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Background

From Guidelines for Uppsala University’s Model for Educational Evaluations (UFV 2015/475): “Uppsala University’s systematic work on the quality of study programmes includes quality assurance and quality enhancement. [...] Uppsala University’s model consists of two parts: annual systematic follow-ups of study programmes and educational evaluations every six years.”

The strength of the model is that it gives each evaluation unit room for impact. This helps to ensure that the evaluations foster development. The acuity of the system is also due to the external review and to the fact that the Faculty Board determines whether to further develop or to discontinue the education (programme or course).

All study programmes shall be evaluated in accordance with the model. For undergraduate and graduate education, this includes degree programmes, all higher education qualifications (degrees), contract education and freestanding courses. The following delimitations apply:

- All degree programmes with active students in the current semester shall be evaluated. This means that degree programmes in which there are students active within the structure of the programme, regardless of whether or not new students are admitted, shall be evaluated. New degree programmes in which no student has completed the entire programme are exempted.
- All higher education qualifications (degrees) shall be evaluated within a degree programme framework. This means that higher education qualifications (degrees) associated with the degree programme, including degrees at lower levels (Higher Education Diploma, Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree (60 credits and 120 credits) for master programmes in engineering (300 credits); Higher Education Diploma for bachelor programmes in science and in engineering (180 credits), as well as Master’s degree (60 credits) for master programmes (120 credits)) shall be evaluated within the framework of the education unit programme. The objectives for the Higher Education Diploma are covered by those for the Degree of Bachelor. The Higher Education Diploma is therefore not treated separately. No degree programme leads to a Higher Education Diploma but Uppsala University issues Higher Education Diplomas in certain main fields of study.
- All active contract education courses (i.e. offered in one of the last two years) with an established course syllabus shall be evaluated.
- All active freestanding courses (i.e. announced in one of the last two years) that are not included in the programme syllabus for any degree programme shall be evaluated.
- Degree programmes and courses offered in collaboration with other higher education institutions shall be evaluated in the same way as other study programmes. Parts of the evaluations performed at other higher education institutions may be used as supporting documentation or replace corresponding parts of the evaluation. The assessment of whether parts of the evaluation can be replaced is made by the responsible educational board.

Evaluation model

According to the guidelines, Uppsala University’s Model for Educational Evaluations (UFV 2015/475) consists of annual systematic follow-up of education and educational evaluations every six years. An educational evaluation consists of four parts: design, implementation, measures and follow-up of measures. Educational evaluations are conducted in a six-year evaluation cycle, which means that each study programme is subjected to a new evaluation every six years.

1) DESIGN
- Heads of evaluation units
- Student participation
- Choice of structure for the evaluation
- External and internal assessors
- Identification of evaluation questions and collection of supporting documentation

2) IMPLEMENTATION
- Self-evaluation

1 Currently only available in Swedish.
3) MEASURES

4) ANNUAL FOLLOW-UP

Design
The six-year evaluation may be carried out using one of the following evaluation methods: assessment panel, benchmarking or joint assessment panel. See Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations2 (UFV 2015/475) for further assistance.

Heads of evaluation units
The course-coordinating department, with the subject coordinator serving as head, is responsible for freestanding courses (which are not included in any degree programme syllabus) and contract education. Each evaluation unit consists of the freestanding and contract education courses that fall under the subject coordinator’s area of responsibility. These units may be divided into smaller units with just cause (the decision is made by the Deputy Dean of Education).

The head of the degree programme with associated higher education qualifications including lower-level degrees is the programme coordinator. Each unit consists of a degree programme (60-credit and 120-credit Master’s programmes with a common first year are part of the same evaluation unit). The programme coordinator then confirms continuing activities with the programme board involved in the process. The programme coordinator may designate a working group to prepare the self-evaluation. Student representatives are included in the working group and are appointed by the relevant student union.

Student participation
Students are given the opportunity to participate in the preparation of the self-evaluation. Students (from other higher education institutions) are included in the assessment panels. These are appointed by the relevant student unions.

Choice of structure for the evaluation
The evaluation structure – assessment panel, benchmarking or joint assessment panel – is chosen by the relevant evaluation unit. An external panel must always evaluate each evaluation unit.

Assessment panel
An assessment panel visits and evaluates the evaluation unit.

Benchmarking
The evaluation unit visits and investigates the corresponding study programme at another higher education institution. Representatives from this corresponding study programme form an external assessment panel consisting of at least two teachers who are experts in the relevant subject. An internal assessor (teacher from another disciplinary domain at UU) and a student (from another higher education institution) shall also be appointed. The internal assessor and the external student may either be included in the external assessment

---

2 Currently only available in Swedish.
panel or prepare a joint assessor statement solely between the two of them (in which case they do a separate site visit). In the latter case, there will then be two detailed and two summarised assessor statements for the evaluation unit. It is recommended that the internal assessor and the external student join the reversed site visit and that assessment panel submits joint assessor statements (one detailed and one summarised).

**Joint assessment panel**

An evaluation unit may choose to be evaluated by the same assessment panel as another education (at another higher education institution or at UU). This may include a comparison between the study programmes. Separate assessments are performed for each evaluation unit. This means one detailed and one summarised assessor statement for each evaluation unit. More than three evaluation units cannot have joint assessment panel.

**Composition of the assessment panel**

The assessors are appointed by the Faculty Board on proposal by the Deputy Dean of Education. The assessment panel shall consist of one internal teacher (from another disciplinary domain within UU), two external teachers with expertise in the relevant subject (from another higher education institution) and one student from another higher education institution (appointed by the relevant student union). In certain cases, a labour market representative may be included. An equal gender distribution is sought. The internal assessor chairs the assessment panel. In the beginning of the assessment process the internal assessor meets faculty representatives to clarify the task.

A third external assessor may be appointed for educations with a particularly broad subject content if needed.

The external teachers should come from at least two different universities (primarily Swedish universities), if benchmarking is not the chosen structure for the evaluation.

Instructions to the assessment panels are provided in Appendix 1.

**Identification of evaluation questions and collection of supporting documentation**

The head of each evaluation unit identifies evaluation questions and collects supporting documentation with the assistance of relevant departments and divisions. Regardless of evaluation structure, all evaluation aspects (see Table 1) must be evaluated. Departments and divisions in the Faculty are obligated to provide supporting documentation as instructed by the responsible educational board. For additional possible supporting documentation, see *Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations* (UFV 2015/475).

**Implementation**

Regardless of chosen evaluation structure, each evaluation must include a self-evaluation, a detailed assessor statement and a summary of this, as well as an evaluation report containing a plan of action.

**Self-evaluation**

The head of the evaluation unit compiles a self-evaluation of no more than 50 pages including important supporting documentation (as appendices). The self-evaluation is written in Swedish or in English, depending on the preferences of the assessors. All evaluation aspects (see Table 1) must be covered by the self-evaluation, but the evaluation unit may choose to place different levels of emphasis on different aspects and should particularly emphasise any area(s) the unit wishes to improve. The self-evaluation must also describe the quality processes in place (for examples of quality processes, see page 6). The self-evaluation aims to provide supporting documentation that enables quality assurance through critical review. It identifies the areas for improvement and thereby promotes quality enhancement.

For degree programmes, all associated degrees are covered by the evaluation unit’s self-evaluation. This can be accomplished by, for example, presenting a chart of objectives based on intended course learning outcomes.
and examination formats for lower-level degrees. Quality enhancement activities for these higher education qualifications are covered under the degree programme’s quality enhancement activities and do not need to be further specified.

Abbreviations must be explained and printed out to ease understanding for students and assessors.
Table 1 The aspects that must be covered by every educational evaluation (from Guidelines for Uppsala University’s Model for Educational Evaluations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• that the study programmes achieve the objectives of the Higher Education Act and Higher Education Ordinance (Qualifications Ordinance) and programme-specific objectives, i.e., that actual learning outcomes correspond to expected learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the content and teaching activities are founded on a scientific basis and proven experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that teaching focuses on the learning of students/doctoral students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the achievement of intended learning outcomes is assessed using appropriate methods, and complying to rule of law, and that progression is ensured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that staff involved in the study programme possess relevant and up-to-date expertise in the subject matter, that they have pedagogical and/or subject didactic expertise, and that there is sufficient teaching capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that internationalisation, international perspectives and sustainability are promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that a gender equality perspective is integrated into the study programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that the study programme meets individuals’ and society’s needs for learning and professional knowledge and prepares students for future careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that students/doctoral students have influence on the planning, implementation and follow-up of the study programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that an appropriate study environment is available to all students/doctoral students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that continuous follow-up and improvement of the study programme is carried out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of the evaluation aspects and examples for working with these are provided in Appendix 2. Also see Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations (UFV 2015/475).

Supporting documentation for the self-evaluation

Suggestions for supporting documentation for the self-evaluation are provided in Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations. Other possible supporting documentation include the Faculty’s new student questionnaire, alumni questionnaire, the study counsellors’ follow-up work, common information from the departments, TUR’s work, the evaluation units’ annual operations reports and statistics provided by the faculty office. Degree programmes can also conduct their own surveys among supervisors, subject readers and examiners for degree projects concerning the students’ knowledge and skills, preferably in comparison with other programmes or higher education institutions. Chart of objectives using intended course learning outcomes/courses in comparison with the objectives in the Higher Education Act/Higher Education Ordinance.

Opinions from the programme board should be obtained (when a programme is evaluated) as well as from the senior faculty administrator (“utbildningsledare”). For freestanding courses and contract education student opinions should be obtained from the programme board that approved the course syllabi. After the approval from the senior faculty administrator the head of the evaluation unit sends the self-evaluation to the assessment panel.

Site visit

The assessment panel must make at least one in-person site visit. The Deputy Dean of Education may grant exemption from this so that the site visit may instead be conducted via video conferencing or similar. A request for this must be submitted by the head of the evaluation unit. Time should be allocated in conjunction with the site visit for the assessment panel to work independently to summarise the visit and begin writing an assessor statement. The site visit lasts one or two days (length to be determined by the head of the evaluation unit). Two days are recommended.

For benchmarking, the external assessors’ site visit is replaced with a visit by the evaluation unit to the corresponding education (referred to as a reverse site visit). Travel expenses will be paid for three participants for each programme: programme coordinator, one teacher, one student representative (the programme may choose to pay for additional participants), in addition to the internal assessor and the external student.

Before the site visit, the respective evaluation unit and assessment panel should be in contact in order to put the education in its context, ensure that the assessment panel gets the supporting documentation they need, and to agree
on the time and implementation of the site visit/reverse site visit.

The evaluation unit and the assessment panel determine which persons should take part in the site visit. This can, for example, be the Deputy Dean of Education or the Chair of the responsible educational board, programme coordinator, subject coordinator, one or more teachers, representative from the faculty office and students. The assessment panel meets students separately. These students are part of the programme board and/or are appointed by the relevant student union.

Additional suggestions for site visits are provided in *Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations*.

**Assessor statement**

The assessment panel(s) must submit two assessor statements. The assessment panels submit a detailed (about 10-20 pages) statement and a summary of this (“summarised assessor statement,” about 2 pages). Both statements must contain the strengths, weaknesses/areas for improvement and recommendations for improvement for evaluated education. The statements must also contain information about the assessors, the methods and when the assessment was made. The aspects that each educational evaluation must cover (Table 1) should be reflected in the assessment. There is a template available for the assessor statement.

One detailed and one summarised statement are written for each evaluation unit, including when there is a joint assessment panel.

The summarised assessor statement is published on the University’s website with the public and students as the primary target groups.

The assessors are requested to submit preliminary assessor statements for review by the heads of the evaluation units so that any errors can be remedied.

After the report, one or more assessors participate in a follow-up meeting (virtual or in-person) with the evaluation unit to give the evaluation unit a chance to ask follow-up questions and thereby gain maximum insight from the evaluation.

**Evaluation report**

From *Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations* (UFV 2015/475):

Each evaluation unit must prepare a brief evaluation report. The report is presented to the responsible educational programme board, the Advisory Committee for Education and the Faculty Board (whose conclusion is added to the report). Suggestions for templates are available.

The evaluation report must contain:
- A description of the evaluation unit, i.e. which education is included in the review
- The method and structure of the evaluation.
- The key conclusions based on the self-evaluation and the assessor statement.
- Planned measures/actions for improvement.
- The Faculty Board’s conclusion, including whether special follow-up is needed.

The evaluation report must be written in Swedish.

**Publication**

The summarised assessor statement and planned measures (the Faculty Board’s conclusion) for the evaluation unit must be made available to the public (published on UU’s common evaluation website). The detailed assessor statement is made available to those who work with the evaluation unit, including relevant boards, preparatory committees and the faculty office.

Self-evaluations, assessor statements and evaluation reports are registered and disseminated internally.
Measures

The Faculty Board will decide whether the education should be further improved or discontinued on the basis of proposals from the responsible educational board. The Faculty Board’s conclusion, including whether special follow-up is needed, is reported in the evaluation report. If it is decided that the education will be discontinued, the evaluation unit shall submit a plan for ensuring the best possible education for the remaining students. This plan must be ratified by the responsible educational board.

The measures included in the evaluation report shall commence no later than the following year and be reported within the framework of annual follow-up. The head of the evaluation unit leads this work.

Annual follow-up

The annual follow-up forms the basis for ongoing quality enhancement activities and for the educational evaluations.

Quality processes

There is a programme coordinator and a programme board for each degree programme (see Rules of Procedure for the Disciplinary Domain of Science and Technology). The programme board consists of teacher representatives, student representatives and labour market representatives. The programme board carries out continuous quality enhancement activities, reviews course syllabi and programme syllabi as well as course evaluations and course reports. Many degree programmes have teacher days at which teachers who teach in the programme convene to discuss current issues. The programme coordinators are part of coordination committees. The programmes and courses are sorted under an educational board (educational board of science or educational board of engineering). The educational boards are tasked with e.g. revising programme syllabi, setting new course syllabi and working with quality issues. The educational boards consist of teacher representatives, student representatives and labour market representatives. Quality enhancement activities are also conducted at the respective departments.

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

Programme study counsellors follow up annually on the students, particularly those in years 1-3. Those at risk of not reaching the cut-off for CSN³ during the upcoming semester or not having enough credits to qualify for admission for upcoming courses are contacted and offered study guidance/individual study planning. Subject study counsellors are available for the different subjects.

A course evaluation must be completed for each course. The course evaluations are followed up in the relevant programme board (applies to programme courses) and by the course-coordinating department.

As part of quality enhancement activities, the Faculty will conduct a survey each year of newly registered degree programme students (first cycle). Programme surveys and alumni surveys will also be conducted at various time intervals.

The evaluation units submit annual operations reports to the responsible study programmes board.

Statistics on the number of students newly registered to the programme as well as gender breakdown and number of students required to pay fees are discussed on an annual basis.

The Council for Educational Development at the Faculty of Science and Technology (TUR) provides support and direction to to the Faculty’s educational improvement efforts. The Faculty also distributes funds from an educational fund in order to support educational development projects.

Development focus

The annual follow-up includes a selected development focus, as shown in Table 2. The development focus is the

³ Study allowance and loan.
areas that will be evaluated and improved/developed. The development focus applies to all degree programmes, freestanding courses and contract education (even those not evaluated in the current six-year cycle) and is part of the annual quality enhancement activities. This arrangement is labour-saving as the parts are used in the self-evaluation. The follow-up of the areas for improvement identified in the evaluation are part of this annual work.

Table 2. Development focus for the disciplinary domain’s educational evaluations for education on the undergraduate and graduate levels with associated definitions. The work with the development focus shall include the description and further development of the processes that address each development focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Goal attainment*</td>
<td>Definition: That each student who graduates meets specific programme objectives and the objectives in the Higher Education Ordinance.</td>
<td>That courses which are not part of any degree programme syllabus also meet the objectives in the Higher Education Act (chapter 1, sections 8-9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course evaluations and course reports:</td>
<td>A meticulously prepared and scientifically grounded management system is being developed and introduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progression and examination*</td>
<td>Definition progression: That knowledge, skills, values and approach build on each other so as to achieve increased depth/complexity. Progression can also refer to increased breadth/complexity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition examination: That the examination is both legally certain and ensures that passing students meet all intended course learning outcomes, e.g. using grading criteria and different examination formats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Teaching ability* and scientifically based teaching and learning:</td>
<td>Definition teaching ability: pedagogical and subject-specific expertise.</td>
<td>Scientifically based teaching and learning is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student learning*</td>
<td>Definition: The best ways for all students to learn (varied types of teaching, background, function variation). Creating conditions for student learning. That scientifically based teaching and learning is used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research basis*</td>
<td>Definition: The students develop a scientific and critical approach. The students are involved in activities related to current research. Research methods. Research ethics. The contents of the courses are based on current knowledge and proven experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society’s needs and preparation for future careers*:</td>
<td>Definition of society’s needs: in-demand labour or entrepreneurs, skilled and educated members of society with a scientific approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition preparations for future careers: e.g. working methods (e.g. projects, professional skills and approaches, cooperation/projects from private sector/public authorities in courses, cooperation with people with backgrounds in another subject, professional contacts (e.g. alumni visit, guest lecturer, study visit).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Internationalisation and sustainability perspective*:</td>
<td>Definition internationalisation: other countries’/international perspective on the subject, interaction with people with backgrounds from other countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition sustainability perspective: promoting sustainable development that ensures a healthy and good environment, financial and social welfare and justice for current and future generations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student influence*:</td>
<td>Definition: the students have influence over their and others’ education and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partially common themes:
For example:
Programme-relevant applications in tool courses (e.g. mathematics and statistics in engineering master’s programmes).
Scheduling and joint studies: scheduled time is booked elements that are not independent study.
Joint studies is when multiple programmes take all or part of a course together. How joint studies could be made an advantage for the study programmes. How much scheduled time that is optimal.

2021
Available and appropriate study environment*:
Definition: that the students have a good physical and mental working environment.

Gender equality perspective* and equal opportunities:
Definition: that the students are given good conditions for learning regardless of background (gender identity, functional variation, ethnicity, etc.)

2022
Continuous follow-up and improvement*:
Definition: that all education is followed up and developed in the desired direction.

*Focus areas marked with “*” are aspects described in Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations.

Annual reporting on the programme
The programme coordinator submits an annual operations report to the responsible educational board. The operations report is part of the annual follow-up and is used as supporting documentation for the self-evaluation. This report shall include a development focus for the year in question. For development focus, supporting documentation (e.g. key figures, supporting documentation from surveys) shall be included, as well as strengths, weaknesses, development areas and, if needed, an action plan. If applicable, a follow-up of the previous year’s action plan should also be included. Implemented improvement actions should also be reported. For study programmes that have been evaluated, corrective measures and improvement actions connected to the evaluation should also be included. It should be stated who is responsible for the implementation of each corrective action. Instructions are provided in Appendix 3. The responsible study programmes board provides additional instructions.

Annual reporting on freestanding courses and contract education
The subject coordinator submits an annual operations report to the educational boards. The operations report is part of the annual follow-up and is used as supporting documentation for the self-evaluation. This report shall include a development focus for the year in question. For development focus, supporting documentation (e.g. key figures, supporting documentation from surveys) shall be included, as well as strengths, weaknesses, development areas and, if needed, an action plan. If applicable, a follow-up of the previous year’s action plan should also be included. Implemented improvement actions should also be reported. For study programmes that have been evaluated, corrective measures and improvement actions connected to the evaluation should also be included. It should be stated who is responsible for the implementation of each corrective action. Instructions are provided in Appendix 4. The educational boards provide additional instructions.
Appendix 1. Instructions for assessment panels for educational evaluations at the undergraduate and graduate levels

Background

This is an appendix to *Model for Educational Evaluations at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels*, which is a description of the Faculty of Science and Technology’s model for systematic educational evaluations. Each evaluation unit has a reviewing assessment panel. The review shall take place in accordance with recognised principles for peer review.

Composition of the assessment panel

The assessment panel shall consist of one internal teacher (from another disciplinary domain within UU), two external teachers with expertise in the relevant subject (from another higher education institution) and one student from another higher education institution (appointed by the relevant student union). In certain cases, a labour market representative may be included. An equal gender distribution is sought. The internal assessor chairs the assessment panel. In the beginning of the assessment process the internal assessor meets faculty representatives to clarify the task.

A third external assessor may be appointed for educations with a particularly broad subject content if needed.

The external teachers should come from at least two different universities (primarily Swedish universities), if benchmarking is not the chosen structure for the evaluation.

Instructions for the assessment panels

The focus of the evaluation is the further development of the study programmes. The assessment panels are therefore asked to identify areas for improvement and present suggestions for improvements.

Before the evaluation, the respective evaluation unit and assessment panel should be in contact in order to put the education in its context, ensure that the assessment panel gets the supporting documentation they need, and to agree on the time and implementation of the site visit (or reverse site visit).

Assessment supporting documentation and higher learning institution interview

The supporting documentation the assessment groups receive is a self-evaluation (written by the evaluation unit) and information collected during an in-person site visit/reverse site visit (unless otherwise decided). The assessors also gain access to the supporting documentation for the self-evaluation (e.g. course syllabi, programme syllabus, survey responses, course evaluations or guidelines). The assessment panels can request additional supporting documentation as needed and contact the evaluation unit if uncertainties arise.

Self-evaluation

The head of the evaluation unit compiles a self-evaluation of no more than 40 pages including important supporting documentation (as appendices). All evaluation aspects (see Table 1) must be covered by the self-evaluation, but the evaluation unit may choose to place different levels of emphasis on different aspects and should particularly emphasise any area(s) the unit especially wishes to improve. The self-evaluation shall also describe the quality processes in place (examples of quality processes are provided on page 6 of *Model for Educational Evaluations at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels*).

---

4 For benchmarking, the external assessors’ site visit is replaced with a visit by the evaluation unit to the corresponding study programme (reverse site visit).
Educational Evaluations at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels, Faculty of Science and Technology.

The self-evaluation aims to provide supporting documentation that enables quality assurance through critical review. It identifies the areas for improvement and thereby promotes quality enhancement.

For degree programmes, all associated degrees are covered by the evaluation unit’s self-evaluation. This can be accomplished by, for example, presenting a chart of objectives based on intended course learning outcomes and examination formats for lower-level degrees. Quality enhancement activities for these higher education qualifications are covered under the degree programme’s quality enhancement activities and do not need to be further specified.

Abbreviations must be explained and printed out to ease understanding for students and assessors.

Table 1 The aspects that must be covered by every educational evaluation (from Guidelines for Uppsala University’s Model for Educational Evaluations, page 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that the study programmes achieve the objectives of the Higher Education Act and Higher Education Ordinance (Qualifications Ordinance) and programme-specific objectives, i.e., that actual learning outcomes correspond to expected learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the content and teaching activities are founded on a scientific basis and proven experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that teaching focuses on the learning of students/doctoral students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the achievement of intended learning outcomes is assessed using appropriate methods, and complying to rule of law, and that progression is ensured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that staff involved in the study programme possess relevant and up-to-date expertise in the subject matter, that they have pedagogical and/or subject didactic expertise, and that there is sufficient teaching capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that internationalisation, international perspectives and sustainability are promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that a gender equality perspective is integrated into the study programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the study programme meets individuals’ and society’s needs for learning and professional knowledge and prepares students for future careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that students/doctoral students have influence on the planning, implementation and follow-up of the study programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that an appropriate study environment is available to all students/doctoral students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that continuous follow-up and improvement of the study programme is carried out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of the evaluation aspects and examples for working with these are provided in Appendix 2. Also see Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations (UFV 2015/475).

Site visit

The assessment panel must make at least one in-person site visit. The Deputy Dean of Education may grant exemption from this so that the site visit may instead be conducted via video conferencing or similar. A request for this must be submitted by the head of the evaluation unit. Time should be allocated in conjunction with the site visit for the assessment panel to work independently to summarise the visit and begin writing an assessor statement. The site visit lasts one or two days (length to be determined by the head of the evaluation unit). Two days are recommended.

For benchmarking, the external assessors’ site visit is replaced with a visit by the evaluation unit to the corresponding education (referred to as a reverse site visit).

Before the site visit, the respective evaluation unit and assessment panel should be in contact in order to put the education in its context, ensure that the assessment panel gets the supporting documentation they need, and to agree on the time and implementation of the site visit/reverse site visit.

The evaluation unit and the assessment panel determine which persons should take part in the site visit. This can,
for example, be the Deputy Dean of Education or the Chair of the responsible educational board, programme coordinator, subject coordinator, one or more teachers, representative from the faculty office and students (students preferably separately). Additional suggestions for site visits are provided in Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations.

Assessor statement
The assessment panel(s) must submit two assessor statements. The assessment panels submit a detailed (about 10-40 pages) statement and a summary of this ("summarised assessor statement," about 2 pages). Both statements must contain the strengths, weaknesses/areas for improvement and recommendations for improvement for evaluated education. The statements must also contain information about the assessors, the methods and when the assessment was made. The aspects that each educational evaluation must cover (Table 1) should be reflected in the assessment. There is a template available for the assessor statement. The summarised assessor statement shall be published on the University’s website with the public and students as the primary target groups.

The assessors are requested to submit preliminary assessor statements for review by the heads of the evaluation units so that any errors can be remedied. After the report, one or more assessors participate in a follow-up meeting (virtual or in-person) with the evaluation unit to give the evaluation unit a chance to ask follow-up questions and thereby gain maximum insight from the evaluation.

Compensation

Remuneration
The two external assessors on each assessment panel receive remuneration in the amount of SEK 10,000 each and the students in each assessment panel receive remuneration in the amount of SEK 4,500. For the internal assessors, remuneration is paid to the department in which the internal assessor is employed. The remuneration level should correspond to the SEK 10,000 provided to the external assessors by the assessor receiving the corresponding amount of time freed up for the assignment.

When there is a joint assessment panel remuneration is received for freestanding courses and contract education corresponding to the part of a bachelor degree these courses are equivalent to, i.e. (number of credits/180)*10 000 SEK for one external assessor. If two programmes are assessed by the same assessment panel, the assessors receive remuneration for each programme (which doubles the expected contribution).

The assessors are not reimbursed for any out-of-pocket expenses.

Other compensation
For site visits, travel and hotel expenses are paid by the Faculty of Science and Technology, UU, after agreement with the faculty office. A daily allowance is not provided but group meals are included.

Travel
Travel should follow the University’s travel policy (http://regler.uu.se/digitalAssets/14/c_14219-1_3-k_riktlinjer- tjansteresor-och-moten.pdf). This means that the environmental impact of the trips should be as minimal as possible and as such, travel should take place by train whenever possible. Flights may be used on trips of more than 500 kilometres. Travel should be in second class or the equivalent. Public transport should

5 Currently only available in Swedish.
be used whenever possible for travel to/from the railway station, airport, etc. Any bonus points and other benefits offered by the suppliers fully accrue to the University. The assessors book their own travel via the travel agency procured by the University after agreement with the faculty office.

**Hotel**
Hotels with state framework agreements must be used. The ranking order must be followed.

**Meals**
In conjunction with meetings, the Faculty of Science and Technology, UU, pays for group meals after agreement with the faculty office. The University’s guidelines on entertaining expenses (http://regler.uu.se/digitalAssets/334/c_334286-I_3-k_14-787-140624-riktlinjer-for-representation-och-gavor.pdf6) must be followed. The evaluation unit must order these meals. The assessors are not reimbursed for any out-of-pocket expenses.

**Handling of disqualification**
The assignment as assessor requires integrity and impartiality. Conflicts of interests that can cause the objectivity of the assessors to be questioned must be avoided. Disqualification is described in sections 11 and 12 of the Administrative Procedure Act. The assessors must not have taught in the evaluation unit in the past five years.

The assessors are expected to certify that there is no conflict of interest.

**Schedule**
Exact dates and times are set jointly by the respective evaluation unit and assessment panel. An approximate schedule is provided below.

- **October:** Introductory meeting with the heads of the evaluation units.
- **November:** UU begins the process of finding assessors.
- **April:** Introductory meeting with the conveners in the assessment panels.
- **June:** The self-evaluation is sent to the assessment panels.
- **September–October:** Site visit. Notes should be taken by the evaluation unit.
- **November–December:** The assessment panels submit a first version of the detailed assessor statements so that any misunderstandings can be resolved.
- **December:** The assessment panels submit a final version of detailed assessor statements and feedback concerning the method itself, time expenditure, etc. The assessment panels also submit a summary (for publication) of their report.
- **December-January:** Each assessment panel has a follow-up meeting with the evaluation unit and other concerned parties and gives the heads of the units the chance to ask questions to learn as much as possible.

---

6 Currently only available in Swedish.
Appendix 2. Definitions of the various evaluation aspects and examples for working with these

This is an appendix to Model for Educational Evaluations at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels, which is a description of the Faculty of Science and Technology’s model for systematic educational evaluation. Examples are provided below. See “Advice and Suggestions for the Planning and Implementation of Educational Evaluations – Model for Educational Evaluations at Uppsala University” for further explanation and examples. This document also contains references to programmes and action plans for Uppsala University.

The student representatives are recommended to especially evaluate how the students are taught in equal opportunities, student influence and available and appropriate study environment.

**Goal attainment:** Study programmes achieve the objectives of the Higher Education Act and Higher Education Ordinance (Qualifications Ordinance) and programme-specific objectives, i.e. that actual study results correspond to expected study results.

**Definition:** that each student who graduates meets specific programme objectives and the objectives in the Higher Education Ordinance. That courses which are not part of any degree programme syllabus also meet the objectives in the Higher Education Act (chapter 1, sections 8-9).

**Evaluation:** For example chart of objectives, i.e. that the students meet the objectives when they graduate/pass the course. Demonstrate that the student knowledge and skills maintain a sufficiently high level (for example, by reviewing reports, examinations, collecting feedback on degree projects from supervisors, subject readers and examiners, ensuring that the internal assessor participates in one or more examinations such as oral presentation and public discussion and examination of projects or degree projects).

**Development:** How is goal attainment ensured?

**Research basis:** The content and form of teaching are founded on a scientific basis and proven experience.

**Definition:** the students develop a scientific and critical approach. The students are involved in activities related to current research. Research methods. Research ethics. The contents of the courses are based on current knowledge and proven experience.

**Evaluation:** How does the evaluation unit ensure sufficiently high inclusion of research basis? Do the students develop a scientific and critical approach?

**Development:** How can and should the research basis be developed?

**Student learning:** The teaching is centred on the learning of students.

**Definition:** the best ways for all students to learn (varied types of teaching, background, function variation). Creating conditions for student learning. That scientifically based teaching and learning is used.

**Evaluation:** How and to what extent is student-activating teaching used? How are teaching and examination formats varied and how do these support the student learning?

**Development:** How can teaching activate students? How can feedback to the students be improved? Variation of teaching and examination formats. (See Action Plan for Education for the Faculty of Science and Technology and Action Plan for the Faculty of Science and Technology).
**Progression and examination:** The achievement of objectives is tested using an appropriate and legally certain method and that progression is ensured.

**Definition progression:** that knowledge, skills, values and approach build on each other so as to achieve increased depth/complexity. Progression can also refer to increased breadth/complexity.

**Definition examination:** that the examination is both legally certain and ensures that students who pass meet all intended course learning outcomes, e.g. using grading criteria and different examination formats.

**Evaluation:** Processes that ensure the intended course learning outcomes are achieved. The chart of objectives (or equivalent) can demonstrate authorisation chains. Processes that ensure the examinations are legally certain.

**Development:** How can progression work be improved, in terms of both subject knowledge and skills? Depth versus breadth. Teams of teachers can, for example, perform peer reviews of examinations in different courses.

---

**Teaching ability:** Staff involved in the study programme possess relevant and up-to-date expertise in the subject matter, that they have university training in teaching/subject teaching experience, and that there is sufficient teaching capacity.

**Definition teaching ability:** pedagogical and subject-specific expertise.

**Evaluation:** Is the subject-specific, pedagogical and subject didactics teaching ability sufficient? Is there sufficient teaching capacity? Processes that ensure teaching ability and teaching capacity. Where is ability lacking? Collegial work such as TUR’s work and the programme’s teacher days.

**Development:** How is clear and well-functioning pedagogical leadership ensured? How are new teachers introduced? How do we ensure that teaching ability is sufficient? Long-term plan for teaching ability. How are teaching staff given equal conditions for their task regardless of background? (See Action Plan for Education for the Faculty of Science and Technology).

---

**Internationalisation and sustainability perspective:** Internationalisation, international perspectives and a sustainability perspective are promoted.

**Definition internationalisation:** other countries’/international perspective on the subject, interaction with people with backgrounds from other countries.

**Definition sustainability perspective:** promoting sustainable development that ensures a healthy and good environment, financial and social welfare and justice for current and future generations

**Evaluation:** In what way are international and global perspectives present in the study programme? How is sustainability present in the study programme?

**Development:** How are the backgrounds and experience of teachers and students from other countries utilised? How is a sustainability perspective integrated into the study programmes?

---

**Gender equality perspective and equal opportunities:** Gender equality perspective is integrated into the study programme.

**Definition:** that the students are given good conditions for learning regardless of background (gender identity, functional variation, ethnicity, etc.)
Evaluation: What is the gender breakdown of students and teachers in the study programme? Is there discrimination based on background? Reading list. Attitudes of students. How are the students taught on equal terms?

Development: How can we work to ensure that the students are given equally good conditions for learning regardless of background (gender identity, functional variation, ethnicity, etc.)? Role models/teachers with different backgrounds.

Society’s needs and preparation for future careers: The study programme meets individuals’ and society’s needs for learning and professional knowledge and prepares students for future careers.

Definition society’s needs: in-demand labour or entrepreneurs, skilled and educated members of society with a scientific approach.

Definition preparations for future careers: e.g. working methods (e.g. projects, professional skills and approaches, cooperation/projects from the public sector/public authorities in courses, cooperation with people with backgrounds in another subject, professional contacts (e.g. alumni visit, guest lecturer, study visit).

Evaluation: How does the study programme meet society’s needs and to what degree does it prepare students for future careers? How is knowledge about society’s needs acquired? Do alumni feel that they were prepared for future careers? To what extent do alumni possess employment relevant to the study programme?

Development: How can the student professional skills and approaches best be developed?

Student influence: The students have an influence on the planning, implementation and follow-up of the study programme.

Definition: that the students have influence over their and others’ education and learning. Students participate actively in follow-up of the education, for example through course evaluations, programme questionnaires and alumni questionnaires. Students participate actively in the work with educational evaluations (in the preparation of models and self-evaluations as well as in assessment panels). Students participate in the decision-making process concerning programme syllabi, course syllabi and resource allocation.

Evaluation: How and to what extent do students participate in the study programme?

Development: How should we work with student influence?

Available and appropriate study environment: There is a study environment that is available and appropriate for all students.

Definition: that the students have a good physical and mental working environment.

Evaluation: Is the student environment available to everyone? Are the premises appropriate? What support is available to students? How are students followed up? Issue management processes in the event of shortcomings.

Development: How can we increase availability? (See Action Plan for Education for the Faculty of Science and Technology and Action Plan for Equal Opportunities for Students for the Faculty of Science
Continuous follow-up and improvement: Continuous follow-up and improvement of the study programme is implemented.

Definition: that all education is followed up and developed in the desired direction.

Evaluation: How the study programme is followed up (e.g. programme surveys, course evaluations, alumni surveys). How the results from surveys and evaluations are communicated to students and teaching staff.

Development: What is the best way to deal with results from surveys and evaluations? How is it ensured that the study programme is improved at a sufficiently high pace and in the desired direction?
Appendix 3. Instructions for annual reporting for degree programmes

This is an appendix to Model for Educational Evaluations at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels, which is a description of the Faculty of Science and Technology’s model for systematic educational evaluation.

The programme coordinator submits an annual operations report to the responsible educational board. This report shall include a development focus for the year in question. Supporting documentation (e.g. key figures, supporting documentation from surveys) as well as strengths, weaknesses, development areas and, if needed, an action plan shall be included for the development focus. If applicable, a follow-up of the previous year’s action plan should also be included. Implemented improvement actions should also be reported. For study programmes that have been evaluated, corrective measures and improvement actions connected to the evaluation should also be included. The responsible educational board provides additional instructions.

1 Annual report

1.1 Content and size

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

1.2 Performance

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

1.3 Changes

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

1.4 Programme management

Programme board, teacher days, student influence

1.5 Exposure and exchange

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

1.6 Identified strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement

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

1.7 Follow-up of study programme’s development plans for current year

(explanation of any changes and inadequate goal attainment). Links to 2.1.

1.8 Goal attainment

Report corresponding to a chart of objectives of intended course learning outcomes in comparison to the objectives in the Higher Education Ordinance. Updated for every change in programme syllabus or course syllabus.

1.9 Specific educational evaluation aspects for the year

Links to the year’s development focus in the educational evaluation model, i.e. none for the 2017 report.

1.10 Programme-specific aspect
Programme-specific assignments given by responsible educational board.

1.11 Financial accounting (1/2 page) (only applies to degree programmes on the Faculty level)

Explanation of year’s costs, e.g. in a table. “Project report” as attachment.

2. Plan of operations (approx. 1 page)

2.1 For the following year:

What the programme coordinator/programme board plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6-1.10. Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.

2. With a longer timeframe:

What the programme coordinator/programme board plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6-1.10. Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.
Appendix 4. Instructions for freestanding courses and contract education

This is an appendix to Model for Educational Evaluations at the Undergraduate and Graduate Levels, which is a description of the Faculty of Science and Technology’s model for systematic educational evaluation.

Subject coordinator submits an annual operations report, to the responsible educational boards, for freestanding courses that are not included in any degree programme syllabus and for contract education. This report shall include a development focus for the year in question. Supporting documentation (e.g. key figures, supporting documentation from surveys) as well as strengths, weaknesses, development areas and, if needed, an action plan shall be included for the development focus. If applicable, a follow-up of the previous year’s action plan should also be included. Implemented improvement actions should also be reported. For study programmes that have been evaluated, corrective measures and improvement actions connected to the evaluation should also be included. The educational boards provide additional instructions.

1 Annual report

1.1 Range, content and size
The range of courses in the subject(s) (undergraduate and graduate levels, target group, course length (day, evening or distance), number of students/participants). Proportion women/men. Justification for the range of freestanding courses offered, including courses in the degree programme syllabus.

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

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

1.4 Management of freestanding courses and contract education
Organisation for ongoing quality enhancement activities and development (e.g. follow-up of course evaluations, changes in range of courses offered), how student influence is ensured, teacher days

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

1.6 Identified strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement
From evaluations (if any) and those identified by course coordinator/study programme coordinator/department (suggestions for corrective measures in next section)

1.7 Follow-up of study programme’s development plans for current year
(explanation of any changes and inadequate goal attainment) Links further on to 2.1.

1.8 Goal attainment
Report how intended course learning outcomes compare to the objectives in the Higher Education Act. Design of examination to ensure goal attainment

1.9 Specific educational evaluation aspects for the year
Links to the year’s development focus in the educational evaluation model,
1.10 Department-specific aspect

*Department-specific assignments given by responsible educational board.*

2. Plan of operations (approx. 1 page)

2.1 For the following year:
What the department plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6-1.10. *Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.*

2. With a longer timeframe:
What the department plans to do in 20XX with link/justification to 1.6-1.10. *Goals, purpose, time, resources, follow-up.*