

Quality assurance system at Karlstad University

Application at the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology

It is the vision of Karlstad University to contribute to a sustainable society. The approved strategic goals for 2030 state that the University will work to increase the scope of its doctoral programmes, improve its attractiveness to students and staff, and reinforce the link between education and research. These goals can only be attained through systematic efforts to identify strengths and ensure their preservation and development. A quality assurance system serves to support and ease University processes and results in terms of overarching vision and strategies.

This document outlines the work undertaken by the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology with quality assurance in education and research as informed by *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University*ⁱ and the areas of responsibility therein specified for the faculties.

ⁱ *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University (Reg.no. 2019/1027)*

Decision:	Faculty Board of Health, Science and Technology 10 December 2020	Reg.no.	HNT 2020/594	Replaces:	Reg.no. HNT 2017/400 and 2018/172
Applies from	10 December 2020	until	further notice	Officer:	

Quality assurance system at Karlstad University

Application at the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology

It is the vision of Karlstad University to contribute to a sustainable society. The approved strategic goals for 2030 state that the University will work to increase the scope of its doctoral programmes, improve its attractiveness to students and staff, and reinforce the link between education and research. These goals can only be attained through systematic efforts to identify strengths and ensure their preservation and development. A quality assurance system serves to support and ease University processes and results in terms of overarching vision and strategies.

This document outlines the work undertaken by the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology with quality assurance in education and research as informed by *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University*² and the areas of responsibility therein specified for the faculties.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
1. Organisation	4
2. Management and reporting.....	5
3. Staff	5
4. First-cycle and second-cycle education.....	6
4.1 Design and approval of programmes	6
4.2 Admission and credit transfer	9
4.3 Continuous monitoring.....	9
4.4 Periodic review	11
5. Third-cycle studies	12

<i>5.1 Design and approval of third-cycle subjects and their graduate school organisation.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>5.2 Recruitment and admission of doctoral students.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>5.3 Study induction, structure, and documentation (ISP) for the individual doctoral student</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>5.4 Supervision.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>5.5 Doctoral level courses and other activities in support of thesis work and goal attainment.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>5.6 Examination</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>5.7 Continuous monitoring.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>5.8 Periodic review</i>	<i>21</i>
6. Research	21
<i>6.1 Good research practice and project review</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>6.2 Research infrastructure.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>6.3 Continuous monitoring.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>6.4 Periodic review</i>	<i>23</i>

Introduction

This document outlines the work undertaken by the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology with quality assurance in education and research as informed by *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University*³ and the areas of responsibility therein specified for the faculties.

1. Organisation

The Faculty of Health, Science and Technology comprises 5 departments and one administrative office, in accordance with *Rules of procedure at Karlstad University*⁴. The departments are: the Department of Engineering and Physics; the Department of Health Sciences; the Department of Environmental and Life Sciences; the Department of Engineering and Chemical Sciences; and the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science. The departments include organisational subjectsⁱ that in some but not all cases correspond to a main field of study at the first- or second-cycle level, or to third-cycle subject areas. Each department is led by a head of department assisted by a deputy head. The head of department appoints the directors of studies and heads of subject at the department.

As specified in *Rules of procedure at Karlstad University*, the collegial bodies at faculty level are the faculty board and several drafting bodies - the education committee, the doctoral programmes committee, the research committee, the appointments and promotions committee, and programme councils. The drafting bodies work on delegated authority from the faculty board or the dean.

The faculty board decided on programme councils at the meeting on 6 December 2017. Each study programme on the first- or second-cycle level shall have a programme council that is led by the programme director and includes at least three students as well as a study and career counsellor. Additional council members, such as teacher representatives or active professionals, can be appointed via dean's decision in accordance with a decision by the Faculty Board of Health, Science and Technology on 22 March 2018, or be co-opted. The duties of the programme councils include

- processing course analyses and suggesting action as needed to the director of studies,
- processing proposed course syllabuses ahead of a decision by the education committee,
- processing programme analyses and alumni reports, discussing the programme's course structure and proposing any necessary changes
- discussing proposed programme syllabuses prior to their being raised by the education committee.

The programme councils work on behalf of the faculty board and submit an annual report on quality assurance efforts to the education committee via the programme director.

ⁱ Karlstad University uses "subject" about areas of knowledge as well as organisational units (specified in the document outlining the local bases of assessment for the establishment and discontinuation of subjects - *Bedömningsgrunder för inrättande och avveckling av ämne vid Karlstads universitet*⁹). Here the word refers to an organisational unit.

The faculty office shall keep up-to-date records of the programme councils and their members. The faculty office also assists programme directors with cooperation between programmes, including by organising forums for the exchange of information and experiences.

As per the faculty board decision from 25 October 2017, the Graduate School of Health and the Graduate School of Science and Technology shall also bolster collaboration between third-cycle subjects at the faculty. They are led by their respective steering groups, which are appointed by the faculty board. The duties and responsibilities of the graduate schools include

- serving as a cohesive educational environment for the doctoral students that the faculty's third-cycle subject areas in science and technology would like to see participate in the graduate school,
- ensuring a proper introduction for every doctoral student in the graduate school,
- organising graduate-school-wide courses and activities based on the needs of the doctoral students and the learning outcomes stipulated in the general syllabus of the third-cycle subject area,
- tasking third-cycle subject areas with organising joint courses,
- organising professional development and other activities based on the needs of the supervisors.

2. Management and reporting

The faculty's planning is decided by the vice-chancellor in accordance with the University's regulations for planning and planning dialogues⁵, based on the University's vision and strategy, government directives, and executed dialogue. Planning is monitored in subsequent dialogues. The dean makes decisions on local assignments for the departments and administrative offices based on faculty planning and decisions by the faculty board on operations and resource allocation. Local assignments are monitored through continuous dialogue between departmental management and the dean, faculty controller, and HR specialist, as well as through the departments' annual reports. Stratsys, a tool for planning and reporting results, is used in the monitoring of the goals decided by the vice-chancellor or dean based on the University's vision and strategy.

The education committee and doctoral programmes committee submit reports each year that describe and analyse the activities of the previous year in first- and second-cycle studies and third-cycle studies, respectively.

3. Staff

The faculty's work in staffing matters and skills supply is based on *Appointments procedure*⁶; the delegation of authority from the vice-chancellor to the dean in personnel matters, pursuant to *Vice-chancellor's delegation of authority; Supplementary regulations for the appointments procedure*⁷ decided by the vice-chancellor; *Strategy for recruiting academic staff*⁸; and the University's commitments in the implementation of HRS4R⁹. The skills supply plans drawn

up by the departments as per the skills supply strategy serve as the foundation for the drafting of employment profiles in recruitments.

Employment profiles are decided by the dean, pursuant to *Vice-chancellor's delegation of authority*¹⁰, and the selection of applicants for an advertised appointment is made by a recruitment team at the department in question, if necessary assisted by statements from external experts. In recruitments for lectureships and postdoc positions, the department submits a proposal for appointment to the dean. In recruitments for associate senior lectureships, senior lectureships, or professorships, the department's selection of applicants and proposed appointments are brought to the appointments and promotions committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the dean. The appointments and promotions committee also prepares matters regarding promotions to senior lecturer or professor pursuant to the Appointments procedure, and applications for appointments as non-stipendiary docents, as delegated by the faculty board.

4. First-cycle and second-cycle education

The faculty's educational quality assurance is informed by *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)*.

4.1 Design and approval of programmes

Objective: For all programmes to provide a good learning environment and up-to-date and clear policy documents, and equip students to meet the qualitative targets

4.1.1 Establishment and discontinuation, main field of study and subject

The faculty board decides to establish or discontinue organisational subjects in accordance with Karlstad University regulations¹¹, and the vice-chancellor decides to establish or discontinue main fields of study in first- or second-cycle education following a quality audit.

The establishment of a main field of study is preceded by a dialogue with the dean before an establishment application is drafted. The dean then requests comments from the education committee and faculty board before the matter is presented to the vice-chancellor. Proposals for the establishment of a new main field of study should be submitted to the faculty office at least five weeks before the education committee meeting. The proposal should include a description of how well assessment criteria and specific requirements for the establishment of a main field of study are met. Requirements include teaching expertise, research, examination, structure, and learning environment and are specified in *Bedömningsgrunder för inrättande och avveckling av huvudområde på grund- och avancerad nivå vid Karlstads universitet*¹². Documents supporting the discontinuation of a main field of study should include justification and account for internal and external consequences. If a subject or main field of study is discontinued, an implementation plan is created by the faculty office.

4.1.2 Establishment and discontinuation, study programme

Establishment of a study programme or revisions of a study programme that prompt a change in the title of qualification are preceded by a dialogue with the dean before an application is drafted. The application should be submitted to the faculty office at least five weeks before

the education committee meeting. An application to establish a new study programme must include justification; an environmental analysis; a description of the programme, skills, execution, recruitment, marketing, relation to other programmes and subjects, as well as costs and funding. See guidelines for the establishment and discontinuation of programmes Karlstad University¹³ (Rb 101/15, reg.no. C2015/752). The application should also include an explanation of how contents and examinations ensure the fulfilment of the national qualitative targets (preliminary goal matrices). The dean then requests comments from the education committee and faculty board before the matter is presented to the vice-chancellor. Documents supporting the discontinuation of a programme should include justification and account for internal and external consequences. The process for discontinuing a programme is specified in *Regulations for first and second level education at Karlstad University* (Rb 68/19, reg.no. C2019/612). The faculty office assists in drafting an action plan for discontinuation of a programme.

4.1.3 Approval of programme syllabuses

The following applies to newly-established programmes and to revisions of existing programmes. The programme director, or another staff member appointed by the dean, drafts and anchors a proposal for a new programme syllabus with the programme councils and department heads in question. The programme director is to submit the proposed new programme syllabus to the faculty office no later than three working weeks before the education committee meeting. The material should include the proposed programme syllabus, a proposed goal matrix (see below) and a summary of comments from the programme council and department heads. For newly-established programmes, the material presented ahead of its establishment should be included (See Establishment and discontinuation, study programme). For revised programme syllabuses, there should be a summary of the changes. There must be an account of the potential consequences of the revision. *Template Programme Study Plan Fak-HNT* should be used and *Riktlinjer för utformning av utbildningsplaner vid HNT* (FN 181206, reg.no. HNT 2018/701) should be taken into account. Programme syllabuses should be updated and approved by the faculty board at least once every five years.

A programme syllabus that has been approved by the faculty board should be sent to the programme director with additional copies to the degree office (examen@kau.se), Ladok (ladokarenden@kau.se), and the faculty registry (diarie.hnt@kau.se). The programme director ensures that the programme syllabus is submitted for translation or language editing and that the Swedish and English versions are uploaded to ÖKA. The programme syllabus will then be published on the University website. The programme director ensures that the English translation is sent to the faculty registry (diarie.hnt@kau.se).

4.1.4 Goal matrix

A goal matrix (educational matrix) should be established for each degree to systematically ensure constructive alignment in the programme and its fulfilment of the national outcomes specified in the Higher Education Ordinance as well as local outcomes specified in the programme syllabus. A goal matrix should always be included to inform the processing or decision regarding programme syllabuses. Goal matrices are updated continuously and the most recent matrix is presented to the education committee in connection to the programme's annual report.

The goal matrix should describe the progression towards the programme's qualitative targets. For comprehensive coverage of national and local outcomes, it is recommended that the two are separated. The faculty office provides templates that should be used for goal matrices with properly divided qualitative targets.

4.1.5 Establishment and discontinuation of a course

By delegation of authority from the vice-chancellor, the faculty board and teacher education board decide on the establishment and discontinuation of first- and second-cycle courses. At the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology, these decisions have been subdelegated to the respective heads of department. First- and second-cycle courses that are included in the faculty's offering are administratively established in the course syllabus tool in ÖKA in accordance with the guidelines for establishing a first- and second-cycle course¹⁴, a document which is available on the starting page of the tool. The discontinuation of a course that will no longer be offered by the faculty should comply with *Regulations for first and second level education at Karlstad University*¹⁵.

4.1.6 Approval of course syllabuses and reading lists

Decisions regarding course syllabuses are made by the education committee. All work with and decisions on course syllabuses should consider clearly specified relationships between outcomes, contents, and examinations to ensure a constructive alignment. To ensure that the course's learning outcomes, contents, and examinations contribute to the fulfilment of the study programme's specified qualitative targets, course syllabuses should be reviewed from both a subject and a programme perspective before the proposal is brought before the education committee.

A course syllabus is drafted or revised in the course syllabus tool in ÖKA Kurs, where the matter is automatically forwarded to the next step of the process. To assist in the process, there are guidelines available in the tool and two documents about course syllabuses and reading lists titled *Anvisningar vid skrivande av kursplaner på grundnivå och avancerad nivå* and *Instruktion för arbete med litteraturlistor*. The directions are available on the starting page in the course syllabus tool. Course syllabus authors enter information into the course syllabus tool and sends the matter on with enough time before the education committee meeting for a subject and programme review to be conducted and subsequent adjustments to be made. The head of department ensures collegial processing with student representation of proposed course syllabuses at the department. Special rules for programme courses apply. Course syllabuses for new courses or courses with major revisions should be submitted to the programme director no less than two working weeks before they have to be submitted to the faculty office. Course syllabuses with minor revisions should be submitted to the programme director no less than one week before. Minor revisions refer to changes that do not affect learning outcomes, contents, or examinations. The faculty office should be contacted if there is disagreement about a course syllabus between the department and programme director.

The course syllabus should be submitted via the course syllabus tool to the faculty office no later than two working weeks before one of the two education committee meetings where course syllabuses are on the agenda. The course syllabus author is responsible for submitting the matter to the faculty office in time.

The education committee will process the course syllabus. If it is a new course, the reading list will also be processed. Upon approval, a Swedish version of the course syllabus will be

published. If it is a new course, the reading list will also be published. The course syllabus will be sent on for translation into English. When complete, the English version should be published. The course coordinator is to ensure that the English version of the course syllabus is published in ÖKA Kurs and that the matter is finalised. The course syllabus and reading list will be automatically registered in ÖKA Kurs.

Reading list revisions are made in ÖKA Kurs and can be made without the course syllabus being revised. The revised reading list is approved by the head of department. The revised reading list should be published no later than six weeks before the course starts.

Minor changes to a course syllabus from no more than three years prior can be approved by the education coordinator continuously throughout the year, by delegation of authority from the education committee. If the matter concerns minor changes, this should be specified in the comment section of the course syllabus.

4.2 Admission and credit transfer

Admission to first- and second-cycle studies is regulated in the University's Admissions regulations.

Students have the right to transfer credits from previously completed university courses in Sweden or abroad. Substantial difference between these courses or study programmes negates the right to credit transfer. Credit can also be awarded for so-called prior learning. The term refers to knowledge and skills from activities other than higher education, such as other forms of study or professional experience. Local regulations for credit transfer are laid out in *Rules and regulations for credit transfer in first- and second-cycle education*¹⁶. Credit transfer matters are administered by the study and career counsellor. Matters regarding complete or partial credit transfer for a course are decided by the examiner. Matters regarding course replacements in study programmes are decided by the programme director.

4.3 Continuous monitoring

Objective: To incorporate student influence to ensure systematic quality assurance and improvements of faculty courses and programmes and to exchange experiences and best practices throughout the organisation

4.3.1 Report on programme offering

To enable the monitoring of the faculty's programme offering, the faculty office compiles an annual report. The report is created in accordance with the vice-chancellor's decision about annual reports of decisions from the faculties and the faculty board for teacher education on programme offerings¹⁷ based on instructions and a template from the Executive Office. The report is presented to the education committee in connection to the annual reports from the programmes before the dean's dialogue with the vice-chancellor.

4.3.2 Monitoring of main field of study and subject

The faculty office conducts a review of organisational subjects, main fields of study, and third-cycle subject areas in three-year cycles, in accordance with the specified bases of assessment as decided by the vice-chancellor (see sections 4.1.1 and 5.1.1). The review should take into account known changes for the next three years, such as retirements. The head of department is to inform the dean without delay if any requirement pertaining to

subjects, main fields of study, and third-cycle subject areas is not fulfilled. The head of department shall also draft and present a plan to the faculty board, based on the departmental skills supply, for how the requirements can be met.

4.3.3 Programme analyses and annual programme reports

Programme evaluation is included in the University-wide systems support for course and programme evaluation as a key part of continuous monitoring of first- and second-cycle education. The survey sent out to students enrolled in the programme is autogenerated. A link enables programme-specific questions to be added to the survey. Written or oral evaluations can be used as a complement. The programme director is informed of times via autogenerated emails in the system and is responsible for the execution and publication of these questions and the programme analysis. The programme analysis is thereafter processed by the programme council, where proposals for development are discussed in order to ensure the fulfilment and examination of the qualitative targets.

The publication of a programme analysis prompts an autogenerated email with a link to the analysis to be sent to the programme director, administrative head, education coordinator, and dean. The programme director ensures a subsequent discussion about actions, priorities, and planning with the heads of department and course coordinators concerned or with the dean if the proposed changes are of a more substantial nature.

The programme director presents an annual report to the education committee. The annual report should describe development efforts and results during that year for the programme. An analysis of student volumes and student completion should be included alongside important changes to the programme. An up-to-date goal matrix and programme analysis should be attached to the annual report. A template for the annual report is provided by the faculty office. In its annual report to the faculty board, the education committee offers a comprehensive assessment of the educational quality and systematic quality efforts in faculty programmes. If the quality of a programme is found to be seriously lacking, the chair of the education committee immediately notifies the dean.

4.3.4 Course evaluations and analyses

Course evaluation is included in the University-wide systems support for course and programme evaluation¹⁸ as a key part of continuous monitoring of first- and second-cycle education. Each department organises course analyses. The head of department ensures peer review with a subject-specific perspective and includes student input on the analyses and proposed measures. The head of department also ensures the feedback reaches the course coordinator.

On the Monday two weeks after the final week of the course instance, an autogenerated email with a link to the analysis material is sent to the course coordinator. The course analysis should be published within three weeks of the course evaluation deadline. The head of department decides on development measures that require resources and reports back to the course coordinator, who in turn is responsible for implementing changes and informing the students in the next course instance. Course analyses that have not been published within a month of a reminder from the dean are compiled once per semester by the faculty office and presented to management and the education committee.

The head of department ensures the completion of an annual analysis of the department's compiled course evaluations. The head presents measures and development plans as well as

their expected effects based on departmental quality efforts. A specification of the department's approach to course analysis processing should be included. The template for departmental improvement, *Mall för analys av institutionens förbättringsarbete*, is used. The specification is sent to the faculty office the following year to be processed at the final education committee meeting for the spring.

The education committee's annual report to the faculty board includes a comprehensive assessment of the educational quality and systematic quality efforts at the faculty's departments. The faculty office is responsible for ensuring the preservation and accessibility of the department's course evaluations. Any deficiency in the department's quality efforts are be immediately reported to the dean.

The programme director reviews the course analyses continuously and decides whether to address issues in a dialogue with the subject and/or the programme council. The programme director primarily reports back to the course coordinator and examiner and thereafter the head of department. If the programme council establishes that the learning outcomes are not met, the programme director ensures that the matter is brought before the heads of department concerned and the chair of the education committee so that they can identify the problem and agree on measures. If necessary, the matter can be brought before the faculty board.

4.3.5 Alumni survey

Every three years, the faculty office conducts an alumni survey on all the study programmes at the faculty. The results are compiled and presented in a report with the questionnaire attached. The report is submitted to the programme councils for further analysis and sent to the education committee and faculty board for information purposes.

4.4 Periodic review

Objective: To ensure high quality in the courses and programmes offered by the faculty and to implement improvement measures informed by the reviews

4.4.1 The Treklöver partnership

For the purposes of regular reviews of courses and programmes, Karlstad University has entered into a partnership system with Linnaeus University and Mid Sweden University (Treklövern), (vice-chancellor's decision titled *Reviderat gemensamt system för utbildningsutvärderingar för Karlstads universitet, Linnéuniversitetet och Mittuniversitetet*¹⁹). These reviews apply to programmes leading to a professional degree and programmes or study routes that lead to a general qualification. The faculty is to deliver written documentation to inform the assessment of the courses and programmes concerned. The review includes programmes leading to a professional qualification and to programmes leading to a general qualification in the main field of study. Independent projects are selected by the faculty office based on a designated checklist. Self-evaluation selection is done by designated "writers" at the institutions concerned. The faculty office offers support as needed in the writing process and compiles the texts to one report per cluster. The evaluation report from the assessment group shall inform actions plans in accordance with the prescribed process (dean's decision *Processer för handlingsplaner och uppföljning av åtgärder inom Treklöversamarbetet samt erfarenhetsutbyte av utvärderingsprocessen*²⁰). Action plans and implemented measures are discussed with the Treklövern steering group one year after the

evaluation report is finalised. Implemented and scheduled measures informed by the action plan should be included in the annual programme reports that are presented to the education committee. Courses and programmes evaluated by UKÄ (the Swedish Higher Education Authority) are not subject to Treklövern reviews.

4.4.2 UKÄ reviews

UKÄ conducts thematic and periodic reviews of the University. These reviews are laid out on the UKÄ website. The creation of action plans based on reports from the UKÄ programme evaluations follows the same process that is used for Treklövern evaluations. The action plans are presented to the faculty board.

5. Third-cycle studies

The faculty's quality assurance efforts rest upon commitment and participation from everyone who is active in third-cycle studies and upon formal quality assurance structures and development that align with the view on quality culture described in documentation from the European University Association, *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University*, and *Regulations for Third-Cycle Studies at Karlstad University*²¹.

5.1 Design and approval of third-cycle subjects and their graduate school organisation

Objective: To create a good academic environment characterised by scientific depth and range, plenty of resources in terms of supervisor expertise, social support, effective infrastructure, and the possibility to interact with others who create and apply new knowledge to the research domain.

5.1.1 Third-cycle subjects

A university or higher education institution entitled to award third-cycle qualifications shall determine the subjects in which third-cycle courses and programmes may be offered (Higher Education Ordinance, Chap. 6, Sect. 25). The faculty board decides on the establishment of third-cycle subjects according to the *Rules of Procedure at Karlstad University* and *Vice-Chancellor's Delegation of Authority*. Drafting follows the stipulations in *Bedömningsgrunder för inrättande och avveckling av ämne för utbildning på forskarnivå vid Karlstads universitet*²². A subject cannot be established as a third-cycle subject area without sufficient teaching and supervision resources, course and seminar activities, and effective infrastructure. Content is regulated by each subject's general study syllabus (Higher Education Ordinance, Chap. 6, Sect. 26-27). The faculty template should be used for new or revised general study syllabuses.

5.1.2 Graduate schools

The faculty board decides on the establishment of graduate schools to further the educational environment and interdisciplinary collaboration. The Graduate School of Science and Technology and the Graduate School of Health will provide a cohesive educational environment for interested doctoral students in addition to 1) securing a proper induction for all doctoral students in the graduate school, 2) organising joint courses and activities based on the needs of the doctoral students and third-cycle subject area learning outcomes specified in

the general study syllabus, 3) tasking third-cycle subjects with organising joint course, and 4) organising professional development and other activities based on the needs of the supervisors.

5.1.3 External contacts and collaboration

The University's research and development strategy encourages conference participation, summer graduate school attendance, and visits to other research or educational environments. Activities of this kind are planned in conjunction with the creation or update of an individual study plan. Conference trips and visits to other environments for doctoral students should be supported by service planning and resource allocation. Heads of department, doctoral students, supervisors, and examiners share responsibility for communication on these topics.

5.2 Recruitment and admission of doctoral students

Objective: To attract and select the candidates who are most likely to benefit from the programme.

5.2.1 Establishment, recruitment, and admission of doctoral students at Karlstad University

Doctoral student admission to Karlstad University is a multistep process and decisions are made in compliance with the Higher Education Ordinance (Chap. 7, Sect. 36-41; Chap. 6, Sect. 26-27); *Admission Regulations at Karlstad University*²³; the delegation of authority at the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology; and the specific entry requirements listed in the general study syllabus for the third-cycle subject. First, a doctoral studentship is *established* in accordance with the admission regulations. This is followed by *advertisement* and *selection* ultimately the *admission* of a doctoral student.

The University admission regulations stipulate that all recruitment shall include a selection procedure and if the doctoral student will complete the studies as a University employee, the position is to be advertised. The advertising requirement can be waived (Higher Education Ordinance, Chap. 7. Sect. 37) if 1) the studies will be completed within the framework of employment by another employer, 2) if a doctoral student transfers from another higher education institution, or 3) if there are similar special grounds.

Establishment: On behalf of the department, the head submits a proposal on a designated form to a faculty administrative officer regarding the establishment of a doctoral studentship. The form states which attachments are required. If the funding includes direct government funding, the administrative office will enter the matter onto the faculty board agenda. If it does not include direct government funding, a faculty administrative officer will present the matter to the dean, who will make a decision. This applies to the establishment of a position that will lead to an appointment as a doctoral student at Karlstad University and a position that will lead to admission within the framework of another appointment at Karlstad University.

If the establishment concerns admission of a student employed elsewhere, an agreement must be drawn up between Karlstad University and the employer. This agreement should specify that third-cycle studies at a study rate of at least 50% can be completed within the framework of employment. The position can then be established as per the above.

Recruitment and admission for the appointment of doctoral students at Karlstad University

The head drafts an advertisement on behalf of the department and submits it to the HR specialist at the administrative office. The HR specialist posts the ad via the recruitment tool, Varbi, and it is distributed through standardised channels. The department is responsible for wider advertising as required. The department reviews all the submitted applications, assesses all candidates based on the qualification requirements, makes a selection, and uses a special form to propose, via the head, a candidate for admission. The selection process should include interviews of the top candidates by the intended principal supervisor and at least one additional person from the subject environment. The recruitment team should be assembled with gender balance in mind. The head of department may attend the interview.

On behalf of the department, the head submits a proposal on a designated form to a faculty administrative officer regarding the admission of a doctoral student. The form states which attachments are required. Ahead of admission, material to inform the decision is sent to the research coordinator and doctoral student representative for a statement. The dean and head of department also receive copies. A faculty administrative officer will then present the matter to the dean, who can approve admission. If so, an admission decision is drawn up along with an employment contract for a doctoral studentship.

Admission to third-cycle studies within the framework of another appointment at Karlstad University:

On behalf of the department, the head submits a proposal on a designated form to a faculty administrative officer regarding the admission of a doctoral student. The form states which attachments are required. Ahead of admission, material to inform the decision is sent to the research coordinator and doctoral student representative for a statement. The dean and head of department also receive copies. A faculty administrative officer will then present the matter to the dean, who can approve admission. If so, an admission decision is drawn up.

Admission to third-cycle studies within the framework of employment elsewhere:

Persons proposed for admission must have been interviewed. An employer representative, the intended principal supervisor, and at least one additional person with a PhD shall attend the interview.

On behalf of the department, the head submits a proposal on the designated form to a faculty administrative officer regarding the admission of a doctoral student. The form states which attachments are required. Ahead of admission, material to inform the decision is sent to the research coordinator and doctoral student representative for a statement. The dean and head of department also receive copies. A faculty administrative officer will then present the matter to the dean, who can approve admission. If so, an admission decision is drawn up.

5.3 Study induction, structure, and documentation (ISP) for the individual doctoral student

Objective: To ensure planning that supports the individual doctoral student's success in terms of qualitative targets and intended career development, documented so as to support continuous monitoring of the studies.

5.3.1 Induction

An induction is offered in connection to admission to third-cycle studies. The department in question provides a subject-specific induction while the faculty office through the Graduate

School of Science and Technology and the Graduate School of Health will provide a general induction to studies. The supervisor, doctoral student, and examiner jointly plan the structure and contents within the framework prescribed by the general study syllabus for the subject. This includes the formulation of a doctoral thesis project and a schedule for its completion as well as any departmental duties (see guidelines for departmental duties²⁴). Planning is documented in the individual study plan as per the description below.

5.3.2 Process for the individual study plan

The first individual study plan: The Higher Education Ordinance states that an individual study plan shall be drawn up for each doctoral student (Chap. 6, Sect. 29). The individual study plan should be drawn up and approved within 6 months of admission to third-cycle studies, as per the vice-chancellor's decision²⁵.

The doctoral student and supervisor fill out the individual study plan form that has been approved by the University, presently a digital ISP system (administrative decision concerning the digitisation of the individual study plan form, third-cycle studies²⁶). The proposed individual study plan is subject to peer review as prescribed by the department. The examiner is not linked in to the digital ISP chain. It is therefore important that the examiner is involved in the initial drafting of a newly-admitted doctoral student's ISP. This comprises alignment with the subject's general study syllabus, fulfilment of qualitative targets (Higher Education Ordinance, annex 2), and how the thesis project and courses can further a post-degree career. Attention will be given to the academic merit and/or value and feasibility of the thesis project. The head of department ensures that the scheduled supervision complies with service planning.

The ISP is forwarded to the faculty office after the approval of the doctoral student, supervisor, and head of department. The office will review the formalities and refer the matter back to be supplemented if necessary. The ISP is then added to the agenda of the next the doctoral programmes committee to be processed. The process is primarily focused on the schedule for studies being formulated to allow for annual monitoring. These are the possible outcomes of the process: 1) the doctoral programmes committee approves the plan being, at which point the dean can give his approval, 2) the doctoral programmes committee refers the plan back for minor changes and instructs the chair to ensure the changes are made, after which the dean can give his approval, 3) the doctoral programmes committee refers the plan back for major changes. A revised ISP is sent via the head of department to the faculty office for a new process before the dean can decide to approve it.

Updates to the individual study plan following monitoring: Monitoring should be conducted at least once every 12 months and documented through the submission of a revised individual study plan to be approved by the dean. Monitoring is done via the digital ISP system.

The doctoral student and supervisor go over what has been conducted and achieved since the last ISP was drawn up. Based on this review, an updated individual study plan will be drawn up and approved by the doctoral student supervisor, and then approved by the head of department. The examiner should be notified of every instance of monitoring. The faculty office reviews the updated study plan, requests supplementary information if needed, and presents the matter to the dean for approval. The review includes ensuring that a goal matrix is attached, as per the below.

Goal matrices: A faculty board decision (15 June 2015) stipulates that general study syllabuses contain requirements for a specified goal matrix for the approval of an individual study plan²⁷:

Goal attainment of the research programme shall be reviewed on two occasions during the course of the programme. After one year, an individual goal matrix shall be formulated and added to the research student's individual study plan as an appendix.

One year before the planned date for the licentiate degree and two years before the planned date for the doctoral degree, the outcome of the individual goal matrix is evaluated in connection with the revision of the individual study plan. If the evaluation shows that the goal attainment is not satisfactory, the plan for the continuing studies will be revised to ensure that the national goals are met by the time of examination. A revised goal matrix is attached to the revised individual study plan.

Supervision of individual study plans The faculty office ensures that an ISP is submitted within six months of admission and that a revised ISP is submitted no later than 12 months after the approval of the first or most recent ISP. If no ISP has been submitted, the faculty administrative officer sends a reminder to the doctoral student, principal supervisor, and head of department to submit an ISP. If no ISP has been submitted three weeks later, the faculty administrative officer notifies the research coordinator, who will contact the head of department to agree on a deadline for the ISP. If no ISP proposal is submitted by the agreed-upon deadline, the matter is handed over to the dean.

Procedure for extended periods of study If the date proposed for the licentiate seminar or defence of the doctoral thesis in a submitted ISP or similar would result in a total programme length corresponding to more than two or four years of full-time studies respectively (400 and 800% of accumulated activity in Ladok), a meeting is called with the supervisor, head of department, research coordinator, dean or deputy dean to establish 1) the background for the proposed extension, 2) the feasibility of the project planning for the remaining period, and 3) if any changes to the work or project planning could facilitate completion. The research coordinator collects a statement from the doctoral student ahead of the meeting. The principal supervisor or the dean reports back to the doctoral student. The conversation is documented and the category of the reason is provided for background. The faculty office submits annual summaries of these conversations to the doctoral programmes committee as part of the yearly monitoring. The summary is made in aggregated form and designed to provide an overview of the most frequently occurring reasons for delays. The faculty office also makes an annual report of the average period of study (actual period of study and maximum permitted period of study) for students who have completed their doctorates during the year.

5.4 Supervision

Objective: To use systematically developed knowledge of supervision to further the ability of individual doctoral students to independently initiate, conduct, and communicate research and other qualified tasks.

5.4.1 Supervision – appointment and change of supervisor

The Higher Education Ordinance (Chap. 6 Sect. 28) stipulates that at least two supervisors shall be appointed for each doctoral student, and one of them shall be nominated as the principal supervisor. It is specified in the *Admission Regulations*²¹ that the principal supervisor and the examiner must both be docents or professors. Decisions regarding

supervisors and examiners are made by the dean in connection to admission. The head of department makes decisions regarding service planning that shall allow for supervision corresponding to 160 hours annually when the degree of activity of 100%, in accordance with the Admission Regulations.

The forms of supervision are agreed upon by the supervisor and doctoral student and shall be documented in the individual study plan. The agreed-upon execution of supervision is included in the university's mandate and shall be described so as to allow for monitoring. The configuration of supervisors may need to change during the course of the studies as a consequence of departmental changes or because a doctoral student requests a new supervisor. In both cases, the dean makes decisions regarding the new configuration of supervisors. See description below.

Changing supervisors or examiners as a result of a change in working conditions: The head of department consults with the parties concerned and proposes a new configuration of supervisors. Such matters are administered as follows: 1) the head of department notifies the faculty office of the proposal in writing or via email, 2) the faculty office registers the submitted proposal, prepares the material and presents the matter to the dean, who makes the decision, 3) the dean's decision is registered and sent out by the faculty office, at which point 4) the research coordinator updates the ISP system.

Replacing a supervisor at the doctoral student's request: Replacement of a supervisor at the doctoral student's request can be administered in different ways. The doctoral student's right to request a new supervisor is guaranteed by the Higher Education Ordinance (6:28) and applies irrespective of how or to whom the request is made. A submitted request for a new supervisor shall be documented, whenever possible through confirmation from the doctoral student in writing or via email. The faculty office sees to it that the request is registered and that the dean is kept informed of the matter's administration. The faculty office also informs the doctoral student of the process going forward and of the support available from the Graduate Student Association and the PhD Ombud.

If the head of department receives a request for a change of supervisor, the head of department is to ensure documentation as described above and forward the documentation to the faculty office for registry purposes. If possible, the head of department consults with the parties concerned and proposes a new configuration of supervisors before notifying the faculty office. The faculty office then prepares material and present the matter as described above. If the head of department deems it inappropriate to propose a new configuration of supervisors himself or herself, or if the matter is deemed to require the input of faculty management, the head contacts the dean. Contact shall be made even if the assessment is that a proposal for a new configuration of supervisors cannot be submitted within three months of the change request.

If a request to change supervisor is submitted to the faculty management or faculty office, documentation and registry follow the above. The faculty office then contacts the head of department for an assessment of the possibilities to draft a proposal for a new configuration of supervisors. If the possibilities are deemed to be fair, the head of department continues the work to propose a new configuration of supervisors, regularly updating faculty management. If it is not deemed possible or appropriate for the head of department to draft a proposal, the responsibility is passed to the dean, with support from the faculty office.

5.5 Doctoral level courses and other activities in support of thesis work and goal attainment

Objective: To provide knowledge and skills that support thesis work and further the attainment of qualitative targets and the doctoral student's appeal and competitive edge in future professional endeavours.

The studies comprise work on the doctoral or licentiate thesis and coursework including examinations. *Examinations that form part of third-cycle courses and study programmes shall be assessed in accordance with the grading system prescribed by the higher education institution. The grade shall be determined by a teacher specially nominated by the higher education institution (the examiner) (Higher Education Ordinance Chap. 6 Sect. 32).* Mandatory courses are listed in the third-cycle subject area's general syllabus and course syllabuses specify the learning outcomes of the individual courses.

5.5.1. Third-cycle courses

Third-cycle courses shall normally have a course syllabus equating first-cycle and second-cycle course syllabuses. Course syllabuses are always required for mandatory courses. Course syllabuses can be available in Swedish only, in Swedish and English, or in English only. If the course may be offered in English, the course syllabus shall be available in English. Graduate schools initiate third-cycle courses deemed to be of interest to doctoral students from several disciplines. Mandatory courses that are not provided by the faculty are the responsibility of the subject's department. Credits may be transferred for courses that have been examined at another higher education institution or within the framework of other studies. A description of this process follows below.

Course syllabuses: Proposals for a new or revised course syllabus are submitted by the head of subject to the faculty office for processing by the doctoral programmes committee. The processing may result in the committee approving the course syllabus or referring it back for revisions. Use the faculty template for third-cycle courses.

Providing courses: If a *course is provided on behalf of the faculty*, course execution is included in the local departmental mandate and designated resources are part of the dean's decision on research funding distribution. The departmental service planning shall specify who is responsible for course execution. The coordinator for third-cycle courses is normally required to hold a PhD. When a course instance is planned, it is announced online by the department on the third-cycle course pages. If a *course is provided on the initiative of a department*, the departmental service planning shall specify who is responsible for course execution. When a course instance is planned, it is announced online on the third-cycle course pages by the intended course coordinator with the support of the faculty administrator.

Examination and reporting: The examiner is responsible for reporting passing grades on third-cycle courses to Ladok. Support for this is provided by a faculty administrator. Documentation shall include a certificate of a completed course with a course syllabus or a certificate containing a brief description of the course and examination.

5.5.2 Other activities

For credit-bearing activities in the programme that are not described by a course syllabus (such as conference participation), the examiner shall issue a certificate containing a brief

description of the component and examination. Non-credit-bearing activities in the programme shall be described in the ISP and be listed in the goal matrix. Mandatory components that are not provided by the faculty are the responsibility of the subject's department. Credits may be transferred for credit-bearing activities that have been examined at another higher education institution or within the framework of other studies. A description of this process follows below.

5.5.3 Credit transfer

Credit transfer is described in the Higher Education Ordinance (Chap. 6 Sect. 6–8). Credit is primarily transferred for components completed at another higher education institution or within the framework of other studies.

The doctoral student applies for credit transfer²⁸ using the designated form, which is then submitted to the examiner alongside course certificates or similar. If the credit transfer is approved, the faculty administrator reports the decision to Ladok. If the credit transfer is rejected, the examiner notifies the doctoral student and attaches information on how to appeal the decision.

Regarding credit transfer for completed second-level courses to third-cycle studies, a faculty board decision from 11 April 2014 states: *Credit can only be transferred for courses that are not part of the prerequisite degree. However, credit may be transferred for components beyond 240 or 60 ECTS credits from second-cycle professional qualifications comprising more than 240 ECTS credits or general second-cycle degrees comprising more than 60 ECTS credits, respectively. This is on the condition that the components are not included in the specific entry requirements. Credit for excess components, such as the second year of a 120 ECTS master programme, may not be transferred by default. No other limitations apply for how much of the course credit may be transferred towards third-cycle studies.*

5.6 Examination

Objective: For doctoral and licentiate theses as well as other study components to be of a high national and international standard.

The Higher Education Ordinance (Chap. 6 Sect. 33-35 and Annex 2) specifies the requirements for a Degree of Licentiate and Degree of Doctor. The subject's general syllabus specifies the portion of course components and thesis work and any other mandatory components. *Regulations for Third-Cycle Studies at Karlstad University* describes the licentiate and doctoral examinations and degrees. Announcements regarding the licentiate seminar and defence of the doctoral thesis shall be made using the faculty's templates.

Review and examination take place at the seminars listed in the subject's general syllabus. Furthermore, a licentiate or doctoral thesis shall be reviewed before it is printed, in accordance with *Regulations for Third-Cycle Studies at Karlstad University*. Review and examination then take place in connection with the defence and examining committee meeting for a Degree of Doctor, and in connection with the licentiate seminar and discussion between the supervisor, examiner, and external reviewer for a Degree of Licentiate.

5.7 Continuous monitoring

Objective: To ensure high national and international quality in the faculty's third-cycle studies and to encourage development and improvement.

5.7.1 Annual review of individual study plans

The annual review of the ISP is conducted as a discussion between the doctoral student, the supervisor, the examiner, the head of department, and the dean. The discussion constitutes monitoring of the doctoral student's study progression, the quality and quantity of supervision, planned and reported courses and other activities (such as conferences, external contacts, and collaboration) in the third-cycle studies and any departmental duties.

5.7.2 Evaluation of third-cycle courses

Evaluations are required for doctoral level courses conducted in accordance with a course syllabus approved by the doctoral programmes committee. Course execution includes providing an opportunity for course participants to share their opinions on whether the intended learning outcomes have contributed to the fulfilment of the qualitative targets, if course execution has been dedicated to the fulfilment of the learning outcomes, and if the learning outcomes have been examined. The course coordinator submits a summary and analysis of statements to the faculty office to be forwarded to the doctoral programmes committee. The course coordinator presents the matter and the doctoral programmes committee discuss the possibilities for alterations of course outcomes and contents, for instance. If so, the committee decides for the course syllabus to be revised.

5.7.3 Annual review of the faculty's third-cycle courses and programmes

The faculty office compiles an annual overview over faculty doctoral programmes and submits it to the dean, doctoral programmes committee, and faculty board. The report is published on the faculty's intranet and emailed to the third-cycle subject areas. The review includes doctoral student activity and supply, the number of completed degrees, the average length of study, conducted conversations for extended periods of study, and an overview of ISP reviews during the year. A short summary of any changes to the teaching expertise at the faculty's third-cycle subject areas is also included. Finally, a brief account is included of the faculty's graduate school activities during the year and, where applicable, the results of doctoral student and alumni surveys. The annual monitoring is added to the agenda of the doctoral programmes committee and faculty board and made available on the faculty intranet.

5.7.4 Doctoral student survey

Every three years, a survey is conducted where doctoral students are given the opportunity to share their opinions about the studies and study environment. If the Graduate Student Association conducts surveys, the results of these are used to provide feedback instead. A good dialogue with the Graduate Student Association is imperative to ensure that attention is paid to the aspects they consider significant. The survey results are made public in the faculty's annual monitoring (see item 5.7.3 above) and are added to the agenda of the doctoral programmes committee. If the Graduate Student Association conducts the survey, the result will be published on their web page.

5.7.5 Alumni survey

Every three years, a survey is conducted where former doctoral students are given the opportunity to share their opinions about the studies and study environment. The survey includes topics such as supervision, the research environment, external contacts, courses, and study plans. The survey targets a group of doctoral students who have completed their degrees within a three-year period, no more than two years before the survey is issued. The survey results are made public in the faculty's annual monitoring (see item 5.7.3 above) and are added to the agenda of the doctoral programmes committee. The report is also made available on the faculty's intranet.

5.8 Periodic review

Objective: To ensure a high national and international quality of the faculty's third-cycle studies and to launch improvements informed by the reviews.

5.8.1 Review initiated by Karlstad University

A model is being developed for regular review of the third-cycle courses and programmes that are not included in evaluations by the Swedish Higher Education Authority (UKÄ).

The University's third-cycle subject areas will be evaluated by assessment teams of external reviewers. The third-cycle subject area's always have access to assistance in the form of a review coordinator and support team. To the extent possible, efforts are coordinated with the higher education institution's continuous research review.

5.8.2 UKÄ reviews

UKÄ conducts thematic and periodic reviews of the University's third-cycle studies. The execution and schedule for these reviews are laid out on the UKÄ website. Action plans based on reports from the UKÄ programme evaluations are created using the same process as for Treklövern evaluations. The action plans are presented to the faculty board.

6. Research

The faculty's research-related quality assurance is based on *Joint framework for HEIs' research quality assurance and enhancement systems*, originated by the Association of Swedish Higher Education Institutions (SUHF) and awareness and compliance on the part of all active researchers at Karlstad University as regards the basic regulations. Continuous monitoring at the institution as well as regular reviews from external experts serve to ensure the high quality of the research. The research committee provides peer transparency into research-related issues.

6.1 Good research practice and project review

Objective: The awareness and compliance on the part of all active researchers at Karlstad University as regards the basic regulations that stipulate fundamental responsibility, ethical values, and reflection on good research practice. In addition, all research projects, including those of doctoral students, are subject to ethical review.

All research projects - internal, external, and doctoral student projects - shall undergo ethical review in accordance with the vice-chancellor's decision on the review procedure for research ethics²⁹, which is done via a designated digital form available on the University's intranet. The review is documented and entered into the registry. The faculty ethical advisor can help

in case of any ambiguity. *Please note that the subjects of ethical review are the specific research projects and not a doctoral project's general plan as described in an ISP. Before a doctoral student knows what to do, specifically which data to collect, or who the subject of the study should be, it is still too early for the review form to be filled out and yield any meaningful results.* Researchers receive an immediate response upon submission of a report. The faculty will receive feedback on the number of reviewed projects and outcomes, for instance projects to the Swedish ethical review board (EPM).

Suspected research misconduct and other serious deviations from good research practice shall be reported immediately in writing to the vice-chancellor. See *Guidance in case of suspected deviations from good research practice*³⁰. If the report is made to another party, this party should immediately forward it to the vice-chancellor. Special rules for feedback to the person submitting a report and the person reported are applied by the National Board for Assessment of Research Misconduct (Npof).

6.2 Research infrastructure

Objective: For all researchers at Karlstad University to have access to the necessary infrastructure to achieve high-quality research and collaboration.

The Faculty of Health, Science and Technology offers research infrastructure in the form of premises as well as other material, such as advanced research instruments, computer resources, and access to national and international research infrastructure. Infrastructure monitoring is part of regular organisational monitoring (section 2) and is also conducted at periodic reviews (see 6.4 below).

The needs of the research staff are met through internal financial prioritisations at a faculty level. The costs of special premises and depreciations are centrally funded to an extent of 95%, the exception being the year in which the investment is made, when the vice-chancellor's central resource may back the investment. Infrastructure investments can also be made through the allocation of financial resources from the dean's strategic resource, faculty funds, departmental means, and external grants.

The infrastructure for the management and publication of research data is provided and operated by central services. There is also central access to the GIO, Grants and Innovation Office, which assists research staff with support in various ways.

6.3 Continuous monitoring

Objective: To ensure that the faculty's research meets high national and international standards and to encourage development and improvement.

Continuous monitoring is based on documentation regularly compiled by Central Services to inform operational dialogue, among other activities. The material includes staff, third-cycle studies, funding, application and publication (bibliometric analysis), and collaboration at the faculty's subjects (*Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University; Publishing policy for Karlstad University*³¹; table 4 in *Procedures for Periodic Research Review at Karlstad University*³²). The faculty communicates this in an annual report of research and doctoral courses and programmes, which is added to the agenda of the doctoral programmes committee and faculty board and made available on the faculty intranet.

To enable the continuous monitoring of research quality, research staff are required to collaborate with administrative officers at the faculty and Central Services. At the faculty/department/subject, research staff regularly report publications etc. to DiVA. Research staff are also given the opportunity for an annual check of the entry data for the bibliometric analysis administered by Central Services.

The continuous monitoring is communicated verbally in operational dialogue and in writing in the faculty's annual report.

6.4 Periodic review

Objective: To ensure a high national and international quality of the research conducted at the Faculty of Health, Science and Technology and to launch improvements informed by the reviews.

The aim of the periodic review is to assess the existing level of performance and the conditions for quality improvement (*Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University*). The GIO coordinate periodic reviews and assist other stakeholders during the process. Faculty management participate in the six-year planning (decided by the vice-chancellor) and in the yearly plan. Faculty management also ensure the execution of special tasks in connection to the periodic review.

The process is regulated in *Procedures for Periodic Research Review at Karlstad University*. The dean decides on appropriate evaluation units at the faculty. It could be a department, research centre, or a targeted effort. The vice-chancellor appoints the assessment team experts and chair. The review is informed by background facts compiled by Central Services, a self-evaluation compiled by the evaluation unit, and an on-site visit. The evaluation results in a report that is submitted to the evaluation unit and faculty management in addition to being made available with the help of the communications office. The evaluation unit thereafter creates an action plan for the dean's approval. The action plan is also made available with the help of the communications office.

The results of periodic reviews, including action plans and their monitoring, are continuously reported in operational dialogue with University management.

-
- ¹ *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University (Reg.no. 2019/1027)*
 - ² *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University (Reg.no. 2019/1027)*
 - ³ *Quality Assurance System at Karlstad University (Reg.no. 2019/1027)*
 - ⁴ *Rules of procedure at Karlstad University (Reg.no. C2019/703)*
 - ⁵ Document titled *Ordning för centrala verksamhetsuppdrag verksamhetsdialoger (RB70/15; Reg.no. C2015/543)*
 - ⁶ *Appointments procedure at Karlstad University*
 - ⁷ *Supplementary Regulations for the Appointments Procedure at Karlstad University (RB 71/20; reg.no. C2020/490)*
 - ⁸ *Strategy and action plan for recruiting academic staff, (reg.no. C2020/913).*
 - ⁹ Decision titled *Beslut om dokument för ansökan om HR Excellence in Research Award (HRS4R); reg.no. C2019/377*
 - ¹⁰ *Vice-chancellor's delegation of authority*
 - ¹¹ *Bedömningsgrunder för inrättande och avveckling av ämne vid Karlstads universitet (RB 98/15)*
 - ¹² *Bedömningsgrunder för inrättande och avveckling av huvudområde på grund- och avancerad nivå vid Karlstads universitet (Rb 99/15, reg.no. C2015/735)*
 - ¹³ Document titled *Riktlinjer för inrättande och avveckling av program vid Karlstads universitet (Rb 101/15, reg.no. C2015/752).*
 - ¹⁴ *Anvisningar för inrättade av kurs på grundnivå och avancerad nivå*
 - ¹⁵ *Regulations for first and second level education at Karlstad University*
 - ¹⁶ *Rules and regulations for credit transfer in first- and second-cycle education (RB126/19, reg.no. C2019/1026)*
 - ¹⁷ Document titled *Årliga redovisningar av fakulteternas och lärarutbildningsnämndens beslut om programutbud (RB 69/15, reg.no. C2015/531)*
 - ¹⁸ Document titled *Införande av universitetsgemensamt system för kursvärdering och kursanalys (RB117/15, reg.no. 2015/331)*
 - ¹⁹ *Reviderat gemensamt system för utbildningsutvärderingar för Karlstads universitet, Linnéuniversitetet och Mittuniversitetet (Rb 71/18, reg.no. C2018/488).*
 - ²⁰ *Processer för handlingsplaner och uppföljning av åtgärder inom Treklöversamarbetet samt erfarenhetsutbyte av utvärderingsprocessen (Db 75/19 reg.no. 2019/527)*
 - ²¹ *Regulations for Third-Cycle Studies at Karlstad University (reg.no. XXXX/XXX), colloquially referred to as "the doctoral student's manual".*
 - ²² *Bedömningsgrunder för inrättande och avveckling av ämne för utbildning på forskarnivå vid Karlstads universitet (reg.no. C2009/557).*
 - ²³ *Admission Regulations at Karlstad University (reg.no. 2019/916)*

²⁴ Document titled *Riktlinjer för doktoranders institutionstjänstgöring vid Karlstads universitet* C2005/164

²⁵ Vice-chancellor's decision RB 37/14, reg.no. C2020/913.

²⁶ *Digitalisering av blankett för individuella studieplaner, utbildning på forskarnivå* (administrative decision 20/16, reg.no. C2016/547)

²⁷ Decision titled *Grafisk utformning av allmänna studieplaner, forskarutbildning* (reg.no. HNT 2015/1)

²⁸ Document titled *Rutin för tillgodoräknande av forskarutbildningskurs vid HNT* (reg.no. HNT 2019/577)

²⁹ Document titled *Forskningsetisk granskningsprocess vid Karlstads universitet* (RB43/18, reg.no. C2018/100)

³⁰ *Guidance in case of suspected deviations from good research practice.* (RB 43/20, C2020/68)

³¹ *Publishing policy for Karlstads University*, reg.no. C2014/596)

³² *Procedures for Periodic Research Review at Karlstad University* (reg.no. C2020/165)