simon Davidsson, Jakob Strandgaard)

18.30 Middag

*27 februari*

9.30 Möte med studierektorerna Douglas Brommesson (Forskarutb) och Jakob Gustavsson (Grundutbildning)

10.30 Intervju med en lärar/handledargrupp (Karin Aggestam, Sara Kalm, Jan Teorell och Anders Uhlin).

*12.00 Lunch*

13.30 Återkopplingsmöte innan avresa (Douglas Brommesson)