

Panel statement of evaluation of the main field of study “Education with Specialization in Learning, Communication and Information Technology”

**Department of Education, Communication and Learning
University of Gothenburg
2023/2024**

Executive summary

The programme has several strengths, including academic rigor, demonstrated by well-staffed courses and high-quality Master’s theses, and a strong student-centered learning approach, where students benefit from responsive teaching staff engaged in current research. The teaching relies upon firm theoretical and methodological foundations, thereby ensuring a solid scientific basis. Additionally, teaching staff are qualified, and the programme effectively prepares students for academic careers. We commend leadership and teachers for the effort during the last years to assure the alignment of the programme courses and for updating course syllabi accordingly.

However, there are areas that could be improved. There appears to be a discrepancy between students’ expectations of a more central technological focus and the scholarly content provided. The interdisciplinary nature of IT and learning poses theoretical and methodological challenges, requiring more scientific integration. Rapid advancements in generative AI highlight the need for updated competences among teaching staff. Moreover, there is a perceived gap between acquired competencies and job market expectations, indicating a need for clearer programme profiles and stronger industry connections.

To address these weaknesses, the panel recommended investigating the mismatches between student expectations and experiences further. Allocating the time for a long-term strategic revision of the programme answering to new societal and technological challenges, such as integrating and communicating the use of generative AI in courses, is essential. Enhancing on-campus activities to foster a stronger student community, especially for international students, is also recommended. Strengthening industry connections to improve students’ professional identity and job market alignment should be a future path to focus on.

Background and setting

The panel of assessors (see below) has been assigned the task of evaluating the interdisciplinary main field of study “Education with Specialization in Learning, Communication and Information Technology” at the Department of Education, Communication and Learning, University of Gothenburg. This main field is spanning across two different programmes; one international MA programme (120 credits) which *is* included in the evaluation, and one national MA programme (60 credits), which *is not* included in this evaluation. The aim of this work has been to evaluate the scientific and pedagogical quality of the main field of study in relation to the Policy for quality assurance and continuous quality improvement of education at the University of Gothenburg document (GU 2022/2839). The quality has been assessed

applying a systematic procedure to evaluate whether the provided education in this main field of study meets a number (8) of specified criteria as defined in the above-mentioned document.

On March 21, 2024, a digital start-up meeting was held for the panel of assessors and staff representing programme, department and faculty. Prior to that, on March 5, 2024, the panel of assessors had been given virtual access to documentation made available through a dedicated SharePoint/Microsoft Teams space and through programme Canvas pages (see Appendix 1. List of input documents for the panel of assessors). Following the start-up meeting, the panel was given access to a number of additional, requested documents. The site visit was carried out on April 22 and April 23 (see Appendix 2. Programme for site visit, April 22 and April 23, 2024). Prior to the site visit, the panel of assessors initiated the work of reviewing the provided documents and made notes of questions and comments to address during the site visit. In addition, a virtual preparation meeting was held on April 3 where both specific and general interview questions were prepared for the site visit participants (see Appendix 3. Interview guide for site visit, April 22 and April 23, 2024). The prepared questions were also revised by the panel members before the site visit. Following the site visit, the panel has then, based on provided documentation and site visit interviews, jointly prepared the following panel statement.

The panel has consisted of:

- *Beata Jungselius, Senior Lecturer, University West (chair)*
- *Christopher Kullenberg, Senior Lecturer, University of Gothenburg*
- *Monica Divitini, Professor, Norwegian University of Science and Technology*

(Unfortunately, the student representatives intended to participate as members of the panel of assessors were never appointed by the student union.)

Introduction

When providing the panel of assessors with the documents constituting the input for the review, the panel was also provided with a helpful reading instruction to introduce the structure and distribution of the activities comprising the main field across the two different programmes. Within this document, the panel was kindly asked to make specific considerations of three areas of particular interest. These involve possible future directions for the international MA programme (120 credits), potential improvements in terms of the scientific grounding of the education provided in this main field of study overall as well as possible collaborations that could be initiated with the purpose of strengthening the main field of study. The following text will be structured based on the criteria (1-8), additional comments (9) and comments related to the three areas of particular interest incorporated below each of the criteria subheadings.

1. Achieved study results match intended learning outcomes and the qualitative targets of the Higher Education Ordinance.

The formal requirements of the Higher Education Ordinance (HEO) are matched in the following order:

1. The programme and courses are staffed by senior lecturers and professors who meet the requirements of a doctorate.
2. All courses have a curriculum and opportunity for the students of a course evaluation is present throughout all courses.

3. The learning outcomes of the master programme is primarily assessed by the Masters' thesis results that have been analyzed. The following remarks can be made:

The theses graded as "Pass with distinction" (Väl Godkänd) are of a high scientific quality. The research questions are firmly anchored in recent empirical research while maintaining a coherent perspective drawn from selected classical learning theories. The methodology is both well-founded and approached with reflexivity.

The theses graded "Pass" (Godkänd) are of sufficient quality for making scientifically founded conclusions. The theoretical approaches are well-described, and the methodological discussions show adequate awareness of limitations of knowledge acquisition.

The theses marked as "Failed" (Underkänd) are distinct from the two higher grades that give actual credits. In these cases, there are either clear methodological insufficiencies or the overall structure of the thesis is inadequate.

In summary, the clear quality criteria in the examination of Masters' theses indicate that the learning outcomes of the programme as a whole are achieved, both in terms of formal criteria and throughout the examination process. Overall, the standards for a Master's thesis to pass is high which ensures a rigorous scientific quality as the learning outcomes are achieved.

2. Teaching is focused on student/doctoral-centered learning.

The assessment of the student-centered learning is primarily based on the on-site interviews that were conducted with students, teaching administration and teachers. From the perspective of the students, the experience can be divided into three phases: expectations before starting the programme, developed experience during the programme and, finally, the retrospective reflections after completion of the programme.

Several students reported that a strong interest in IT led them to applying to the programme. As a consequence, there were in many cases expectations of a more technical focus, for example courses in programme and computer science/engineering. From this perspective, the scholarly focus on learning sometimes came as a surprise. Also, students often anticipated more hands-on courses and assignments. However, during the first year, expectations were progressively adjusted with the actual programme content. It should be noted here that the evaluation committee has only spoken to those students who stayed on the programme. Thus, a recommendation would be to further investigate the possible mismatches between expectations and actual student experiences, with special regards to the students who dropped out early on. This is especially important for international programmes, since mismatches in recruitments can be costly primarily for the individual student, but also for the programme budget as a whole.

Overall students perceive teachers to be responsive and favorably inclined to provide feedback on assignments and individual progression. Furthermore, from the perspective of students, the teaching collegium as a whole is perceived as firmly integrated in current research. Of special concern and interest to students are recent developments in (generative) AI, in which they report mixed impressions from teachers and courses. While teachers do address AI, students often feel uncertain with regards to *how* generative AI could and should be used in assignments and essays. As a recommendation the programme council could develop a strategy for communicating how generative AI is integrated both into courses (theoretically, methodologically) and in practice with special attention to what is allowed, disallowed as well as what is good and bad practice.

Finally, several students mentioned a desire for more on-campus activities. Such activities include both more time spent with teachers as well as with fellow students and possible employers and relevant stakeholders. This concern was expressed from the perspective of the special requirements that international students have. The causes of such expectations sometimes spring from the cultural differences in how higher education is structured in the student's respective home country. However, another cause was spelled out as originating in the psycho-social circumstances of being an international student in which a higher degree of social contact may be needed to establish a stable study environment as a whole.

3. The content and form of teaching rests on scientific and/or artistic bases and proven experience.

Interdisciplinary higher education programmes are particularly difficult to assess as neither curricula nor staff competencies can be measured against conventional (disciplinary) criteria. This becomes especially troublesome if the specific combination itself is derived from two relatively young areas of study, in this case "IT" and "Learning".

However, given that the programme encompasses robust theoretical and methodological elements that are consistently tested through the teachers' research, it gives the overall impression that the majority of the instruction is indeed grounded in a scientific base. This impression is also shared amongst the students, who report that the scientific base is a strong foundation throughout several courses.

The primary strength is to be found in the strong research agenda of a majority of the teachers, which have allowed them to integrate internationally recognized approaches into their teaching practices. The link between the fields of IT and Learning have for more than a decade been sustained by well-funded external grants that have resulted in prolific academic careers for several of the teachers on the programme.

The weakness of interdisciplinarity in general, but to this programme in particular, is that evaluative statements will differ depending on what measurement system is adopted. This weakness can, however, at times be seen in the theoretical approaches adopted by students in their Masters' theses. The "classics" of learning theories, in which the students are well versed, are combined with contemporary IT theories in for example UX-design, media theory, et. cetera. While such combinations are completely legitimate, they may need to be glued together better with contemporary empirical studies. A recommendation would be to find teaching opportunities and literature that connect theoretical foundations, which are often of "classical" origins, with the very recent studies and research frontier that students are eager to contribute to. For example, various contemporary literatures that act as a glue in between the canon of Dewey, Piaget and Vygotsky and the current developments in AI, digital learning and mobile technologies.

4. Teachers have up-to-date and adequate competence as regards their subjects and teaching and learning in higher education, and the numbers of teachers are in proportion to the scope and content of study courses and programmes.

The competence level of the teaching staff seems to be adequate to the programme needs. In particular, their research allows them to be at the forefront of the field and integrate their competences in the courses. Most of the teaching staff has received pedagogical qualification.

It should however be recognized that the field is facing major changes, with generative AI requiring serious re-consideration of both content and pedagogical approaches. As a consequence, teachers will need to develop new competences. It is recommended that a re-assessment of the teachers' competences is made and the programme defines a professional development plan to make teachers in the conditions to take advantage of the genAI wave. This requires giving teachers time for long-term strategic planning, something that seems challenging given the current workload.

One point of concern is that the allocation of teachers to courses is, in some cases, fragmented. The responsibility for courses seems to be in the hands of a relatively small number of teachers, with the other teaching staff being associated in the courses with other duties. Though this is not necessarily a problem, and it can actually increase overall cohesiveness, there is a risk in terms of programme resilience.

During the interviews some concerns emerged about changes in course's responsibility. It is clear that this can happen. However, new teaching staff should be given time to appropriate the course material and shape the course as needed. Otherwise, these changes are frustrating for the involved teachers and confusing for students.

The programme seems to have addressed the problems with the staffing of some of the courses. Courses that in previous years had less resources than budgeted have been fully covered in the last year. This might have solved some of the challenges experienced by students, as reported above.

5. Study courses and programmes are relevant to the needs of the students/doctoral students and society.

The programme is rather popular, with a good number of applicants, nationally and mostly internationally. As mentioned by many students, the programme of study is rather unique, and it attracts people with different backgrounds and interests. It should however be noted a slight decrease in the number of students. This should be carefully monitored. Though this might be connected to external reasons, it is still a challenge for the sustainability of the programme.

Based on the information that we collected during the interviews, it seems that a number of students who graduated have continued with PhD studies. From this perspective, it seems the programme is successful in educating students to continue along this path, fulfilling a need in academia. It is however questionable to what extent this is a sustainable model.

Some students reported challenges that students from previous years had in finding a job and a perceived discrepancy between the actual competencies gained by students and the expectations of future employers. Some students also seem to struggle with identifying their potential position in the job market. Recently, the programme has put a considerable effort in defining more clearly the nature of the studies and the way it is disseminated. This might solve some of the problems and the programme should continue in this direction. In particular, during the interviews, it became clear that, while the 60-credits national MA programme has a clear profile, the profile of the international master is somehow vaguer.

Internships could play a critical role in the definition of students' professional identity and offer students a richer learning experience. However, it might be challenging for students, especially from abroad with no local connections, to grasp this opportunity.

The committee strongly recommends a more systematic interaction with potential employers to better identify the needs that the programme is intended to meet, at the same time offering

students more spaces for developing their professional identity. This might also be an opportunity for the programme to identify new opportunities, for example to meet the increasing societal needs for upskilling and re-skilling in the workplace.

6. Students/doctoral students have influence in planning, implementing and monitoring study courses and programmes.

During the interviews, teachers and leadership appeared as deeply engaged with students and fully committed to taking their perspectives into account, making changes at the programme and course level to accommodate the suggestions of students. On the overall, student influence seems to be encouraged from both individual teachers and management, but it might not be clear to the students just how they can provide feedback, make suggestions, etc. This might partly be connected with a large population of international students, who might be less familiar with the opportunities offered by the system. Some targeted information at the beginning of courses might help to clarify to students the space of possibilities for engagement.

In the assessment committee there was no student representative – this should not be considered the fault of the programme, but it is clear that in this way students are missing an important occasion to influence the overall development of the programme.

At the programme level, according to the management, the participation of a student representative in the board has brought much valuable feedback to the table.

At the course level, teachers report problems with low response rates on course evaluations. This is a common challenge at university level also in other universities. We underline and commend the effort of the programme to create alternative ways to collect feedback and promote participation, for example the student dialogue meetings, twice a year. (See also Criteria 8.) During the interviews, students confirmed that some students might feel more comfortable in giving oral feedback than answering course evaluation forms. The feedback might also be richer, engaging teachers and students in a dialogue.

Summarizing, though there is an effort to include students, the programme could work to define more systematic ways to work on the feedback that are received. Students should also be made aware since the beginning of their studies about the different possibilities that students have to get involved. This is critical considering that a number of students are not familiar with the Swedish educational system and culture.

Finally, we recommend that students are involved not only to provide feedback but as programme and course co-designers, especially in the context of the suggested long-term strategic revision of the program.

7. The study and learning environment is accessible and purpose-oriented for all students.

In relation to the seventh criterion, the education's strengths and weaknesses have been examined primarily through analysis of the digital (Canvas) study and learning environments and interviews with students, alumni and teachers. Through our evaluation of the digital learning environment provided through Canvas, the panel believes that this environment seems to meet the accessibility standards. Similar to physical sign post directing students on the physical premises, digital "signposts" for direction through modules and order of examinations are provided on Canvas. The structure and clarity of instructions in course guides/Canvas pages is overall clear and "to the point".

The primary obstacle to accessibility is associated with the challenges of acquiring residence permits. For international students needing residence permits, significant concerns and obstacles arise before enrollment, before even getting access to the programme. This is of course beyond the department's mandate to resolve, yet still remains an identified and substantial issue affecting the accessibility of the programme.

Study administration personnel and study counselors are recognized for their commendable efforts in addressing more solvable issues, and are being described as approachable, flexible, and helpful when providing support to students on how to apply and register and answering questions regarding tuition fees and visas, as well as student health and academic writing concerns. To support the latter, a collaboration with the Unit for Academic Language (ASK) has been initiated, which is described to have had positive effects in facilitating accessibility. Workshops with ASK and possibility to book individual sessions were mentioned to have been providing fruitful opportunities for enhancing academic writing skills.

As mentioned, the international students request more campus presence in order to fully develop a student community learning environment. Due to the low number of lectures and seminars, the campus is not fully seen as a natural meeting point. It was mentioned that the IT Faculty in general were more open to digital settings, while courses at the Faculty of Education were more often taking place at the physical campus.

While some initiatives on informal social online activities for creating a sense of community are described, it seems as if these initiatives come from individual teachers. However, these activities might be used as inspirational examples to get everyone on board. More formal initiatives of creating digital learning environments and meeting spaces have been taken as well, such as “open office” drop-in sessions. Student requests for drop-in Zoom sessions and non-mandatory literature seminars were also described to have been met by providing those very kinds of digital learning environments, yet unfortunately very few students showed up.

Presentations made by the teachers at the beginning of the programme were described by students as positive and as contributing to both getting an idea of each individual teacher’s specific interest as well as providing a sense of the programme content and focus as a whole.

An increased amount of lectures in physical settings at the beginning of the programme could be an additional way to provide the students with an overview of the field of studies faster, early on.

In general, there is an expressed desire for more meeting opportunities, encompassing not only lectures but also future scenario workshops, seminars, and group activities. As an example, the big data/machine learning workshop (“training the machine”) was mentioned as highly appreciated.

8. The study courses and programmes are continuously monitored and developed.

Course evaluations are being made on each course, these are evaluated together, and analysis and ideas of improvement are provided in a programme report. The general problem of low response rates on course evaluations has been met with introducing so-called “student dialogue meetings” twice a year. These dialogues were also initiated as a response to some students feeling more comfortable in giving oral feedback, why these meetings as well as feedback during the final lecture during a course are now serving to complement written course evaluations. The programme board student representative is also being mentioned as having been able to bring valuable feedback to the table. The document provided for the panel

containing student comments on the programme report of 2022 and the web site information show that students agree that the programme report does provide a fair and comprehensive overview of the International Master's programme in Information Technology and Learning as of the 2022 calendar year.

Programme management meets at least three times per semester for a programme council board meeting. They are confident in their overview of the courses and there seems to be a "red tread" established and maintained connecting the course syllabuses (for instance through work with a matrix constructed to oversee the learning outcomes of each course, transitions between courses discusses, meetings between course leaders). The programme council meets all the course leaders to discuss the "table of learning outcomes" jointly on a regular basis. The collaboration between the two faculties seems to be strong and positively overlapping, yet also provide some challenges for evaluation.

Course progression is being continuously monitored. A review of literature and content was proposed on board meeting in October 2023 and initiated during the fall of 2023 (the literature update was especially concerning the first course within the Master's programme) to secure that the course literature reflect the programme. This is an ongoing process.

There are routines in place for reporting course evaluations to programme councils and reports to the faculty. However, there has not been in-depth analyses for some time, and there is a need to make a thorough oversight and analysis of the programme.

9. Additional comments from the panel

In the document providing student comments on the programme report of 2022, it was highlighted that there is an interest from students' point of view in expanding collaboration with relevant industry representatives. It is mentioned that "For instance, me and other students have experienced that its very challenging to connect with relevant professional industries, that the programme mainly facilitates academic opportunities" and that "support and information on how to facilitate an internship with a master thesis have also been an issue with the programme". From our analysis, there seem to be fruitful and well-established and maintained academic collaborations, yet it is our understanding that collaboration with representatives from industry and public sector is yet to be further explored. We strongly recommend the definition of a strategy to engage more extensively with stakeholders in industry and the public sector, including creating occasions for bringing students closer to the world outside academia. This could be achieved, for example, through initiating industry meetings as social activities, facilitating interactions among students, teachers, industry, and public sector representatives. This could possibly coincide with an alumni day where graduates share their career paths post-graduation.

The integration of student learning, industry, and academic research presents a unique opportunity. This can be achieved by establishing intersections between students, industry, and the public sector, particularly in the context of student internships. It is crucial to pay special attention to the evolving technological landscape. This is especially important for thesis projects, which require up-to-date theoretical and methodological reviews to stay abreast of current research trends.

Master's theses consistently exhibit high scientific quality. This presents an opportunity to enhance collaboration with industry and public sector entities. The subjects of these thesis can be linked to applied problems within these organizations, leveraging the strong academic quality of the theses. As previously noted, technological and societal changes may influence

the direction of the programme and unveil new opportunities. However, this can only be achieved if the teaching staff and management are allotted sufficient time to define a long-term strategy for the programme. This includes identifying directions that will maintain the programme's relevance and open up for new possibilities. We recommend that this effort be highly inclusive, seeking ways to incorporate the voices of students, alumni, and the private/public sector. This will ensure a comprehensive and diverse range of perspectives are considered in the strategic planning process.

Gothenburg, Sweden 2024-06-20

Beata Jungselius
University West

Christopher Kullenberg
University of Gothenburg

Monica Divitini
Norwegian University of
Science and Technolog

Appendix 1. List of input documents for the panel of assessors

Utvärdering huvudområdet pedagogik med inriktning mot lärande, kommunikation och informationsteknologi

VT2024

Attachment 2 for the Reading instruction

Attachment 2. Documentation made available to the evaluation committee

The documentation provided has been sorted and categorized into 5 main areas which is reflected in the digital folder system the evaluation committee will have access to:

1 - Policy documents including rules, procedures and guidelines

University policy

Policy at Faculty and Department levels

2 – Assessment and evaluation

Course level reports

Program reports

3 – Courses in Canvas

Student work, feedback and grading

4 – Student comments

Student comments on the programme report

5 – Miscellaneous

1 - Policy documents including rules, procedures and guidelines

Policy, rules, procedures and guidelines at University level

Documents are available at <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/policy-rules-plans/Education/>

University guidance for external review of study courses and programmes at first and second cycle: see <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/quality/Policy+implementation+supports/>

Criteria support document for assessor panels reviewing first and second-cycle education (study courses and programmes): see

<https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/quality/Policy+implementation+supports/>

Policy (e.g.)

- University Vision 2021-2023: <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/Organisation/vision-2021-2030/>
- [Policy for quality assurance and continuous quality improvement of education at the University of Gothenburg](#)
- [Policy for the development of teaching and learning in Higher Education](#)
- [Pedagogical ideas programme at the University of Gothenburg](#)

Rules (e.g.)

- [Rules and regulations for first- and second-cycle examinations at the University of Gothenburg](#)
- [Rules for studies at first- and second-cycle studies](#)

- [Rules for student influence](#)

Procedures (e.g.)

- [Procedure for handling complaints from students](#)
- [Administrative procedure for reports relating to suspicions of disciplinary matters](#)

Guidelines

- [Fakultetsöverskridande programsamarbeten](#) (Swedish only)

Policy, rules and procedures (e.g.) at Faculty and Department levels

Policy at the Faculty and Department levels are generally provided in Swedish only.

The collected policy documents for education at first and second cycles at Faculty level are provided here: <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/staff-uf/styrdokument/utbildning-pa-grund--och-avancerad-niva/>. Policy documents for education at first and second cycles at Departmental level are provided here: <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/internt-ipkl/utbildning/styrdokument-for-utbildning/>.

- [Färdriktning för Utbildningsvetenskapliga fakulteten 2022-2025](#)
- Department action plans 2022 and 2023
- [Programme syllabus](#)
- Formal agreement between departments
- The local qualification descriptors (Lokal examensbeskrivning)
- [Regler för programråd \(generell examen\)](#)
- [Utbildningsutvärdering med extern bedömning vid Utbildningsvetenskapliga fakulteten](#)
- [Rutiner vid misstanke om disciplinär förseelse](#)
- [Handläggningsordning för kursuppföljning på grund- och avancerad nivå, 2023-04-27](#)

2 – Assessment and evaluation

This folder contains documents at programme level. The evaluation team will also be provided with the programme web-pages: <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/internt-ipkl/motestider/programrad/itlgu/>

- Course reports for PDA courses
- [Programme year report 2022](#)
- Programme council meeting notes, see <https://medarbetarportalen.gu.se/internt-ipkl/motestider/programrad/itlgu/>
- Evaluation 2018-2019 and the following action plan

3 – Courses: student work, feedback and grading

This folder contains two subfolders, one for the 120 credits international MA programme and one for the 60 credits national programme. These folders in turn contain a sub-folder for each course. Please remember that the entire 60 credit programme is not being evaluated but we provide this information for the sake of convenience and to facilitate a full picture of the context for the courses that belong the main field of study being evaluated (course code PDA). Correspondingly, the 120 credits programme includes courses that are not being evaluated (course code TIA) The evaluation team will also be provided access to these courses in the LMS Canvas, and links to the course modules are provided in a Word-document in this folder.

The courses included in the 120 credits international MA programme are:

PDA675

(TIA132 is not under evaluation)

PDA685

PDA679

PDA676

(TIA130 is not under evaluation)

PDA699 – thesis course

The courses included in the 60 credits MA programme are:

PDA681

(TIA120 is not under evaluation)

(TIA122 is not under evaluation)

PDA672

PDA683

(TIA123 is not under evaluation)

(TIA124 is not under evaluation, thesis course)

Each folder contains a selection of student work, assignments, feedback and grading. We propose to make available three final course assignments for each course, for the last completed academic year (2022-2023) and when relevant also for the autumn term of the current academic year (2023-2024).

The selected course samples contain one example of work that is graded outstanding (VG), one graded pass (G) and one graded either border-level or not passed (U). All student assignments will also be available through the Canvas pages.

4 – Student comments

This folder contains students' independent reflection and commentary on the last programme report.

5 - Miscellaneous

This folder contains statistical information on:

- staffing, teachers form of employment, academic degree, pedagogical training, teaching incidence, research activity, sex.
- statistics on student recruitment, throughput and degrees awarded.
- course budgets
- examiners

The folder also contains website information that can help clarify the interdisciplinary cooperation and academic environment between Faculty of Education and the IT-Faculty that surrounds the main field of study being evaluated. See <https://www.gu.se/en/research/gothenburggroup>

Appendix 2. Programme for site visit, April 22 and April 23, 2024

Site Visit - schedule

Evaluation of the main field of study labelled “Education with Specialization in Learning, Communication and Information Technology” at the Department of Education, Communication and Learning

Contact information:

Anna Nyberg, anna.nyberg@gu.se tel. 0766-185815, +46-(0)31-786 5815

Kristin Martinsson, kristin.martinsson@gu.se tel. 0766-182344, +46-(0)31-786 2344

April 22:

Time	Purpose	Participants	Location
9.00-9.45	Internal meeting	Panel of assessors	B4 437
	Coffee break	Panel of assessors	B4 437
10.00-11.00	Meeting Programme leadership	Panel of assessors Elin Nordenstöm, Mikaela Åberg, Johan Lundin, Linda Bradley, Annika Bergviken Renstedt	B4 437
11.00-11.30	Meeting student counselor, student administration	Panel of assessors Karin Wester, Lena Wendt, Marie Andersson, Ann-Marie Bengtsson	B4 437
11.30-13.00	Lunch	Panel of assessors: Beata Jungselius Monica Divitini Christopher Kullenberg Student Representatives, to be announced Maria Svensson Markus Nivala Sylvi Vigmo Mattias Zackrisson Åsa Mäkitalo Ann-Marie Eriksson Kristin Martinsson Annika Edenhalm Elin Nordenström Mikaela Åberg Linda Bradley Karin Fogelberg Anna Nyberg	Gegerfeltska villan

13.00-14.15	Meeting students	<p>Panel of assessors</p> <p>Students MA 120 credits Year 1: Lilyan Kobaissy Julia Christina Von Bartenwerffer Marta Soledad Serpas-Guardado Anezka Tosovská</p> <p>Year 2: Oritsema Chidi Rasha Khamis Xenia Panayot</p>	<p>B4 437</p> <p>https://gu-se.zoom.us/j/67727263307?pwd=djZqNW1iWnVkQ3pCbVQveDNtWVFXdz09</p>
14.30-14.45	Meeting students	<p>Panel of assessors</p> <p>Students MA 60 credits Year 1: Nektaria Prodromou</p>	<p>B4 437</p> <p>https://gu-se.zoom.us/j/61608525077?pwd=cDdzTS8vQkUkXZIVIEzaWNXTIRVQT09</p>
	Coffee break	Panel of assessors	B4 437
15.15-16.00	Meeting teachers	<p>Panel of assessors,</p> <p>Teachers MA 120 credits PDA675, PDA676, PDA685, PDA679 och PDA699 Mona Lundin Ewa Skantz-Åberg Géraldine Fauville Lena Pareto Elin Nordenström Ann-Marie Eriksson</p>	B4 437
16.15-17.00	Meeting teachers	<p>Panel of assessors,</p> <p>Teachers MA 60 credits PDA672, PDA683 och PDA683 Ewa Skantz-Åberg Géraldine Fauville Lena Pareto Jonas Linderoth Elin Nordenström</p>	B4 437
18.00	Dinner pre-booked	<p>Panel of assessors:</p> <p>Beata Jungselius Monica Divitini Christopher Kullenberg Student Representatives, to be announced</p>	

April 23:

Time	Purpose	Participants	Location
9.00-10.00	Meeting Alumni	Panel of assessors Alumni: Erik Winerö Jonas Karlén Phong Trang Tran Than Hadil Ghazy Elsayed Iuliana Bădică	B4 437
	Coffee break	Panel of assessors	B4 437
10.15-11.15	Meeting Department leadership	Panel of assessors Markus Nivala Sylvi Vigmo Åsa Mäkitalo Mattias Zackrisson Ann-Marie Eriksson Annika Edenholt Kristin Martinsson Nathalie Rundberg	B4 437
11.15-13.00	Panel of assessors prepare feedback Lunch included	Panel of assessors	B4 437
13.00-14.00	Feedback to Faculty, Department and Programme leadership Coffee/Tea included	Panel of assessors Maria Svensson Markus Nivala Sylvi Vigmo Mattias Zackrisson Åsa Mäkitalo Ann-Marie Eriksson Kristin Martinsson Annika Edenholt Elin Nordenström Mikaela Åberg Linda Bradley Karin Fogelberg Anna Nyberg	B4 437
14.00- 18.00	Internal meeting (Optional)	Panel of assessors Conference room at disposal for the Panel of assessors	B4 437

Interview guide for site visit, April 22-23, 2024

1. Achieved study results match intended learning outcomes and the quality targets Higher Education Ordinance

- a. Tell us about staffing, organization of courses and assigning of course leaders.
- b. Tell us about staff turnover since the last evaluation.
- c. Last report highlighted outdated and gender biased literature and identified a great variety in-between courses in terms of mandatory reading (in pages). Has this been revised?
- d. What research is conducted by researchers at the department? Do they also teach and lead courses? How much teaching vs research do the staff engage in?
- e. Post-LinCS and LETS – is the department research-oriented in a similar way still?
- f. Are you confident with inhouse competence? Do you wish to recruit any specific competence in a near future?
- g. What do the students learn? Do the study results match intended learning outcomes and quality targets?
- h. How is progression considered and implemented?
- i. Are there program reports?
- j. Who is responsible for the course evaluation?
- k. Are drop-outs still a big concern? From the last evaluation report: (*“To this list can be added that the drop-out rate seems high – 21 out of possible 55 individual papers were examined up to 2018 (38%). However, it is, however, not an easy task to get a clear picture of which numbers that are to be taken into account”*)

2. Teaching is focused on student-centered learning

- a. How are examinations planned, varied and evaluated?
- b. Do teaching and examination promote active learning?
- c. Is peer learning and feedback being used as pedagogic tools?
- d. Are course pedagogic concepts being made visible, e.g. through course guides (or equivalent)?
- e. What are your thoughts on use of generative AI? Is it considered cheating? Is it a big problem? How is this talked about?

3. The content and form of teaching rests on scientific and/or artistic bases and proven experience

- a. Does your (teacher's) teaching rest on scientific bases? Is teaching being characterized by a scientific approach?
- b. Do students pick this up? (Do teachers talk about the textbook or about their own research etc)
- c. How does this vary between courses?
- d. Are students being trained in research-like activities?
- e. Are students being trained in reading, writing and critically review academic texts?

4. Teachers have up-to-date and adequate competence as regards their subjects and teaching and learning in higher education, and the numbers of teachers are in proportion to the scope and content of study courses and programmes.

- a. How many teachers are there and what is the ratio permanent position/guest lecturer?
- b. Who are the guest teachers?
- c. How do they distribute thesis supervision?
- d. How do the students choose thesis topic? How are they assigned a supervisor? Do the supervisors “choose” students or how does that process work?
- e. Do general and/or subject-specific higher education teaching and learning competencies need strengthening?

5. Study courses and programmes are relevant to the needs of the students/doctoral students and society.

- a. Do you think that the courses are relevant to students and society?
- b. What is relevance here? What are the “needs”- is it “getting a job” or something else? And how well do those needs correspond with needs from society?
- c. Are there procedures for the quality assurance of the form and content of course/programme elements run in collaboration/conjunction with working life?
- d. How are industry needs represented?
- e. What about internships? Is it difficult to organize and administrate? How are the students followed up?
- f. Are there routines for collecting the students’ experience of study and work environment?
- g. Are there working-life related elements (e.g. study visits, visiting lecturers, case-based teaching/examination, degree projects commissioned by stakeholders)?

6. Students have influence in planning, implementing and monitoring study courses and programmes.

- a. Course evaluation questions: to what extent are they formulated to stimulate student reflection on own learning? Are the results communicated back?
- b. Is there student representation in program councils?
- c. Do you have student mentoring programs?
- d. What are the mechanisms and the processes for how student influence is secured?
- e. Do the students believe that they have influence?
- f. Is there provision for systematic discussions, development and monitoring/revision of course syllabuses (including forms of education and examination), course literature and study courses and programmes as a whole?

7. The study and learning environment is accessible and purpose-oriented for all students students.

- a. Are material and learning environments accessible? And to who?
- b. Teachers and students: their perceptions of how well the learning environments support the education’s specific needs, pedagogic concepts and student learning.

- c. How are new teachers introduced?
- d. Are learning environment purpose-oriented? Both in terms of physical classrooms as well as digital spaces.
- e. What kind of learning environments are created? Lectures, literature seminars, peer-review seminars, writing dens, Canvas etc.
- f. What about the clarity of instructions in course guides/Canvas pages or equivalent?
- g. What about the availability of study administration personnel and study counsellors?

8. The study courses and programmes are continuously monitored and developed. (Mainly management perspective here)

- a. How old are the syllabuses, are they being continuously revised?
- b. Who is responsible for monitoring and developing those?
- c. Are there funds for course development work?
- d. How do you allocate funds for developing programs?
- e. Is there a systemization in the continuous monitoring of the education?
- f. Is there a presence of collegial forums focused on development initiatives?
- g. Procedures for carrying out various forms of course evaluations?
- h. Results of course evaluations and how said results are drawn on in development initiatives and reported back to students?

9. Miscellaneous

- a. How are students recruited?
- b. When starting, do students have realistic expectations of study courses/programmes?
- c. Are there other tools for monitoring and continuous quality improvement of study courses and programmes than already stated?
- d. In summary, what are the provided education's strengths and areas for improvement?