

Avdelning  
Utvärderingsavdelningen  
Handläggare  
Anna-Karin Malla  
08-563 086 66  
anna-karin.malla@uka.se

Rektorer vid berörda lärosäten

## Utvärdering av utbildning på forskarnivå inom arkitektur

### Beslut

Universitetskanslersämbetet (UKÄ) beslutar att ge följande samlade omdöme för utbildningar på forskarnivå som leder till licentiat- och doktorsexamen inom arkitektur.

#### Chalmers tekniska högskola AB

Arkitektur - licentiat- och doktorsexamen, hög kvalitet

#### Kungl. Tekniska högskolan

Arkitektur - licentiat- och doktorsexamen, hög kvalitet

#### Lunds universitet

Arkitektur - licentiat- och doktorsexamen, hög kvalitet

#### Umeå universitet

Arkitektur - doktorsexamen, ifrågasatt kvalitet

Utbildningar med det samlade omdömet *hög kvalitet* uppfyller kvalitetskraven för högre utbildning på forskarnivå. Utbildningar med det samlade omdömet *ifrågasatt kvalitet* uppfyller inte kvalitetskraven för högre utbildning på forskarnivå. För de utbildningar som fått omdömet ifrågasatt kvalitet innebär det att UKÄ ifrågasätter tillståndet att utfärda dessa examina. Dessa lärosäten (Umeå universitet/Arkitektur - doktorsexamen) ska senast 2 maj 2019 inkomma med en redogörelse för de åtgärder som vidtagits. Därefter kommer UKÄ att ta ställning till om det finns skäl att besluta att lärosätet inte längre får utfärda dessa examina.

### Ärendets hantering

UKÄ har i enlighet med regeringens uppdrag genomfört en nationell utvärdering av utbildningar som leder till licentiat- och doktorsexamen på forskarnivå inom arkitektur. I de fall lärosätet ger både licentiat- och doktorsexamen i arkitektur har dessa utvärderats som en enhet. Utvärderingen har utgått ifrån de krav som ställs i högskolelagen (1992:1434) och högskoleförordningen (1993:100). Uppdraget ligger inom ramen för det nationella systemet för kvalitetssäkring av högre utbildning (*Nationellt system för kvalitetssäkring av högre utbildning. Redovisning av ett regeringsuppdrag, Rapport 2016:15*).

För granskningen av berörda utbildningar har UKÄ efter ett nomineringsförfarande utsett en bedömaregrupp bestående av ämnessakkunniga, doktorandrepresentanter och arbetslivsföreträdare. Bedömarna har inte deltagit i beredning eller bedömning av utbildningar vid lärosäten där de uppgett jäv. En förteckning över bedömare och jävsförhållanden framgår av bilaga 2 i bedömaregruppens yttrande.

De underlag som ligger till grund för bedömningen framgår av bilaga 3 i bedömaregruppens yttrande. Utifrån underlagen har bedömaregruppen redovisat en bedömning med vidhängande motivering av respektive utbildnings kvalitet utifrån nedanstående aspektområden och perspektiv (se bedömaregruppens yttrande, bilaga 1).

Aspektområden:

- miljö, resurser och område
- utformning, genomförande och resultat
- uppföljning, åtgärder och återkoppling.

Perspektiv:

- doktoranders perspektiv
- arbetslivets perspektiv
- jämställdhetsperspektiv.

I bedömaregruppens yttrande ges även ett förslag till samlat omdöme för respektive utbildning.

UKÄ har innan detta beslut fattats skickat bedömaregruppens preliminära yttranden till respektive lärosäte på delning, för att korrigera eventuella sakfel. Delningstiden var tre veckor. De svar som lärosätena inkom med framgår av bilaga 4. Bedömaregruppen har tagit del av lärosätenas svar, och i de fall där det bedömts vara relevant har ändringar gjorts i yttrandena.

### **Universitetskanslersämbetets bedömning**

Med utgångspunkt i bedömaregruppens förslag ger UKÄ respektive utbildning det samlade omdömet *hög kvalitet* eller *ifrågasatt kvalitet*. Det samlade omdömet ifrågasatt kvalitet innebär att UKÄ ifrågasätter lärosätets tillstånd att utfärda doktorsexamen inom forskarutbildningsämnet och att UKÄ efter uppföljning kommer att ta ställning till om tillstånd att utfärda denna examen bör dras in. (För närmare information, se *Vägledning för utvärdering av utbildning på forskarnivå*, Universitetskanslersämbetet 2016).

UKÄ:s samlade omdöme för respektive utbildning och lärosäte redovisas i bilaga 1.

Beslut i detta ärende har tagits av generaldirektören Anders Söderholm efter föredragning av utredaren Anna-Karin Malla i närvaro av biträdande avdelningschefen Lisa Jämtsved Lundmark och strategi- och planeringsansvariga Per Westman.

Anders Söderholm

Anna-Karin Malla

Kopia till:  
Bedömagruppen

## Bilaga 1: Samlat omdöme

### Chalmers tekniska högskola AB

Lärosäte	Forskarutbildningsämne	ID-nr	Samlat omdöme
Chalmers tekniska högskola AB	Arkitektur - licentiat- och doktorsexamen	A-2016-11-4119	Hög kvalitet
<p>Universitetskanslersämbetet instämmer i bedömargruppens ställningstagande.  <i>"In conclusion, the programme is assessed as maintaining high quality.</i></p> <p>Aspect area 'environment, resources and area': The higher education institution has a good depth of supervisory resources, an impressive track record of publications, and a strong collaborative ethos with other higher education institutions, both at the national and international level. This enhances critical mass and ensures that the higher education institution has developed a significant network. The merger with the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering gives additional scale, but may pose challenges to some areas of research listed in the demarcation of the subject area of the programme. The vitality and effectiveness of research groups seems uneven and the overall picture needs to be addressed, for the benefit of both doctoral students and staff.</p> <p>Aspect area 'design, teaching/learning and outcomes': The higher education institution demonstrates a robust system for tracking doctoral student progress, involving individual study plans and progress seminars. However, the depth and rigour of the study plans appear quite variable and the panel recommends that a more systematic approach be taken. The emergence of thematic 'centres' can be powerful tools, extending the academy's interaction with professional and non-academic partners and deepening the relation with various stakeholders. While the panel feels that generic and transferrable skill acquisition is well covered, there appears to be issues with methodological courses for some areas of study. There are interesting and innovative initiatives that the panel commends, such as the 'popular science presentation', where doctoral students are required to publically present their work to non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Working life perspective: The doctoral programme is well-integrated with working life, with the profiles of staff and doctoral students showing strong links with industry and extra-academic institutions. Likewise, there is a track record of publication in professional journals, etc. The panel emphasises the good example of the Generic and Transferrable Skills courses. Linking up with alumni, however, is a potential area of improvement both in terms of (1) knowing what doctoral students do after taking their degree and how successful they are (an indicator of the quality of the programme in relation to working life) and (2) feeding their knowledge and experience back into the programme.</p> <p>Doctoral student perspective: The systems for the integration of doctoral students within the department are robust and convincing, and the panel commends this. There are indications, however, of a shortfall of practical and material support for student-led initiatives for seminars, etc.</p> <p>Gender equality perspective: The panel acknowledges the higher education institution's recognition and concern with gender equality but recommends that a more coherent policy is put in place that takes account of diversity more generally. This is not only a matter of recruitment and equality of numbers, promotional possibilities, etc., but also a matter of the content of courses, directions of scholarship, and everyday practice.</p>			

Aspect area 'follow-up, actions and feedback': The systems in place are generally good, and clear examples are given of actions taken when issues have arisen with doctoral students' supervision. More widely, the panel recommends that further thought is given to who constitutes 'stakeholders' with regard to specific research projects for the purposes of feedback. For example, it is not very clear from the higher education institution's reporting how feedback operates in relation to non-academic stakeholders. Follow-up of alumni seems largely a blind spot."

## Kungl. Tekniska högskolan

Lärosäte	Forskarutbildningsämne	ID-nr	Samlat omdöme
Kungl. Tekniska högskolan	Arkitektur - licentiat- och doktorsexamen	A-2016-11-4120	Hög kvalitet
<p>Universitetskanslersämbetet instämmer i bedömargruppens ställningstagande.  <i>"In conclusion, the programme is assessed as maintaining high quality.</i></p> <p>Aspect area 'environment, resources and area': The higher education institution is assessed by the panel to deliver a very coherent programme in all its facets. The third-cycle environment is assessed as an environment of high quality and intensity of activity with a range of connections and collaborations with external bodies. The staffing of the programme is generally satisfactory, and the higher education institution's intention to appoint staff in order to improve the number of supervisors in some areas is noted.</p> <p>Aspect area 'design, teaching/learning and outcomes': The assessment panel highly values the very effective structure offered to the doctoral students. Individual study plans, methodological seminars, national and international conference participation, and individual supervision guarantee broad knowledge and understanding. Moreover, the institution stimulates doctoral projects that explore design and experimental writing as a way of research and knowledge production. Further attention paid to the mutual relationship between these elements of supervision could enhance the programme even more. Regarding the training of research methods and a methodological approach to thesis work, the assessment panel values that the development of scientific methodologies is supported by ResArc courses, supervisor-student discussions (which include advice on which courses to take), actual step-by-step writing exercises, and cross-referral by supervisors. This 'co-supervising' is received very positively and as exemplary. An international orientation and performance adds to this positive framework.</p> <p>Working life perspective: The working life perspective is satisfactory as doctoral students are well prepared for both an academic career and a career outside academia. However, a potential area of improvement is follow-up and feedback from alumni, a strategy that will inevitably need time and resources.</p> <p>Doctoral student perspective: Doctoral students at the higher education institution have ample opportunity to make their voices heard in various forums at the department and institution level.</p> <p>Gender equality perspective: By focusing on a balanced recruitment of students and staff and, by the continuous evaluation of the gender content of each research and teaching field, the higher education institution is a leading institution in the field of gender issues and architecture.</p> <p>Aspect area 'follow-up, actions and feedback': The processes for follow-up and responsibility for action is unclear when it comes to the third-cycle programme environment. When it comes to the teaching/learning, there is a valuable structure for evaluation and feedback, with good examples of initiatives such as the supervisors' collegium. The assessment panel sees a more rigorous use of the individual study plans as a potential area of improvement."</p>			

Lunds universitet

Lärosäte	Forskarutbildningsämne	ID-nr	Samlat omdöme
Lunds universitet	Arkitektur - licentiat- och doktorsexamen	A-2016-11-4121	Hög kvalitet
<p>Universitetskanslersämbetet instämmer i bedömargruppens ställningstagande.  <i>"In conclusion the programme is assessed as maintaining high quality."</i></p> <p>Aspect area 'environment, resources and area': The higher education institution offers excellent physical resources to its doctoral students, which encourages their presence and integration in the life of the department. Although the number of doctoral students is limited, it achieves a critical mass through the ResArc consortium and through collaborations within the higher education institution, which opens additional course opportunities for doctoral students. Initiatives such as the ABES seminar programme are commended by the panel, as is the valuable recognition of staff contribution via the 'excellent teaching practitioner award'. The panel recommends that follow-up, feedback and action procedures are clarified and made more visible and that the opportunities to intensify relevant collaborations with non-academic bodies and surrounding society should be taken up.</p> <p>Aspect area 'design, teaching/learning and outcomes': The higher education institution has a robust system to develop, support and assess the research of its doctoral students. Doctoral students have good access to courses, and the individual study plan is a well-utilised. While the panel believes that the higher education institution performs well in this area, it recommends that reflection be given to the category of 'relevant stakeholders' in relation to research follow-up and feedback procedures, and that potential challenges arising from the end of funding of ResArc need to be addressed.</p> <p>Working life perspective: The higher education institution shows a good connection with professional life, with strong staff and doctoral student ties and some clear initiatives to facilitate this link. However, there is something of a blind spot with regard to alumni and the way in which their knowledge and expertise might feed back into the school and enrich and inform doctoral student experience with regard to working life.</p> <p>Doctoral student perspective: There is good evidence that doctoral students are well-integrated within the department and that there are channels through which their voices and opinions can be heard. At present, the higher education institution hosts a number of doctoral students from a Jordanian university and care has to be taken that as far as possible there are equal working conditions, opportunities, and access to resources.</p> <p>Gender equality perspective: While there is an admitted gender imbalance among available supervisory staff, it is noted that this will shift in the coming years. The higher education institution shows awareness of the issues and there are evident steps that have been taken to address the gender imbalance, e.g., by installing an advisory board to promote equal opportunities.</p> <p>Aspect area 'follow-up, actions and feedback': This aspect is strong and convincing in relation to academic support, monitoring and feedback on the progress of doctoral students, but the systems are less obvious elsewhere. The panel has no doubt that this is a research environment that works, but the case would have been clarified if some examples of follow-up actions and processes had been given in the self-evaluation report. As noted, the definition of 'relevant stakeholders' is important in</p>			

order to understand the context, extent and targets of feedback and follow-up."



## Umeå universitet

Lärosäte	Forskarutbildningsämne	ID-nr	Samlat omdöme
Umeå universitet	Arkitektur - doktorsexamen	A-2016-11-4122	Ifrågasatt kvalitet
<p>Universitetskanslersämbetet instämmer i bedömargruppens ställningstagande. <i>"In conclusion, the programme's quality is being questioned."</i></p> <p>Aspect area 'environment, resources and area': This aspect area is impossible to judge positively because of a lack of clarity and information regarding the plan for the development of the doctoral programme in coming years. Although the panel found the demarcation statement interesting and provocative, it raised questions that were not addressed in the self-evaluation or the interviews. Despite these issues, good initiatives and ideas are presented, including the provision of an independent reference person for each doctoral student and the incorporation of doctoral students within research groups that involve staff. The panel is concerned that the higher education institution's relative geographic isolation might pose problems when ResArc funding ends (loss of funding will make it difficult for doctoral students to travel to courses, etc.), and that a way should be found to address this. The panel strongly recommends that the programme develop a thorough five-year plan that includes related resourcing.</p> <p>Aspect area 'design, teaching/learning and outcomes': The assessment panel views the response to this aspect area as not satisfactory. The panel is concerned that there is no clear account of what changes have been implemented in the interim since the previous cohort of doctoral students and how this will affect this aspect area. The panel found good suggestions and approaches in the self-evaluation, but also at times a lack of coherent strategy coordinating the actions that ensure the doctoral students achieve the qualitative targets.</p> <p>Working life perspective: The panel commends the 'Project Office' idea and the general aspirations of the self-evaluation in this perspective. However, details regarding the 'Project Office' are vague and there is no mention of the working life perspective in the quality management system of the higher education institution. There is also no identifiable strategy that addresses alumni.</p> <p>Doctoral student perspective: The panel commends initiatives such as common planning days, an annual research studies seminar, and yearly survey of doctoral students' experiences. The panel is, however, concerned that there is no mention of the issues raised by the previous doctoral students in the self-evaluation and how these issues have been addressed.</p> <p>Gender equality perspective: The panel considers this a relatively strong section in the self-evaluation report, with clear attention to this issue and processes. From the interviews, the panel noticed a tendency for the strategic and operational staff to be split along gender lines, and that this was also reflected in the responses given to questions.</p> <p>Aspect area 'follow-up, actions and feedback': Overall this is not a strong area as it meets only the minimal level for being assessed as satisfactory. It is clearly deficient in the aspect area of 'environment, resources and area' and in 'working life perspective'.</p>			

Overall, the panel has no option but to judge the quality of the programme as questioned and assess it as 'under review'. In resubmitting for approval, the panel advises that the higher education institution provides the following information:

1. A clear strategic plan for the development of the programme over five years, describing prospective doctoral student numbers and resourcing requirements. This should also address related issues connected to the doctoral student, working life, and gender perspectives, as well as articulating an approach for how to deal with foreseeable problems such as the ending of ResArc funding.
2. An explicit statement of the institutional response to the complaints of the previous doctoral students, showing what changes have been implemented, and describing how they address the issues raised.

In conclusion, the panel stresses the importance of the full integration of the views of both operational and strategic staff (and eventually doctoral students) in planning the future of the third-cycle programme."