

Phase 2b: Determining an educational structure

Translated by ChatGPT

Background

The feedback from phase 1 of the consultation process has convinced us in the faculty management team that it would be best to allocate more time for the structural discussions necessary to complete the changes to the educational landscape. We would like to highlight two points.

First, there is a need to ensure better student involvement, which means we must create better opportunities for discussions within the formal educational organizations, where parity staffing allows for better inclusion of student perspectives.

Second, the feedback is so contradictory that it seems necessary to have a broader discussion within the faculty on the structural issues. This concerns central questions such as whether we should maintain elective options, whether we should ensure a higher degree of mono-disciplinary focus or prioritize interdisciplinarity, and how we should ensure opportunities for students to complete dual-degree programs.

In light of this, the faculty management team has decided to create an independent process for the decision on the educational structure, which will be referred to as phase 2b. We acknowledge within the faculty management team that in some environments there is a need for quick clarification of structural issues, and therefore, we have worked to design a process that allows a working group to provide guidance on the direction throughout the work.

Proces for determining an educational structure

To allow time for a faculty-wide discussion, the process has been designed with the aim of reaching a final decision by the end of March 2025. The process will be divided into three phases, creating space for exploratory discussions in the first phase, while the second phase will take the form of a more formal consultation within the governing bodies, and the third phase will consist of the decision-making process.

Part 1 – Working Group, Reference Group, and Education Forum (UFA)

The faculty management team has decided to establish a working group consisting of the Vice Dean for Education and the three program leaders, who will be responsible for drafting proposals for the faculty-wide discussions. The working group will be supported by a staff member from the Education and Learning Unit (SNUK).

To ensure a broad perspective in the working group's thinking, the heads of departments will be used as a reference group, tasked with discussing drafts with the working group and conducting local discussions within the academic environments. In order to ensure a connection between the working group and the study strands from the outset of the process, the faculty's Education Forum will also be involved in the discussions. The working group will, at multiple stages, present proposals and revised proposals for the educational structure, which will be discussed with the reference group and the Education Forum.

When the initial announcement of the overall plan was made, a list of the structural issues that need to be addressed was included. In order to achieve a conclusion to the discussions by March, it is necessary to focus the working group's task so it can concentrate on the most important issues. Therefore, the faculty management team has decided to initially focus on the following topics.

At the Master's Level:

- *New structure for regular master's programs (120 ECTS)*
- *Master's structure for dual-degree candidates*
- *Thesis and thesis preparation programs*
- *Structure of new programs*
- *Framework for the master's thesis in 75 ECTS master's programs*

At the Bachelor's Level:

- *Elective options*
- *Retention of the possibility to pursue a dual-degree bachelor's*
- *Placement of the bachelor's thesis*
- *Mobility window*
- *International elective courses*
- *Project-oriented track in the bachelor's program*

We are presenting this list here so that it is already possible to begin the dialogue within the academic environments, and we hope that this will enable the heads of departments and Education Forum (UFA) representatives to be well-prepared to provide input to the working group from their respective areas of the faculty.

Part 2 – Involvement of Formal Bodies – Including Students

By the new year, a proposal for the future educational structure will be prepared and sent to all educational committees. The proposal will then be discussed at meetings of the educational committees and program committees in either January or February. Based on these meetings, it will be possible to submit written proposals for adjustments, etc.

To ensure some consistency in the feedback, a template will be developed. As members of the reference group, the heads of departments are obligated to bring forward points from the discussions in the educational committees to the working group.

Part 3 – Final Decision

Based on the input from the educational and program committees, the working group will prepare a final proposal for an educational structure, which will be sent for decision to the faculty management team at the end of March.

Schematic overview

Date	Description
7 November	Phase 2b: Announcement of special process for developing the educational structure sent as part of Phase 2.
Mid-November – End of December	Part 1: The working group prepares proposals, which are discussed in academic environments and with the reference group and Education Forum.
New Year	Final proposal sent to educational and program committees.
Early January – End of February 2025	Part 2: The proposal for a new educational structure is discussed in all educational and program committees, with written input subsequently submitted to the working group.
End of February 2025	Deadline for input on the educational structure.
Early March – End of March 2025	Part 3: Input from the formal bodies is incorporated into the final proposal for the educational structure.
End of March 2025	The faculty management team makes the final decision on the educational structure.