

PhD Council Meeting

4 May 2021, Zoom

Present: Rose Boyle, Emma Brandon, Hanna Furuseth, Martine Lie

Agenda

1. PFF meeting 5. May, Hanna attends.
 - a. Orientation from last meeting.
 - b. Upcoming cases
 - i. <https://www.uio.no/for-ansatte/enhetssider/jus/ledelses-og-utvalgsmoter/pff/moter/2021/PFF%20050521/sakskart.html>
 - ii. BEYOND project PhD position possibly too tailored because of Bengal language (Hanna)
 - iii. note in particular case A3 on guidelines for article-based dissertations
 1. Importance of justifying relationship between articles (Martine)
 2. Question of which journals to be published in (Martine)
 3. But maybe the quality of the article is what matters not where it's published (Hanna and Emma)
 4. Expand on what a good article entails (Rose)
 5. Limit on number of articles is important because there is uncertainty now (Hanna)
 6. Current language seems to allow for articles written/published 5 years before your PhD contract
 7. Issue of unfairness between people writing monographs and articles (Hanna and Emma)
 8. Issue of allowing people to just use previous research and possibly not work enough to justify salary (Emma)
 9. Issue of discouraging people from exploring a different area of research in their PhD than their Masters (Martine)
 10. But also important to publish lots of articles (Rose)
 11. Including pre-PhD articles makes the PhD like a doctor philos that you get paid for (Hanna)
 12. But there may be circumstances where it makes sense to include pre-PhD articles so there should be exceptions (Rose and agreed to by all)
 - iv. Confusion over whether we are already conducting systematic evaluation of PhD courses (Hanna)
 1. Reassess of the program every 5th year now
 2. Some in PFF under impression that PhDs fill out evaluation forms for all courses but that is not true
 3. Do they ever change things after evaluation?
 4. An issue to discuss at meeting with deans



2. Thoughts on meeting between PhDs and Gørill and Vibeke?
 - a. Suggestion from other PhDs: Outdoor social event. Should we perhaps try to organise something in May or June?
3. Update from committee on the national seminar.
 - a. Will be December 1-3
 - b. Primarily in English but with Norwegian group discussions (Trygve via Martine)
 - c. No overarching theme (Trygve via Martine)
 - d. One theme will be perspectives on using verdicts as data (Trygve via Martine)
 - i. Privacy and verdicts (Trygve via Martine)
 - ii. Importance of using verdicts in qualitative analysis (Martine)
 - e. Next committee meeting in June (Trygve via Martine)
4. Any news from LiMU?
 - a. Meeting on strategy recently (Rose)
 - b. More detailed strategy coming soon (Rose)
 - c. Not sure when next meeting (Rose)
 - d. Issue of expanding mentorship program to men (Hanna)
 - i. PFF say they have agreed to expand but LIMU is in charge of it (Hanna)
 - ii. LIMU say it's no longer in their mandate if its open to men because it is no longer addressing inequality (Hanna and Rose)
 - iii. Rose will bring it up at LIMU
 - iv. PFF or someone else could take over the expanded mentorship program
5. Events:
 - a. Thoughts on the digital event with Johan and Rune?
 - a. Generally positive feedback from the Council
 - b. Arrange a new event with former PhDs? When?
 - a. John Todd from IKRS could be good speaker (Martine and Rose)
 - b. Astrid Iverson could also be a good speaker (Martine)
 - c. Might be useful to focus this event more than the last one so that it is not repetitive (Emma)
 - d. Potential focus on early in the PhD process (Hanna and Emma), or defence/disputation (Martine)
 - e. Have next event in August unless we can't do the outdoor event in June
 - f. If we can't do outdoor event in June, we can do a more social Zoom event like a quiz (Emma and Martine)
 - g. Discussed possibility of event on obtaining funding but decided that it was not entirely within our mandate
 - h. Event on funding could be a collaboration with postdocs and the departments (Rose)
 - i. Rose is willing to moderate a future event if Emma is unavailable
 - c. Social event outside – any thoughts?
 - a. PhDs at Monday meeting really wanted chance to socialize (Hanna)
 - b. Current regulations only allow for up to 10 people (Emma)

- c. Wait until we can gather more than 10 people
 - d. Set tentative date in future (mid-June)
 - e. Send out email with tentative date soon and hope the regulations cooperate
 - f. Meeting on DJ rooftop terrace
 - g. Thomas and Heidi offered to help plan (Hanna)
6. Meeting with the deans. When? What should be our agenda?
- a. Martine will email Vibeke and Gørill for the dates
 - b. We can discuss agenda after we have the dates
 - c. Hanna brought up discussing systematic evaluation
7. Dinner with the former council
- a. Postpone further?
 - a. Yes

If time:

8. Discussion: Several PhDs expressing dissatisfaction with working conditions et al. - what should the Council's role be/what can the Council do, with regards to both assistance in individual cases and collective issues? What if any recourse do we potentially have in these scenarios? Postponed.

Action items

- Martine emails Vibeke and Gørill about meeting with deans
- Emma contacts Council to find good date for June event
- Emma emails PhDs with tentative date for June event

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 am by Martine Lie.

Minutes submitted by: Emma Brandon