

Follow-up of Subject and Study Programmes in First-Cycle and Second-Cycle Education¹

These guidelines were ratified by the Faculty Board on June 12, 2024 and are in effect as of the same date.

Registration number HS 2025/184

¹ This is a translation of the Swedish version (Uppföljning av ämne och utbildningsprogram inom utbildning på grundnivå och avancerad nivå, dnr HS 2024/398). In the event of any discrepancy, the Swedish version of this document shall prevail.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	The follow-up of academic subjects and programmes on a six-year cycle	2
	2.1 The establishing of areas and bases of assessment as well as a selection of degree objectives, theses, and courses to be evaluated	3
	2.2 Start-up.....	4
	2.3 Self-Evaluation	4
	2.4 External review	5
	2.5 Analysis and report by the Faculty Board.....	5
	2.6 Further development of the course/programme	7
	2.7 Feedback on planned and implemented measures.....	7
3	One-year follow-up of a new subjects.....	8
4	Other responsibilities for follow-up of a subjects and a programme	8
5	This document is valid from	10
	Appendix 1: Areas and bases of assessment in university programmes.....	11
	Appendix 2: Areas and bases of assessment in programme subjects	14

1 Introduction

All the academic subjects² and programmes at the University are to be followed up on every six years (six-year follow-up). Furthermore, newly established subjects are to be followed up on within one year after the first course started (one-year follow-up). The six-year follow-up is done internally by the Faculty Board which also includes external reviews of final projects and theses.

The one-year follow-up is only done by the Faculty Board. The follow-up includes all the academic subjects and programmes. Here are also academic courses which lead to formal qualifications or offered as contract education included. Courses and programmes that are planned for review by the Swedish Higher Education Authority during the current six-year cycle are not followed up on by the University. An internal follow-up of assessment areas and bases that are not reviewed by the Swedish Higher Education Authority may be done as a complement. Decisions about this are made by the Faculty Board.

2 The follow-up of academic subjects and programmes on a six-year cycle

The follow-up of academic subjects and programmes on a six-year cycle is planned by the Faculty Board. A plan or schedule for this is decided by the Dean well before the follow-up in order for each Head of School to be able to allocate resources for the follow-up. A self-assessment by each subject and programme is to be the basis for this follow-up. The self-assessment is to be structured based on the assessment areas and bases that are to be followed up on (Appendix 2).

The main steps in the six-year follow-up are:

- Establishing the areas and bases for assessment as well as selecting examination objectives and courses to be reviewed
- Start-up
- Self-assessment
- External review of how well final projects and theses meet the objectives
- An analysis and report from the Faculty Board
- How to further develop and improve the programme
- Feedback on planned and carried out measures

² The term “academic subject” in this document refers to main areas (subjects that at the University can lead to a diploma as well as resource subjects (subjects which cannot lead to a diploma).

2.1 The establishing of areas and bases of assessment as well as a selection of degree objectives, theses, and courses to be evaluated

2.1.1 The establishing of the areas and bases of assessment

The establishing of the areas and bases of assessment used for the review can be found in Appendix 2. The Faculty Board may decide that further areas and bases of assessment are added to a specified follow-up. The programme coordinator of the course and programme in the subject that is to be followed up on, along with the programme coordinator of the vocational programme, which only leads to a degree in that field, as well as the Dean may submit requests for additional areas and bases of assessment. Besides suggestions made by the subject coordinator, alternatively the programme coordinator and the Dean, the Faculty Board makes their decisions about the areas and bases of assessment considering the following:

- The results of previous internal follow-ups, for example the six-year follow-up and the one-year follow-up of a new subject
- The results of carried-out external assessments and follow-ups (for example reviews of programmes and seats of learning done by the Swedish Higher Education Authority)
- The University's plans for development and its function as well as similar regulatory documents and decisions about directions

Based on the Faculty Board's decisions on areas and bases of assessment, a form for self-evaluation for the follow-up in question is drawn up (2.3).

2.1.2 A selection of degree objectives, theses, and courses to be evaluated

The six-year follow-up of the university programmes is included in the assessment of reached targets of the national degree targets (Appendix 1). This assessment is partly done by externally reviewing degree theses (2.4). Usually, five degree objectives are selected for this review. If a programme results in two degrees, one vocational and one general, objectives from both must be included in the review. The Faculty Board decides on which degree objectives that are to be reviewed after consultation with the subject coordinator in question, alternatively the programme coordinator if it only concerns a vocational-programme degree. The selection is decided on and informed about no later than at the start-up meeting.

The degree theses that are to be reviewed are randomly selected by the Faculty Board's presidium. The selection, however, can partly be

controlled to ensure that different specializations and programmes are included in the random selection. Usually between 5 and 15 theses in a main field, or a vocational-programme degree, are reviewed.

2.1.3 The selections of courses to be reviewed

At the six-year follow-up of subjects, the quality of the selected courses are also assessed (Appendix 2). Usually, two courses for each subject are reviewed. The school in question selects one course and the Faculty Board the other. Reviewed courses could be programme courses, separate courses, courses that are included in programmes leading to a degree or a contract education course (with or without ECTS credits). Information about the courses to be reviewed will be given no later than at the start-up meeting.

2.2 Start-up

The follow-up begins with the Faculty Board presidium formally announcing a start-up meeting. The Dean, heads of division, subject coordinators, and programme coordinators as well as student representatives will be invited to the meeting. The purpose with the meeting is to give information about the follow-up process and the material available. In connection with this meeting, a self-evaluation form will be presented as well as relevant material. This will be accessible from a common online storage folder.

2.3 Self-Evaluation

A self-evaluation needs to be written for all subjects and programmes. A common self-evaluation can be made for a programme where a large part is done as several similar lessons in different courses/programmes. In that case, this is done as an agreement between programme coordinators and the Faculty Board presidium, and a decision about this is made no later than at the start-up meeting.

Subject coordinators and programme coordinators are responsible for putting together the self-evaluation, with appendices, of the respective programmes. This cooperation is to be done together with others involved in the university programme, first and foremost other teachers teaching the same subject and those teaching in related programmes. The student council should be invited to take part in the self-evaluation work.

The self-evaluation is to include an analysis and a reflection as well as a description related to the areas and bases of assessment (Appendices 1 and 2). The self-evaluation should also include a summarizing reflection of the subject alternatively the programme.

Specific examples to show how the bases for assessment can be achieved are also to be presented here.

Facts produced by the Support Services will serve as support for the writing of the self-evaluation. The facts included partly depend on the areas and bases for assessment that will be included in the follow-up.

The self-evaluation must not be on more than 30 pages (appendices not included). The Head of School must approve the self-evaluation before it is submitted to the Faculty Board.

2.4 External review

An external review of the targeted achievements in the randomly selected degree theses is done (2.1.2).

The Dean appoints the external reviewers after suggestions made by the school. The external reviewers are appointed no later than at the time of the start-up meeting. The reviewers' fee is regulated in a separate decision and is paid by the school in question.

The reviewers must have very good knowledge of the programme area and have at least a Ph.D. (or the equivalent). Conflicts of interest and aspects of that must be considered at the appointment.

2.4.1 The reviewers' duty

Usually, each degree thesis is assessed by one reviewer ³. Each reviewer usually assesses five degree theses. The theses are to be assessed both based on each one of them and each objective but also overall for all theses that have been reviewed.

The reviewers will, besides the theses, also be given access to:

- the definition of the subject for the relevant main area
- syllabi for the programme/programmes
- course plans (syllabi) for the degree theses including grading criteria and a description of the examination.

2.5 Analysis and report by the Faculty Board

The Faculty Board's analysis is partly based on the written material available (self-evaluation, data, external reviewers' comments) and partly on interviews with persons involved in the course/programme as well as students.

³ If the school wishes to have more than one reviewer per degree thesis, the Dean must be contacted for consultation.

2.5.1 Interviews with persons involved in the course/programme and students

The interviews are conducted by the Faculty Board with the aim to complement and clarify the written material.

The Faculty Board performs the interviews with the different groups and in the following order:

- Student representatives from the programmes concerned.
 - In most cases at least five students but if possible more than that.
 - The Student Union appoints the students to take part.
 - Prior to the interviews, the students are given access to the self-evaluations regarding their subject and programme. If the students cannot read texts in Swedish, an AI-generated translation of the self-evaluations is made with support from the Faculty Board. The translation is reviewed by the concerned subject coordinators respectively programme coordinators.
- Subject coordinators and programme coordinators.
 - In most cases also subject coordinators for programmes not part of the main field of the programme will take part.
 - When programmes leading to a vocational degree are reviewed, the concerned division suggests the teachers to be invited.
 - For internship training (VFU), representatives of this part of training should take part.
- The Dean and Heads of Division

2.5.2 The Faculty Board's report

The Faculty Board puts together a report for each subject included in the programme leading to a general degree in the subject. For programmes that only lead to a vocational-programme degree, a report is made for each degree included⁴.

The Faculty Board makes a general assessment of the subject as well as an assessment of the vocational-programme degree which is done in a single report. The reports describe the strengths as well as areas for development that the Faculty Board identified.

⁴ This means, for example, all programmes leading to a degree in engineering are treated in one and the same report.

Furthermore, the Faculty Board reviews each assessed area and the basis for this assessment (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2).

For the overall review of a subject, the following forms of assessment are used:

Satisfactory: No areas that might jeopardize the quality of the course/programme were identified. However, areas of development that further can improve the course were identified.

Not fully satisfactory: Areas that need to be adjusted in order to retain the quality of the course/programme were identified.

Unsatisfactory: Inadequacies that mean a major risk to have an impact on the quality of the course/programme were identified.

For each **criteria**, the assessments “Satisfactory” and “Unsatisfactory” were used.

For each **basis of assessment**, it is stated if “Met” or Not met.”

Before the report is finalized, the persons in charge of the course/programme will have the opportunity to read and comment on potential errors in the report. The ratification is usually done at one of the Faculty Board’s regular meetings.

2.6 Further development of the course/programme

The recommendations in the Faculty Board’s report are to be the basis for further development of the academic subject and the programme respectively. The students are to be given the opportunity to take part in this development and in planning for measures to be taken.

Furthermore, other units, for example relevant Support Service units and various school divisions are to use the recommendations for further development of their routines and processes. Objectives and measures to be taken related to the follow-up are to be documented in plans and other documents related to the course and programme quality.

2.7 Feedback on planned and implemented measures

In cases where the follow-up assessment resulted in “not fully satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory,” relevant subject teachers, programme coordinators, and the Head of School are to provide their feedback on planned and implemented measures to the Faculty Board.

In cases where the assessment was “not fully satisfactory,” the feedback is to be given approximately one year after the follow-up. If the assessment was “unsatisfactory,” feedback is to be given after approximately six months.

The feedback given must include a report on planned and implemented measures regarding items assessed to be “unsatisfactory.”

If the Faculty Board regards the implemented and planned measures as insufficient in order to guarantee course/programme quality, the matter will be referred to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor will then, in consultation with the Faculty Board and the school in question, decide if more time should be given for implementations of necessary changes.

3 One-year follow-up of a new subjects

New subjects are to be followed up after about a year from the first course start. The purpose of the follow-up is to assess the start-up of the subject and to note if changes need to be made to guarantee the quality of the course/programme.

The one-year follow-up is done internally by the Faculty Board. It opens up with a start-up meeting where the process is introduced for relevant leaders and staff. The follow-up is done through interviews with the subject coordinators, programme coordinators, student representatives, and the dean and the Head of Division. The Faculty Board may choose to also interview other staff members of the school in question and the Support Services. As a basis for the interviews, the Support Services prepare some facts. Those facts are made available for the participants at the follow-up meeting no later than in connection with the start-up meeting. At the start-up, information about what kinds of questions that might be asked in the interviews will also be given.

At the one-year follow-up, a selection of bases for assessment (see Appendix 2) will be used. The assessments used in the six-year follow-up will also be used at the one-year follow-up (2.5.2). The Faculty Board shares its assessment in a report. Prior to the completion of the report, it is shared with the school for comments about potential errors and misunderstandings.

The recommendations in the report are to make up the basis for further development of the subject and are documented in plans and other documents related to the mutual work for quality in the course/programme. The follow-up of implementations is done the same way as in the six-year follow-up (2.7).

4 Other responsibilities for follow-up of a subjects and a programme

For the follow-up of courses and programmes at the first-cycle and second-cycle levels to work well, efforts by other staff at the

University are needed. Below, responsibilities not already mentioned in the document are listed.

Head of School and Head of Division

- Guarantee that the results of the follow-up are recognized and that changes are planned and implemented.
- Guarantee that planned changes are communicated with staff involved and students.
- Guarantee that the results of the follow-up and planned changes are communicated to relevant external parties (e.g. external parties that are involved in programme board or the equivalent).

Head of university administration

- Guarantees that funds are allocated at the Support Services to support the implementation of a follow-up as well as the required work on producing facts as well as communicating the results.
- Guarantees that the parts of the follow-up that involve the Support Services are attended to and added to plans and/or other relevant documents.

The Faculty Board

- Uses the experiences from the follow-up in order to continually improve the follow-up process.

Dean and Pro-Dean

- Address the results of the follow-up in the annual quality dialogue⁵ with schools concerned and the Support Services.

The Vice Chancellor

- Includes the results of the follow-up in the overall University development of its courses/programmes, activities, and quality system.
- Addresses the results of the follow-up in the annual quality dialogue with schools concerned and the Support Services.

⁵ The Dean and the Pro-Dean carry out a quality dialogue with all the schools and the Support Services annually where the work for high quality is followed-up on. The quality dialogue is done as one part of the Vice Chancellor's dialogue meetings. Besides the Vice Chancellor, Dean, and Pro-Dean, the Pro-Vice Chancellor and the Head of the university administration also take part.

5 This document is valid from

This document is valid from June 12, 2024 and replaces Follow-up of academic subjects and programmes at the first-cycle and second-cycle levels (Registration number HS 2020/897)

Appendix 1: Areas and bases of assessment in university programmes

The areas and bases of assessment mentioned below are used for six-year follow-ups of university programmes. The Faculty Board may for each separate six-year follow-up decide to include other areas and bases of assessment (Section 2.1.1. in the guidelines).

The instructions related to those areas and bases of assessment can be found in the self-evaluation template.

Area of assessment 1: Objectives reached

Base of assessment 1:

The design of the programme, its implementation and examination guarantees that the students have reached the national objectives when having been awarded a graduation certificate.

Base of assessment 2:

The admission requirements for the programme are relevant in relation to the objectives to promote quality and accessibility of the programme.

Area of assessment 2: The pedagogical design of the programme

Base of assessment 1:

The pedagogical design of the programme is based on experience and recent university pedagogics research.

Base of assessment 2:

The design of the programme guarantees that the students have the opportunity to actively participate in their learning process.

Base of assessment 3:

A clear learning process gives each student the opportunities to complete their studies within the planned study time.

Base of assessment 4:

There is systematic work to guarantee quality in the programme.

Area of assessment 3. Equality

Base of assessment 1:

An equality perspective is taken, communicated, and based in the programmes content, design, and implementation.

Area of assessment 4: Teacher competence and teaching hours

Base of assessment 1:

The teacher competence and teaching hours are adequate and in relation to the contents of the university programme, its scope, and its implementation.

Base of assessment 2:

For a programme leading to a vocational degree, the University provides adequate professional competence in relation to the contents of the university programme, its scope, and its implementation.

Area of assessment 5: Research-based teaching

Base of assessment 1:

The programme is largely based on research.

Base of assessment 2:

The programme is clearly related to one or more of the University's research units.

Area of assessment 6: Working-life relevance

Base of assessment 1:

The programme prepares the students for their future working life.

Base of assessment 2:

There is collaboration with the surrounding society.

Base of assessment 3:

The students in the programme are of great interest in the labor market.

Area of Assessment 7: Student influence

Base of assessment 1:

Programme coordinator, course coordinators, and other relevant staff make it possible for the students to take an active part in the development of the programme.

Base of assessment 2:

The students are always given feedback after completed course evaluations and annual follow-ups of the programme. The reports are always complete.

Base of assessment 3:

The results of the course evaluations and annual follow-ups of the programme are used to further develop the programme including all its courses.

Area of assessment 8: Internationalization**Base of assessment 1:**

A perspective of internationalization is integrated in programme design and implementation.

Base of assessment 2:

The program students have the option to study abroad at least one semester (primarily at the programme's first-cycle level which consists of 180 university credits).

Area of assessment 9: Infrastructure**Base of assessment 1:**

The programme has a sound and appropriate structure which is provided by the school and the University's support services.

Base of assessment 2:

Access to learning environments (digital and physical) that promote the students' completing the programme are guaranteed.

Appendix 2: Areas and bases of assessment in programme subjects

The areas and bases of assessment mentioned below are used for six-year follow-ups of university programmes. The Faculty Board may for each separate six-year follow-up decide to include other areas and bases of assessment (Section 2.1.1. in the guidelines).

The instructions related to those areas and bases of assessment can be found in the self-evaluation template.

Area of assessment 1: Quality

Base of assessment 1: *

Systematic work for high quality is done to guarantee and develop the subject.

Area of assessment 2: Teachers and teacher competence

Base of assessment 1: *

The number of teachers and their collective competence is adequate and in proportion to the programmes as well as related research done in the subject (main subject or supporting subject).

Normally, all the teachers should have tenure at the University.

Target value for the number of full-time teachers with tenure

	Main field at first-cycle level	Main field at master level (60 credits)	Main field at master level (120 credits)	Supporting subject
Scientific and artistic competence	A minimum of four teachers with a PhD (or equivalent artistic competence) of which at least one person is a professor	A minimum of six teachers with a PhD (or equivalent artistic competence) of which at least one person is a professor and one is a docent	A minimum of ten teachers with a PhD (or equivalent artistic competence) of which at least two persons are professors and two are docents	A minimum of one teacher with a PhD (or equivalent artistic competence)
Pedagogical competence	A minimum of two merited or excellent teachers	A minimum of two merited or excellent teachers	A minimum of two merited or excellent teachers	A minimum of one merited or excellent teacher

Base of assessment 2:

The teachers are given the opportunities to continuously improve their skills both academically and when it comes to the subject being taught.

Base of assessment 3:

The teachers are given the opportunities to continuously improve their skills and exchange experiences in the course University pedagogics.

Area of assessment 3: Course quality in selected courses

Base of assessment 1:*

The content of the course is relevant for the definition and area classification for the subject where it is a part

Base of assessment 2:*

The content of the course is based on scientific research or an artistic basis as well as proven experience⁶.

⁶ Courses in programmes leading to a degree as well as in contract education follow relevant regulations, first and foremost relevant regulations as well as (for programmes leading to a degree) the Swedish National Agency for Education's subject description and course content for the equivalent course at high school.

Base of assessment 3:*

The prerequisites correspond to contents of the requirements for a programme at the first-cycle and second-cycle levels as well as the area classification ⁷.

Base of assessment 4:*

The course objectives correspond to the requirements for a programme at the first-cycle and second-cycle levels ⁸.

Base of assessment 5:*

The forms of teaching, course literature, and other teaching material as well as examinations and grading criteria guarantee that the student can reach the course goals and objectives⁹.

Area of assessment 4: Infrastructure**Base of assessment 1:**

The infrastructure of the subject is stable and appropriate and is provided by the school in question as well as the University's Support services.

Base of assessment 2:

The students have access to learning environments (digital and physical) which support the students in their completion of their studies

⁷ Not relevant for follow-ups of courses in programmes leading to a degree and contract education.

⁸ Not relevant for follow-ups of courses in programmes leading to a degree and contract education which does not lead to university credits.

⁹ In follow-ups of contract education which does not lead to university credits, "fulfilling the course objectives" can be replaced with "having learned the course content."