



IT FACULTY

2020-11-24

Dnr GU 2019/901
Fastställd av IT-fakultetsstyrelsen 2020-12-09

REPORT

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**N2CMN – Communication master
programme, 120 credits**

Universitetslektor Ben Clarke

Programme Manager for the master program Communication at University of Gothenburg

The Department of Applied Information, and the Communication master program in particular, would like to thank the external evaluation committee for their work and their report. We believe that many of the recommendations made by the evaluators are fair and accurate, with many of these recommendations being possible to implement.

In this Development Plan, the order of presentation of the recommendations and the work necessary to respond to them differs a little from their original presentation in the Evaluation Report, as follows:

- A. Recommendation: “Ensure quality through coherence and continuity” (#1 in the Evaluation Report)
- B. Recommendation: “Take a brand initiative” (#3 in the Evaluation Report)
- C. Recommendation: “Ensure relevance through dialogue and collaboration with employers” (#2 in the Evaluation Report)
- D. Recommendation: “Reconsider entry requirements and external communication” (#4 in the Evaluation Report)
- E. Recommendation: “Profit more from Programme and course evaluations” (#5 in the Evaluation Report)
- F. Recommendation: “Development of ‘ethical considerations’ in the Programme” (#7 in the Evaluation Report)
- G. Recommendation: “Provision of ‘physical environment’ for facilitating student learning” (#6 in the Evaluation Report)

Thus, letters, rather than numbers, are adopted in this Development Plan to refer to the recommendations. This is to avoid ambiguity when cross-referencing to the Evaluation Report.

The revised order reflects the order of priority of our work, given the quite extensive scope of at least several of the evaluators’ recommendations – some “...crucial for the short-term...” (see Recommendation A, below) and “...important for the long-term” survival of the Programme (see Recommendation B, below).

The recommendations are not otherwise ordered, grouped or thematized; this, we judge to be inappropriate given the quite varying scope of the recommendations and work necessary to address them. That is, while some recommendations (particularly A and B) impact many aspects of our work, our programme and, indeed, have consequences for other stakeholders in the programme (e.g. key members of the Faculty; the Head of, and other management in, the Department of AIT; etc.), other recommendations are far more specific. To some degree this is reflected by the evaluators in their report when they classify recommendations A (1 in the Report), B (3 in the Report), C (2 in the Report), D (4 in the Report) and E (5 in the Report) as ‘of primary importance’ and recommendations F (7 in the Report) and G (6 in the Report) as ‘of secondary, lesser importance’.

Recommendation A: “Ensure quality through coherence and continuity”

“[A] high staff turnover has affected [...] aspects of the Programme considered as key for developing the Programme. The coherence and continuity in the Programme is one of these aspects and an important one. The lack of coherence and continuity manifests itself in quality problems such as a low degree of connection of the Programme to the department’s research and an unstable foundation when it comes to teaching. [...] The Programme clearly lacks senior academic personnel, and is in need of securing the future competence provision to give it a more stable foundation. Thus, the first recommendation to management is crucial for the short-term survival of the Programme, i.e. to ensure quality through coherence and continuity. In order to do this, a long-term staffing plan/recruitment strategy is needed.”

There are evidently at least two major aspects of this recommendation: one concerning staffing, identified by the evaluators as **cause**, and one concerning **pedagogical consequences**. We choose to focus on the former in this recommendation because the latter are returned to in Recommendation B below, the latter point being something the evaluators themselves state in their report. To separate out these two facets discussed by the evaluators under Recommendation A (1 in their report) allows us to be more concrete in our response in here detailing the necessary work to be carried out to address the evaluators concerns.

Concerning, then, the staffing aspect of the evaluators – the teaching team feels the points identified by the evaluators very acutely; the unsustainable staffing picture in the programme which has at least been present for the last three or four years makes many aspects of our work very challenging. It is, therefore, obviously very difficult for the teachers in the programme in their respective roles to make progress on other aspects of the work required in response to this evaluation while the situation described in this recommendation remains. For this reason, we err on the side of caution in proposing the consequent work described below in this Development Plan – particularly in providing conservative timeframe estimates in respect of the work to be done; we must be realistic to achieve feasible positive improvements given our current limited and unstable staffing resources.

Action Point (A-i): Completion of recruitment of two senior lecturers to the posts ‘Universitetslektor i Kommunikation (organizational communication focus)’ (Job ID: 5697) and ‘Biträdande Universitetslektor i Kommunikation (digital communication focus)’ (Job ID: 5699).

Timeframe: With much of the recruitment work already completed – namely, the writing and publishing of job advertisements; the recruitment of external experts to review applications; the short-listing of candidates for interview; the interviews of the short-listed candidates – the announcement of the recruited persons is due any day at the time of writing. It is quite possible that the chosen candidates will have some notice to serve on the current work employments. We can cautiously plan, then, for having the recruited persons start their work with us as of Easter 2021.

Responsibility: The Appointing Committee at Faculty level.

Action Point (A-ii): Further staffing recruitments to be undertaken and completed.

Timeframe: To this end, a first meeting of the Programme Manager and the Head of Department, together with the Vice Head of Department for Education and the Head of Division is planned for December 2020. Because the staffing situation is such that as of August 2021 we are, by present planning, due to lose five of the programme's eight current teachers – not factoring in the two recruitments hopefully made under Action Point (Ai) here – inevitably, this meeting will have to prioritize shorter-term needs. However, it would be very preferential and strategic if the same discussions can include the longer-term staffing needs (including ones aligned with our needs given our current direction of travel – see Recommendation B and specifically Action Point (Bi) there), with subsequent planning for such long-term recruitments possible to sketch after this (or at subsequent follow-up) meetings.

Responsibility: Primarily, Jonas Landgren as Head of Department for AIT, in liaison with Ben Clarke as Programme Manager and Alex Almer as Head of Division who can provide the Prefect with a clear picture of staffing needs.

Resources: Evidently, primarily the resources are of an economic nature. Specific calculations would require consultation with one of our departmental economists. At the time of writing, it seems premature to make such calculations before principles for such decision-making are agreed in conjunction with Jonas Landgren (as Head of Department), Alan Said (as Vice Head of Department for Education) and Alex Almer (as Head of Division). As costs to time associated with such outcomes are circa 5 hours (collectively) for meetings (see 'Timeframe' under Action Point (Aii) just above) for the aforementioned parties.

Recommendation B: “Take a brand initiative”

“The lack of a clear Programme identity manifests itself through the imbalance between generally oriented areas/courses and areas of specialization and between theory-practice-contextual [...]. It also manifests itself through the missing or implicit trade-off between the master’s level scientific height on the one hand, and the insufficient level of non-academic applicability and relevance on the other.

All of this leads to other – major – problems, in particular a mismatch between students’ expectations and what they receive in reality, and a very (too?) broad job profile. Thus, the third recommendation to the management is ambitious but important for the long-term survival of the Programme, i.e. to take a brand initiative, aligning strategy (programme/department/university), culture (teachers), and image (potential students, employers and others)”.

We accept that the identity of the programme as it is today is not as strong as it might be, and agree with the evaluators’ analysis that such a situation is likely when the staffing picture is as changeable as it has been in the programme for at least the last few years (see Recommendation A above). We contend, however, that a development in the direction of a clearer programme identity has been underway in the last two to three years in terms of three ‘areas of specialization’: digital communication (both how digitality affects communication and how digital technologies can be used to study communication.), intercultural communication (exploring the influence of culture on communication in contexts ranging from business to cooperation and conflict) and organizational communication (focusing on issues, approaches to, and challenges of communication within organizations, and between organizations and external stakeholders). We agree that this identity needs strengthening in the course content, programme organization and external communications about our programme to key stakeholders and particularly students therein (though we address the last of these here in relation to Recommendation D below where that point is also raised by the evaluators).

Following two consecutive off-site days planning work carried out by the programme’s teachers (during 29-30/10/2020) focusing on the programme’s education, a mutually agreed picture of the programme’s purpose and structure was arrived at by the teachers. Put succinctly, the programme’s teachers intend to offer an educational programme that is informed by our teachers’ both practice-based and also more ‘basic-’ research activities; we will do so by retaining the three ‘areas of specialization’ in the programme (as above) which have characterized the approach of the programme in the last two to three years; however, a re-articulation of the digital communication area of specialization is considered necessary; to a lesser degree, the same thing is considered necessary for the organizational communication area.

This now allows us to specify much of the work (see also Recommendation C below) necessary to respond to Recommendation B by the evaluators, and it is thus expressed as a series of action points with the responsibility for many of these residing with the teachers corresponding to the area of specialization referred to in the action point in question.

Action Point (B-i): As is hopefully apparent from the brief characterization given just above, the vast majority of what presently happens in the digital communication area of specialization in the programme is geared to ‘basic’ and ‘critical’ research orientations (e.g. in critiquing digital practices

and their effects on communication and relevant wider societal matters; in exploring non-verbal communication, such as eye-gaze and facial expression, with relevant hardware and software). It is clear that, while this is valuable for the programme overall, alone it leads to at least some student disappointment regarding expectations (e.g. a lack of more practice-based skills) and causes a weaker integration with the other two areas of specialization in the programme than would otherwise be the case. Much of the pre-existing 'basic' - and 'critical'-oriented education will be re-designed and moved to serve as the education for a more research-heavy option during the programme's elective third semester (see the planned parallel internship course, Recommendation C below) for those students in our cohort for which such courses are of high interest. This will make space for earlier courses in the programme – quite likely in collaboration with our sister international Master programme in the Department, Digital Leadership, which is also presently undergoing a significant programme-level re-design – which address the student expectation gap of a more practical digital communication education (e.g. search engine optimization, website building, etc.).

Timeframe: Given both (a) the need to work to realistic timeframes (see above, Recommendation A) and (b) the need to align our external communications about the programme's adjusted education (see Recommendation D below), the revisions here must be in place to go live by September 2022. The late Spring and Summer 2021 will be a particular focus for the work in question.

Responsibility: Teachers in this part of the programme's education – presently, Ben Clarke, Scott Burnett and the soon-to-be recruited person for Job ID: 5699 (see above, Recommendation A) – in conjunction with the Programme Manager. In terms of aligning education synergies with the Digital Leadership programme, Ben Clarke as Programme Manager will liaise with Fredrik Svahn as the Programme Manager for Digital Leadership, with a first meeting arranged for early December 2020 and subsequent work to take place during early 2020.

Resources: Circa 100 hours to primarily be used by Ben Clarke, Scott Burnett and the soon-to-be recruited person for Job ID: 5699.

Action Point (B-ii): Some re-structuring of those courses in the programme aligned to the organizational communication area of specialization will optimize the education in this area in roughly equivalent ways to those mentioned above, under Action Point (B-i), for digital communication. For example, the leadership component of the present 'Strategic Communication and Leadership' course will move into the present 'Communication among Professionals' course. This latter course will change a little in foci and scope to offer a more practical-based approach to organizational communication education, possibly adopting a more suitable name such as 'Business Communication'. Particularly, a more logical progression between the three courses comprising the organizational communication area of specialization will be at focus in this work.

Timeframe: As with Action Point (B-i) above, so too here the revisions must be in place to go live by September 2022. Again, the late Spring and Summer 2021 will be a particular focus for the work in question.

Responsibility: Teachers in this part of the programme's education – presently, Guro Sanden, Davide Girardelli, Tomas Lopez Izquierdo and the soon-to-be recruited person for Job ID: 5697 (see above, Recommendation A) – in conjunction with the Programme Manager. As the senior member among this team, Guro Sanden will take the lead on this work.

Resources: Circa 60 hours to primarily be used by Guro Sanden, Davide Girardelli, Tomas Lopez Izquierdo and the soon-to-be recruited person for Job ID: 5697.

Action Point (B-iii): Given recent student and alumni evaluations of the programme, to better optimize the progression between the three courses in the intercultural communication area of specialization, the present order of the second and third of these will be reversed. What consequently becomes the final course in this area of the programme will also gain closer integration with the organizational communication education in the programme.

Timeframe: Again, by September 2022, with the late Spring and Summer 2021 a particular focus for the work in question.

Responsibility: Teachers in this part of the programme's education – presently, Nataliya Berbyuk Lindström and Arjan Verdooren – in conjunction with the Programme Manager. As the senior member among this team, Nataliya Berbyuk Lindström will take the lead on this work, including liaising with colleagues in the programme teaching in the intercultural communication courses of the programme.

Resources: Circa 60 hours to primarily be used by Nataliya Berbyuk Lindström and Arjan Verdooren.

Recommendation C: “Ensure relevance through dialogue and collaboration with employers”

“Overall, the connection of the Programme to the labour market does not seem to be very strong. Thus, the second recommendation aimed at Programme managers and coordinators is to ensure relevance and congruence with the market through dialogue (advisory board?) and collaboration with companies and potential employers.”

Under Recommendation B above, we acknowledge the need to supplement the current slimmer-than-optimal practice- and skills-based provision in various parts of our programme. There, we detail the changes necessary to the existing educational content itself. Sitting alongside a more basic-/critical-research heavy set of elective courses in the third semester of the programme would be a 30 half-speed credit internship course. It is here that we plan to formalize relations with relevant external partners (e.g. in industry) – as is suggested at several places in the report (e.g. “...the assessment group finds that the Programme can be improved in terms of [...] increased focus on labor market relevance, e.g. through internships or similar”).

Action Point (Ci): Before our would-be internship course can sensibly exist, we will first commission the formation and early growth an Industry Panel (or similar) of external partners to the programme led by relevant teaching members from our team (see ‘Responsibility’ just below). First establishing and growing these relationships would ensure a functioning internship course which would likely attract those more practice-oriented students in the programme during the third semester.

Timeframe: For the duration of the calendar year of 2021, starting in January.

Responsibility: Primarily with two teachers currently employed in the programme – Tomas Lopez Izquierdo and Davide Girardelli. Tomas has already begun preparatory work for an Internship course in our programme, liaising with other relevant teachers elsewhere in the University running similar internship courses (e.g. Monica Lindh de Montoya in Global Studies). Davide will bring his experience working with external practice partners in teaching and research at other academic institutions before he joined GU.

Resources: Quite some staffing hours will be required here. We estimate circa 100 hours, mostly to be divided between Tomas Lopez Izquierdo and Davide Girardelli.

We are also fortunate enough to draw on the help of Professor Magnus Bergquist who can offer his experiences running internship courses at Halmstad University. The Programme Director will meet Magnus during December 2020.

Recommendation D: “Reconsider entry requirements and external communication”

“[T]he unclear identity of the Programme leads to a mismatch between students’ expectations and what they receive in reality. The problem manifests itself in a lack of motivation and, ultimately, dropouts (according to the interviews with students, as dropouts are not measured at the moment). Thus, the fourth recommendation aimed at Programme managers and coordinators is to reconsider entry requirements and external communication. Ideally, the revision shall take place in two steps, i.e. as soon as possible and again, after the Programme management has implemented measures strengthening the Programme identity”.

Although open to interpretation out of context, a wider reading of the evaluators’ use of “external communication” shows that they intend communication aimed at would-be applicants of the programme. Other ‘external stakeholders’ are discussed but in relation to their potential to function as collaborators or practice-partners to the programme, this matter being addressed in Recommendation C above. Under this recommendation, then, we focus on student applicants to the programme. So as to make the discussion more amenable to specific and concrete work to be done in response to the recommendation, we take the specific entry requirements issue first and the more general matter of external communications with applicants to the programme second.

Starting with the student-applicant entry requirements, then, significant work in response to this part of the recommendation has already been completed. The evaluation occurred while we were in the process of our work here. Thus, in many respects – we were happy to receive this feedback from the evaluators because it aligns with our own concerns about entry requirements and hence our response. The completed work in question was to require of applying students a letter of motivation which puts the case for the relevance of the subject of communication studies and our programme’s specific education therein – in terms of applicants’ educational and professional background, as well as their future professional ambitions. This letter of motivation becomes a central criterion in admitting students to the programme. All student letters of motivation are read and ranked by two members of the teaching team after the close of each of the respective two admission periods. Additionally, the letters of motivation provide us with a different perspective on students’ expectations going into the programme (cf. course and alumni reviews; see Recommendation E below).

Action Point (D-i): The letter of motivation format and the subsequent review process do require some smaller revisions based on our experience with these during Spring 2020. This is quite natural given it was our first experience with this additional requirement of applying students. First, rankings by teachers will be subject to statistical aggregating based on our observations after Spring 2020 that some graders are systematically more stringent in evaluating letters than other graders.

Timeframe: To be implemented in the Spring 2021 peer review process following the two Spring 2021 admission rounds.

Responsibility: Programme Manager

Resources: Circa 2-3 hours for the statistical analysis and interpretation of the outcome

Action Point (D-ii): A second respect in which the letter of motivation entry requirement addition can be improved, based on our experience with this during Spring 2020, is in requiring students to write their letters in a pre-structured template aligned to the criteria graders use in ranking these letters. Most importantly, it is felt by graders that this will speed up the review process which is not a small task with typically several hundred applicants to the programme each year. Again, that such fine-tuning is required is quite natural given last academic year was our first experience with this additional requirement of students in their application process.

Timeframe: To be implemented ahead of the first of the two academic session 2021-22 admission rounds (e.g. late in the calendar year of 2021).

Responsibility: Programme Manager in conjunction with the Education Officer

Resources: Circa 1-2 hours for the Programme Manager and Education Officer together

Returning to external communications with applicants to our programme more generally, a thorough review of, and subsequent revision to, what is currently communicated about the programme (e.g. on GU's website, on our relevant social media pages, etc.) will be required, particularly in being more specific about the kind of education that does – and does not – take place within the programme's three areas of specialization. However, this revision work is most efficiently done once work on Recommendation A, Recommendation C and particularly Recommendation B is in progress and more of the details in question have been determined. This would go in line with a revised programme curriculum to begin in September 2022. For this, revised external communications about the programme in anticipation for student applications from early Autumn 2021 need be in place from Summer 2021.

Action Point (D-iii): Review and revision of all existing external communications about the programme authored by ourselves.

Timeframe: To take place during June 2021.

Responsibility: Department Communication Officer in conjunction with the Programme Manager

Resources: Circa 30 hours (collectively) for the Communication Officer in conjunction with the Programme Manager

Recommendation E: “Profit more from Programme and course evaluations”

The assessment group believes that evaluations and reviews by students, alumni, external assessors and others, e.g. a panel of potential employers and/or a so-called advisory board, help to continuously improve the Programme. [...] Recommendation no 5 is formulated as questions: (1) at which intervals are study programmes evaluated/reviewed by alumni, external assessors and others? (2) how are the results of course and programme evaluations/reviews used in strategy work and actual practice? (3) how can the Programme benefit from measurement of drop-outs? The assessment group recommends that Programme management and coordinators critically reflect upon these questions.

Owing in important part to the changeable, unsustainable staffing situation that has characterized at least the past three to four years (see Recommendation A above), routines for course and programme evaluations by current and past students of the programme and other stakeholders are limited. All courses in the programme are presently evaluated by current students as they reach their conclusion, as administrated by the Education Officer at the department. This is formally responded to in the course leader’s course report after the course has finished. Some of the courses in the programme have mid-term evaluations arranged by the course leader in question; these are usually courses that have course leaders who have taught the course in question for consecutive years. Still, no formal system for mid-term evaluations is currently in place in the programme’s courses and some courses do not undergo such mid-term evaluations. The picture is similar for mid-term evaluations at the programme-level: informal practices have led to a tendency of meeting students to this end once each semester in their respective year cohorts; however, the practice is not formalized. Presently, no routine for an alumni survey or similar is in place. We understand from the Vice Head of Department for Education that it is the Department’s intention to collect alumni data systematically for all the programmes at the Department in the future, in conjunction with GÖTA Student Union. In recent months, the Study Counsellor has informally carried out exit interviews wherever possible with those students dropping out of the programme.

Given the situation just described, we want to prioritize formalizing routines for (a) mid-term evaluations at both course-level and programme-level and (b) exit interviews with dropouts from the programme.

Action Point (E-ii): Introduce mid-term evaluations three weeks into each of our programme’s courses, arranged and run by the course leader in question and supported by the Education Officer if necessary. This will be to encourage a feed-forward culture in courses, to the benefit of both students and course teachers. The value, to students, of the mid-term evaluation will be formally tracked in a corresponding question in the final student survey evaluation on the course. This will therefore provide the course leader with the chance to reflect on the successes or otherwise of the mid-term evaluation in writing their subsequent course report.

Timeframe: Preliminary work in the Spring 2021, to be in place as a routine for all courses in the programme from the start of the academic session 2021-2022.

Responsibility: Primarily, Education Officer in conjunction with the Programme Manager; later, course leaders.

Resources: Circa 2-3 hours (collectively) for the Communication Officer in conjunction with the Programme Manager

Action Point (E-ii): Introduce mid-semester evaluations of the programme as a whole (late October; early March) with each year cohort of the programme, arranged and run by the Programme Manager and supported by the Education Officer.

Timeframe: Preliminary work in the Spring 2021, to be in place as a routine for all courses in the programme from the start of the academic session 2021-2022.

Responsibility: The Programme Manager in conjunction with the Education Officer.

Resources: Circa 2-3 hours (collectively) for the Communication Officer in conjunction with the Programme Manager

Action Point (E-iii): Formalize the exit interview of students dropping out of the programme.

Timeframe: During January 2021.

Responsibility: Study Counsellor in conjunction with the Programme Manager

Resources: Circa 2-3 hours (collectively) for the Student Counsellor in conjunction with the Programme Manager

Recommendation F: Development of 'ethical considerations' in the Programme

"The assessment group finds that ethical considerations related to theses and course exams are under-developed and reduced to rudimentary discussions without references to key documents, statutes or sites. Also, the trade-offs and dilemmas of doing industry-related research are largely lacking. Thus, the recommendation to Programme managers and coordinators is to develop ethical considerations."

We agree with this critique of the methodological provision in our programme at present. Indeed, approximately two years ago we revised the programme which, at that point, only had an optional methods course in the second year of the programme. Several of our programme teachers have since felt that our revisions at that point were not radical or far-reaching enough.

Action Point (F): In conjunction with other programme content and structure changes described above under Recommendation B – the new version of the programme to be introduced in Sept. 2022 will have a 15 credit, half-speed course running for the duration of the second semester of the programme. The current 7.5 HS credits methods course in the programme (see just below here) will form the basis of the adapted course. This will allow us to address the ethical considerations referred to by the evaluators in this recommendation – but also other, including more general, remarks they make of a related kind concerning matters of methodology. For example, for Recommendation A above we stated a focus on staffing-cause to the neglect of pedagogical-consequence(s) and that the latter would be taken under Recommendation B where many of the same points are returned to. One exception to this was the statement by the evaluators concerning pedagogical consequences of Recommendation A that "Other quality problems are [...] the missing theory of sciences and methods literature and/or courses". We take this critique here as evidently of primary relevance to the recommendation currently under discussion.

As alluded to above, our programme teachers have for a while had concerns about what is presently a very packed 7.5 HS credits course run at half-speed in the first half of the second semester of the programme. This comes from our own observations and, to some degree, is revealed through students' evaluations on the course during the academic sessions 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Timeframe: All aspects of the new course (course syllabus, learning outcomes, course assignments, course literature, course sessions, course structure and logic, etc.) to be ready by September 2022 when the programme will transition to its new form (see above, Recommendation B). Thus the work will mostly be carried out during the Autumn Semester 2021.

Responsibility: Guro Sanden as current Course Leader, primarily in conjunction with Ben Clarke as Programme Manager but also liaising with all other course leaders regarding the methodological provisions and requirements of those other courses.

Resources: Circa 80 hours for the elaboration of the course in question, mostly granted to Guro Sanden as Course Leader of the current methods course who will undertake most of this work

Recommendation G: Provision of ‘physical environment’ for facilitating student learning

“[A]t the site visit, the members of the assessment group got the impression that there is a lack of study rooms and facilities which can be used by MiC students. As study rooms and facilities are important for the study environment, the assessment group recommends that management takes this up for critical reflection.”

The vast majority of Master in Communication students’ activities take place at Hus Patricia building on Lindholmen. In the twelve to eighteen months leading up to the near-closure of Hus Patricia building to students owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, we teachers on the programme anecdotally observe the same problems of students’ limited access to space in the building and that, increasingly so, this had become a problem for students. This in significant part owes to the growth of the Department’s staff and the need to house new members of staff in rooms previously used as student study rooms.

While the programme’s teachers are aware – in broad terms – of plans within the Faculty to review and plan for increased estates at Campus Lindholmen, much in respect of this Recommendation and the relevant planning of work to solve the challenges it causes (such as those raised by the evaluators) lies outside the work-remit and power of any member of staff teaching in the programme in question. Therefore, in our Development Plan here we limit our response to representing the needs of our students in relation to estates to the relevant members of the Faculty and University.

Action Point (G): Engage the views of the programme’s student body and then subsequently relay the needs of our programme’s students in relation to housing (e.g. study rooms, labs, etc.) to key members of the Faculty involved in developing the relevant parts of the estates plan at Campus Lindholmen.

Timeframe: During January and February 2021.

Responsibility: Programme Manager and Study Counsellor who will subsequently meet with Miroslaw Staron in his Faculty role to outline a roadmap for developing housing which factors in our students’ needs.

Resources: Circa 5 hours (collectively) for the Student Counsellor in conjunction with the Programme Manager.