

**BEDÖMARUTLÅTANDE FÖR UTBILDNINGKLUSTER MARINA
VETENSKAPER VID FAKULTETEN FÖR NATURVETENSKAP OCH
TEKNIK**

2026-03-22

Evaluation of the Candidate and Masters programmes in Marine Science at the University of Gothenburg

Report, 2026-03-22

Background

This report comprise an evaluation of the Marine Science Programme at the University of Gothenburg, performed between December 2025 and March 2026. The evaluation is a component of Gothenburg University's policy for quality assurance and quality development of education (Ref. No. GU 2022/2839), which had been developed to comply with the quality assurance system developed by the Swedish Higher Education Authority (Universitetskanslersämbetet, UKÄ) for the period 2017–2022 (revised in 2023). Specifically, this evaluation serves as an external audit of the education, with a main purpose to identify areas of improvement.

The evaluation committee comprised two external evaluators who are familiar with the subjects of the education programme, one internal evaluator from an independent department at Gothenburg University, and a student representative. The intention was also to have a representative from industry, but unfortunately at the start of the process, the appointed person had to retract for personal reasons. Specifically, the members were:

- Chair and external evaluator: Professor Agatha de Boer, Department of Geological Sciences, Stockholm University
- External evaluator: Professor Emeritus Christer Brönmark, Lund University
- Internal evaluator: Senior lecturer Jens Andreasson, Department of Law, University of Gothenburg
- Student representative: Oskar Elmquist, Masters student in Earth Sciences, University of Gothenburg

The *Policy for Quality Assurance and Quality Enhancement of Education at the University of Gothenburg* dictates that the education needs to follow, and thus be evaluated against, eight core criteria. These are in short that: 1) actual learning outcomes correspond to intended outcomes, 2) student-learning is at the centre, 3) the content is scientific-based, 4) the teachers are qualified, 5) the education is relevant, 6) the students have influence, 7) the study environment is suitable, and 8) continuous development is carried out. According to the guidelines provided to the committee, the Marine Science programmes were evaluated against these criteria and the conclusions for each criteria formatted as a summary statement, followed by suggestions that either "could", "should", or "must" be followed.

The evidence for the evaluation comprise an extensive collection of online documents, an in-person site visit to the Department of Marine Science, as well as additional information provided in email correspondence as per request. The online resources were provided by the Department of Marine Science and include a selection of programme plans, course plans, course evaluations and reports, a list of teachers with links to their university webpages,

examples of schedules, degree projects, minutes from the education council (Grundutbildningsberedning, GRUB) and teachers meetings, strategy documents, etc. During the site visit, the committee met with the GRUB, the study directors and counsellors, and representatives of the students and the teachers.

The committee first met (on Teams) with representatives from the Faculty of Science and Technology and the Department of Marine Sciences on 14 January 2026 to receive instructions and guidelines. The committee's next meeting was arranged on 22 January (on Zoom) to elect a chair, discuss a strategy for the evaluation, and to set up future zoom meetings for discussions. Further meetings occurred during the site visit on 11-12 February. The final completion of this evaluation report and its recommendations occurred through a series of emails and is a joint work to which everyone on the committee contributed. Likewise, the report is endorsed by the whole committee

General Observations

Overall, the committee was impressed with the programme. The department has successfully developed a unified Marine Science programme that integrates multiple disciplines and specializations while maintaining a strong sense of coherence. Joint courses and fieldwork play an important role in fostering this cohesion and ensure that students graduate from the bachelor's programme with broad knowledge across several areas of Marine Science. The programme offers a well-balanced combination of lectures, fieldwork, and laboratory work. It is particularly noteworthy that a relatively small department delivers bachelor's and master's programmes of high quality across four core subdisciplines. The teaching administration through GRUB is also of a high standard, and it is clear that emerging issues are taken seriously and addressed appropriately.

The programme's strong interdisciplinary structure is a key strength, but it also brings challenges. Designing and maintaining coherence across distinct disciplines requires considerable coordination, particularly when individual instructors are primarily specialists within a single field. Aligning learning outcomes, ensuring progression, and integrating course content therefore demand substantial planning time, collaboration, and institutional support. GRUB plays an important role in this work; however, more frequent and broad engagement from all teaching staff in programme-level discussions would further strengthen the coherence of the programme.

The different specialization tracks, each with their own prerequisites, can be difficult for new students to navigate and require clear guidance and coordination. In this regard, the presence of three student counsellors is a significant asset, helping to ensure consistent support throughout the students' studies. Students expressed strong appreciation for this guidance. Although some concerns were raised, overall student feedback was very positive: students reported high satisfaction with the programme, enjoyment of their studies, a willingness to recommend the programme to others, and appreciation of the support they receive.

Criteria 1. That actual study outcomes correspond to the intended learning outcomes and degree objectives

Summary assessment

The overall assessment is that the Bachelor's and Master's programmes in Marine Science demonstrate a functioning and largely well-implemented constructive alignment between course learning outcomes, programme learning outcomes and the degree objectives stipulated in the Higher Education Ordinance. At the same time, there are differences in how clearly and systematically the progression of learning objectives is articulated across courses and specialisations. While individual courses generally follow a natural progression, they are not always sufficiently coordinated with one another. Greater efforts could be made to streamline course content, reduce overlap, and ensure clearer progression and consistency across the programmes.

The Bachelor's programme begins with two years of basic courses in which all disciplines are integrated. In the third year, students specialise in marine biology, marine chemistry, marine geology or oceanography. During this year, students may also select courses offered by the Departments of Biology, Earth Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics. It is understandable that the Marine Sciences programme cannot offer highly specialised courses in each discipline with a clear marine focus. However, it is unfortunate that third-year courses with a marine focus are not mandatory and not always available. As currently structured, a student may complete the third-year specialisation, with few or no explicitly marine-focused courses, which appears inconsistent with the programme's profile. This is especially evident in the oceanography track, where third-year courses consist primarily of mathematics and physics. While these subjects are important and necessary for physical oceanographers, the specialisation does not appear to include a greater proportion of oceanography than other specialisations, as implied in its profile. It appears to function more as a stepping stone for the Masters in Physical Oceanography, than to have a standalone identity consistent with its profile. To solve this problem while maintaining its utility to prepare students for Masters studies, the department should consider introducing a single dedicated third-year course in (physical) oceanography within this specialisation. This could solve another problem - as mentioned under criteria 2, it appears that some first year courses include demanding mathematical components that are not aligned with prerequisites. These can then be moved to the third years course and the first-year courses could instead place greater emphasis on descriptive physical oceanography and lighter mathematical concepts, improving progression and alignment with student backgrounds.

Another inconsistency is that the general subject area of oceanography, which usually is taken to include biological and chemical oceanography, is here applied only in the physical oceanography sense, with biological and chemical oceanography incorporated more in the Marine Biology and Marine Chemistry tracks. It would be more streamlined and consistent with its name if this specialization was called Physical Oceanography or possibly Marine

Physics. Such a change would also help to motivate the 3rd year courses in physics and mathematics.

Regarding the Master's education, one issue in alignment appeared. From the Faculty web page, it is evident that two almost identical Master's programmes in Physical Oceanography are offered, one of which is within the Marine Sciences programme and one that is independent. This appears confusing and could not be clarified during the site visit – with several persons expressing uncertainty regarding the rationale for maintaining two closely related programme variants. If confusing for external and internal personal, it would be even more so for prospective student. The need for both programmes must be reviewed and unless there is clear motivation for both, one of these programmes should be removed and integrated in the other.

Recommended measures

Measure 1.1 The department must review the structure and content of the Bachelor's Programme in Marine Science with the third-year specialisation in Oceanography to ensure that the specialization courses are actually reflective of its profile. In this context, consideration should be given to adding one or more explicitly oceanography-focused courses during the third-year specialisation. Alternatively, a name change, such as "Marine science with specialization in quantitative methods" could be considered.

Measure 1.2 The department must review the use of the "oceanography" subject as specialization in the Bachelors programme and should consider changing to the subject "physical oceanography", which reflects more closely the course content and intended learning outcomes of the specialisation, and the 3rd years courses on offer. The subject area can be created if it does not exist currently.

Measure 1.3 The department must review the structure and profile of the two master's programmes in Physical Oceanography. To enhance transparency, coherence, and external comprehensibility, the department should consider whether the current structure remains pedagogically and strategically justified, including the possible consolidation or discontinuation of one of the programme variants.

Measure 1.4 Allocation of responsibility for programme learning outcomes should be established in order to strengthen traceability and reviewability.

Measure 1.5 Progression in knowledge, methodological competence, analytical ability and independence should be articulated more explicitly in course learning outcomes across the Bachelor's programme, particularly in the early stages where progression is currently realised largely implicitly through the programme structure. The department should therefore conduct a systematic review of course syllabi and learning outcomes in first-year core courses, second-year methodological courses and third-year specialisation courses. This review should clarify how each course contributes to programme learning outcomes and how competencies

develop progressively from earlier courses. The results should be documented in programme-level curriculum mapping to strengthen transparency, alignment and programme coherence

Measure 1.6 It should be ensured, at both Bachelor's and Master's level, that key programme learning outcomes—particularly those relating to judgement, ethical considerations, systems perspective and scientific approach – are clearly anchored in specific courses prior to the degree project. At present, these competencies appear to be realised mainly cumulatively or through the final thesis. The department should therefore review programme and course documentation to identify where these learning outcomes are introduced, developed and assessed throughout the programmes. The results should be documented in programme-level curriculum mapping in order to strengthen transparency, progression and alignment between courses and programme objectives.

Measure 1.7 The department could develop programme-level mapping documents that visualise progression and alignment across courses, thereby supporting internal dialogue, external review and continuous quality enhancement.

Criteria 2. That teaching places students' learning at the centre

Summary assessment

The education in Marine Sciences at the University of Gothenburg largely fulfils the ambition of student-centred learning in practice. There is a clear commitment among the teaching staff to provide high-quality, student-focused learning, and students express strong overall appreciation of the programmes, indicating that they feel supported and valued. Student-centred learning is embedded in programme design, teaching and learning activities, and assessment practices, and this is reflected in students' academic performance. The programmes make extensive use of laboratory work, field studies, project-based components and degree projects, all of which foster active learning, collaboration and increasing independence. Students particularly appreciate the diversity of the programme and value the opportunity to get to know one another during fieldwork. Project-based components are regarded as especially meaningful. Student performance demonstrates independent thinking, critical reflection and methodological awareness, particularly in the later stages of the programme. Progression towards higher levels of independence is perceived as demanding but purposeful, and the pedagogical culture within the department appears reflective and development-oriented.

At the same time, student-centred learning is more consistently practised than explicitly articulated. Progression in independence and responsibility is not always clearly described in formal documentation, and variations can be observed between courses regarding feedback practices, clarity of expectations, and transparency of alignment. In some cases, course content does not align optimally with stated prerequisites. For example, the level of mathematics expected in certain first-year courses exceeds the background knowledge students typically possess at that stage.

Communication and coordination between teachers across courses and disciplines appear somewhat limited. More regular meetings among teaching staff would strengthen coherence across disciplines, courses and levels, help avoid unnecessary overlap, ensure consistency in teaching methods, support appropriate academic progression and create better conditions for continuous programme development.

Furthermore, while structures for quality assurance and student influence are formally in place and actively used, the absence of systematically compiled and communicated course reports reduces transparency in the feedback loop from the student perspective. Student-centred learning thus functions well in practice, but its programme-wide coherence, transparency and structural support could be strengthened. This is further discussed under criterion 6.

The topic of Artificial Intelligence (AI) was raised, and a lack of guidance for students was identified. Students report substantial differences between courses and teachers in their approaches to AI, and there have been limited discussions about the ethical use of AI, as well as the potential errors and misuse associated with generative AI. AI is developing rapidly, and its applications vary considerably among subjects, making it challenging to provide up to date and generally applicable advice. At the same time, it is widely used by both teachers and students, and certain uses may be unethical or represent poor academic practice. Although the university has developed some guidelines, students reported that these are not always easily accessible, transparent, or applied consistently across courses. Clear and shared guidelines communicated at the start of each course would promote transparency, fairness, and the responsible use of AI within the programmes.

Recommended measures

Measure 2.1 Communication between teachers must be improved, and greater insight into one another's courses must be achieved. This is in order to facilitate students' transitions between courses and to avoid unnecessary repetition as well as undesirable gaps in knowledge.

Measure 2.2 The department must develop and share clear and coordinated artificial intelligence (AI) guidelines, outlining how students may and may not use AI tools in their studies. It must be ensured that all students are aware of these.

Measure 2.3 Progression in independence, responsibility and analytical depth should be articulated more clearly in programme documentation and course syllabi, particularly in the early stages of the programmes where such progression is currently more implicit than explicitly described. The department should therefore review programme and course documentation to clarify how these competencies are introduced, developed and assessed across courses and programme levels. The results of this review should be reflected in

programme-level curriculum mapping in order to strengthen transparency, progression and alignment within the programmes

Measure 2.4 Feedback practices and the transparency of assessment criteria should be reviewed to ensure greater consistency across courses and programme levels. The department should examine how feedback is provided and how assessment criteria are communicated in different courses, with the aim of clarifying expectations and supporting student learning. The outcome of this review should be reflected in course documentation and discussed in programme-level pedagogical coordination

Measure 2.5 A coordinated programme-wide pedagogical framework should be further developed to ensure that student-centred learning is systematically embedded across the programmes and not primarily dependent on practices within individual courses. Such a framework could clarify shared pedagogical principles, expectations regarding teaching and assessment practices, and the intended progression of student independence and responsibility throughout the programmes

Criteria 3. That the content and format of teaching are based on scientific and/or artistic foundations and on proven experience

Summary assessment

Overall, the teaching staff consists largely of active and highly qualified researchers, reflecting the department's strong research focus. The academic level of the course content is high and students report and appreciate that teachers integrate their own research into their teaching, thereby strengthening the connection between research and education.

Excursions and fieldwork were highly valued by the students, as evidenced both during the site visit and in the written course evaluations. Field-based learning constitutes an integral component of the programme. Maintaining a strong field component is essential to ensure the credibility of education in marine sciences. Continued access to ship time (Skagerak) and field stations at no less than the current level is therefore crucial.

One avenue in which this research-based content breaks down, and learning outcomes do not align with intended learning outcomes, appears to be in the statistics teaching that is imbedded in the first year education. Here, teaching is currently done at the fundamental level by the Statistics department, but the thread to research-based applications in Marine Science is lacking. Instead, it would be beneficial if relevant applied statistics were taught by teachers from within the Marine Science department. This would allow the content to be more closely aligned with the department's research profile, emphasize the specific skills required in Marine Science, and incorporate relevant examples from the field. The use of external teachers and courses can be beneficial to students, but their use need to be carefully and continuously scrutinised, to ensure it is appropriate to the programmes in which they are imbedded.

Recommended measures

Measure 3.1 The integration of courses and teachers from external departments should be reviewed on a continuous basis to ensure that learning content remains relevant to the programme, and that actual learning outcomes reflect intended learning outcomes. If it breaks down, as it appears to do in the statistic teaching, then alternative solutions need to be sought.

Criteria 4. That the number of teachers is proportionate to scope and content of education, and that they possess current and appropriate subject-specific, higher education pedagogical, and subject-didactic competence

Summary assessment

The teaching staff in Marine Sciences are, to a very high extent, active researchers, reflecting a strong research-based foundation for the programme. Students expressed particular appreciation for being taught by PhD candidates and researchers, noting that their limited pedagogic experience is often compensated by strong subject knowledge and an effective pedagogical approach, especially during exercises and practical sessions. Overall, the academic quality of teaching is considered high. Nevertheless, it was somewhat challenging to do a thorough assessment of teachers' research and pedagogic competence. In the teachers' summary provided, not all teachers appear to have pedagogic training. If these teachers have obtained it at other institutions, or through ways considered equivalent to formal GU pedagogy courses, is not obvious. The department should ensure that teachers who have several more years of teaching ahead fulfil the pedagogic requirements expected by the university.

The teachers' spreadsheet contained links to teachers' profile pages, but these were in many different formats with different content. The content varies between research summaries, publications, a formal CV, description of teaching, leadership responsibilities, and various combinations thereof. To strengthen transparency and the department's research profile, it is recommended that all teaching staff maintain up-to-date professional information on the department's website, such as resumes, research descriptions, or links to Google Scholar profiles, ideally in a standard format. This would make it easier to assess academic and teaching competence while also enhancing the department's external visibility and professional profile.

Although many lecturers have completed pedagogical training, continued professional development should be encouraged. Allocating time within teaching loads for pedagogical education—such as university courses on teaching with AI and other emerging methodologies—would support ongoing enhancement of teaching quality. GU offers a broad spectrum of pedagogical courses within the Pedagogical Development and Interactive Learning (PIL) programme and it is important that teachers are encouraged and have the

opportunity to take these courses. This could also be brought up and discussed at the regular Teachers meetings in order to ensure a mutual pedagogical base. Along these lines, it is also essential that teaching staff are not overburdened by teaching or administrative responsibilities to the extent that they are not able to retain research excellence.

Increasing the involvement of PhD candidates as teaching assistants in courses where students struggle, for example in mathematics or other fundamental skills, could provide valuable academic support. While lacking formal pedagogic training, the PhD students can sometimes explain concepts better due to having more recently struggled through them.

Finally, the establishment of teaching teams for first- and second-cycle courses is recommended, where it is not yet in place. This would reduce vulnerability in cases of illness or sabbatical leave, promote continuity, and strengthen collaboration and quality assurance within the programme.

Recommended measures

Measure 4.1 The department should ensure that all teaching staff have the appropriate pedagogic training as required by the university for their position and role. If not, it should be justified, for example by virtue that the person being close to retirement or having equivalent qualifications or experience.

Measure 4.2 All teaching staff should maintain accessible and up-to-date professional information on their department profile pages, such as resumes and short research descriptions. Links to Google Scholar profiles would also be useful and improve the research and teaching profiles of the department. A consistent framework could be developed to insure similar profile pages across the department.

Measure 4.3 Time for professional pedagogic development should be imbedded in teaching time allocation to allow teachers to stay up to date with the latest pedagogic developments, e.g., effective use of AI in teaching.

Measure 4.4 PhD students could be used to a higher degree for helping out in teaching in, for example, exercises, lab work and seminars. This would be specifically useful for courses where content is challenging for students with a scholastic background that is less well aligned to the course content.

Criteria 5. That the education is relevant to the needs of students and society

Summary assessment

The education demonstrates clear and well-functioning links to society and the professional field. The Master's programme Sea and Society includes several built-in opportunities for internships with industry, providing students with valuable practical experience and professional exposure. Similarly, students in the third year of the Bachelor's programme have

opportunities to undertake industry internships. Student counsellors play an active and supportive role in facilitating these placements, and many students take advantage of these opportunities.

In addition, several courses (e.g., MAV10 and the Master's programme Sea and Society) include guest lectures from industry representatives, further strengthening the connection between the programmes and relevant professional sectors. The annual Career Day also represents an important and well-functioning platform for engagement with industry, offering students opportunities to network, explore potential career paths, and establish professional contacts.

At the same time, there is scope to strengthen the systematic follow-up of the programmes' societal relevance.

Recommended measures

Measure 5.1 Alumni investigations seems to have been conducted continuously. However, the programme has now been in place for a number of years, and a substantial number of students have graduated. A more thorough investigation could be performed, including students from all years, and results being communicated at the programme web pages.

Measure 5.2 A workshop could be organized with representatives from authorities, industry and other relevant sectors to discuss whether graduates possess the knowledge and skills required in the labour market. Such initiatives would provide structured feedback and support the continued development of the programmes' relevance to society.

Criteria 6. That students have influence over the planning, implementation, and follow-up of the education

Summary assessment

The programme largely fulfils its role in giving students influence over key aspects of the programme. Student representatives participate in various groups, such as GRUB, the programme councils, and department councils. This structure helps ensure that work is carried out properly and with students' interests in focus.

To further strengthen student influence, communication back to students about ongoing work within the programme and department should be improved. While evaluations and student concerns are taken seriously and addressed at the teacher and GRUB levels, many students are not aware of what actions have been taken. When students do not see the outcomes of their input, they may feel that their voices are not heard. Clearer follow-up would help close this feedback loop and strengthen trust in the system.

Students are generally unaware of how course evaluations contribute to course development. To increase motivation for completing evaluations, it is important to demonstrate their impact. Quantitative course evaluations should be summarised in a formal course report, including changes implemented in response to feedback from previous years as well as planned improvements. These reports should be published on the course websites. Lecturers should also present the reports informally at the start of the course or highlight implemented improvements during the course as they arise. Such measures would enhance transparency and allow both current and prospective students to see how their feedback contributes to continuous quality enhancement.

Finally, student representatives play a crucial role in maintaining a two-way flow of information. They are responsible both for conveying student perspectives to the department and for informing students about how their feedback leads to concrete changes. Strengthening this communication loop would enhance student engagement and confidence in the quality assurance process.

Recommended measures

Measure 6.1 It must be ensured that course evaluations are systematically compiled into formal course reports and communicated back to students, in accordance with university regulations, in order to strengthen transparency and close the feedback loop within the quality assurance system, for example on course website or Canvas.

Measure 6.2 Ways to motivate more students to complete course evaluations should be explored. For example, at the beginning of each course, teachers could present the changes that have been made since the previous year to increase transparency and demonstrate that student feedback leads to concrete improvements.

Measure 6.3 Student representatives should always be informed at the start of their tenure of the importance of two-way communication and their central role in communicating back to students how their concerns have been addressed.

Criteria 7. That a study and learning environment accessible and suitable for all students is provided

Summary assessment

The new Natrium building provides an efficient and attractive study environment for students, teachers and researchers. At the same time, the relocation has brought certain challenges, particularly regarding shared space and coordination between departments. Students report that they currently lack sufficient study spaces. While this is not an issue the department can resolve independently, communication about available study areas could be improved. Greater collaboration with SG Marin and the Faculty Board (Göta NATSEK student union) could help identify and communicate information about additional or less visible study spaces within the building.

The Faculty Board also represents an important resource for promoting student wellbeing and awareness of support structures. Inviting representatives to present at the start of programmes or major courses could help inform students about the building and nearby facilities, student representation, and student health services. This is particularly important for master's students, many of whom are international and may be unfamiliar with the Swedish higher education system and the University of Gothenburg. An introductory package tailored to master's students could therefore include practical information about study spaces, student unions, healthcare services and other support functions.

Students have also noted that the routines for accessing teaching laboratories are perceived as unnecessarily complicated. For example, students must contact the lab supervisor to leave and re-enter the laboratory (e.g., for bathroom visits), and some students have reported being locked out. These procedures could either be simplified or, if this is not possible due to safety requirements, communicated more clearly in terms of the process and its justification. This would help reduce uncertainty and improve student understanding and acceptance.

At the time of the evaluation, it was unclear how the takeover of Kristineberg by the Polar Institute will affect fieldwork opportunities, and how financial constraints may influence ship time on Skagerak and field activities at Tjärnö Marine Laboratory. It must be emphasised again that field-based teaching is an absolutely crucial component of education in Marine Sciences. Ensuring continued access to field stations, research vessels and practical fieldwork is essential for maintaining the quality and relevance of the programmes.

Recommended measures

Measure 7.1 There must be a review the communication between the department and SG Marin and the Faculty Board (Göta NATSEK student union), to ensure that students (Bachelors and Masters) receive relevant and timely information about student health services, Natrium and the surrounding buildings, including study spaces, dining facilities, and student representation. The department could invite representatives from the Faculty Board to present at the start of programmes to help inform students about the building and nearby facilities, student representation, and student health services.

Measure 7.2 Continued access to field stations and research vessels must be ensured.

Measure 7.3 Routines for student access to laboratories should be reviewed, with potential need to improve communication to students.

Criteria 8. That continuous follow-up and development of the education are carried out

Summary assessment

The programme is at this point established, appreciated, and well-functioning. It remains important to maintain a strong and efficient strategy for continuous evaluation and development. Senior teachers may retain approaches from their traditional disciplines, while newly recruited teachers may not yet fully understand the philosophy of the entire programme. Continuous discussion and communication of course goals and content are essential to ensure consistency in teaching methods and proper progression of course content.

GRUB has a broad responsibility for continuous evaluation and development of the Marine Sciences education programme and demonstrates strong engagement through regular meetings. To ensure integration into departmental education, the closely connected Sea and Society programme should have a representative in GRUB to support coordination and ensure smooth programme progression.

Organizing dedicated Teachers' meetings that include all teaching staff is valuable for discussing course development and broader programme issues. Full participation ensures all perspectives are considered, and attendance could be facilitated through short, focused meetings, Zoom sessions, and Department days dedicated solely to educational issues.

While students express strong appreciation for the diversity of the Bachelors programme and highlight fieldwork as an important integrative component that fosters cohesion and peer interaction, courses outside field-based activities appear to function largely at the level of individual teachers rather than as coordinated elements of a coherent programme structure. Similarly, the Bachelors programme include several courses offered by other departments, such as Biology, Earth Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics and it is unclear whether progression and alignment between these external courses and related Marine Sciences courses are systematically evaluated. Regular programme-level Teacher meetings, such as those suggested under criterion 2, could ensure that development of courses within a programme occurs in a coordinated manner.

The "quality tool" (Kvalitetsverket) has strong potential as a resource for evaluation and development. While elements related to basic education are discussed in GRUB, it is important that Kvalitetsverket is effectively communicated to all teachers and ideally reviewed during Teachers' meetings to ensure transparency and follow-up on programme improvements.

Note that, the integration of student feedback into the course development process is dealt with under criteria 6.

Recommended measures

Measure 8.1 Measure 2.1 emphasise that regular programme-level Teachers' meeting should be continued. These meetings should include continuous programme assessment and development to strengthen coordination, ensure appropriate progression, reduce unnecessary overlap, and enhance consistency in teaching and assessment practices across the programme. Measures should be taken to improve attendance at meetings and that the notes/results from the meetings are more efficiently communicated to all teachers,

Measure 8.2 Currently, teaching hours do not formally include time for course design and development. This allotment should be adjusted to allow staff to dedicate time to course improvement and broader programme development is recommended. Steps in this direction are already underway, which is commendable and will further strengthen the programme's continuous development efforts. The faculty management needs to clarify that funds are already allocated to departments for this purpose and that these funds are in fact used for the intended purpose.

Measure 8.3 The closely connected Sea and Society programme should have a representative in GRUB to support coordination and ensure smooth programme progression.