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**A**. **Planned Development Measures within the Faculty**

The follow-up report is based on the situational analysis conducted by the faculty in 2024 and the development measures that the faculty identified as priorities for the upcoming three-year period.

**B. Follow-up on Development Measures**

Before the annual quality dialogue between those responsible for doctoral education at the faculty and university levels, the quality report should be updated with information on the progress of the implementation of measures.

**C. Possible Supplementation of the Situational Analysis**

The report should be sent to fur-sekr@slu.se no later than **September 15, 2025**.
The **Division for Planning and Research Support** is responsible for the registration of the quality report.

# A1. Planned Measures at the Faculty Level

This section describes the measures that the faculty identified as priorities in its 2024 report to strengthen the conditions for high quality.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Development measure** | **Background and purpose** |
| 1 | Clarify at faculty level the process for recruitment and admission of doctoral students, including licentiate students.  | Some departments need more support in the recruitment and admission process. Also, we need to reduce the number of licentiate students admitted as the majority continue to do a full PhD.  |
| 2 | Clarify at department level regarding matters concerning departments (e.g. by producing checklists for recruitments, how to evaluate applicants and thesis defence). | Some processes, in particular recruitment and admission, and thesis defence involve both departments and the faculty. We see a need for clarifying the processes at department level.  |
| 3 | Review information flow, including which information should be sent out to new PhD students from the faculty. | It is common that new PhD students get overwhelmed by a lot of information at the beginning of their education. Some information also appears to get lost in the flow from the faculty to the departments/PhD students/supervisors. |
| 4 | Continued implementation of the “expectations document” at department level at the beginning of the education and also follow up the expectations.  | To support a good working relationship between PhD student and supervisors, it is important to discuss expectations, which can be done by using the “expectations document” available at the faculty. |
| 5 | Investigate whether it is possible to implement measures to even out the number of PhD students per supervisor, e.g. by directed cofounding. | The number of PhD students per supervisor is uneven at some departments and not all available supervisors are used, which can be problematic for the quality of the education. This is also a problem for career development and possibilities to get external funding.  |
| 6 | Clarify responsibilities for infrastructure and risk management at department level. | Because PhD projects are dependent on well-functioning infrastructure, there should be clear guidelines for department responsibilities and risk management.  |
| 7 | Investigate the roles of support for PhD supervisors, and adapt it to research education. | Supervisors seem to find it hard to handle cases when PhD students are stressed, and available support for the supervisors is unclear. Could HR or a course e.g. on interpersonal skills support supervisors? |
| 8 | Faculty support for departments where the ISP is not working. Write a routine for how to work with the digital ISP and post on the homepage. | The digital ISP has not been well implemented in departments with few PhD students. |
| 9 | Continued work on clarifying the division of work tasks between the roles of faculty and department study directors.  | Some supports from study directors should be performed at department level to be closer to the PhD students and supervisors. Thus, we aim to strengthen the role for department study directors regarding information flow, support and follow up of the education. |
| 10 | Clarify the difference between doctoral talks and appraisals for PhD students at department level. Investigate if the faculty should implement some overview guidelines for the doctoral talks also adjusted to the stages of PhD education. | Even though the doctoral talks usually work well, there is some confusion about ~~is~~ the difference it has from appraisals; whether they are controlling or supporting meetings and whether they are adapted to the stage of the education.  |
| 11 | Discussions about equal opportunities and handling different student backgrounds, such as nationality, at faculty level. | To raise awareness of equal opportunities and different backgrounds it is important to have an ongoing discussion about this. |
| 12 | At the faculty, continue to work on keeping up the number of subject courses across subject areas in the research schools. | As the LTV faculty has broad subject areas, we need to continue our work to supply a broad range of subject courses.  |
| 13 | Write guidelines at faculty level regarding when PhD students supervise student projects. | There is some uncertainly about the responsibility and compensation for PhD students supervising student projects. |
| 14 | Start supervisor network at the LTV faculty led by junior supervisors who received faculty funding for PhD students. | There is a need for knowledge and experience exchanges between supervisors at the faculty.  |
| 15 | At faculty level, write guidelines for changing main supervisors. | PhD students have the right to change their supervisors. As changing the main supervisor can sometimes be difficult, it would be good to have some clear guidelines so that the PhD student does not lose a lot of study time in this process. |
| 16 | Develop some future career support at the faculty, e.g. work together with the extension unit at the LTV faculty to organise an event where PhD students can meet future employers, and include questions at the end of the education about future career (e.g. at 75% follow-up at the faculty). Clearer expectations from departments/supervisors about discussing future careers. | Future career support needs to be increased but it is unclear who should take the responsibility for this, and some central support it probably necessary as well.  |
| 17 | Follow up the measures introduced at the departments. | All departments indicated that they have good measures at the department level for improving research education, which they are about to start implementing. |

*If needed, additional rows can be added to the table.*
A2. Proposed Discussion Points for the Quality Dialogue with the Pro Vice-Chancellor

This section describes the questions and challenges that the faculty wishes to address in the dialogue with the Pro Vice-Chancellor regarding how the conditions for high quality can be strengthened.

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions/challenges** |
|  |
|  |
|  |

*If needed, additional rows can be added to the table.*

A3. Other Comments

[Any suggestions or feedback on the quality assurance process or overarching reflections not covered above.]

B. Follow-up on Development Measures
Before the annual quality dialogue with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (2025 and 2026), the faculty should describe the progress made in implementing the measures and the changes they have led to. Factors influencing the implementation and/or effectiveness of the measures should also be described.

Copy the table below for each measure in Table A1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Development measure no.: ….** **Headline:……** | **Status**Välj ett objekt. |
| **2025**: |
| **2026**: |

C. Possible Supplementation of the Situational Analysis
This section should only be completed if significant changes have occurred since 2024, necessitating new measure(s).

[Possible supplementation of the situational analysis]
[Date of supplementation]

#