

Alexander Maurits
Agnes Malmgren

Quality Dialogues with Doctoral Education at the HT faculties, 2024. Outcomes and prioritized follow-up measures

This document presents and discusses the main outcomes from the 2024 quality dialogues (QD) for doctoral education at the HT faculties, including the follow-up measures which are planned as a result of these dialogues. Last year's dialogues were the final ones in a six-year long cycle that ran from 2019 and ended with the theme *perspectives in education*, which related to the following criteria in [LU:s guidelines on quality assurance and development](#):

- gender equality and equal opportunities perspectives are integrated in education.
- subject-relevant perspectives regarding sustainable development are promoted in education
- doctoral students have influence in the planning, execution and follow-up of education.

Prior to the quality dialogues, we asked the departments, the HT libraries and the Humanistic and Theological Doctoral Council (HTDR), to give a written response to a set of questions related to their views on and experience of working with the criteria mentioned. Through these questions, they were tasked with making *an inventory* of perspectives on gender equality, equal opportunity and sustainability within the curriculum of their doctoral education. Furthermore, they were asked to make an assessment and reflect upon the criteria above in relation to the *execution of doctoral education*. When it comes to the execution of doctoral studies, the questions were focused on the admission process with regards to bias, and to the issue of gender equality, equal opportunities and social sustainability in relation to the work and study environment of doctoral students. There was also a set of questions focused on the issue of doctoral students' rights and possibilities to exert influence over their education. Prior to the dialogues, we invited representatives from the departments, HT libraries and HTDR to participate in a workshop where they had the opportunity to exchange experiences on the themes evaluated in 2024.

As usual, separate quality dialogues were held with all departments at the HT faculties, as well as with the HT libraries. Due to the large number of doctoral subjects at the Centre for Languages and Literature (SOL), three dialogues were organized there. In each of the dialogues two doctoral representatives were present: one from HTDR and one from the department. New for this year was that we organized a separate dialogue with HTDR which departed from the councils' written response to a questionnaire tailored after their specific role and competencies.

The departments were encouraged to work collectively on the task of answering the questions for the dialogue, and to include doctoral students in the process. We also emphasized that the written documentation could be submitted in a simple form, for instance as notes from a pre-dialogue discussion within the respective unit or department. Finally, even as we left it to the departments to select the dialogue language, our strong recommendation to use of English as default language in international settings, seems to have paved the way for more dialogues held in English than earlier.

Written up by the programmes director (utbildningsledare) for doctoral education, in close cooperation with the vice-dean for doctoral education, this text draws on the responses to the dialogue questionnaires, notes from the dialogues, and comments and suggestions from the follow-up day for doctoral education, held in January 2025, when an earlier version of the text was discussed. Below, we outline the main outcomes from the dialogues, and offer examples on how different subjects or units think about and deal with these issues. It is important to note that these examples are not representative or exhaustive in relation to the plethora of ideas and opinions circulating in the dialogues, but that they were chosen to illustrate how different issues are tackled or viewed across the HT-faculties. It is also important to underline that issues which are relevant only to specific departments, and which have no obvious bearing on doctoral education at large, are not included in this document.

The outline below is followed by a brief discussion around the dialogue results, and a list of the measures which have been planned as a result of the dialogues.

The dialogue process and format	Examples and comments
<p>In many cases the process was collegial. However, in very small, as well as in larger environments, collegial work with the dialog material is viewed as more difficult to carry out.</p> <p>A few smaller subjects critically assess the meaning of the dialogue process for them. For instance, the questions in the instructions were found to be inadequate in relation to the realities of smaller subjects, with very few doctoral students.</p> <p>More generous time frames would enhance the possibility to work collaboratively on the dialogue topics.</p>	<p>As an example, the document from German states:</p> <p><i>For very small doctoral research subjects like German, it is difficult to meaningfully contribute and participate in the quality dialogue, as the questions and points are raised with significantly larger environments in mind.</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The issues concerning the dialogue process and format is taken into account during the revision of the</p>

<p>In 2024, a few subjects received the instructions with huge delay, due to obstacles to the flow of information. To the affected subjects, this made the process more stressful and less collegial and meaningful.</p> <p>In a handful of subjects, doctoral students were included in the work process prior to the QD, by commenting on the answers given by the departments. Many subjects and doctoral students ask for clarifications regarding the role of the doctoral students in this work and wish to include them more in future QDs.</p> <p>Many subjects appreciate the possibility to hand in the answers to the instructions in a simpler (note-like) format, which was introduced this year.</p> <p>A few subjects ask for the faculties to consider external evaluations in the future, akin to the program conferences on master level. Cross-subject evaluations within the faculty were also suggested in a QD.</p> <p>In a few QDs, the outcome of the dialogues, in terms of action points and follow-up initiatives, were discussed, and the faculties were asked to make these more clear and concrete than they have been in the past.</p>	<p>QD process in 2025. Among other things, this revision aims at making the time frames for the dialogues process more generous (dialogues every second year, more time for follow-up measures, etc.) and for clarifying the role of doctoral students in the QD process. This latter issue all the more important in the light of comments that we received after the dialogues, when doctoral students pointed to a dissonance between how they and their senior colleagues view and experience the themes of the dialogues. Within the current frames of the dialogue process, and given the precarious status of doctoral students, voicing these dissonances remains difficult for doctoral students in some subjects.</p>
<p>Sustainability in the curriculum doctoral education: an inventory</p>	<p>Examples and comments</p>
<p>The definition of sustainability was discussed in many dialogues. A very broad definition was found to encompass most of our activities within doctoral studies at HT; a narrow one to exclude many of them.</p> <p>The notion of <i>key competencies</i> for sustainability, which was introduced in the supplemental instructions to the QDs, was found useful in some of dialogues. These include the ability to collaborate and to think critically and systemically. Some subjects suggested that these competencies, which fall under the category of transferable or generic competences, could be introduced and trained through faculty-driven initiatives geared towards all doctoral students.</p> <p>Many subjects brought forward existing reading courses, course components, seminar series and dissertation projects directly tied to the issue of environmental or social sustainability. Several subjects underlined that sustainability, broadly understood, informs their scientific and educational endeavors.</p>	<p>Examples:</p> <p>At the Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies a seminar series about environmental issues has been organized and run by a doctoral student (as a departmental duty).</p> <p>In English Literature, a reading course was created and given in 2023, on the topic of Environmental Humanities, focused on contemporary writing addressing environmental issues.</p> <p>Education sciences describe their relation to sustainability as follows:</p> <p><i>Educational sciences is a research area that focuses on ensuring learning and development for future generations. The</i></p>

	<p><i>sustainability aspect is always relevant, as well as the societal relevance. Good conditions for learning and teaching are important for all social development, based on citizens having access to good educational opportunities throughout their lives. This perspective is well anchored in educational science, which is not only about children's and students' learning or 3 teacher training but focuses on all learning and education required in our society. Development in our society can only be seen with good educational opportunities, and the focus is on contributing knowledge on how these can be developed and meet future challenges.</i></p> <p>From Slavic as well as Semitic languages, the issue of sustainability was tied to ethical concerns arising from dissertation projects' both dealing with, or being composed during, ongoing wars and conflicts. The situation of the doctoral students affected by these wars was also mentioned.</p>
<p>Gender equality and equal opportunity in the curriculum of doctoral education: an inventory</p>	<p>Examples and comments</p>
<p>Many subjects highlighted reading courses, course components, seminar series, workshops and dissertation projects with a direct relation to the issues of equality and equal opportunity.</p> <p>Several subjects pointed to their orientation towards issues of identity formation, power relations, social inequalities, and how these link to perspectives of gender equality and equal opportunity.</p>	<p>Examples:</p> <p>The Introductory course for doctoral Gender equality and equal opportunity is duly covered in the compulsory Introductory Course at the HT-faculties, according to many QD participants.</p> <p>The course <i>The Inclusive Classroom</i> at AHU (the Division for Higher Education Development) is also mentioned as a positive example of a course where these issues are covered.</p> <p>The Philosophy Department lifted their targeted efforts to handle the male dominance among senior staff, including the hiring of a guest professor with expertise on gender equality.</p>

Open science and good data management	Examples and comments
<p>Nearly all subjects find the libraries' educational efforts within this field laudable.</p> <p>In most subjects, the level of competence within data management is found to be higher among doctoral students than among senior staff. Therefore, the efforts to invite supervisors together with doctoral students to joint meetings with the libraries, are considered useful. However, to this day, this possibility is underused by the supervisors.</p> <p>Doctoral students in a few subjects point to an inequality between those who write monographs and those who write a compilation thesis, whereof the latter group is more likely to develop publication strategies and open science skills.</p> <p>In some QDs, doctoral students ask for a broader variety of targeted workshops dealing with publication strategies, data management, ethics approval and other issues within the expert competencies of the libraries.</p> <p>For some doctoral students, the answer to the question of "what actually constitutes data?" is not entirely clear. Are, for instance, photographs of archived material data?</p> <p>In one QD, the interface of the existing data management plan (DMPonline) is problematized, as it tailored after the needs of natural sciences and medicine, not humanities.</p>	<p>In their QD documentation, the HT libraries make a connection between their work and the issue of sustainability:</p> <p><i>Making research accessible and ensuring its preservation long-term are important aspects of making research sustainable. The library (and archive) works towards making it possible for as many as possible to access research, for as long as possible.</i></p> <p>The libraries also share these reflections:</p> <p><i>(...) there are several factors that affect how much knowledge the doctoral student has gained about e.g. legal frameworks, and handling personal and sensitive personal data, at the end of their studies. One factor may be related to the student's research question and discipline, another may depend on the supervisor, a third, to which extent the student has utilized the resources and support available at the faculties.</i></p> <p>(...)</p> <p><i>Occasionally, when meeting with doctoral students we find directly or indirectly, that they have received conflicting information on a particular matter, such as data collection procedures, data storage, necessary documentation, publishing strategies etc. While we do our best to provide support in the matter at hand, and may refer to the expertise of persons with different advisory roles in our contact network, we find that there are instances where it is not clear how we should proceed or follow up on a matter. Therefore, we believe that more established routines would be useful and beneficial to all parties involved.</i></p>
Bias in the recruitment process	Comments and examples

<p>Most subjects express an awareness of the risk of bias in recruitment, and in some QDs systematic efforts to lower this risk are mentioned, including the usage of external reviewers (along with internal ones), or the open discussion and reflection around potential bias among those recruiting.</p> <p>In many QD, the relevance criteria, which is to be applied during the assessment of candidates, was problematized, as it might contribute to a narrow (and potentially self-interested) selection of the candidates deemed fit for the department.</p> <p>The risk of group-thinking, next to subjective bias, was also put forward in some QD.</p> <p>A few internationally oriented subjects pointed to bias rooted in Western-centric attitudes, language ideals, and preferences towards certain academic traditions.</p> <p>In many QDs, the role of the doctoral representative in the recruitment process was discussed. In some subjects, doctoral students participate actively throughout the whole process; in other subjects their participation is more modest.</p> <p>Some subjects pointed to the risk that doctoral representatives might not be able to freely express their views on the process, in environments dominated by senior staff, including (potentially) their supervisors. Considering this, the faculty was asked to clarify the role of the doctoral representative when it comes to the assessment and recruitment of new doctoral colleagues.</p>	<p>Archeology writes:</p> <p><i>In our last PhD recruitment round we spent considerable time and effort to explicitly address potential bias in recruitment, both at the level of individuals, but also in the dynamics of how the committee went about its work. The members reflected diversity (gender, age, backgrounds, etc.) and were appointed well ahead of time and had full and timely access to the dossiers. The process was well defined in advance in relation to the objective selection criteria set by HT. At the interview stage, each panel member had a standard question that was asked of each candidate in turn to maintain objectivity. The committee did not rank as it interviewed but conducted a final structured evaluation of all candidates at the end. In making the final rankings, the committee paused and engaged together in a shared moment of critical self-reflection to identify any biases that had been overlooked. After that, a decision was made collectively.</i></p>
<p>Sustainability in relation to the execution of doctoral studies. The situation of international doctoral students.</p>	<p>Examples and comments</p>
<p>In most dialogues, the situation of international doctoral students was discussed at length. Many subjects make efforts to ease their transition into Swedish Academia, with tailored information and social activities. At the same time, there is a feeling, repeated across most QDs, that important pieces of information on administrative routines, as well as venues for social interaction, are still lacking, making the first – critical – months of doctoral studies particularly precarious for those doctoral students.</p> <p>The Faculty Offices' efforts to organize welcome days and doctoral breakfasts, as well as to make improvements to home pages and other channels of information, are noted and appreciated, but not found sufficient.</p>	<p>From French comes the following observation regarding the situation of international doctoral students.</p> <p><i>The doctoral students make a reflection that goes beyond the subject of French and the current situation in the field. In their response, the doctoral students highlight the difficulties non-Swedish-speaking doctoral students face regarding integration and well-being, both in social and professional contexts such as lunchrooms and meetings, which are often held in Swedish. The doctoral students question why doctoral students without Swedish language skills are admitted</i></p>

<p>A contributing factor to the situation mentioned above are the language barriers existing within the HT-faculties between non-Swedish-speaking staff and (more and less) Swedish-speaking environments. The consequences of this are well known and range from non-Swedish speakers missing out on crucial information, to having less opportunities for social and professional bonding, and for participating as a doctoral representatives in various boards and boards and working groups at the HT faculties.</p>	<p><i>when they are still expected to participate in meetings held in Swedish, which can lead to them avoiding participation. This also affects representation on boards and supervisory committees, which are dominated by a fairly homogeneous group. Even those who are proficient in conversational Swedish find the language to be a barrier due to the extra effort required.</i></p>
<p>Social sustainability in relation to the execution of doctoral studies: general issues</p>	<p>Comments and examples</p>
<p>In many QDs, <i>sustainability</i> was used as a catchphrase to describe a variety of less sustainable aspects of doctoral education at the HT faculties. These include the discrepancy between ideals of giving a high-quality education and the diminishing resources to actually do so, as well as the “content overload” that results from subjects being asked to introduce new perspectives – such as sustainability – into the curriculum of doctoral education.</p> <p>Considering the expectations put on doctoral students today, regarding the content of their education and the amount and kinds of publications expected from them, the existing time frames of doctoral education were problematized in some QDs.</p> <p>In almost every QD, the existence and significance of in-group solidarity between doctoral students was mentioned, along with the factors that contribute to it; joint social gatherings, writing groups, in-house as well as elsewhere organized workshops, and so forth.</p> <p>Several doctoral students point out that socially strong environments are normally fueled by the enthusiasm of individuals or small collectivities of doctoral students, and therefore run the risk of losing steam, when/if that fuel runs out. In the light of this, the departments/faculties are asked to consider creating formal systems for mentoring and/or other social initiatives that hinge less on the involvement of particular people.</p> <p>Some smaller subjects come across as tightly knit in social terms, but in general the risk of (personal as well as professional) loneliness or even isolation is heightened in environments with few doctoral students and other colleagues.</p> <p>The welcome day and introductory course are viewed as good opportunities to get to know doctoral</p>	

<p>students across the faculties, but these initiatives are concentrated at the very beginning of doctoral studies. Some doctoral students wish to see more faculty-overarching activities for doctoral students.</p> <p>Some subjects point to the dissonance between fostering caring and collegial environments and promoting ideals of “brilliance” and competition.</p> <p>In many QDs, seminars run or co-run by doctoral students are mentioned as a way to enable their inclusion in the research environment and make the seminar format more accessible and allowing for them.</p> <p>Judging from the QDs, it seems that prefects for doctoral education (or equivalent) play an important role in bringing together doctoral students within a department/section, supporting them in their education and helping them find other support at potentially critical moments (for instance from Occupational Health services).</p> <p>Several supervisors, present at the QDs, experience a lack of information about faculty organized activities and administrative “news” around doctoral education. They ask for the faculty to fill this information gap, which would help them give better support to their doctoral students.</p> <p>In a few dialogues, the question of how to involve doctoral students in teaching in a sustainable and meaningful way is discussed, and some subjects are actively working on giving their doctoral students more subject-specific pedagogic training.</p> <p>Social sustainability in relation to the <i>work – life balance</i> of doctoral studies is mentioned in a few dialogues, together with the reflection that these studies are usually carried out in tandem with doctoral students starting a family or going through other life-altering experiences. More understanding for the impact of such events on doctoral students is called for, according to some subjects.</p> <p>In a few QDs, the impact of ongoing wars and conflicts, as well as of political polarization, on doctoral education is discussed, and the faculties are asked to clarify how and if doctoral students and environments affected by this can receive any support.</p>	<p>In the QD documentation from history we learn that:</p> <p><i>A new arrangement starting from the autumn term of 2024 is that the higher seminar will be led by four people, two senior members and two doctoral students (who fulfill this within the framework of ITG). This way, the doctoral students will also be more directly involved in the planning and execution of the important text-reviewing seminar activities.</i></p> <p>In English, the following initiatives have been introduced:</p> <p><i>Our unit has recently had two pedagogical projects where doctoral candidates have been actively involved. The aim with one of the projects was to have doctoral candidates act as co-supervisors of BA theses, together with an experienced supervisor (...). The aim of the second project that involves four staff members and four doctoral candidates is to create a system of pedagogical mentoring that would allow doctoral candidates to receive training and development also as teachers, which will in turn make them more competitive in the academic job market. This initiative was conceived in response to the increasing value that pedagogy has at both HT, and in the academic job market more broadly, and is directly related to drives towards doctoral education for sustainability.</i></p>
<p>Doctoral involvement at the HT Faculties, in HTDR and at subject, departmental level</p>	<p>Examples and comments</p>

<p>While most subjects manifested a supportive stance towards doctoral involvement in HTDR and in different boards and committees, some expressed worry that this might steal focus from their dissertation work.</p> <p>In 2024, the faculty organized a separate dialogue with HTDR for the first time. The main takeaways regarding doctoral involvement, were as follows:</p> <p>Doctoral students were found to experience variation in the amount of information and degree of involvement in influencing their education.</p> <p>This variation depends on the individuals behind the HTDR Working Committee and how active the Committee is in spreading information, strategizing with members, and creating a common environment for student influence.</p> <p>Very little information comes from the departments and faculty office; most information comes at the start of the education, and it is not continuous. Many barriers have been reported in terms of having access to this information and understanding the process of doctoral influence.</p> <p>One of the major issues that HTDR works on is language accessibility, which is closely related to doctoral students' access to professional and social networks, and to their overall well-being. Furthermore, as HTDR caters to a population of doctoral students which partly consists of non-native speakers of Swedish, doctoral representation cannot be discussed without a careful look into the issue of language accessibility.</p> <p>The continuation and sustainable functioning of the HTDR council as a whole was found to be a major concern in the dialogue. Due to existing barriers, finding representatives for different functions is found difficult. HTDR therefore asked the faculty to help create more advantageous working conditions for working committee members, so more people join and stay for more than one year.</p> <p>Suggestions for ways to enhancing the conditions of HTDR included: employing a doctoral student, part time, and giving them the task of running the daily operations of HTDR; providing HTDR with its own room for storage and meetings; put more emphasis HTDR:s contribution to doctoral education, as find more tangible – symbolic but also formal – ways of</p>	<p>In relation to the issue of doctoral involvement, it is important to note that this was not sufficiently discussed in many of the dialogues, where we should have asked more about <i>how</i> doctoral students are informed about their right to exert influence over their education at subject, department and faculty level. Therefore, we see a need to follow up on this issue in the next cycle of quality dialogues.</p> <p>In their QD documentation (based on a meeting with doctoral students who were invited broadly), HTDR writes:</p> <p><i>It is crucial then that the faculty office collaborates with HTDR more closely, knowing who is in which position and what are vacant positions, trying to help to disseminate information at different moments and different levels. Public valuing and supporting doctoral representative work are also crucial.</i></p>
--	---

<p>valuing doctoral representatives, for instance by issuing certificates which would highlight the transferable skills honed through doctoral involvement.</p>	
<p>Other issues that were discussed in the dialogues</p>	<p>Examples and comments</p>
<p>Some QDs touched upon shifting conditions for, and visions surrounding, doctoral education, related to their embeddedness in different forms of financing (faculty/external) and organization (within the framework of a doctoral research school or not).</p> <p>In some QDs the (potential) clash between international mobility and sustainable ways of travelling were discussed. Participants in one QD noted that doctoral students are more prone to experience “flight shame” than senior colleagues. It was discussed if sustainable travel could be incentivized, for instance by increasing the “allocated funds” (ograduerade medel) for doctoral students who chose sustainable modes of transportation.</p> <p>The issue of extensions of doctoral education, due to departmental duties, sicknesses, doctoral representation and other reasons, was touched upon in nearly every dialogue. A request was geared towards the faculties to promptly look over and revise the procedures regarding extensions and make them transparent for all parties involved. This also includes bringing transparency to the amount of extension that is granted for different kinds of doctoral representation.</p> <p>Several issues with the Varbi system were mentioned in the QDs, including the problem that applicants could only chose between two genders and that the nationality of the applicants is immediately visible to the reviewers.</p>	<p>In relation to the issue of shifting conditions for doctoral education, the Department of Archeology and Ancient History wrote:</p> <p><i>The issue is that quite different (contradictory?) visions of a PhD trajectory have now emerged: (a) it is a generic training programme where students complete a large number of taught courses, gain credits, professional experience and other skills; OR (b) it is a transition to an independent research career where students need to in-dependently produce a coherent and original contribution to knowledge through publication of either a book or collection of journal papers (i.e. they are awarded a PhD and then move into a future career of their choosing). One problem for new PhDs is that the two different visions easily become confused, especially as they start their trajectory at HT. They are furthermore incentivized by HT through salary increments to accumulate courses and credits early on, which can delay progress on their core research activities. At a certain point, this raises issues about overall completion rates, including how many PhD finish within four years, versus finish in 5 years, or suffer terminal delays that may never be fully resolved.</i></p>

Concluding remarks

The theme for 2024 year’s dialogues concerned major issues which can be understood and researched in multiple ways, across different disciplines. When applied to the concrete realities of doctoral education at the HT faculties, it is striking how this theme echoes discussions, insights and challenges which have been present in the dialogues since the very beginning of this quality cycle. For instance, language barriers are still an issue in many departments, as is the risk of doctoral students missing out socially and professionally in some HTs smaller subjects. Building community and solidarity among doctoral students, preferably with support from the faculties and departments, is the best way to combat this risk, according to the data from the dialogues. However, since these communities are normally fueled by the enthusiasm of individuals or small

collectivities, they are vulnerable to changes in the composition of the doctoral student population. Considering this lingering situation, one of the prioritized follow-up measures after the 2024 dialogues, presented below, directly addresses subjects where the risk of not having sufficient access to social and professional networks became visible through the dialogues. In general, we find from the dialogues that the quality work begs for a more systematic approach to the various issues that keep presenting themselves as the faculties and the departments meet to discuss doctoral education.

A few issues that were lifted in the dialogues come across as novel, or at least worth an extra mention in this document. One of them concerns the situation of supervisors, who pointed to their lack of insight into the information that flows from the faculties to doctoral students, during welcome days, doctoral breakfasts, the introductory course, and through other channels. Being let in on this information, as well as having a forum to discuss these and other aspects of supervision, would strengthen the supervisors' ability to guide their doctoral students through their education. As a direct result of this input, special gatherings for supervisors were introduced and are planned to be held once or twice a semester, where we will share information, exchange "best practice ideas", and offer a space for informal conversations about the role of supervisors and the situation of doctoral students.

Our first separate dialogue with HTDR also deserves to be noted, even if many of the issues which it covered were already known to the faculties. However, our previous knowledge was of a fragmented kind, whereas the dialogue gave a fuller picture of the challenges that HTDR is facing, ranging from the stressful working conditions for its leadership, via difficulties with recruiting new representatives, to the lack of means (time, a physical location, sufficient support from the faculties and the departments) to build a sustainable organization. Two of our prioritized follow-up measures directly address and seek to enhance the situation of HTDR. The result of these measures will be monitored in the quality evaluations to come, as we plan to introduce separate dialogues with HTDR as a permanent element of our quality work.

When this document is finalized, we are in the midst of revising our quality assurance model for HT's education at all levels. The special working group which is involved in this process has been informed about and discussed the merits and the shortcomings of the previous quality cycle. An obvious, but sometimes overlooked, merit is the aggregated knowledge that the faculties gather throughout the dialogues about the different ways in which doctoral education is carried out and experienced across the faculties. However, this knowledge tends to be of a rather thin and general kind and, as we have seen, it repeats itself across the dialogues. This, in turn, attests to the shortcomings of the previous quality system, which range from the ways in which the dialogue themes have been formulated and operationalized, to the (generally) low effectiveness of proposed follow-up measures. With these shortcomings in mind, the revised system for quality assessment will allow for more time to formulate, plan, carry out and follow-up dialogue themes, as well as to adapt and tailor these steps in accordance with the situation in and needs of different departments. It will also make clear the responsibilities of all involved parties regarding participation in the dialogues and local implementation of the and agreed follow-up measures. Ideally, the dialogues ahead will build on and contribute to a body of accumulating – faculty general and

department specific – knowledge which will be useful in HT's continuing efforts to offer high-quality doctoral education.

Prioritized follow-up measures after the 2024 dialogues

The annual follow-up day after the dialogues was held on January 14th 2025, and it gathered persons responsible for doctoral educations at the departments, HT librarians, doctoral representatives and staff from the Faculty office. During this day, data from the dialogues was discussed and follow-up measures were prioritized. Below is a list of the follow-up measures which are planned as a result of the dialogues in 2024. It is important to keep in mind that while some of these measures will be planned and implemented shortly, others will have to await the fall to be initiated, since the spring of 2025 is largely filled with work related to the revision of the quality system.

Follow-up measure	Who is responsible for implementing it?
The role of the doctoral representative in the recruitment process of applicants to doctoral studies is to be looked over and clarified. Guidelines regarding this role are to be provided to doctoral students.	The programmes director together with vice-dean for doctoral studies
The language situation of doctoral students is to be addressed and included when the faculties implement the action points on language in the Action Plan for Gender Equality, Equal Opportunity and Diversity	The vice-dean for doctoral studies with support from the programmes director
In line with the Action Plan for Gender Equality, Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the departments are tasked with looking over and adapting their language practices with regards to non-Swedish-speaking doctoral students.	The departments are responsible for looking over and adapting their language practices, whereas the programmes director follows up the result of this task.
A meeting with representatives from "small subjects" is to be held, to exchange ideas on how to ensure a good working environment and access to professional networks within them.	The vice-dean and programmes director for doctoral studies, together with the departments and/or subjects who are targeted by this measure.
Doctoral students are to be offered the opportunity to present their research at the LUX lunch seminar series.	The programmes director together with the communication officers at the Faculty office
Gatherings for supervisors are to be initiated and held 1-2 times per semester. These gatherings aim at sharing information and exchanging experiences related to supervision and doctoral education.	The vice-dean and programmes director are responsible for organizing the meetings. The Reference group for doctoral education helps spread the information and encourage colleagues to participate.
Issues with Varbi are to be looked over and, to the extent that it is possible, solved.	The faculty office

A plan on how to solve the problems with extensions of doctoral education is to be written up and implemented	The vice-dean for doctoral studies together with the faculty office
A proposal is to be composed regarding how the faculties can put light on and – symbolically and formally – strengthen the value of doctoral involvement in HTDR and other bodies.	The vice-dean for doctoral education together with the programmes director
A document is to be issued in which HTDR highlights its current situation and proposes how to improve it. This document is to be commented upon by the vice-dean of doctoral education and the programmes director, whereafter it will be presented at a suitable instance at the HT faculties.	HTDR with support from the vice dean and the programmes director for doctoral education
The HT Libraries will develop additional educational activities for doctoral students, on matters related to open science, data management, and publication strategies, based on the needs and/or requests of the HT Faculties.	The HT libraries, with support from the programmes director and the Reference group for doctoral education.
A list of remaining pedagogical and organizational issues, lifted at the dialogues, is to be composed and the further handling of these issues is to be discussed at the Reference group for doctoral education	The programmes director together with the Reference group for doctoral education

Follow-up measures from earlier dialogues

Next to the follow-up measures planned as a result of the 2024 dialogues, we are working on activities which were planned after dialogues in previous years, as follows:

Follow-up measure	Who is responsible for implementing it?
Workshops on careers outside of Academia are to be organized in the Fall of 2025, with the participation of invited experts.	The programmes director, in cooperation with the vice-dean for doctoral studies.
The reference guide and other channels of information are to be updated and made more reader friendly	The Faculty office