**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