



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Dnr TEKNAT 2022/198

Model for Educational Evaluations at the Bachelor's (first cycle) and Master's (second cycle) levels

Faculty of Science and Technology

Approved by the Faculty Board of Science and Technology
2023-06-13

Innehållsförteckning

Introduction	4
Areas and aspects of the educational evaluation	4
Educational evaluation every six years	5
Design	6
Heads of evaluation units	6
Student participation	6
Structure	7
Evaluation with assessor visit	7
Evaluation with benchmarking	7
Evaluation with assessor visit, joint assessment panel	7
Assessment panel composition	7
Handling conflict of interest and objection of disqualification	8
Compensation to assessors	8
Remuneration	8
Other compensation	9
Implementation	9
Self-evaluation	9
Site visit	11
Assessor statements	12
Evaluation report	13
Publication	14
Measures	14
Timetable for evaluation in the six-year cycle	14
Timetable for an evaluation unit	15
Annual follow-up	16
Ongoing quality management work	16
Annual reporting on the programme and on freestanding courses and contract education	17
Focus areas	17
Appendix 1. Abbreviations of programme names	18
Appendix 2. Instructions for annual reporting for programmes	20

2023-06-13

1.	Activity report _____	20
2.	Operational plan (approx. 1 page) _____	21
Appendix 3. Instructions for freestanding courses and contract education _____		22
1.	Activity report _____	22
2.	Operational plan (approx. 1 page) _____	23

Introduction

Guidelines for the programme review model (UFV 2021/2434) states: “Uppsala University conducts systematic quality assurance and quality enhancement of all its courses and programmes. [...] The model has two components: annual follow-up of education, and education reviews every sixth year.”

One of the strengths of the model is that it gives each evaluation unit room for influence. This helps to ensure that the evaluations foster development. The system also has the added benefit of external review and the Faculty Board deciding whether an education (programme or selection of courses) should be further developed or discontinued.

Areas and aspects of the educational evaluation

The evaluation will cover all eleven aspects enumerated below and describe ongoing quality assurance and enhancement in each area. The weight given to each aspect may vary depending on the development needs and relevance for the evaluation.

Goal attainment, teaching and assessment

- That the education achieve objectives of the Higher Education Act and the Higher Education Ordinance (System of Qualifications) as well as the specific goals, i.e. that the actual learning outcomes correspond to the intended learning outcomes.
- That the content and teaching methods are founded on a research basis and proven experience.
- That the teaching focuses on student-centred¹ learning.
- That the achievement of intended learning outcomes is assessed using appropriate and fair methods, and that progression is ensured.

Teaching expertise

- That staff involved in teaching and supervision possess adequate expertise in the subject matter, and in teaching and learning in higher education and/or subject didactics, and that there is sufficient teaching capacity.

Student participation and student perspective

- That students have influence on the planning, implementation and follow-up of the education.

¹ The term “student” refers to any person admitted to and undertaking Bachelor’s, Master’s or doctoral studies.

2023-06-13

- That an accessible and appropriate study environment is provided for all students.

Working life and social relevance

- That the education meets individuals' and society's needs for learning and professional knowledge and prepares students for future careers.

Inclusion, international outlook and sustainability

- That equal opportunities and a gender equality perspective are integrated in the education. (The Faculty's model includes broadened recruitment and broadened participation.)
- That internationalisation and international perspectives are promoted.
- That a sustainability perspective is promoted.

Educational evaluation every six years

All education shall be evaluated in accordance with the model. The educational evaluations are conducted in a six-year evaluation cycle, which means that each evaluation unit undergoes one evaluation per six-year cycle. For Bachelor's and Master's level, this includes programmes, with all of their higher education qualifications (degrees), freestanding courses and contract education. The following delimitations apply:

- Programmes with active students at the start of the evaluation shall be evaluated, regardless of whether there are new admissions. However, new programmes which no student has fully completed are to be excluded.
- All higher education qualifications (degrees) shall be evaluated within the framework of the programmes. This means that the higher education qualifications (degrees) associated with the programmes, including degrees at lower levels (Higher Education Diploma, Bachelor's degree, Master's degree (60 and 120 credits) for Master's programmes in engineering; Higher Education Diploma for Bachelor's programmes in science and in engineering, as well as Master's degree (60 credits) for Master's programmes (120 credits)) shall be evaluated. The goals for the Higher Education Diploma are covered by those for the Bachelor's degree. The Higher Education Diploma is therefore not handled separately. No programme leads to a Higher Education Diploma, but Uppsala University issues Higher Education Diplomas in certain main fields of study.
- All freestanding courses that have been conducted in any of the past two years and are not included in the syllabus of any programme shall be evaluated.
- All active contract education courses (i.e. offered in any of the past two

2023-06-13

- years) with an established course syllabus shall be evaluated.
- Programmes and courses offered in collaboration with other higher education institutions (HEIs) shall be evaluated in the same way as other study programmes. Parts of the evaluations performed at other HEIs may be used as supporting documentation or replace corresponding parts of the evaluation. The assessment of whether parts of the evaluation can be replaced shall be made by the responsible educational board.

Design

Heads of evaluation units

Each programme constitutes an evaluation unit (Master's programmes (60 and 120 credits) with the same main fields of study and the same first year are part of the same evaluation unit). The programme director is responsible for study programmes with associated degrees, including lower-level degrees.

Each subject's freestanding courses and contract education constitute an evaluation unit (this corresponds to the subject coordinator's area of responsibility). The course-coordinating department, with the subject coordinator serving as head, is responsible for freestanding courses (which are not included in any programme syllabus) and contract education.

An evaluation unit may be divided into smaller components if there are grounds for this (decision is made by the chair of the responsible educational board). A request for this is submitted by the head of the evaluation unit.

Student participation

Programme students are informed that an evaluation is in progress and the results of the evaluation via the programme pages and the programme boards (the programme director ensures that this is done). Students are given the opportunity to participate in the preparation of the self-evaluation. For programmes, the self-evaluation and evaluation report are discussed in the programme board. Students from other HEIs are included in the assessment panels. These are appointed by the relevant student union. Students participate in the site visit. These are also appointed by the relevant student union.

The approved evaluation report is sent to the relevant student union by the senior educational officer.

Structure

The structure of the evaluation (see below) is chosen by the respective evaluation unit. An external assessment panel shall evaluate each evaluation unit. The review is conducted according to generally accepted principles for peer review.

Evaluation with assessor visit

An assessment panel visits and assesses the evaluation unit at Uppsala University.

Evaluation with benchmarking

Together with the internal assessor and the student assessor, the evaluation unit visits another HEI and examines the equivalent programme there. The external assessors are taken from this HEI.

Evaluation with assessor visit, joint assessment panel

An assessment panel visits and assesses the evaluation unit at Uppsala University. The evaluation unit is assessed by the same assessment panel as another education (at another HEI or at UU). This may include a comparison between the programmes. Separate assessments are made for each evaluation unit. This means that there will be one detailed and one summary assessor statement per evaluation unit. A joint assessment panel may not cover more than three evaluation units.

Assessment panel composition

The assessment panel shall consist of one internal teacher (from another disciplinary domain within UU), two external teachers with expertise in the relevant subject (from other HEIs) plus one student from another HEI. In certain cases, a labour market representative may be included. An equal gender distribution is sought. Student assessors are appointed by the relevant student union. Other assessors are appointed by the Faculty Board based on the proposal from the Deputy Dean of Education.

The internal assessor is the convening chair of the panel. The internal assessor meets the senior educational administrator at the start of the evaluation period for further clarification of the assignment. In exceptional cases, the student union concerned may appoint a student assessor from other faculty at UU, after first receiving approval for this by the senior educational officer.

For programmes with a particularly broad subject content, a third external teacher with expertise in the subject may be appointed.

2023-06-13

If the benchmarking approach is not chosen the external teachers with expertise in the subject shall come from at least two different HEIs (preferably Swedish HEIs). For benchmarking, representatives from the equivalent programme form an assessment panel consisting of at least two teachers with expertise in the subject. The assessment panel also includes one internal assessor (teacher from another disciplinary domain within UU) and one student (from another HEI).

Handling conflict of interest and objection of disqualification

The role of assessor requires integrity and impartiality. Conflicts of interest that could make the objectivity of the assessors be called into question must be avoided. Conflict of interest is described in Sections 11 and 12 of the Administrative Procedures Act. Assessors must not have taught in the evaluation unit within the past five years. Assessors are expected to certify that there is no conflict of interest.

Compensation to assessors

Remuneration

The two external teachers in each assessment panel as well as the labour market representative (where applicable) receive remuneration in the amount of SEK 10,000. For the internal teacher, equivalent compensation is paid to the department at which the teacher is employed. The student in each assessment panel receives SEK 5,000 in remuneration.

For a joint assessment panel, the remuneration for freestanding courses and contract education equals the proportion of a Bachelor's degree that the courses correspond to, i.e. $(\text{number of credits}/180) * \text{SEK } 10,000$ for an external teacher.

The same applies for the student and the internal teacher. If the same assessment panel evaluates two programmes, the assessors are compensated for each programme (which doubles the expected contribution).

The remuneration and compensation are paid when the final version of the assessor statements have been submitted.

2023-06-13

Other compensation

For site visits, travel and hotel expenses are paid by the Faculty of Science and Technology, upon agreement with the Faculty Office. No per diem is paid, but shared meals are included.

The trips shall follow the University's travel policy. This means that the environmental impact of the trips shall be minimised, which is why train travel should be the primary mode of transportation. Connecting trips should be by public transport as far as possible. Any bonus points or other benefits offered by the travel providers shall go to the University in full. The assessors will be contacted by the Faculty Office to make travel arrangements.

Hotel reservations must be made with a hotel with which there is a government framework agreement. The ranking must be followed.

The Faculty of Science and Technology shall pay for all shared meals in connection with meetings. The University's guidelines for entertainment shall be followed. The evaluation unit shall order these meals after an agreement has been reached with the Faculty Office. For longer site visits (3 days), a more formal dinner and a light dinner are included. The assessors shall not incur any out-of-pocket expenses.

Implementation

Regardless of the chosen evaluation structure, each evaluation must include a self-evaluation and site visit, and result in a detailed assessor statement, a summary of this, and an evaluation report that includes an action plan and the conclusions of the Faculty Board.

Self-evaluation

The head of the evaluation unit writes a self-evaluation of not more than 40 pages, including the most important supporting documents (in the form of appendices, but excluding any previous evaluation report). The self-evaluation is written in Swedish or English, depending on the needs of the evaluation unit and/or assessment panel.

For programmes, the programme director is responsible for drawing up the self-evaluation. Teachers and students are involved early-on in the drafting of the self-evaluation based on a discussion in the programme board on how this can be done. Students can be involved by participating in a working group, writing a student submission, or being part of a reference group. If a working group or reference group is appointed, one or more student representatives are included in this

2023-06-13

(appointed by the relevant student union). The self-evaluation must state how it was drawn up and how student opinions have been taken into account.

For programmes, all evaluation aspects (see page 3) must be covered by the self-evaluation, but the evaluation unit may choose to attach different weight to different aspects based on development needs. The reasoning for this must be stated. For programmes, all associated degrees must be covered by the evaluation unit's self-evaluation. This is done by presenting an outcome matrix based on the intended course learning outcomes for lower-level degrees. The quality management work for these degrees is included in the programme's quality management work and does not require further specification.

For freestanding courses and contract education, the subject coordinator is responsible for drawing up the self-evaluation. All areas (see page 3) must be covered, but the evaluation unit may choose to attach different weight to different aspects based on relevance and development needs. If any aspect(s) are not considered relevant, the reasoning for this must be stated. Equal opportunities and the gender equality perspective must always be included. The reason for the course offering and the target group of the courses must be stated. The subject coordinator decides which of the courses that are offered as freestanding are to be included in the evaluation (however, courses that are not part of a programme's curriculum must be included).

The self-evaluation must also describe the ongoing quality management work that is carried out. The self-evaluation aims to be a document that enables quality assurance through critical review. It identifies areas for development and thus promotes quality.

If there is an approved evaluation report from a previous evaluation, it is attached.

Comments on the self-evaluation must be obtained from the programme board (for programmes) and the senior educational officer. After coordination with the senior educational officer, the head of the evaluation unit (i.e. the programme director/subject coordinator) sends the self-evaluation to the assessment panel.

Abbreviations must be explained and written out to make it easier for students and assessors. A self-evaluation template is available from the Faculty Office.

2023-06-13

Identification of evaluation questions and collection of supporting documentation

The head of each evaluation unit identifies evaluation questions. These may be within or outside the evaluation areas in the UU guidelines (see page 4), based on the identified needs of the programme. For support, see [Idébank – utvärderingsfrågor utifrån aspekterna](#) (UU), currently only available in Swedish.

The head of the evaluation collects supporting documentation with the assistance of relevant departments or other units at the faculty. The departments and units are obliged to provide supporting documentation as specified in the instructions from the responsible educational board.

Examples of supporting documentation include the Faculty's survey for new students, programme survey, alumni survey, the study counsellors' follow-up work, TUR's work, the evaluation units' annual reporting and statistics provided by the Faculty Office (student completion, gender distribution, applicants per place). Programmes can also conduct their own surveys among teachers, supervisors, subject reviewers and examiners for degree projects concerning the students' knowledge and skills, preferably in comparison with other programmes or HEIs. An outcome matrix with intended course learning outcomes/courses in comparisons with the goals in the Higher Education Act/Higher Education Ordinance is used. If there are programme-specific goals, these are included in the self-evaluation.

Site visit

The assessment panel must make at least one in-person site visit. The Deputy Dean of Education may grant exemption from this so that the site visit may instead be conducted digitally. A request for this must be submitted by the head of the evaluation unit. In connection with the site visit, time should be allotted for the assessment panel to summarise the visit in their own words and begin writing the assessor statement. The site visit for an evaluation unit lasts one or two days (as determined by the head of the evaluation unit). A two-day visit is recommended.

For benchmarking, the external assessors' site visit is replaced by the evaluation unit, internal assessor and student member of the assessment panel making a visit to the corresponding programme. The Faculty pays travel and subsistence expenses for three people per programme: the programme director, a teacher, a student representative (the programme may choose to pay for additional participants) as well as for the internal assessor and the external student.

2023-06-13

Prior to the site visit, the respective evaluation unit and the assessment panel should be in contact to put the education in its context, ensure that the assessment panel gets the supporting documentation it needs, and to agree on the time point and execution of the site visit. A draft agenda is provided by the senior educational officer.

The assessment panel can make requests about which functions will participate in the site visit. Normally, the participants are the Deputy Dean of Education or the chair of the responsible educational board, the programme director (for programmes), subject coordinator, one or more teachers, the senior educational officer, and students.

Alumni may also be included. The assessment panel shall meet the students separately. These students are appointed by the relevant student union.

The assessment panel is asked to forward questions to the students before the site visit to make it easier for the students to collect views from other students (if desired). However, this does not prevent the assessment panel from asking other questions during the site visit.

The site visit concludes with the assessment panel summarising its preliminary reflections and conclusions.

Assessor statements

The focus of the evaluation is the further development of the programmes. The assessment panels are therefore asked to point out areas for development and make development suggestions.

The assessment panel must submit two assessor statements per evaluation unit, including in cases of a joint assessment panel. The assessment panels submit one detailed statement (approx. 10–20 pages) and one summary of this (approx. 2–4 pages). The statements are written in Swedish or English, depending on the needs of the evaluation unit and/or assessment panel. Both statements shall include the programme's strengths, weaknesses/areas of development, and recommendations for development. The statements shall also include information about who the assessors are, implementation, and when the evaluation was performed. The aspects/areas covered by each educational evaluation shall be reflected in the assessment. For freestanding courses, the suitability of the course offering must also be assessed.

The statements include a brief summary evaluation of the programme. The assessors shall also identify (preferably stating reasoning) strengths

2023-06-13

and give suggestions for how the programme can further work with these.

The assessor statement template is available.

The summary assessor statement shall be published on the University's website with the public and students as the primary target groups.

The assessors are asked to submit a preliminary assessor statement for review by the evaluation unit heads to enable correction of any factual errors.

After the statement has been submitted, one or more assessors are encouraged to participate in a follow-up meeting (virtual or physical) with the evaluation unit in order to give the evaluation unit a chance to ask follow-up questions and thereby maximise the lessons learned through the evaluation. The head of the evaluation unit convenes this meeting.

Evaluation report

A brief evaluation report should be compiled by each evaluation unit head. For programmes, the report is discussed in the programme board. The report is presented to the responsible educational board, the Advisory Committee for Education and the Faculty Board (whose conclusions are added). Suggestions for templates are available.

The evaluation report must contain:

- A description of the evaluation unit, i.e. which programme is included in the review.
- Implementation of the evaluation.
- The key conclusions based on the self-evaluation and the assessor statement.
- Planned measures/development initiatives, along with the timetable and who is responsible these.
- Strengths the programme director/subject coordinator would like to develop further (to facilitate dissemination of good examples).
- How the report was drawn up and how student opinions have been taken into account.
- The Board's conclusions, including whether special follow-up is needed.

The evaluation report is written in Swedish or English, depending on the needs of the students and assessors. Planned measures/development

2023-06-13

initiatives, along with the timetable and who is responsible for these, and the Board's conclusions must be in Swedish.

The approved evaluation report shall be submitted (by the senior educational officer) to the relevant student union and to the assessment panel.

Publication

The summary assessor statement and the planned measures (including the Faculty's conclusions) for the evaluation unit shall be made available to the public (published on UU's joint evaluation website). The detailed assessor statement is made available to those working with the evaluation unit, including relevant boards, advisory committees and the senior educational officers.

The self-evaluation, assessor statements and evaluation report are registered.

Measures

The Faculty Board shall decide whether the education shall be further developed or discontinued, based on suggestions from the responsible educational board. The Faculty Board's conclusions, including whether special follow-up is needed, are reported in evaluation report. If it is decided that an education should be discontinued, the head of the evaluation unit shall submit a plan for how the remaining students will receive the best possible education. This plan is approved by the responsible educational board.

The measures identified in the evaluation report shall be initiated by no later than the next year and reported within the context of annual follow-up. This work is led by the head of the evaluation unit.

Timetable for evaluation in the six-year cycle

Table 1. Educational evaluations 2023–2028. Abbreviations are explained in Appendix 1.

2023	No new evaluations
2024	Foundation year programme/Foundation semester programme

2023-06-13

	Computer science: freestanding courses and contract education (free/contract) Bachelor's programmes in engineering (EI, BI, KKI, MI, HUI, MTI) Physics: contract education kLKF
2025	Biology: kBIO, mBIO, mMEME, mTBT, mBINF, free/contract Earth science: kEO, kGEO, mGEO, mSINReM, mPANGEA, mgVIND/mVIND, mHU, mVT, free/contract incl. CEMUS
2026	Chemistry: kKE, mEACH, mKE, mBT, free/contract Physics: kFY, mFY, mMV, mBF, mKT, free Mathematics: kMA, mMA, free/contract Computer science: kDV, mDV, mDA, mBM, mINS, mTBV
2027	Technology: mLI, mIA, mHDU, mFE, mEF, mENTECH, mAT, mMT, free/contract
2027.5	Master's programmes in engineering (E, F, I, IT, K, Q, W, X, ES, STS)
2028	No new evaluations

Timetable for an evaluation unit

Exact dates are set jointly by the respective evaluation unit and assessment panel together with the senior educational officer. The following is an approximate timetable (a similar time frame is applied for the Master's programmes in engineering).

October (year before the specified start date): Kick-off meeting with heads of the evaluation units.

November: The work to find assessors begins.

January: The evaluation unit starts drawing up the self-evaluation (the year stated in the timetable for the respective evaluation unit (according to Table 1)).

April: Kick-off meeting with internal assessor.

May: The self-evaluation is submitted to the responsible senior educational officer.

June: The self-evaluation is sent to the assessment panel.

September–October: Site visit.

November–December: The assessment panels submit a preliminary version of the detailed assessor statements so that any misunderstandings can be sorted out.

2023-06-13

December: The assessment panels submit a final version of detailed assessor statements. The assessment panels also submit a summary of their statement (published).

December–January: Possibly, a follow-up meeting is held with representative(s) of the assessment panel and the evaluation unit.

February–March: The evaluation report is submitted to the responsible senior educational officer.

Annual follow-up

The annual follow-up forms the basis for ongoing quality management work and for the educational evaluations. Each year, the evaluation units submit a report to the responsible educational board.

Ongoing quality management work

For each programme, there is a programme director and a programme board; see Rules of Procedure for the Disciplinary Domain of Science and Technology (TEKNAT 2019/177). Each programme board consists of teacher representatives, student representatives and labour market representatives. The programme boards conduct continuous quality management work, reviewing course and programme syllabuses, survey results, course evaluations and course reports.

Many programmes have teacher days, during which teachers who actively teach in the programme gather to discuss current issues. Programme directors take part in coordination committees which discuss and coordinate common quality issues. The programmes and courses are sorted under a responsible educational board (Educational Board of Engineering or Educational Board of Science). The duties of the educational boards include revising programme syllabuses, approving new course syllabuses, and working with quality issues. Each educational board consists of teacher representatives, student representatives and labour market representatives.

Quality management work is also conducted at the respective department.

Resource allocation (e.g. to course-coordinating departments, programme directors and study counsellors) is determined by the Faculty Board after preparation by the Advisory Committee for Education as part of the operational plan.

2023-06-13

Each year, the programme study counsellors follow up on the students, particularly those in years 1–3. Students at risk of not reaching the minimum threshold for student finance from CSN during the upcoming semester are contacted and offered study guidance/individual study planning. There are also subject study counsellors for the different subjects.

A course evaluation must be conducted for each course (see the Faculty's guidelines for course evaluations). The course evaluations are followed up in the relevant programme board (for programme courses) and by the course-coordinating department.

As part of quality management, the Faculty conducts an annual survey of the newly registered programme students. Programme surveys and alumni surveys are also conducted at various time intervals.

Each year, the evaluation units submit a report to the responsible educational board.

The Council for Educational Development at the Faculty of Science and Technology (TUR) provides support and guidance for the Faculty's pedagogical development. The Faculty also distributes funds annually from a pedagogical fund to support pedagogical development projects.

Annual reporting on the programme and on freestanding courses and contract education

Each year, the head of the evaluation unit (programme director or subject coordinator) submits a report to the responsible educational board (including the years when the evaluation in the six-year cycle is carried out). For programmes that have been evaluated, measures and development initiatives linked to the evaluation must be included. The report must state who is responsible for implementing each measure and when it should be or was implemented. Instructions can be found in Appendices 2 and 3. The chair of the responsible educational board will provide any additional instructions.

Focus areas

The annual reporting from each evaluation unit includes an operational plan, which shall focus on one or more areas in particular. This becomes the evaluation unit's focus area(s) for the year. In addition, coordination committees and boards can work on additional focus areas, involving the evaluation unit heads and other interested parties. The focus areas are followed up as part of the annual follow-up.

2023-06-13

Appendix 1. Abbreviations of programme names

Programme name	Programme abbreviation
Bachelor's programme in mathematics	kMA
Bachelor's programme in computer science	kDV
Bachelor's programme in physics	kFY
Bachelor's programme in earth sciences	kGEO
Bachelor's programme in biology	kBIO
Bachelor's programme in chemistry	kKE
Bachelor's programme in leadership – quality management – improvement	kLKF
Bachelor's programme in energy transition	kEO
Master's programme in electrical engineering	E
Master's programme in engineering physics	F
Master's programme in industrial economics	I
Master's programme in computer and information engineering	IT
Master's programme in chemical engineering	K
Master's programme in engineering physics with materials science	Q
Master's programme in environmental and water engineering	W
Master's programme in molecular biotechnology	X
Master's programme in energy systems	ES
Master's programme in systems in engineering and society	STS
Bachelor's programme in structural engineering	BI
Bachelor's programme in electrical engineering	EI
Bachelor's programme in nuclear engineering	KKI
Bachelor's programme in mechanical engineering	MI
Bachelor's programme in sustainable development in industrial engineering	HUI
Bachelor's programme in medical technology	MTI
Foundation year and foundation term programme	Foundation year
Master's programme (60/120 credits) in wind power planning	mgVIND, mVIND
Master's programme in mathematics	mMA
Master's programme in applied scientific computing	mTBV
Master's programme in computer science	mDV
Master's programme in human-computer interaction	mMDI
Master's programme in biology	mBIO
Master's programme in evolutionary biology – MEME	MEME
Master's programme in applied biotechnology	mTBT

2023-06-13

Master's programme in sustainable development	mHU
Master's programme in physics	mFY
Master's programme in materials science	mMV
Master's programme in earth sciences	mGEO
Master's programme in sustainable and innovative natural resource management – SINReM	SINREM
Master's programme in palaeobiology – PANGEA	PANGEA
Master's programme (60/120 credits) in sustainable destination development	mgHDU, mHDU
Master's programme in chemistry	mKE
Master's programme in analytical chemistry – EACH	EACH
Master's programme in bioinformatics	mBINF
Master's programme in embedded systems	mINS
Master's programme in renewable electricity production	mFE
Master's programme in industrial management and innovation	mLI
Master's programme in energy technology – ENTECH	mET
Master's programme in additive manufacturing	mAT
Master's programme in materials engineering	mMT
Master's programme in water engineering	mVT
Master's programme in industrial analysis	mIA
Master's programme in data science	mDA
Master's programme in image analysis and machine learning	mBM
Master's programme in biophysics	mBF
Master's programme in all-electric propulsion systems	mEF
Master's programme in quantum technology	mKT
Master's programme in battery technology and energy storage	mBT

Appendix 2. Instructions for annual reporting for programmes

This is an appendix to *Model for educational evaluations at the Bachelor's (first cycle) and Master's (second) levels*, which describes the Faculty of Science and Technology's model for educational evaluation.

Each year, the programme director submits a report to the responsible educational board.

1. Activity report

1.1 Content and size

Number of students – newly registered and total. Proportion women/men.

1.2 Performance

Evaluations (incl. course evaluations, surveys, ...), student follow-up (e.g. report of study counsellors' follow-up)

1.3 Changes

Changes in programme syllabus and major course changes, changes in course-coordinating department, special activities (incl. the purpose and outcome of these), gender equality, ...

1.4 Programme management

Programme board, teacher days, student influence ...

1.5 Outlook and exchange

Continuous work with e.g. internationalisation, marketing efforts, research basis, contacts with the private sector and other outward-looking activities, career preparation...

1.6 Identified strengths, weaknesses and areas for development

From evaluations (if any) and those identified by programme director/programme board/department

1.7 Follow-up of programme's operational plan for the current year; follow-up of the previous year's 2.2

What was planned in the previous activity report and what the outcome was. Fill in the table of measures from the evaluation report (if applicable).

1.8 Goal attainment

Summary comparing the intended course learning outcomes against the goals in the Higher Education Ordinance, in the form of an outcome

2023-06-13

matrix. Updated each time the programme syllabus or course syllabus is changed. Clearly state that all students must meet all goals in order to earn a degree.

1.9 Follow-up of joint quality management work

Links to assignments from the responsible educational board, directives from the Faculty Board, work in the coordination committee, and focus areas in the evaluation model. Instructions from the chair of the responsible educational board.

1.10 Programme-specific aspects

Programme-specific assignments given by the responsible educational board.

1.11 Financial accounting (1/2 page) (applies only to programmes at the faculty level)

Opening and closing balance. Allocation for the year. Report of indirect cost management. Explanation of the year's costs, e.g. in a table. "Project report" as attachment.

2. Operational plan (approx. 1 page)

2.1 Planned measures in the evaluation report from the six-year cycle (if applicable). The entire list of planned measures from the evaluation report.

2.2 For the following year:

What the programme director/programme board plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6–1.10. Where applicable, planned measures in the evaluation report from the six-year cycle, plus any other measures.

Goals, purpose, time, responsible person, resources, follow-up.

3. With a longer time frame:

What the programme director/programme board plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6–1.10. Where applicable, planned measures in the evaluation report from the six-year cycle, plus any other measures.

Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.

2.4 Focus area(s)

One or more focus areas defined, justified and planned by the programme director.

Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.

Appendix 3. Instructions for freestanding courses and contract education

This is an appendix to *Model for Educational Evaluations at the Bachelor's (first cycle) and Master's (second cycle) level*, which describes the Faculty of Science and Technology's model for educational evaluation.

Each year, the subject coordinator submits a report to the responsible educational board regarding freestanding courses not included in any programme syllabus as well as contract education courses.

1. Activity report

1.1 Range, content and size

The range of courses within the subject(s) (undergraduate and graduate levels, target group, study time (day, evening or distance), number of students/participants. Proportion women/men. The reason for the range of freestanding courses offered, including courses included in any programme syllabus.

1.2 Performance

Evaluations (incl. course evaluations, surveys, ...), student follow-up (e.g. student completion)

1.3 Changes

Changes in the range of courses offered in the subject(s), major course changes, special activities (incl. the purpose and outcome of these), gender equality, ...

1.4 Management of freestanding courses and contract education

Organisation for ongoing quality management work and development (e.g. follow-up of course evaluations, changes in the range of courses offered), how student influence is ensured, teacher days

1.5 Outlook and exchange

Continuous work with e.g. internationalisation, marketing efforts, research basis, contacts with the private sector and other outward-looking activities, career preparation,...

1.6 Identified strengths, weaknesses and areas for development

From evaluations (if any) and those identified by the course coordinator/programme directors/department (suggestions for measures in next section)

2023-06-13

1.7 Follow-up of programme's operational plan for the current year; follow-up of the previous year's 2.2

What was planned in the previous activity report and what the outcome was. Fill in the table of measures from the evaluation report (if applicable).

1.8 Goal attainment

Summary of how intended course learning outcomes are in line with the goals in the Higher Education Act. Design of examination to ensure goal attainment.

1.9 Follow-up of joint quality management work

Links to assignments from the responsible educational board, directives from the Faculty Board, and focus areas in the evaluation model. Instructions from the chair of the responsible educational board.

1.10 Department-specific aspects

Department-specific assignments given by the responsible educational board.

2. Operational plan (approx. 1 page)

2.1 Planned measures in the evaluation report from the six-year cycle (if applicable). The entire list of planned measures from the evaluation report.

2.2 For the following year:

What the department plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6–1.10. Where applicable, planned measures in the evaluation report from the six-year cycle, plus any other measures.

Goals, purpose, time, responsible person, resources, follow-up.

2.3 With a longer time frame

What the department plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6–1.10. Where applicable, planned measures in the evaluation report from the six-year cycle, plus any other measures.

Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.

2.4 Focus area(s)

One or more focus areas defined, justified and planned by the subject coordinator.

Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.