



FACULTY  
OF SOCIAL  
SCIENCES

STATEMENT FROM EXTERNAL  
EXPERT GROUP

Reg. No.  
STYR 2023/22

2023-11-03

## **Evaluation report for the Department of Human Geography: bachelor and master studies in Human Geography and Urban planning**

Assignment and composition of the external expert group

The expert group consists of two (originally three) members, including

Associate professor Lene Møller Madsen, Department of Science Education, University of Copenhagen (UC), PhD in Human Geography (2001, UC). Vice-deputy for teaching, (2016-2019). She has served as external member of two accreditation boards for the MSc Geography programme at Roskilde University as well as pedagogical and didactic recourse and evaluator of 7 Science programmes (including BSc and MSc in Geography and BSc and MSc in Geology) at UC. Her research lies within the field of science education focusing on the disciplines of geography and geology, both concerning students' learning and ways of becoming members of the disciplines.

Professor John Östh, Oslo Metropolitan University (chair). John Östh has a PhD from 2007 in Human Geography (Uppsala University), biträdande professor in Human Geography at Uppsala University (2020), Full professor in Urban analysis (2021). He has previously participated in an equivalent panel for

---

educational evaluation at Gävle University. John has long experience of development of relevant teaching and research in Sweden but never at Lund University.

The evaluating team received an invitation to participate in the panel during early spring 2023, and we have had access to tasks and documents that are relevant for our work for a long enough period. The evaluating team has met for a few times online prior to the meeting in Lund, and this report is the fruit of our discussions and mutual understanding. We have written our report using the Lund University's eleven criteria for quality development as the backbone of the text.

Representatives for Lund University have been effective and clear in all communication with the reviewing team, and we are grateful for the open and reflexive nature of all parts of the program. We have received all information and documentation we have wanted and we would extend our appreciation for the arrangement and clarity in all communication to Mikhail Martynovich, and to Ola Hall and the department leadership for the transparent and effective arrangement. We also share the view that the department not only has been helpful in answering any questions we have had but the department staff has also actively helped us to reflect on matters that we have identified as potential problems.

The remainder of the text is organised in two main parts. In the first and shorter part a summary of our issues is listed (issues are developed in part 2). Issues/suggestions are suggested to form the basis for development strategies at the department. In the second and longer part, the main text and reflections around the eleven criteria are presented.

## Part 1: Suggestions

Overall comments - we have concluded that the education offered at the department is of very high quality, and that the staff are professional and well qualified for the task. The issues we have identified and the suggestions for tackling these issues could improve the quality of the education further. The issues may be more or less easy to solve depending on suggested solutions ranging from simple such as improved communication to altering rooms /buildings. We are aware of the long-term plans for moving the department to other buildings and in that process some of the listed issues may be easier to solve. We trust that the department and faculty consider our suggestions carefully, but also that the implementation of change follows the *time-geography* of the department in ways that facilitate implementation of particularly student areas when the department is relocating.

List of issues (to be discussed with more detail below):

- Lack of suitable social and study areas for students.
- Potential educational fragmentation in the planning bachelor where the collegial narrative and sense of belonging may be at risk.
- Potential mismatch between student expectations and offered studies in some instances. Much can be facilitated with closer involvement of study administration and better communication strategies.
- That GIS is not an integral part of the teaching in Human geography is surprising. The lack of GIS is potentially limiting labour market success among alumni students.
- PhD-recruitment procedures require a complete master thesis submitted long before the local master students have an opportunity to submit theirs and therefore being eligible to compete for a PhD-position. This means that

transition from LU- master to PhD is not facilitated and that local talent is lost to other universities.

- During the site visit it became clear that both the BSc and the Msc programme holds potential for linking students learning in the 'praktik'/internship with the programmes more clearly. We see this as potentially very promising, with opportunities for increasing collaboration with external stakeholders and companies but also for enriching teaching with *market* experience.
- A systematic organisation of the work with alumni is recommended
- The department, faculty and university may need to reconsider the way they offer students to participate in influencing teaching. Perhaps by devoting specific days to student influence activities, or to find new platforms for meeting students.

## **Part 2: Lund University's eleven criteria for quality development**

In this section we will **first** present a few categories of questions that have guided our work when talking to respondents.

**Thereafter** questions and comments adapted to the eleven criteria are listed separately.

### **Overarching questions > all respondents**

For each group we have met we have prepared a set of specific questions, but the below listed general questions provided guidelines for more generic questions asked during all meetings.

- **About alignment/progression:** Seen from both a student and a teacher perspective – how is knowledge and/or information about acquired knowledge used to secure progression in education between courses?

- **Retention:** Do we have a number for retention in the material? How is it addressed by the programme and by the teachers?
- **Research-based teaching:** Healey and Brew's model – how is research-based teaching in the BSc and MSc programme according to students and teachers? What would their dream scenario look like? How many MSc students continue into a doctoral programme? Are there certain educational tracks that are more successful in receiving PhD-positions?
- **The implied student:** who (socio-demographics etc.) is the *good* student? How is diversity among students (and teachers) addressed? What about language?
- **Transition:** do they (students) have a first-year coordinator? How are students' different backgrounds used in the courses at BSc and MSc and how are they positioned/integrated in the programme? The transition into job, is this both after BSc and MSc?
- **Rooms/budget/personnel:** Are there locational, budget-related or personal challenges related to where you plan to be in the future?

### **Criterion 1. That the actual study results correspond to learning outcomes and exam goals**

The general design of curriculum and course descriptions are clearly written and fulfil their aims. Over time, documents of this kind have become more or less formalised and leaves little room for development. We have therefore based the majority of our evaluating work on our understanding of how goals and outcomes are presented by the department and understood by students at different levels, and what effects this understanding has in the long perspective. After discussions with the current student advisor (becoming program coordinator) we were

informed that the majority of students that leave the planning bachelor program do so for either of two reasons: 1. Expecting to study architecture alternatively, studying planning while waiting to study architecture; 2. Finding the studies to be more theoretical and less applied than expected. In other words, there seems to be a mismatch in the understanding of course contents from a student perspective and from what the formal documents are stating. There is likely no problem related to the document contents but potentially a problem in how the communication of course and program information is received and understood by students. Improved means of communication could facilitate the spread of a more accurate course/program description, and therethrough help the student to meet educational goals. The described mismatch between students and program contents mainly seems to have been a problem at the bachelor level and predominantly for planning students. However, several respondents indicated that they wanted to improve communication with students on all levels.

The planning program director have recently acquired their coordinating role, and clearly possess all skills necessary to make this into a successful program, so although change of program may be necessary the coordinating group is the right one for the job. We trust problems related to progression, and possible alienation can be solved if our comments are considered.

Questions at the site visit > bachelor's programme:

- the two specific ILO's on applied and critical thinking, where and how are they in the specific courses and how is the progression within them?
- Half of the students continue in a MSc programme, where do the rest of the students go after completing their bachelor studies?
- How are the two GIS courses related to the other courses in the BSc programme?

- is Semester 3, period 4 the first time the students are working on a project?
- During semester 5 and 6, how do the students keep contact in this period?
- How are there courses and “praktik” related to the previous courses in the programme.
- How is the Bachelor thesis related to the “praktik”?

Questions at the site visit > master’s programme:

- There is a lack of information about where the Msc candidates go after studies.
- How many go into a doctoral programme?
- In what ways could improved knowledge about their trajectories help you to develop the education?
- How (courses, subjects, etc.) is the programme appreciated by the students?
- What about the attendees, in what way is the Msc programme ‘deep anchored in the departments research profile’ as described?

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

The self-assessment report states that focus on student-oriented teaching is central to the educational philosophy of the Department. Courses and programmes are designed in a way that encourages analytical ability, independence, knowledge seeking, and reflexive approach. Signs of this can be seen in the programme and course introductions provided. In the teaching and learning activities signs of student-orientation are documented through the various analytical and reflective elements included in the courses as well as in the progression of

the students' independent and individual learning through the programme, student-led elements.

A student focus in teaching and learning activities includes taking point of departure in the students existing knowledge. It is difficult to see how the different courses do this and specifically how their content is related in terms of this as well as how the students' elective courses and internships are integrated in a student-oriented approach of the BSc and MSc programmes. The teachers indicated that much of the knowledge transfer between teachers and between courses and programmes were done informally while meeting in the lunch room, over coffee or similar. It is essential that these forums for informal meeting places are supported in the move to the new building, and that increases in tele-commuting/work-from-home which risk limiting the daily informal meetings, are counteracted by arranging incentives to bring staff together more regularly for social activities (telecommuting is here to stay, and measures taken to limit telecommuting may backfire, so carrots are better than sticks in this respect)

Student evaluations are systematised in a formal education system supplemented with continuous communication between teachers and students in the ongoing course activities as well as workshops with BSc students and the Student Barometer at the MSc programme. However, it looks like there is a relative low response rate on the student evaluations. What mechanism in the system is in place to address this, and how are the students involved in the follow up on student evaluations and course development? These are noncritical, yet also non-trivial questions the department should consider. Could traditional evaluations be exchanged with student led discussions (or other formats) and summarization of experiences from the courses?

During the site visit it became clear that both the BSc and the Msc programme holds potential for linking students learning in the 'praktik'/internship with the programmes more clearly. We



see this as potentially very promising, with opportunities for increasing collaboration with external stakeholders and companies but also for enriching teaching with *market* experience.

The experience of fragmentation in the urban planning BSc programme could be a result of the newly restructuring of the BSc programme. Measures to address this could include teacher workshops to create a coherent narrative on the programme and knowledge sharing, as well as student/teacher partnerships on linking the different courses.

Questions at site visit:

- Focus in student learning and student-oriented teaching is central – can you give us some examples of this.
- Course evaluations, the formal system – what are the response rates in these? How are the students included in developing the courses based on course evaluations, like students-partnerships?
- There is a challenge in coherence and bridging of teaching experience between short courses, especially on bachelor level. This may lead to fragmentation of taught material and the involvement of (too) many teachers – do you have ideas to accommodate this?

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

As documented in the recently conducted self-evaluation report for the Lund University's research Quality Evaluation Project 2020, the department is home to a diversity of research strengths. It is also clear that the research experience of the teaching community is outstanding, and that the experience (if invested in students learning) has great potential.

The relation between research and teaching is described in the self-assessment report as well as at the site visit as what is termed Research-led and/or Research-oriented as defined in Healy's terminology (2001). Here, an important output of research is high quality teaching that is practised as for example described by that almost all teachers are research active, the literature is drawn from published research and many lectures are highly interactive. Also signs of the programme being Research-tutored and/or Research-based is seen as students are encouraged to do their own research projects (especially in thesis work) and enrolled into research projects during academic internships. This creates a strong fundament for further development of the students' involvement in research activities in the current courses at both BSc and MSc, for example by securing knowledge and content is negotiable, inquiry is open-ended and inquiry is open-ended and tasks unstructured (Brew 2013).

The strength and challenges of the self-assessment is seen from a teacher's perspective. Could a use of Brew's model be discussed and applied at each course, developing an idea of the variety of research-based teaching practices?

During the interviews, teachers indicated that the ability to connect research driven teaching is (relatively) easy at master's level but that the need for educating the bachelor students with the classics that prepares the students for better receiving research-front at a later stage means that there is a clear distinction between the need of being at the research front in the teaching and preparing the students for advanced and new research. The statement is a good indicator of the scientific base on which the education rests – the department is doing very well in this respect.

Questions at site visit:

- How would you describe your programme as research based?
- The strength and challenges in the self-assessment in this section is described from a teacher perspective. When you also say in the self-assessment your focus is on students' learning then issues in the Brew model might be relevant.

**Criterion 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 also indicated above, the teachers at the department are skilled seen both from a scientific and teaching perspective. However, there are actions that may further the quality.

From what we learned during the interviews, it is our understanding that there is generally limited knowledge about the teaching offered at other departments but that is accredited as equivalent to in-house educations in some of the programmes and in a similar fashion and that there also seems to be limited knowledge about skills and supervising quality in some of the "praktik". We fully understand that the department has no or limited means for assuring quality in externally offered education/"praktik". However, strategies to mitigate potential future problems in educational mismatch and/or misconception of the role among external tutors could be strengthened to better serve the learning of the students. We suggest that study coordinators at receiving departments are contacted and informed about study orientations of students attending their education, and also that contacts between study coordinators and external students are maintained during periods where there is no local tuition.

All higher education in Sweden is suffering from the same structural funding problem, in that most tenure staff lack

sufficient funding for research and that considerable time is devoted to finding funding for research. The main educational problem connected to the funding issue is connected to the volatile composition of teachers where success or failure in funding may lead to problems in educational plans where some teachers “buy” themselves free from teaching, while others need more teaching to stay funded. If the imbalance becomes semi-permanent in time, there is a risk that teachers at the research front constantly teach less, while those that haven’t been successful in finding external means, will do the lion's share of the teaching. As a result, the funding system counteracts the aim for research related teaching. We fully understand that this is a problem that cannot be mitigated by the department or any department at the university for that matter, but we believe that the systemic effects are negative and should be noted.

#### Questions discussed with the teacher community

- Strength: “New positions are announced based on long-term strategic needs in research and teaching” 1. How does this conflict with risk of biased hiring procedures? 2. How do you determine what are long term strategies? - is it climate change, SDG, Ai, changes in Labour market?
- Weakness is very generally written – what do you intend
- Opportunities are generic specific (fields are identified but nothing about how)
- What threats do you identify in the:
  - recruitment procedures
  - Funding procedures (dependent on external funding to a large extent)
- The department strives to offer research-based teaching, but as this can be quite specialized, it has as a

consequence that even members of the same research group cannot easily substitute for each other.

- Is the doctoral students involved in teaching the BSc programme, the MSc programme and/or free courses?
- The use of “buying free of teaching” of researchers receiving substantial amounts of research

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

By providing a broad range of topics related to the challenges of society today like uneven development, segregation, migration, the role of innovation, sustainability and development as well as responses to climate change the BSc and MSc programmes as a whole address the needs of society. The programmes further draw on guest lectures with practitioners in relevant fields as well as alumni are invited to speak about work-situation and how their education is in use.

‘Praktik’/internships is integrated in both BSc and MSc programmes to strengthen relevance and authenticity, which presumably lays the foundation for a smoother transition into the job market making it more clear for the students the competences they have achieved during the programme and how they can make use of them. See comment above on potentials for integrating these elements even more in the programmes.

Little information on students’ experiences is given in the material and unfortunately no opportunities to talk to students at the site visit either do not allow us to comment on the students experiences and how improvements of for example progression in the programmes are experienced in relation to relevance and other issues of importance.

As suggested in the self-assessment a systematic organisation of the work with alumni is recommended.

Questions at site visit:

- Little information is provided (one former student interviews and alumni activities but very little concrete information).
- Is there any statistics on the type of employment of graduates?
- How is the integration of the internship in the programme?
- Why is the alumni work ad hoc?

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

From the self-assessment we conclude that the most common way to include students in planning, implementation and follow up of the programme is almost solely through the student evaluations. The site visit confirms this impression.

Based on dialog at the site visit we find that there is a great potential for the inclusion of students in both discussions of course development and alignment of programmes. However, it also seems that this is a more general challenge at the university to get students involved other than through students' unions. We had unfortunately no opportunities for talking to students at the site visit to discuss these issues, simply because none of the invited students showed up. From what our discussions with department staff rendered, there is a growing separation between students and teachers that primarily is due to the boxing-in and separation of areas where teachers prepare lectures and where students are allowed to mix with teachers. But there is also possibly a sense of lack of student-confidence in that things can

be changed which leads to a focus on student's own situation and less on the student community. The department, faculty and university may need to reconsider the way they offer students to participate in influencing teaching. Perhaps by devoting specific days to student influence activities, or to find new platforms for meeting students.

Questions at the site visit raised issues related to:

- Power relations, level of engagement, a specific type of students being too interested (when student engagement is low, the words/opinions of the few that are engaged may produce non-representative student opinions?)
- How are the student evaluations used by the department?
- In which ways are students involved in course and programme restructuring?

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

From a physical accessibility perspective, the department is situated in a building that doesn't facilitate mobility for individuals with different kinds of impairment. However, the department/university has done with is possible in respect to the old (but lovely) architecture. Since the department is moving to a renovated building complex in a few years, there is no need for further alterations of the current building as we see it.

From a support perspective, the staff working with student-contacts are very professional are doing a good job as far as we have learned. However, their deep knowledge about motivations for dropping out students and /or need for support seems not to be common knowledge to all parts of the teaching community. It could be beneficial to the department to develop strategies for

strengthening flows of information between study support staff and the teacher community.

Students doing internships are, according to the student support staff sometimes isolated and left-out of the regular *flow* of student activities. There could be benefits from increasing measures to keep the contact with students while they are active elsewhere (including also your students that temporarily study at other departments).

As indicated in several parts of this document, we find the separation of students from regular department activities problematic (this due to security restricting access, but also due to the buildings lack of student-friendly areas). During the pandemic, students were increasingly confined to their own places – this naturally had consequences both for learning outcome and for social integration of students (Casalone et al. 2023), but in the post pandemic era, the spatial separation and potential isolation of students still seem to be present and this may in the long-term lead to decrease in wellbeing and a sense of lessened belonging to the academic environment.

We learned that the recruitment of students is sociodemographically skewed, but that the department was alert to the effects of an unbalanced student population, and actively attempted to facilitate integration of groups not coming from non-academic backgrounds or from non-Nordic regions.

Questions at the site visit raised issues related to:

- Physical access to buildings and limitations due to construction and security barriers
- Sense of belonging and casual communication
- Sociodemographics, representativeness and integration



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

Generally, there seem to be practices for follow up and development of master studies. It is also likely that more experienced students find it easier to navigate between courses and contents in ways less experienced students can.

There has been a recent reorganisation of the bachelor program in planning and although much of the issues raised are related to the fragmentation of the bachelor in planning – we are equally confident that the current team responsible for the education has good ideas and strategies to develop the education in the best way possible.

There are relatively many teachers involved in each course and the teachers, we talked to, experienced a relatively large number of courses in a program – this means that the progression of taught material and communication not necessarily has the best potential. We learned that the majority of the follow-up and development work is based on informal communication over a coffee or similar, and that course representatives regularly had communication with involved teachers on matters relating to course development. There is potential for a more structural approach when it comes to discussing contexts and progression between courses, but we are confident that all study representatives on either level have plans for how to further this work in the years to come.

Questions at the site visit raised issues related to:

- Staff meeting, for who? – what issues are discussed on matters related to course and programme development?
- Working group of gender equality etc., can we hear more about this?
- The programme level, yearly meetings – what critical issues could be discussed?

- Unclear how course evaluations are used by the teaching community
- Questions in evaluations schemes: can course convenors not include own questions?
- How can progression between courses be addressed – the role of the director of studies
- Are there technical and practical challenges that risks the development (for example Central IT is ineffective, HR is ineffective, lack of teaching rooms makes needed/wanted changes difficult to implement
- To what extent is money and time a player in the work with development of courses/programmes.

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

The self-assessment describes internationalisation and international perspectives to be central for the education at the Department. This is done in terms of an international curriculum (using examples and cases from different geographical contexts), having international staff teaching (bringing in the international) and students (mobility of students incoming and outgoing). While this is a foundation of a strong international perspective we suggest strengthening the international perspective to a higher degree by actively using the resources of the students, both incoming and outgoing. This will also be in line with a sustainability pedagogy as described in section 11.

The challenges as described in the self-assessment report of finding the right balance between engaging with the international and the Swedish scholarship need continuous attention.

Widening the perception of research-based teaching as in Brew (2013), as outlined in section 3 could facilitate such a process.

#### Questions at the site visit:

- International mobility leads to internationalisation of staff and students - in what ways are hybrid, physical and digital teaching used in the courses and how successful is it?
- Aims on university and faculty level - how well do you live up to the different listed aims and how easy is it to find suitable housing for international students, etc.
- $\frac{2}{3}$  of the master students are international - how do we ask for their advice and learn of their experience?
- How are the students' experiences from abroad used in the programme/education?
- The challenges seen at the MSc on research link – can this be moderated by using Brew's model?

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

The equality work is mainly based in the equity plan(s) established in 2016. Five department activity areas are identified ~ (students/education, Recruitment, leadership, research and staff) for which plans and inclusive and integrative actions are presented and mitigation strategies to cope with problems are indicated. The text is *academically imprecise* in its writing, leaving room for interpretation and questions for the current situation. Different questions relating to gender, impairment and international backgrounds were discussed with all groups we met. We learned that there is a slight female gender imbalance in the student groups (including PhD-students) while there has been a male surplus in senior positions. The gender imbalance situation has improved over time and our questions related to gender bias in the selection of more or less favourable study orientations (seen from an employer perspective) was answered

satisfactorily. Impairment is to some extent problematic in that the building is old and difficult to adapt (small elevators, steep stairs, etc.). Having that said, the benefits from working in the beautiful building has clear benefits as well. The long term plans for moving to other and more modern buildings and the structural difficulties in remodelling the current building makes suggestions for improvement in relationship to the needs of impaired students and staff difficult to implement and we are happy with the answers from our respondents.

We learned that the student recruitment is somewhat sociodemographically unbalanced and that there is a considerable difference between the bachelor and master students in terms of social and international background. The building is lacking the opportunity to facilitate students' social activities, and the over-time increase in safety systems blocking access to hallways, off-hour lecture rooms and social areas on evenings and weekends is not facilitating the situation. As we understood from our respondents, this trend is not isolated to the department or the faculty but is a trend on university level. However, the lack of social spaces and the separation of students from staff and research may have unwanted effects. Perhaps unrelated, but no student came to meet us (the department had made several attempts to get students to meet us so we do not blame the department for lack of assistance in this matter), and we wonder if the separation of student and staff has led to an alienation, reluctance or lack of interest in engagement from the student perspective. The indicated skewed social recruitment of students, the increasing internationalisation of master students and the lack of opportunities for casual students/teacher interaction may have negative long-term effects that should be considered by more units than the department.

Question(s) during the visit:

- Indicate how situation has changed since the equality plan was implemented

- Indicate also how international or new students are integrated/welcomed into the educational environment

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

As described in the self-assessment report sustainability in all of its three components (environmental, economic and social) is the backbone of the programmes documented by the BSc and MSc programme outlines. Hence, from a curriculum perspective the BSc and MSc contains not only content of sustainability (*education of sustainability*) but we also saw signs of *education for sustainability* (a critical questioning of assumptions; contribution to problem-solving) in the dialog with the teaching group. There might also be *education as sustainability*, however we do not have student documentation on this (Mochizuki & Yarime 2015).

Sustainability from a pedagogy perspective includes collaborations, problem based, transdisciplinarity as well as non-university collaborations. Based on the dialogue with the BSc and MSc leaderships as well as the teaching group we find the programmes to be working with this to varying extents.

In the self-assessment a lack of progression is pointed out based on students' feedback. We unfortunately did not have the opportunity to discuss possibilities of this with the students at the site visit.

Questions at the site visit:

- How is sustainability in relation to different perceptions of educational sustainability?
- Mix between action, theory, method, policy, i.e. the engagement of the agents.

## References

Brew, A. (2013). Understanding the scope of undergraduate research: A framework for curricular and pedagogical decision-making. *Higher Education, 66*, 603-618.

Casalone, G., Michelangeli, A., Östh, J., & Türk, U. (2023). The effect of lockdown on students' performance: A comparative study between Italy, Sweden and Turkey. *Heliyon, 9*(6).

Healey, M., & Jenkins, A. (2009). Linking discipline-based research and teaching through mainstreaming undergraduate research and inquiry. *Higher Education, 47*, 1-66.

Mochizuki, Y., & Yarime, M. (2015). Education for sustainable development and sustainability science: re-purposing higher education and research. In *Routledge handbook of higher education for sustainable development* (pp. 11-24). Routledge.

## **Appendix: Programme for site visit**

### **May 22<sup>nd</sup> (all meetings in room Utopia, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Geocentrum I, Sölvegatan 10, Lund)**

9.00-9.30 – Department leadership

9.45-10.15 – BSc in Urban and Regional Planning leadership

10.30-11.00 – MSc in Human Geography leadership

11.15-12.00 – Teaching community

12.00-13.00 – Lunch

13.00-13.45 Students

14.00-14.30 Representative(s) from the admin team

14.45-15.30 Tour around Geocentrum I and Campus Paradis

15:30-16.30 Experts independent work

16.30-17.00 Reconvening with department leadership

18.00 – Dinner at GASTRO|nome (Bangatan 6, Lund)

To navigate you a bit with the program: the day starts with a session with the Department leadership (including head of department, director of studies, and director of PhD studies). After that, you will meet individually various actors involved in the educational process at the Department (programme directors, representatives of a teaching community and admin team, and of course students). We will also organize a brief 'tour' around our teaching facilities to provide you an idea of the physical environment in which our educations are provided. After that, you will have some space for independent work, which is followed by the wrap up with the Department leadership.