Evaluators' report

Evaluators' report on doctoral education in four subjects at the Faculty of Culture and Society

Table of contents

Introduction

The Faculty of Culture and Society is a young faculty, founded in 2008. Before Malmö University attained full university status in 2018, the faculty was responsible for two doctoral programmes covering the four subjects evaluated in this report: International Migration and Ethnic Relations (IMER), Urban Studies (US), Interaction Design (ID), and Media and Communication Studies (MCS). In the pre-university period, IMER and US constituted the doctoral programme of *Migration, Urbanisation and Societal Change*, while ID and MCS formed the doctoral programme of *New Media, Public Spheres and Forms of Expression*. At the faculty level, both programmes were led by the same director of doctoral studies and shared a doctoral studies administrator with another faculty.

In 2018, doctoral education and its administration were reorganised within the faculty. The departments are now responsible for their own doctoral subjects as follows: (1) Dept. of Global Political Studies administers IMER[1], (2) Dept. of Urban Studies administers US, and (3) The School of Arts and Communication administers the subjects of ID, and MCS, respectively. Also, large parts of the responsibility for funding and administration of doctoral education were decentralised from the faculty to the departmental level. However, this new organisation was soon forced into an online format (along with temporary ad hoc solutions) due to the Covid-19 pandemic restrictions between March 2020 and February 2022. Thus, combined with the organisational process of turning back to a post-pandemic "new normal", it should be noted that doctoral education at this young faculty had undergone three immense transformations within approximately four years when the evaluation committee visited Malmö University in May 2022.

Against this background, this report focuses on the current situation and the future trajectory of doctoral education in the four subjects. However, in places where experiences from the pandemic years and related measures are relevant to organisational learning and development, we will briefly touch upon this matter. Our observations are based on formal documents related to doctoral education at Malmö University and the Faculty of Culture and Society, self-evaluations from the faculty and each subject evaluated (US, IMER, ID, and MCS), and interviews with the Pro dean, Vice dean for doctoral education, department heads, doctoral education coordinators, supervisors, administrative staff, librarian staff, and doctoral student representatives. Guided by the faculty's instructions for this evaluation, we have reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty in general, as well as the conditions, organisation, and course content of each doctoral subject.

---

[1] The Department of Global Political Studies also runs a doctoral programme in Global Politics. This subject is not included in this report because their first doctoral students had not yet graduated at the time of evaluation.

In the report, we initially comment on the overall faculty organisation and activities related to doctoral education. Thereafter, we give a brief overview of common issues that we identified among supervisors and doctoral students. Next, each subject is evaluated separately by: (1) framing our understanding of their subject-specific doctoral education, and (2) summarising key points of subject-specific relevance. Since the doctoral subjects of ID and MCS share the same work environment, they are addressed in the same chapter. Each chapter of the report (1. Faculty, 2. Key issues from supervisor and student perspectives, 3. US, 4. IMER, 5. ID and MCS) ends with a bulleted list of suggested development areas, while the entire report concludes with a short conclusion of the overall evaluation.

Finally, we would like to remind the reader that our evaluation is not based on an overall picture of doctoral education at the faculty. One subject was not included in the evaluation, we did not interview all staff members, and many of our insights are based on a single site visit. Thus, our results do not present a comprehensive picture, but they do provide some insights into the subjects as they appeared in May 2022. As such, we hope that this report will stimulate further discussions on how to further develop doctoral education at the Faculty of Culture and Society.

Lund 29 September 2022

The Evaluation committee

Eva Brodin (chair), Associate Prof. of Educational Sciences with special expertise in higher education development and doctoral education, Lund University

Andrew Karvonen, Prof. of Urban Design and Planning, Lund University

Tobias Olsson, Vice dean of research and doctoral education at the Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University

Mervi Pantti, Prof. of Media and Communication Studies, Helsinki University

Johan Redström, Prof. of Design, Umeå University

Rikard Roxner, Doctoral student at the Faculty of Odontology, Malmö University

Maritta Soininen, Prof. of Political Science, Stockholm University

1. The Faculty of Culture and Society

The Faculty of Culture and Society was founded in 2008 as an interdisciplinary base for education and research within the humanities and social sciences. Before Malmö University attained full university status in 2018, the faculty had the right to award doctoral degrees in the four subjects (IMER, US, ID, MCS) evaluated in this report. Currently, nearly 40 students are enrolled in doctoral education within three interdisciplinary departments and five subjects[2] at the faculty, and each subject including 5 to 13 doctoral students. Although the student size of these subjects is smaller than average for doctoral subjects at Malmö University, the Faculty of Culture and Society is recognised as one of the most research-intensive faculties. This indicates that the senior scholars in the faculty are active researchers within their fields, which is a strength. At the same time, there are differences between the departments in how they allocate faculty funding between senior researchers and doctoral students. Since different departments have chosen various strategies in this regard, it would be helpful to reflect upon whether some faculty guidelines are needed.

All necessary regulations to ensure high quality doctoral education (e.g., admission, selecting and changing supervisors, course requirements, etc.) are well documented and will not be further discussed here.[3] Also, the library provides excellent support including doctoral courses, although in our interview with the librarian it appeared that those courses were underused. That said, we will in this part of the report instead direct attention to the administrative implications of the decentralised organisational structure.

The three departments within the faculty are to a large extent responsible for the economic and educational requirements of doctoral education. Given the fairly small number of doctoral students within each department (16 students at GPS comprising 7 in IMER and 9 in Global Politics, 13 students at US, and 10 students at K3) in relation to the quite dense administration and coordination of doctoral

---

[2] The fifth doctoral subject being Global Politics was established in 2018 and is not included in this evaluation.

[3] We noted some inconsistencies in labelling across the documents. For instance, the 'doctoral education coordinator' is in some cases labelled as 'director of doctoral studies' (e.g., see both the Swedish and English versions of *Guidelines for specially appointed examiners in third-cycle education at the Faculty of Culture and Society*). Also, we recommend that the concept of 'postgraduate education' is replaced by 'doctoral education' throughout the documents to avoid confusion. In British, 'postgraduate education' includes both Master's education and doctoral education, and the same principle holds for 'postgraduate students' (the term 'graduate' has the same inclusive meaning in the USA). Furthermore, the notion of 'third cycle education' (which is also mentioned in the documents) is a European concept derived from the Bologna reform, while 'doctoral education' is used worldwide irrespective of continent.

education at the departmental level, this type of organisation has both strengths and weaknesses as outlined in the following sections.

Administrators and coordinators

At faculty level, there is a research liaison officer who works about 50% of full-time employment to administer doctoral education. Each department has their own administrator, who allocates 50% of his/her time to doctoral education, and there is also "backup from other department-level administrative assistants for more practical issues, and from the departments' administrative officers who deal with more general employee issues such as workload records" (*Faculty joint self-evaluation*, p. 11). While the overall administrative support to doctoral education is very strong, it also seems to be unproportionally high when considering the small number of doctoral students in the three departments. It would be useful to consider whether one administrator could be shared across the departments or if administrative percentages could be calibrated in relation to the number of doctoral students in each department. On the other hand, with future expansion of doctoral education in each department, the current investment in administration (50% per department) might be needed.

Connected to each department, there is also a doctoral education coordinator (20% of full-time employment) who coordinates doctoral education within each department, establishes individual study plans, and maintains a regular dialogue with each student and the supervisors in the department. The doctoral education coordinators also collaborate across the three departments to arrange doctoral courses and support shared doctoral education activities (*Study Handbook* p. 10). Each student is also assigned an examiner who monitors the student's progression and goal attainment in relation to the General and Individual Study Plans (*Study Handbook* pp. 17–18) and participates in the supervisor collegium.

It would be helpful to reflect upon the responsibilities of the doctoral education coordinators and examiners to see if there are ways to streamline their work and avoid duplication. While the examiner plays an important role in supporting the student outside of the supervision team, it might be possible to combine the examiner and doctoral education coordinator roles so that each department has one person that fills both roles. In addition to the doctoral education coordinators, each department appoints a doctoral student as a "doctoral student coordinator" to function as "a point for liaison for the others" (*Faculty joint self-evaluation*, p. 8). Remuneration for the doctoral student coordinator role varies across the three departments (50 hours per semester in K3, 40 hours in GPS, and unreported in US, according to the self-evaluation reports).

Introduction and courses for doctoral students at faculty level

A two-day introduction and a set of doctoral courses in general skills are available to students across the university. However, in this report, we focus on faculty level only. The faculty offers a one-day introduction for all newly admitted doctoral

students in February and September. In this introduction, the students receive an overview of the doctoral education system at the university, faculty, and departmental levels. In our interview with the students, they noted that it was difficult to retain so much information in a single day, and they suggested that a longer "introduction course" could be spread over several days. The information provided in the introduction as well as other practical information is also available in the recently updated and more detailed *Study handbook.* When we visited the faculty in May 2022, it appeared that the doctoral students and supervisors were aware of this handbook, but they had not yet read it thoroughly. While the faculty still struggled with how to spread this useful information, we suggest that all staff involved in doctoral education should proactively familiarise themselves with this book.

All doctoral subjects within the faculty require 60 credits of coursework, including 30 credits of coursework with "in-depth nature in the specific subject area". The remaining credits include "broad courses" focusing on theory of science, methodology, and ethics as well as "elective courses".[4] Within the Faculty's Advisory Committee for Doctoral Education (KFKS) there have been discussions about arranging doctoral courses across the departments. Two cross-departmental courses have been offered to date: *Ethnographic fieldwork* (funded by GPS and US), and *Practice-based research* (funded by K3). Otherwise, the number of faculty-wide doctoral courses has been modest because they are dependent on the identification of shared needs among the doctoral students and departmental co-funding.

Due to the decentralisation of doctoral education, the faculty has limited resources to coordinate and arrange faculty-wide courses of relevance to all doctoral students. We nevertheless believe that more courses could be offered across the faculty if departmental funding could be reallocated to the faculty. For example, the introduction day could be expanded into a faculty-wide course, where new students could reflect upon and discuss their current position, planned research project, and expectations on doctoral education while learning about the doctoral education requirements and norms. In many places, such introduction courses are credit-based (e.g. 3 to 5 hp) to demonstrate that the course is important while also compensating the students for their invested time. Another course could be offered on 'interdisciplinary knowledge production' and the various ways that this is interpreted in each subject. Interdisciplinary doctoral students often find this topic to be very helpful in the development of their own scholarly positions and to understand how their positions relate to different epistemologies and disciplines. Other courses could address sustainability as well as various research methodologies that are relevant across the departments.

---

[4] Licentiate students are required to complete a total of 30 credits across the same course categories.

One challenge raised by the students is to identify suitable external courses since there is no national database available. Instead, they tend to identify potential courses by word of mouth. Malmö University recently created a university-wide database of courses and is encouraging Lärosäten Syd to establish a formal strategy to exchange information on doctoral courses offered by universities in Southern Sweden.

Preparing doctoral students for an (academic) career

Pedagogical courses are offered at the university level by the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CAKL). Depending on their departmental affiliation, some doctoral students within the faculty can include pedagogical credits as part of their doctoral coursework while others may not. We would recommend that the faculty develop a common policy to ensure equal treatment of the students. Important questions to ask in such a process are: Should the mandatory coursework of 60 credits be restricted to the student's research development? If so, should pedagogical courses be included as a part of the student's allocated teaching hours?

Another issue is the type of teaching responsibilities that are expected from doctoral students. In our interview with the students, they mentioned examples of taking over a new course with little or no support from the previous course leader. We suggest that the faculty create guidelines for departmental heads to avoid such stressful situations for the doctoral students. However, on the positive side, the faculty runs a mentorship programme where doctoral students receive one year of hands-on support in teaching skills and career planning from a mentor who is not their supervisor. We find this programme highly commendable, although we see a risk that the support might come too late for some students if the programme is not offered on an annual basis. Thus, rather than waiting for a cohort of students to create a critical mass, we recommend that the faculty create a pool of mentors who are available to students who are teaching for the first time.

It appears that most current career support for graduating doctoral students at the faculty level is related to academic careers. National statistics indicate that about two-thirds of all graduates go on to careers outside of academia and thus non-academic career support is equally important. Such support is currently offered at the university level through programmes that offer insights on a wide range of career paths. However, to further strengthen the sense of an inclusive environment within the faculty, we suggest that non-academic career paths should also be supported at the faculty level. The faculty can reinforce that both academic and non-academic career paths are possible. In the interviews with the pro dean and vice dean, they noted that they could recruit alumni for career planning purposes. We strongly support this idea along with other potential measures to prepare doctoral students for a range of careers after graduation.

Supervisors' competence and continuing development

According to the faculty regulations, the main supervisor should normally be associate professor (*docent*) or professor. Also, at least one of the supervisors must have taken a supervision course (or possess similar competence), while in practice almost all supervisors in the faculty – main supervisors and co-supervisors alike – have undergone such training.[5] This is a strength, as is the faculty's "mentoring seminars" where supervisors from the faculty are invited to read selected texts and discuss various topics together with invited facilitators. Irrespective of previous supervisory experience, the seminars have been appreciated by the attending participants, although the number of participants could be higher.

According to the faculty, they tried to increase the attendance at the "mentoring seminars" last year by ensuring that the seminars would not collide with other departmental activities, and by inviting staff to suggest relevant themes for discussion. However, in our interviews with the supervisors across the departments, they provided four reasons for not attending the seminars: First, the supervisors' calendars were already fully booked, so they found it difficult to attend the seminars. Second, they were not compensated for their attendance and thus, the supervisors prioritised other responsibilities. Third, some supervisors thought that the seminars would not add much to their existing supervisory experience (although it should be noted that experienced senior supervisors who did attend the seminars found them very valuable for their professional development). Fourth, although the seminars were well-publicised, some supervisors acknowledged that they had missed the announcements due to an overabundance of information flow from different sources. Acknowledging that it might be difficult to address many of these challenges, it appears that the real issue is about priority. Thus, in addition to the measures already implemented by the faculty to facilitate attendance at the seminars, it might help to:

- Consider another title of the seminars than "mentoring seminars" since the mentoring aspect most probably does not attract experienced supervisors. Furthermore, even though the seminars aim at strengthening quality supervision, it might help to frame them as 'seminars on *doctoral education*'. This, too, could create a more attractive path for experienced supervisors who seldom experience challenges with their supervision *per se*, but rather see problems within the entire academic system including, e.g., tensions between different policies and funding opportunities.

- Emphasise that no preparations are necessary to attend the seminars. The presenter should be able to introduce the topic so that there is a sound basis

---

[5] Such a course is offered by the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CAKL) at the university level. The course comprises an "internat" and four scheduled full days (where it is unclear whether these include the final seminars or not) but the number of weeks and credits is not defined.

for discussion, while providing a list of recommended readings for those who wish to learn more.

- Make the seminars an attractive meeting place, where informal and formal discussions are intertwined. A well-known success factor is to combine the seminar with joint lunch(boxes) or "fika" paid by the organisers (in this case, the faculty). In that case, this should also be clear in the advertisement of the seminars. Also, the faculty could think about other ways to compensate the participants for their attendance beyond lunch/fika.

Communication within the faculty

A common theme across the interviews with students, supervisors, and leadership was the issue of communication. Even though there was a strong ambition to follow a collegial structure of the overall faculty organisation, some information was lost along the way. The only group of staff who did not experience any communication issues was the administrators including the faculty research liaison officer and the departmental doctoral education officers/administrators.

While collegial structures are often accompanied by communicative frictions due to relational complexity, some of the knots can be untied by reflecting upon the current modes of communication between the faculty and the departments and how they might be improved. For instance, a joint workshop could be arranged where the faculty and departmental staff (including the doctoral students) create models for their understanding of how communication currently works and what changes could be made to improve it. Such an exercise could be helpful for identifying different preferences and expectations while serving as a starting point for developing a new communication strategy across the faculty.

Improving student health

Stress-related illness is unfortunately a common occurrence among doctoral students at all universities and this problem is evident within the faculty with a high number of doctoral students who are or have been on a sick leave in the last few years. The faculty leaders plan to explore the reasons for this situation and to develop organisational measures to reduce sick leave occurrences. For instance, the faculty planned to have a start-up meeting with the doctoral students in the autumn 2022 to talk about well-being. We strongly support the emphasis on this issue, and we further recommend that the faculty continue to develop a permanent strategy to address student work situations.

Suggestions for further development

- Review the allocation of doctoral education administration across the departments and consider opportunities to streamline this service and use the resources elsewhere.

- Clearly state whether pedagogical courses are included as part of the doctoral education coursework or if they are part of the doctoral student's teaching or institutional duties.

- Develop engagement and outreach as a key strength of the doctoral subjects in the faculty. This is important both internally and externally and is currently underemphasised at the faculty level. Such focus would be particularly beneficial for graduating doctoral students who are interested in non-academic careers.

- Consider ways to strengthen communication between the faculty and departments. For instance, create workshops for staff (including doctoral students) to develop a shared communication strategy.

- Consider if there is a need for faculty guidelines related to the allocation of faculty research funding for doctoral students and senior staff in each department.

2. Key issues from supervisor and student perspectives

In our interviews with the supervisors and doctoral students, it was clear that they were all very engaged and highly motivated to improve doctoral education. Both groups also felt there was a strong sense of community among the doctoral students, and that the overall milieu offered many opportunities for the students to transcend disciplinary boundaries. However, they also identified some issues that could be addressed at both the department and faculty levels. These issues are summarised in the following paragraphs.

Supervisors' voice

The supervisors agreed that the allocated time for supervision (320 hours for four years of full-time doctoral study) was insufficient to provide quality supervision. Thus, they supervised more than they were compensated for. It should be noted that neither the amount of allocated hours, nor the experience of being undercompensated, is unique to this particular faculty. Rather, it is a common problem in most universities and faculties. However, in relation to the fact that some supervisors were uncertain about their responsibilities within their allocated hours, we suggest that this issue is further discussed within the departments. For instance, should the supervisor engage in student career planning? If one considers the expected learning outcomes in CAKL's syllabus for the doctoral supervision course, this seems to be true – but the crucial question is: *Should* it be the case? Perhaps students' career planning could be supported at faculty level. Moreover, how are responsibilities divided among the supervisors, examiner, and doctoral education coordinator? Clarifying these responsibilities can potentially decrease the workloads of all

persons involved. Even though this type of information is available in the handbook, we recommend that it is also discussed among staff (including doctoral students) in an appropriate forum.

Doctoral students' voice

Across the doctoral programmes, the students described a community where they shared similar interests and engaged in interdisciplinary collaboration. One issue that was raised by the doctoral students involved compensation for study delays due to the pandemic. They felt that there was no transparency or fairness in how their individual applications of extension were assessed. Given that a special cross-departmental committee was formed by the faculty to address similar situations in the same way, regardless of department, subject, or budgetary situation, it might be a good idea to have a new dialogue with the students and explain the assessment procedure. In this way, feelings of unequal treatment might be sorted out. Another issue raised by the students was the unwillingness of some academic staff to return to their physical workplace after Covid restrictions were lifted. They noted that the lack of staff in the building hindered their academic development and satisfaction with the day-to-day interaction within the faculty. Accordingly, feelings of isolation have lingered, and the students felt worried about the lack of progress in their projects and overall development. On the other hand, most students stated that they received adequate supervision.

The doctoral courses were another concern for the students. On the one hand, they found it difficult to plan their studies when the doctoral courses (within the faculty) were offered infrequently, with long intervals between course offerings and ad-hoc scheduling. In addition, the students were concerned that the compulsory courses changed in some programmes. (However, this experience might be based on a misunderstanding of the general study plan, since it may change over time and doctoral students remain on the general study plan that they were enrolled in when admitted to their doctoral subject). On the other hand, some felt that their 'doktorandryggsäck' (50.000 SEK institutional funding) was insufficient to cover the costs for external courses and they also felt that obtaining additional funding via the university scholarships was difficult. The students explained that they were forced to pay from their own pocket (private financing) for travel and accommodation when taking a course elsewhere. However, a positive effect of the pandemic was that online courses became more commonplace, resulting in reduced costs for external courses.

It should nonetheless be noted (as mentioned in the Faculty Self-Evaluation, p.12) that in addition to the 'doktorandryggsäck', doctoral students can apply to two well-publicised travel funds attached to the university (the Reidar Peters Internationalisation Fund and *Stiftelsen för främjandet av Malmö universitets utveckling*). Yet, according to the faculty, there have been only a handful of applications from KS students every year. Also, according to the financial reports to the faculty, it is unusual for doctoral students to exhaust the funds in their 'doktorandryggsäck', so it is unclear if the 'doktorandryggsäck' is sufficient or not. For this reason, we recommend a direct dialogue between the faculty

and doctoral students about students' finances related to external courses and research activities.

The students were also concerned about a lack of clear communication with the faculty and they were not certain who they should approach to address various questions and problems. Sometimes they were directed to look for the requested information on the website. However, this information was not always easily found, and occasionally it was not discovered at all. Thus, unless someone else in the student community had this knowledge, some questions remained unanswered. The students admitted that they might have missed important information from the introduction day, but they could not recall all of the information presented. While the students acknowledged that the workplace meetings (APT) were a channel to disseminate information and discuss important issues about the workplace, they did not feel that these meetings were relevant for their situation as students.

Suggestions for further development

- Clarify the responsibilities of supervisors in an appropriate forum.

- Consider possibilities to allocate more hours for supervision.

- Strengthen direct communication with doctoral students to avoid misunderstandings and/or unequal treatment between individuals and programmes. Clarify that the doctoral education coordinator and the doctoral education administrator are the first points of contact when students have questions about the subject requirements.

- Improve the work and study environments for doctoral students by stressing the importance of physical attendance among academic staff. For example, it could be suggested that people should come to the office at least x days a week and be present in certain weekdays.

- Oversee the organisation of doctoral courses at the faculty level, so the students can plan their studies with reasonable foresight.

- Reconsider whether the same courses should be mandatory or not within the faculty. Clarify for the students that they will follow the general study plan (ASP) that was in force when they were admitted to their doctoral education.

- Communicate directly to the students how external course fees should be covered, and what costs should be covered by the 'doktorandryggsäck'.

- Create a policy for reading courses, e.g., maximum credits, who should decide the literature and length of paper, and how the examiner shall be renumerated. Also, we recommend that the same reading course includes more than one student.

3. Urban Studies

Urban Studies was established as a subject for doctoral education in 2012. It was originally part of the larger research subject MUSA (Migration, Urbanisation and Societal Change) and was reorganised as a standalone research subject when Malmö University was granted full university rights in 2018. In the self-evaluation report, the subject is defined as "the scientific study of the content, form, planning and transformation of urban areas together with environmental, economic, and organisational aspects on urban development."

The doctoral students in the subject are placed within one of the department's three units: 1) Built Environment and Environmental Studies, 2) Real Estate, and 3) Leadership, Organisation and Business Administration. All three units arrange topical seminars in which all doctoral students are invited to participate. The doctoral students present their work in the Urban Seminar series, and they are also invited to participate in a variety of seminars organised by various research centres, platforms and programmes across the faculty and university.

Since 2012, seven students have defended their doctoral theses in Urban Studies and at present 13 students are enrolled in the subject. In September 2022, two additional doctoral students will be admitted. The self-evaluation notes that two doctoral theses were recognised as "Dissertation of the Year" at Malmö University in 2018 and 2019.

Research/work environment

Urban Studies at Malmö University is an inherently interdisciplinary research environment. It includes researchers from multiple academic disciplines and the research topics are informed by a wide range of theoretical and methodological traditions. The research environment benefits from a lively and creative seminar culture. The interviews with the doctoral students and senior academic staff revealed that the doctoral students have a stronger sense of shared subject identity than the senior academic staff members. This is commendable as interdisciplinary subjects can sometimes suffer from too many disparate agendas. It also suggests that the doctoral student cohort could be used to inspire greater cohesion and identity across the department as a whole. In essence, the shared activities that feed into the doctoral subject can serve as a common core to anchor the department while continuing to allow for diverse interdisciplinary inquiry.

With respect to doctoral student supervision, the supervisors noted that there is a healthy exchange of supervision expertise within the subject and across related subjects in the faculty. The supervisors meet on a regular basis to discuss shared challenges and to learn from one another. The supervisor role is limited to internal staff members to support career development and there are currently no external supervisors.

While there are limited resources available for doctoral education, the department is dedicated to maintaining a healthy number of active doctoral students. A key strategy is to attract external funding for doctoral students. Despite these efforts, the ratio of doctoral students to senior academics could be increased to create a healthy balance of junior and

senior staff members. With a department of 100 employees, a minimum of 15 doctoral students would be desirable to create a vibrant cohort. To some extent, the rather small number of doctoral students is compensated by the fact that doctoral students interact with the post-docs to create a critical mass of early career researchers. There are tentative plans to establish a new doctoral subject in organisational theory. While this could expand the subject area in new directions, it is also important to consider the unintended side effect of fragmenting an already small doctoral student cohort. Instead, it might be more desirable to offer different specialisations within the existing subject.

Beyond the supervisors, the doctoral students are supported by a doctoral student coordinator. The purpose of this role is to facilitate self-organisation of the doctoral students by hosting professional and social activities. The doctoral students are also supported by dedicated administrative staff. The interviews revealed that several recurring administrative meetings take place at both the departmental and faculty levels.

Outside of the university, the research environment is well-anchored in international networks. The students participate in international conferences and the department participates in [RC21 Urban and Regional Development](). This latter network provides a formal route for the doctoral students to develop international connections. The move towards online meetings and conferences in recent years has also facilitated more international networking for the doctoral student cohort.

Educational environment

The self-evaluation report and interviews revealed the challenges associated with the new digital format for the individual study plan (ISP). The introduction of the digital ISP resulted in a lot of confusion because it was perceived as complicated and time consuming for doctoral students, supervisors, doctoral education coordinator, and administrator to transfer the established paper-based ISP data into the digital format. However, two years after experiencing these teething problems, the advantages with the digital ISP have come to be appreciated.

The doctoral students in Urban Studies have very good access to a range of seminars at both departmental and faculty levels to support their academic development. The seminars provide important opportunities for interdisciplinary discussion and learning but it is also necessary for the supervisors to help doctoral students navigate the seminar landscape and strategize on how much to engage. With the wide variety of activities offered, there is a risk of seminar overload.

The general study plan states that doctoral students in Urban Studies are required to complete a minimum of 60 credits of coursework and 180 credits of thesis research. Coursework includes 30 credits for "in depth studies" within the doctoral students' specific subject area, 15 credits for "broad" courses on theory of science, methodology and ethics, and 15 credits on "individually relevant courses" (Joint introduction to doctoral education at the Faculty of Culture and Society, p. 16). The department offers two semi-annual courses (one every autumn) to fulfil 15 credits of doctoral student coursework.

Apart from these two courses, the department also has a set of individual courses (formerly "reading courses") that are offered to the students. Courses are also offered at the university level and the students have the possibility to follow courses organised by other faculties within the university. Outside of Malmö University, the doctoral students in Urban Studies have the opportunity to complete courses offered by the National Network for Research Education in Human Geography. All in all, the course offerings for the doctoral students are diverse.

Outreach and engagement activities are increasingly important to universities. The industrial doctoral students have direct connections to non-academic stakeholders while the work of the other doctoral students varies with respect to societal engagement and relevance. There is an opportunity for the subject to demonstrate the social relevance of academic research while also using this agenda to enhance modes of academic knowledge production.

The examiner role is shared among multiple staff members. During the interview with the supervisors, it was apparent that this role could be clarified (a general description of this role is outlined in the Student Handbook for Doctoral Education on pp. 17-18). The examiner can play an important role as an independent assessor outside of the supervisory committee to ensure that students are progressing in a timely manner.

Career development

Preparation for future careers is provided by the supervisors and the university's Career Services office. Guidance tends to focus on academic careers because this is where the supervisors have the most experience. Providing guidance for non-academic careers is more challenging but there are opportunities to connect doctoral students with non-academics to expose them to a range of career pathways.

General strengths in the subject's doctoral education

Overall, the subject provides a thriving and dynamic environment for the doctoral students. The international reputation of the programme is commendable and reflects the ambitions of the senior staff members to contribute to the global discourse on urban studies. The provision of two core courses provides a common grounding for the students while optional individual courses provide customised learning opportunities.

Ongoing development work

The supervisors noted that there is a cultural expectation of high-performance among the students that has sometimes contributed to burnout. The students do not compete with one another but rather inspire one another to overachieve and this can result in unhealthy work practices in some instances. The supervisors recognise Previa as a useful service for mental health and well-being and they also noted that they can do more to assist students in managing their workloads and recognise that the work they are doing is sufficient. In

other words, the supervisors can help to moderate the tendency for the students to attempt to over-perform.

Suggestions for further development

The following are a few suggestions to strengthen the doctoral subject:

- The doctoral student coordinator role could be leveraged more strategically to support the doctoral student cohort. This individual can help to develop a collegial environment where the doctoral cohort can provide peer-to-peer support and can also support constructive communication between the doctoral students and the doctoral education coordinator.
- Career development for graduating students could be expanded beyond academic careers to include non-academic career paths in the public and private sectors. This could be achieved by engaging with alumni who work in non-academic positions (e.g. municipal governments).
- The subject could be enhanced with a stronger emphasis on outreach and engagement as central to academic knowledge production. This could be achieved through coursework, research outputs and events.
- The two doctoral courses (KSUS003 and KSUS002) offered by the department could be advertised internationally to attract external students and enrich the learning environment while enhancing the reputation of the department.

4. International Migration and Ethnic Relations

The International Migration and Ethnic Relations (IMER) doctoral subject is hosted by the Department of Global Political Studies (GPS). IMER has existed as a separate doctoral subject since 2018 when the joint doctoral education MUSA (Migration, Urbanisation and Societal Change) that included IMER and Urban Studies was dissolved.

The working environment of the doctoral students involves the doctoral subject itself, GPS, and the Malmö Institute of Migration Studies (MIM). The multidisciplinary research milieu at MIM organises workshops and conferences, maintains close connections with policymakers, and collaborates with partners outside of the university. The researchers and teachers in GPS are in charge of a major part of the MIM activities, which includes the weekly Migration Seminar, and the obligatory planning, mid-term and final seminars for IMER doctoral students.

The department offers education in IMER at both bachelor and master's levels, and involves around 40 professors, senior researchers and lecturers. According to IMER's self-evaluation, their scholarly scope is defined as:

> … a broad research field with a multi- and interdisciplinary basis. It is concerned with the politics of migration, migration policies, and reasons for and consequences of migration in both societies of origin, destination, transit, and return. It devotes interest to the ways ethnicity and race have social

relevance due to historical and current migration. It deals with the integration processes of immigrants and their children into different social arenas like the labour- and housing market, as well the political and social domains. Adjoining foci of interest relate to citizenship, belonging, diaspora and identification processes as well as to care and norms, democracy, racism, populism and the issues of marginalisation, exclusion, and alienation. It also includes the reactions and attitudes towards migrants and ethnic groups by receiving societies. These issues have a bearing on and are studied in local, national, regional, international, and global empirical contexts.

Currently, the subject has seven active doctoral students, of which six are fully funded by the faculty, while the seventh is funded through a combination of external funding (three years) and internal funding (one year). The strategy is to recruit internationally with backgrounds from all sub-areas in the subject. Previous announcements available doctoral student positions have attracted over one hundred applications from all continents. Due to budgetary restrictions, however, a maximum of two applicants could be employed within each call. Thus, IMER would benefit from more external funding to employ additional doctoral students.

Research/work environment

The research environment that supports the IMER doctoral students is rich and multifaceted. MIM plays an important role in this regard with a large number of senior and junior researchers, including national and international guest researchers. Also, the Malmö City Guest Professorship in Migration Studies hosts prominent international researchers at MIM. The researchers are involved in several international research networks, such as IMISCOE and the Metropolis. Also, as the self-evaluation describes, the multidisciplinary research at MIM covers four divergent research areas in migration and integration: a) *Patterns of mobility and demography,* b) *Early reception and integration,* c) *Discourses and attitudes,* and d) *Long term integration, citizenship and acculturation.*

In our interview with the supervisors, it appeared that they experienced no issues with this broad approach of MIM and they noted that their doctoral students develop an *interdisciplinary* identity. In practice, this means that the supervisors collaborate across the research areas, and that the students actively participate in each other's seminars. However, we are concerned that the broad definition of the subject field as defined in the self-evaluation. The variety of research topics, research orientations, approaches, and disciplinary perspectives, might be experienced as overwhelming for students. From a doctoral student perspective, it might be justified to delimit the scope of research to some extent, e.g., by carving out a core profile which would also distinguish the doctoral programme from other IMER environments in Sweden and internationally.

Educational environment

The limited number of active doctoral students enables ready access to mentorship and support of the senior researchers in the subject. At the same time, it is difficult for the

programme to offer doctoral courses in the subject with a sufficient number of participants. Developing a shared subject identity could also be facilitated by a larger cohort of fellow IMER students. While the general support that IMER students receive from their peers in other subjects is very beneficial for their psychosocial environment, their sense of belonging to IMER is ultimately strengthened by a strong cohort of students in the IMER subject.

IMER allows for a high degree of individual choice for doctoral students in designing their coursework. The subject offers three doctoral courses that are not obligatory but recommended, including *International Migration and Ethnic Relations I (IMER I): Theories, causes and consequences of international migration,* and two cross-departmental courses: *Ethnographic Fieldwork* and *Qualitative Interviewing* (to be proposed in autumn 2022). To fulfil the intended learning outcomes of the subject, the thesis and specialist courses fulfil the requirements for "in-depth knowledge" and "specialisation" in the subject, while "broad knowledge" is addressed by general core courses.

The department offers three courses to IMER students, which collectively provide the subject-specific knowledge (30 hp). However, depending on the number of enrolled doctoral students, these courses are often offered on a semi-annual basis. This might hinder students to develop specific knowledge and skills when needed in a particular phase of their thesis work, i.e., often in the beginning of their studies. Assuredly, there are several courses offered by other national and international IMER environments, although they are typically coupled with a fee, and require both travelling and accommodation. According to the interview with the students, they felt that their 'doktorandryggsäck' was insufficient to cover these additional costs. It should nonetheless be mentioned that doctoral students can apply for available scholarships for such purposes.

According to IMER's self-evaluation, their seminars were attended by a much wider audience via Zoom during the pandemic. For this reason, all their seminars are now arranged in a hybrid format. However, some doctoral students have mentioned that they would prefer to have their formal (planning, mid-term, and final) seminars with staff at the department only. We would like to point out that a vast range of different viewpoints are not optimal for doctoral students, who are already struggling to grasp their interdisciplinary projects, and need help to see their own path forward in such seminars. Also, the formal seminars are usually coupled with nervousness as the students' progress is assessed. Thus, not knowing exactly whom the critique comes from (as is often the case in online networks) and hence how to properly respond to it, puts the student into an even more vulnerable position. In worst case, this can decrease the student's *self-efficacy* (belief in one's ability to execute a given task, such as writing a thesis). Therefore, we recommend that formal seminars should be restricted to an in-house audience to facilitate focus and constructive learning.

Even though the supervisors at IMER are involved in several EU projects, including national and international collaboration, this extended network has not yet resulted in external supervisors. The current pool of supervisors for IMER doctoral students are all from within the university. The supervisors explained that their in-house researchers could

in this way get experience in supervision. They also mentioned that their doctoral students were already involved in extended networks beyond supervision. However, we suggest that IMER considers the possibilities of engaging external co-supervisors when their in-house scholars have achieved sufficient supervision experience. Otherwise, it seems as if the choice of using internal supervisors only is based on the needs of the supervisors rather than the doctoral students. What if the students had the opportunity to choose their supervisory team?

Career development

Most of the graduating IMER doctoral students have continued on to careers in academia, while some are employed at Malmö stad (which has long-standing cooperation with IMER). Thus, in the self-evaluation it is stated that "We are less clearly oriented towards preparing the students for a future career outside the higher education sector." However, with respect to supporting doctoral students in pursuing academic careers, there are several useful resources connected to the environment. The IMER supervisors' and senior scholars' well-established *international networks* in GPS and MIM are valuable in this regard, and the senior researchers are also closely connected to policymakers. For example, they have close contacts with the Delegation for Migration Studies (DELMI), which is a committee that serves the government with studies and research for decision-making in migration policy issues. This provides opportunities for IMER students to participate in the scholarly publications by DELMI. Such opportunities during their doctoral studies increase their chances to attain future post-doc positions and research funding.

A teaching portfolio is also important for a future academic career, and teaching allows doctoral students to engage in additional departmental activities. Since both the BA and MA level courses in migration are given in English, it is possible for international doctoral students to engage in teaching within the department. Acknowledging that novice teachers need more time for preparation, the department commendably pays doctoral students four hours per hour of classroom time, instead of the standard of three hours. Faculty offers the 'Hands-On Teaching' programme to support doctoral students and the Centre for Teaching and Learning offers a pedagogical course 'Supporting the Learning of Others'. There is confusion about how doctoral students are reimbursed for their time to complete this pedagogical course, but we recommend that the teaching portfolio of doctoral students should be a priority for the department.

With respect to non-academic careers, doctoral students can receive support from the Malmö University Career Services. Although most IMER doctoral students have hitherto continued their careers in academia, it would be helpful to offer faculty or departmental support to students who will work in non-academic contexts.

General strengths in the subject's doctoral education
The IMER subject has a strong international profile among their staff and students, and English is the working language in both teaching and examination. We consider this a

clear strength not only with respect to substantial diversity, but also for the international competitiveness of the department and faculty.

Furthermore, the doctoral students have commendable influence over their education. The programme provides good opportunities for students to customise their doctoral education through choices about coursework and thesis topics. Also, doctoral students have good formal representation in all relevant decision-making bodies, at multiple levels within the faculty and the university.

Ongoing development work

The department has taken initiatives to enhance doctoral students' psychosocial working environment. One such measure has been to employ a doctoral student coordinator to organise joint social activities. Doctoral students also have a seminar of their own to promote collaboration and socialising within the student cohort. Yet, there are issues related to the fragile working environment and the health of doctoral students. These issues are related to start planning, conducting research in a complex interdisciplinary environment without knowing the field yet, and uncertainty among some students on how to finance their coursework without paying from their own private money.

More temporary problems that have also been stressful for current doctoral students include the transition to digital Individual Study Plans and prolonging funding due to problems with empirical field work during the Covid-19 pandemic. These are unforeseen but common difficulties that most universities and their doctoral students have faced in recent years.

Quality assurance is an important question for the subject. The faculty and the department have a coherent quality assurance framework in place (LED 2021/1201) and a structure for implementing the quality assurance work (LED 2019/649). The department has the operative responsibility for quality assurance work of the subject but faculty is in charge of major issues of principal character. Thus it is necessary to involve supervisors at several levels in evaluation initiatives and quality assurance.

Suggestions for further development

- IMER would benefit from a larger cohort of doctoral students and more external funding would help in this regard. A larger cohort would also strengthen a shared IMER-subject identity among the students.

- Consider the possibility to carve out a core profile to make IMER unique when compared to similar environments at other universities. This would also help the doctoral students to form a shared subject identity.

- Find ways to offer core courses on an annual basis, for instance by collaborating with other IMER environments. In this way, the problem with fees might be solved as all environments contribute with their teaching resources.

- Communicate with the students about funding opportunities to cover the costs for external courses.

- Create a list of relevant courses offered at other universities and update this list every semester.

- Restrict formal seminars (planning, mid, final) for doctoral students to the department only. These seminars are critical for student development and should be designed to optimise the learning conditions.

- When the researchers at IMER have received experience in supervision, we suggest that the option of including external supervisors is considered.

- Consider in-house possibilities to expand career support to include non-academic pathways.

5. Interaction Design; Media and Communication Studies

The School of Arts and Communication (K3) hosts two doctoral subjects: Interaction Design (ID), and Media and Communication Studies (MCS), respectively. Interaction Design is defined as "a subject within the design sciences that explores how designed systems, processes, artefacts can shape our world". Further, ID "integrates scholarly research and professional practices" with "an emphasis on integrating design practices with critical reflection". Media and Communication Studies is defined as focusing "on the significance of media for culture and society, and for human thinking and everyday life". Furthermore, in MCS "the analytical and critical approach has been increasingly supplemented with practice and art-based research".

Both subjects were introduced in 2010 when the university received rights to examine doctoral students in the research area of *New Media, Publics and Forms of Expression*. Since 2015, a total of ten students have defended their doctoral theses in the department, including seven students from ID and three from MCS. There are currently five doctoral students enrolled in ID, two of which are funded by and hence partly based at Linnaeus University. In MCS, there are five PhD students, of which one is externally funded.

All students participate in the joint K3 research seminar. Two of the students will defend their doctoral theses in 2022, and recruitment of two new doctoral students is planned for 2023.

K3 is divided into three units: (1) Design and Humanities, (2) Media and Communication, and (3) Language and Cultural Production. Apart from two ID students who are partly employed by Linnaeus University, all doctoral students organisationally belong to the Media and Communication (MC) unit. While this means that the ID doctoral students belong to a different unit compared to their research field and teaching, it has the advantage of gathering all students at the department in the same unit. The character of many of the seminars and courses available to the students across subjects further illustrates the rich interdisciplinary character of the department with many crossovers and collaboration across its two research subjects. This is also reflected in the self-evaluation and interviews, where K3 highlights collaboration across disciplines, and with industry

and other stakeholders, as a core of the department's research quality and distinctiveness within the respective fields in Sweden and internationally.

Research/work environment

The two doctoral subjects have a conscious strategy to develop their distinctive and joint identities and thereby strengthen their position in the field, not least vis-à-vis external funding. The overall research environment is characterised by practice and action orientation, and benefits from a vibrant seminar culture and collegiality which intentionally includes doctoral students in departmental activities and development.

In the interview with the Head of department and Doctoral education coordinator, they noted the size of the student group is on the borderline of being too small. This small number is not in any sense due to a lack of potential candidates since the announced positions have had significant numbers of applicants, but rather to the financial situation of the subject. Yet the supervisors noted that the small number of doctoral students is advantageous as it creates closeness and solidarity between supervisors and students. New doctoral positions are planned in accordance with other recruitments and activities in the department.

Interviews suggest that there is little collaboration and communication between K3's doctoral subjects and other doctoral subjects in the faculty. It is important to consider the potential benefits of more active collaboration.

Educational environment

The 2015 evaluation of doctoral education at K3 pointed to the need to strengthen the introduction of newly admitted doctoral students. As discussed with students during the site visit, this need continues. Students are admitted twice a year, which provides for a possible joint comprehensive introduction organised at the faculty level, combined with or supplemented by activities at the departmental level. A new comprehensive introduction programme would benefit from being spread out over several weeks, with shorter meetings each week.

While the transition to digital ISPs has been a struggle, several important insights emerged during the process. In particular, a more complete picture of the students' curricular and departmental commitments in combination with increased attention to learning progression are important steps towards making the ISP an even more active pedagogical tool for planning and assessing how the education unfolds. In many ways, a student's final ISP is, besides the thesis, the primary documentation of their education; what it entailed and how it developed over the years. The formalities involved tend to emphasise the managerial aspects of ISPs, and the report gives evidence to the importance of finding a balanced process. While vetting etc. is important, it is also crucial to make the ISP a pedagogical tool to reveal how the different elements of the education come together and address the intended learning outcomes.

The ID and MCS students have good access to research seminars. In addition to the weekly departmental seminar, there are seminars hosted by other programmes, projects, research groups, and networks. Involving doctoral students in the research environment in these multifaceted ways provides excellent opportunities to learn and develop their individual approaches to research. However, such opportunities also pose challenges. As noted in the interviews and self-evaluation report, it might be difficult for a doctoral student to prioritise the most relevant activities. This connects to the question of disciplinary identity: since both ID and MCS have an interdisciplinary approach, the doctoral students need to build up their own interdisciplinary package. From the interviews it is nevertheless clear that the students need support from the supervisors to balance the depth and breadth of an environment that strongly promotes interdisciplinarity.

The department supports the students' interdisciplinary identity development by providing a joint methods course on *practice-based research*. While we strongly support this initiative, we would like to further emphasise the importance of providing relevant doctoral courses – especially for students who work in other environments. Currently, a significant part of the work with integrating different lines of theory and practice into a coherent form of research seems to fall on the doctoral students. There are very good reasons for the combination of general and individual study plans in research education, and it is crucial to maintain this flexibility. Still, it would be helpful to review the courses offered with respect to how the research subject is defined, assessing where different skills, abilities and knowledges are addressed and acquired.

Strengthening ID in particular

Overall, it is clear that the ID programme offers rich opportunities for students to demonstrate "advanced and up-to-date specialised knowledge in a specific area of this field" (Study Handbook, p. 6). However, it is less clear how the curriculum meets the need for students to "demonstrate broad knowledge and systematic understanding of the research field" (Study Handbook, p. 6) in relation to how the general study plan defines interaction design as "a subject within the design sciences that explores how designed systems, processes, artefacts can shape our world" (ASP, p. 1).

In the interviews with the head of department and doctoral student coordinator, they mentioned several courses that address the disciplinary foundations for ID doctoral students. To exemplify, the course evaluations of 'Current directions in Interaction Design Thesis research', in which five contemporary doctoral theses are discussed, the summary states that "It could be questioned to what degree the students gained a thorough overview of the field of interaction design." Since this is the perhaps the only course with a clear focus on interaction design in the curriculum, it might be worth considering to what extent it allows the students to learn, understand and carry out the kind of interaction design research that defines this environment.

Related reflections can be made regarding the centrality of participatory design to the character of the 'Malmö school'. While the course 'Practices that Question / Practices in Question: Practice Based Research in Culture and Society' seems highly relevant and useful, it appears to contribute more to cross-disciplinary perspectives on practice than

provide foundations in interaction design research. Since the group of supervisors that can offer such in-depth knowledge in design inevitably change over time, it might be relevant to consider what aspects of design and designing are so central that they need to be explicitly covered by the curriculum. This is of special importance to doctoral students less embedded in the research environment because they are employed elsewhere. Indeed, it should be noted that the 'Malmö school' of interaction design is internationally very prominent within the areas of participatory design and codesign – which also contributes to the legitimacy of ID in the faculty.

Strengthening MCS in particular

MCS is closely aligned to ID through its focus on materiality and practice-based research. This distinguishes MCS from other media and communication programmes in the Nordic countries. At the same time, the interviews suggest that not all research topics align with this focus (e.g., extremism studies and more traditional media studies). Thus, even though the current focus on practice-based research is valuable, we also encourage continuous emphasis on theoretical and methodological skills.

For MSC doctoral students, the TRAIN network provides the compulsory theory courses as well as courses in methods. Importantly, these courses are open to students without a fee. The self-evaluation report notes that that some universities charge for courses, which is a practice that should be avoided. While it might be difficult to influence this development in other universities, we suggest that the department continues to offer national courses of relevance to MCS for free. In this way, the number or course participants would probably increase to create a critical mass of students.

Career development

Doctoral students at the K3 department are provided the option to teach undergraduate courses, giving students "opportunity to work both on depth and breadth of the teaching experiences" (p.32, MCS & ID self-evaluation). The faculty level 'Hands-On Teaching' mentoring programme provides students with important and necessary practical skills and offers support in the role of teacher. However, formal pedagogical courses can also prepare students for teaching. As noted in the subjects' self-evaluation, such courses are no longer counted toward departmental duties or doctoral student coursework. It would be beneficial, for students and the faculty alike, if students were compensated for taking pedagogical courses, either in course credits counting towards their doctoral degree or as part of their teaching time.

General strengths in the subjects' doctoral education

Overall, ID and MCS provide a rich and dynamic learning environment for doctoral students. The research environment is internationally very prominent and as such highly visible and well connected. The doctoral students actively engage in creating a productive research environment. Both subjects are included in several international and national

networks that connect doctoral students effectively to the field. The programmes offer rich opportunities for interdisciplinary research and collaboration with external stakeholders.

At K3, there is a laudable community-building focus with regular official and unofficial meetings involving early career and senior researchers. Inclusiveness is well considered as seen in the change of the language of the meetings from Swedish to English.

Ongoing development work

The ISP process is still under development, and we encourage this process of finding ways of working with the ISP that are in line with the pedagogical profile and ambitions of the department. We strongly support the initiative to look further into how the courses, projects and other activities continuously address the intended learning objectives, and how to make this progression a basis for deciding which activities to prioritise in the coming years.

As work slowly returns to a new post-pandemic normal, students consider it important that faculty members and staff return to the workplace and reestablish the day-to-day research and teaching environment. For students it is important to feel part of the workplace, which provides social contacts, and having access to important functions. Therefore, supporting the return to the office for students as well as staff would be helpful in reestablishing a vibrant work environment. At the same time, remote work and hybrid formats have some positive effects and it is important to integrate both approaches into the future work environment.

Suggestions for further development

The quality of the education is partly related to the number of students, as exemplified in the self-evaluation report: "The challenge, as in many other cases, is the small number of doctoral students, where holding a course with a large-enough seminar group means teaching students from other programmes/universities." (p. 26). It appears that the current level of base funding cannot sustain a critical mass of doctoral students. This is by no means a unique situation for these subjects, but it means that the department, as well as the faculty, should consider strategies to address it. Relying on external funding for sustaining the education, implicitly or explicitly means relying on researchers to acquire it. However, since sustaining the subjects is of significant importance to the department's overall educational environment, there might be a need to collectively form a strategy for what funding to prioritise applying for, and how to best support and conduct such initiatives.

In addition to external funding, we suggest that the department also look into future scenarios that could support critical mass. This could include creating shared research schools in collaboration with other environments, both nationally and internationally. However, it could also include rethinking the two current subjects within the department, to explore what a new and more explicitly interdisciplinary programme that combines them could be like. It seems relevant to consider the benefits (as well as the problems) of

creating such a programme in light of the strong presence of interdisciplinary perspectives, and the existing integration of both courses and organisational structures.

Apart from the main concern above, we suggest the following measures to further improve doctoral education in ID and MCS:

- Consider the balance between disciplinary and interdisciplinary elements across the seminars and courses (in light of having two separate subjects in one department).

- Continue to develop the processes around the ISP as a *pedagogical* tool.

- In ID: Make explicit how breadth *and* depth is achieved in courses with respect to both the subject of interaction design and the notion of the 'Malmö school'.

- In MCS: Consider further fostering of theoretically and methodologically diverse subject identities.

- In MCS: Consider ways to strategically apply for research grants in relation to the specific practice-based profile of the subject in the department and the university when compared to other Nordic universities.

6. Conclusion

Our overall impression of the organisation of doctoral education at the Faculty of Culture and Society is promising. Clearly, the faculty and departments have created a sound foundation for maintaining high quality in their doctoral education and subjects. There are formal routines for, e.g., admission, selection/change of supervisors, and required control of doctoral students' progress. The departments offer strong interdisciplinary research environments in which the students can work closely with senior researchers and there is also substantial administrative support around doctoral education. At the university level, the library is well prepared to support doctoral students in multiple ways.

However, we have identified some areas for further development:

- Based on the changing conditions over time, ensure that research funds from the faculty are strategically allocated across junior and senior staff in the departments.

- Increase the number of doctoral students in each subject to create a critical mass, especially within subjects having fewer than ten students. If faculty funding is insufficient for this purpose, more external funding is necessary to support the subjects.

- Continue to strengthen the communication between the faculty and departments.

- Replace the one-day introduction course with an expanded "introduction course" involving a series of shorter meetings over several days.

- Find ways to offer more doctoral courses at faculty level, and to provide the in-house courses on an annual basis.

- Provide clear instructions to students about how to pay for external courses and what costs should be covered by the 'doktorandryggsäck'.

- Create a common policy across the faculty for pedagogical courses, e.g., if doctoral students may include these in their doctoral coursework or teaching hours.

- Provide faculty support to prepare doctoral students for non-academic careers.

- Strengthen the outreach and engagement profile of the faculty in seminars, courses and other activities.

- Find ways to strategically support applications for research funding to finance doctoral students.