**PhD Council Meeting**

28 May 2021, Zoom

**Present:** Rose Boyle, Emma Brandon, Hanna Furuseth, Martine Lie, Trygve Losnedahl

**Agenda**

1. PFF meeting 2 June, Hanna attends.

* Orientation from last meeting
  + Guidelines for article-based theses
    - Good discussion at last PFF meeting
    - Question was raised on whether the number of articles should be different for criminologists than lawyers
    - Ended up with minimum 3 articles for everyone
  + Apply for funding for social events
    - Hanna waiting to hear for more details on the funding process
    - We should apply for as many events as we can
    - We can estimate that at least 25 people will attend the event in June
    - Ask for money for three events
      * June, August, October
    - Calculate three drinks per person (beer, wine, non-alcoholic options)
    - Also ask for money for food (e.g. ordering pizza)
    - Social events can be combined with informational/academic events to make them more interesting to us and to the administration - Trygve
    - This funding can set a precedent for future councils
    - Emma will estimate how much funding we need
    - Hanna will write up a brief application
* PhD course evaluations
  + 1st and last forms listed in the PFF agenda seem to be the best
  + Should include a question on digital teaching
  + Should include a question on whether the teaching was adequate
  + Christina Voigt still hasn’t sent out evaluations for her recent course
  + We should ask PFF when the last in-depth evaluation of courses/ the PhD program was done
  + Discussing evaluations in PFF once they’ve been filled out
* PhD course on publishable article
  + What’s the point when you’re writing an article-based thesis?
  + Can the article be part of your thesis?
  + Hanna will ask about article from your thesis
  + What is the purpose of this course for those writing article-based theses? – Martine and Emma
* Disputas
  + Should we continue recorded trial lecture and digital defense?
  + Nice to keep streaming the defense even if it’s in person– Rose
  + Streaming in opponents might be less of a nice thing to keep? - Emma
  + Generally, in favor of giving the PhD candidates options

1. Faculty board meeting 14. June (no case list yet).
   * Will probably be mostly about the faculty strategy - Martine
   * Will discuss over email once we have the case list
2. Thoughts on the meeting with the deans?
   * Bringing up course evaluations helped because Raghnild talked about the quality evaluation
   * Discussion of getting information to PhDs was more difficult
   * Focus on individual assessments for PhD extensions was surprising and there could be more general rules – Trygve
   * We can use the recent petition on COVID issues to back us up in PFF meetings – Hanna
     + UiODoc is part of the union that created the petition so they should have the results and we can ask at the meeting next week – Rose
   * We should send out a questionnaire to the PhDs at the law faculty on COVID-related issues – Martine
     + General agreement
     + Emma can draft a quick questionnaire
   * Wait and see if Rose gets the promised email to the new PhDs with information
     + Hanna will reach out to Gørill if the email doesn’t come soon
3. Social Event June 25
   * Current regulations allow it
   * 18 RSVPs yes and 7 tentative
   * Emma will be on a plane during the event so the other Council members will be in charge of getting drinks/snacks
   * Emma will reserve the room next to the terrace and send an email with an update to the guests
   * See discussion of orientation from last PFF meeting for info on applying for funding
4. Update from Committee on the National PhD seminar
   * No news and no new meeting time set - Trygve
   * Email Trygve if you have suggestions for speakers or topics
   * Using verdicts/judgments as data and GDPR is a good topic– Martine
   * People involved in recent climate judgments would be interesting – Trygve
   * ¼ of program will be on how to write a PhD thesis
   * Recently finished PhDs – Emma
     + John Todd – Martine
5. Hearing, LiMU’s action plan on Diversity, equality and inclusion, 2021-2023:
   * They haven’t taken on board many of our comments but the new draft is an improvement - Rose
   * They have not taken on board the English language issue - Rose
   * Good that they took away the idea of acting as headhunters to find more diverse candidates - Rose
   * Nothing about obligatory diversity training, in particular for course leaders – Rose
   * Information on where to report sexual harassment should also be sent to students - Rose
   * Importance of including temporary staff on all committees - Martine
   * Rose will write short feedback to LIMU focusing on staff concerns as that is who we represent
   * Attending the hearing unnecessary because we already gave our comments through Rose – Martine
6. Dinner with the former council
   * Have it in August when Emma has returned from the U.S. and everyone has returned from July vacations
7. Plans for the fall
   * Date for the Annual Meeting (October).
     + Mid-October
     + Invitation to be sent out three weeks before the Annual Meeting
     + Annual report sent out prior to the meeting
   * Event in August on the final stages of the PhD process and the job search
8. UiODoc interfaculty council meeting 2nd June.
   * Everyone can attend even though Martine, Rose and Emma were the only ones directly invited
   * Covid situation is our most important topic – Martine
   * We should ask if they have been in contact with UiO centrally about COVID issues
   * More automatic extensions for COVID could be at the University-level and go through UiODoc
9. Discussion: What can/ should the PhD Council do if/when PhDs express dissatisfaction with working conditions et al. (often department and not faculty issues)? - What should our role be, with regards to both assistance in individual cases and collective issues? What if any recourse do we potentially have in these scenarios?
   * Many issues brought to us by PhDs relate to working conditions/environment - Rose
   * What is the role of the PhD council at the department level? - Rose
     + We generally don’t work at the department level but instead at the faculty level
     + Our niche is dealing with policy-level questions not specific individual complaints
     + Being generally more visible at departments and other places could help PhDs
   * What to do if people come to us with a personal issue? - Rose
     + Tell them who to speak to at the department or other level
     + Tell them that we work at the faculty level
   * What is the Union role? – Trygve
     + Hanna seconds that these kind of issues should be handled by unions
     + Is there a group for temporary staff within Forskerforbundet?
       - Trygve can reach out to them and see
   * Committee on working environment that we are not involved in
     + Called LAMU
     + Run by Prof. Mads Andenaes
     + Potentially inactive
     + We should try to get on it

**Action items**

* Emma calculates budgets for events
* Hanna writes short application for funding
* Emma drafts brief questionnaire on COVID to send to PhDs
* Hanna emails Gørill about introductory email to new PhDs if it isn’t sent out soon
* Emma reserves room and sends out email update for June social event
* Rose sends short feedback on LIMU strategy
* Martine figures out what is happening with LAMU?

**Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm by Martine Lie.

Minutes submitted by: Emma Brandon