DS Board Meeting #VT16-6, 2016-09-09

Time: 14.00 – 17.00  
Place: Luftbryggan A810, MC2 building, Chalmers

Attendance:
Linnea Qvirst (Chair), Elke Miercema (secretary), Naghmeh Taghavi (adopting minutes), Jonas Sundell, Maria Ekstrom, Oskar Thulin, Silvia Tuzi, Cristina Rigaio, Sanjuk Menon, Gunnar Orn Simonarsson, Marco Longillis, Joahn Wendel, Joakim Strandberg, Anna Kohler, Onur Kaya

Not attending: Tomasz Kosinski

§1. Opening of meeting
Linnea opens the meeting.

§2. Approval of agenda
Agenda approved with additions:
Work contracts for new PhD's only up to Licentiate.

§3. Election of meeting officials
Elected chair: Linnea Qvirst
Elected secretary: Elke Miedems
Elected to adopt minutes: Naghmeh Taghavi

§4. Meeting notice in due order
Meeting notice was in due order.

§5. Meeting notes
Previous meeting notes from GA meeting and board meeting in May still need to be signed and send out.

§6. Activity division
Last meeting the activity division was decided, though some changes need to be made:

Election Committee - Naghmeh will be added and will take over Elke and her tasks when needed.

Newsletter - Sanjuk will replace Johan

Internationalisation - Christina will take this up, though right now it is unclear what this will be due to the chair's (Gustavo) health issues. Linnea will contact Gustavo on continuation and planning.

Rakesh (computer science, CSE) will no longer be part of the DS. Unfortunately, he had to step down. We should try one more time to get a new representative for the computer science department. Though next year we will be more actively recruiting at Computer Science.

Linnea will save the activity list on Box.

§7. Key topics from committees
In the key topics we will discuss all the different activities in the DS Board.

AIK – Onur
First meeting has happened. Within AIK they discussed a career development project evaluating 20 male and 20 female doctoral students.

Also the AIK discussed the results of the employee survey. Onur has all the results, but argues that it would be good to invite someone (probably Johanna) to one of the DS meetings to present the results. The DS agrees and Onur will invite them for an upcoming meeting. In general, the results were positive (over 70% in all questions).

Also we discussed how much Onur needs to be at the AIK meetings. The meetings are not always relevant for the DS if no PhD topics are raised. The hours spent there might be better to so spend for other activities. The proposal is that Onur will check the agenda and read the notes, then attends (part of the) meeting when relevant.

Linnea will check what the requirements for DS attendance in AIK are.
Chalmers AB board – Oskar

No meeting so far this semester. The last one was held in early June and that was the yearly strategy meeting, focused at positioning Chalmers for the future.

The board was presented the result from a brand survey detailing prospective students' view about Chalmers. Based on the result, the board discussed how Chalmers could be made a viable option for a more diverse group of prospective students. This would lead to a larger pool of talents applying to Chalmers, leading to an even more talented group of students starting at Chalmers every year. The importance that females and individuals from deprived neighbourhoods, in a larger extent than today, starts seeing Chalmers as a possible path was discussed. Further, it was also discussed that Chalmers should market itself as a place for world-improvers and creative people, more than what currently is being done.

DS made sure to add to the discussion that the lack of positive academic/engineering role models for young individuals is not only a problem in areas that usually come to mind when deprived neighbourhoods are mentioned. It is also a challenge on the countryside and in cities with no strong academic tradition. DS also commented on the importance that all individuals are treated independent of gender, ethnicity etc., and not as representatives of their attributes, when dealing with these questions.

Elke commented on that the discussion reminds of organised seminars organised which are not physically accessible for people in a wheelchair, even though the topic of the seminar is closely related to them. Example at architecture; Lic seminar about safety, but no access for people with disability.

Charm – Joakim & Silvia.

No meetings yet. Hand-over has happened and contacts have been made.

CKI – Cristina

Cristina is introduced to the CKI board, though the board is currently not active. Gustavo, the initiator and chair of the CKI is still on sick leave. It was decided that Christina will ask for a meeting to get some clarity, and Linnea will contact Gustavo on continuation and planning.

Home page – Thomas

Thomas (responsible) was not present, and nothing was sent out by him to mention.

There are still some difficulties with being able to see the DS calendar. This needs to be solved.

DS calendar is connected to SIACK.

Linnea will send around (again) how to add activities. Also she will add the upcoming meetings with the place, and responsibilities.

Elke will also send out the PhD Pub & Introduction day dates.

Faculty council – Joakim

First Faculty council meeting was a workshop like start for the year. Different terms of research misconduct on a general level have been discussed. Defining what it is, and ideas to prevent it.

It is brought up that some sort of exchange of knowledge with the research ethics GTS course might be relevant.

Also it is a question of if students get specific information on plagiarism by others on their PhD work. This could be plagiarism within the research group, or outside the department. It is argued that while important, this issue does not fall under our responsibility, and we should not take that responsibility.

Though it is mentioned that Chalmers has specific lawyers that are specialized in this, specifically to protect Chalmers' work. It is suggested that we should ask for this information to be available online on the website for instance. Linnea will first search for what she can already find, and asks for the missing information on this topic to be made available.

Linked to the topic of ownership of work we discussed the rights of doctoral students and their ownership on their work. Specifically, patent rights or trade secrets are things that doctoral students should be aware of when discussing confidentiality of their work.

Next meeting will be on October 4th. There are 4 meetings per semester in total.

FUN - Linnea/Anna

No handover and no meetings yet. The first one will be in few weeks before our next meeting.

Some highlights from before.

- They are currently moving all publications from CPL to the 'research portal'.
- Popular science description on book of thesis should be in both Swedish and English but you can choose which one will be on the printed version. Both versions will be online to read, though the Journal version is specifically important for journalist.
- A presentation course to help prepare the popular presentation is added to the GTS courses. More people should have done the popular presentation now, since it is introduced since 2012. It is questioned whether it might be hard to find for people what it should be exactly. Also the examples now to be found are often in Swedish. Joakim directs us to the GTS page that explains the requirements and process of the popular presentation.
- There is now officially free course exchange between GU and Chalmers students. This does not count for the GTS courses since they are often already full.
- Every doctoral student should have yearly follow up talk with supervisor combined with head of PhD studies. AND an employee meeting. These are not the same.
- There will be a workgroup to work on the Individual Study Plan.

Introduction Day – Elke

New dates for the introduction are known; the first one will be on November 11th.
DOMB should be invited by Eline (done).

Also last year we got some comments on our video quality. Britt-Marie Anderson had suggested that maybe they (from TV) could help us to make a better version. Eline will see if this is still open for discussion, and will have a proposal send out before the next meeting to get some money/time from it.

Also Eline stresses the importance of not overwhelming the students that day, there is only one point to make: we are there for you.

The presentation should give us some examples of what we do, but the main point should be clearest.

Investigation departmental work – Naghneh

There remain issues around departmental work for PhD's specifically on local department level. For instance; some departments now have no hours for administrative work. The local boards asked what they can do about it. We advise to keep discussing where those hours should be placed.

Also there are still discussion on the 20% teaching. Which is a maximum during the full PhD. Which allows you to take up to 1 year of time on teaching maximum during the PhD. This does not imply you have to teach/do department work 20% of your time. This might have consequences for your final date.

Comment: “If there are different contracts, it should be clearly communicated amongst PhD and department heads.” The DS could help highlight this maybe.

Also we should argue for fairness in counting departmental hours. For instance, different ratios of preparation time and lecture time differs between divisions sometimes. The same is valid when starting to teach a course, versus repeating a known course/lecture.

Unfortunately, these issues cannot be focused on if we don’t have money to do so. We did not get the funding we applied for, but we can try again in Fall. Which should also be our prime focus for the committee of departmental work.

Suggestions: Maybe something about the department work should be added in the employee survey.

ISP

Right now waiting to be contacted by Lena Wall.

Library council –Nohan

Handover meeting has happened, though minimal so far. No information on if there is a meeting coming up.

Nohan shall look up the contact person in the Excel list (Box Drive) and contact them to ask for the planning.

Election committee

Rakesh from computer science department has left. We shall have to email Fatemeh one more time for a replacement.

Otherwise we will search again next year.

Newsletter – Sankar / Marco

The aim is to have 3 letters this year, including all webpage items. We already have some material to be send out; Supervisor of the year, GTS courses.

Also the last two newsletters are on the website and should also be added on the page that includes most recent letters.

Introductions to some of the members should be added to the newsletters and also to be shared on Facebook. The next introduction can be to the new chair (Linnea). Sankar will send out the template.

PHD satisfaction – Onur

Onur has not been updated, though he knows some things from last year’s presentations. Right now the focus should be on finding out in which departments there were no seminars organized, and focus on those.

Departments are responsible for paying for the lunch/fika.

Research foundation – Christina & Gunnar

Hand over meeting took place, though no invitation for upcoming meetings so far.

Questions: Can we apply for the research funding? We can apply, though we cannot be in the room when discussing the specific proposal.

Research misconduct – Jonas

Currently waiting for meeting invite.

SACO – wage negotiations – Jonas

Currently we are continuing the negotiations with special attention to the seminar after 50% of the process and the wage increase after 50% of the process time i.e. when the increase in salary should take place. In the discussion in the meeting there was a proposal to retroactively raise the wage after the licentiate thesis to make up for the 'lost' salary. Also there where suggestions for an obliged 50% seminar (besides the Licentiate) that would be at 50% of the time. Also an alternative was to connect the evaluation for salary raise more to the study plan, though this would make the credit counting very important and possibly hard to measure.

As DS we think the retrospective wage increase after the licentiate is a good idea. The link to the study plan seems hard in practice and also delimits the evaluation to quantitative data, while we discuss it should include qualitative information. Also DS thinks it is important to address that the delay is regularly not due to the student, though could be due to external factors. The student should not be held back on wage because a supervisor got sick or unable to suggest an opponent in time.

SFS-DK – Maria

Postponed
Social activities – Elke
We discussed whether this should still have a focus and hours. It is decided that the hours are used for communication of social events at the different departments so that other PIIs could join as well. Also the hours are used for drop-in lunches.

Supervisor of the year – Tomasz, Gunnar, Nahmeh
No updates. Linnea suggests to already make a time plan and update the existing plan, and start early since it takes much time.

The Deadline is in December but maybe it will be moved to earlier. The group cannot nominate their supervisor.

§8. Plan of operations - Linnea
The plan of Operations was heavily revised and discussed last year, and only had some small comments on the renewed version. Things that still should be changed will be the part on the DOMB where the focus shifts from finding one, to supporting the DOMB.

We need to rephrase paragraph 4.3 about Individual Study Plan. Oskar will help rephrase this.

Status 5.2 on visa issues is that not much is happening. It is still quite unclear, and handled case by case. The background is Non-European PhD students were not able to get a permanent residency and citizenship. There is a Facebook page "equality for foreign PhDs in Sweden" about this where students can discuss and support each other.

§9. Financial – Maria
Maria explained how we get paid. It happens 4 times a year. She will remind all members to fill in a form that she needs for the administration.

• Fill in the bank data, including your clearing number.
• Fill in the dates and number of hours, and the activity. (please pick from correct one)
• Make sure you have enough hours in the budget
• The comments are for you and Maria to remember what you have done

Please note if you have not spent hours, so Maria knows. If you forget to report the hours, you might not get paid for them later due to statistic and administrative reasons. The year changes when the board switches. If you are in an activity together with another representative, split the hours and don’t use more than what is agreed upon.

Secondly, the financial document was explained.

The columns give activities and committees with planned and actual hours based on previous years. Some activities might be lowered along the year. For instance, it is planned as all members will be present at all meetings, though this will probably not be the case.

§10. Actions from last meeting
There were not many tasks on the list.

Linnea - Descriptions of working groups is requested
From last activity year, Fatemeh started collecting descriptions of committees to be posted on the webpage. Status: still missing. It should be done by the one responsible for the committee last year. Otherwise we would need to wait until new members know what to write. Tomasz will upload the information and see what Fatemeh has from last year.

Onur – Healthcare service should be as “feel good” for employees which your boss needs to be notified and “akademihälsan” is for students. Onur will check if PhD students can go to akademihälsan and try to get in writing that PhD’s can come to akademihälsan.

§11. Other issues
PhD contracts
There are some issues at local departments on new PhD contracts. Specifically, new PhD’s only get a contract up to licentiate instead of 1+2+2 years like others. The question is if it is allowed from central level or not and if there is a Chalmers policy or only at the local department. This is not only an issue for the employment, but also has consequences for the possibility to get a home loan etc.

It is not a Chalmers policy and actually in another departments it (this type of contract) is only possible if students ask for it. Jonas will bring this up to SACO.

Linnea will help in this issue, Nahmeh will send some more background on the case.

We will check the official document and contact the Chalmers HR on their view.

Speaking Swedish for foreign PhD’s
International doctoral students are often asked to be able to teach in Swedish at Bachelor level courses. Though there is little support for them that would like to have Swedish courses. We could argue if teaching in bad Swedish or better English would but better, though when we want the full bachelor to be Swedish and this includes the international doctoral students. What are the general ideas on learning Swedish in the departments? Do the departments fund the courses, or do they give credits or hours for Swedish courses? Are there specific courses in teaching in Swedish? Linnea will lift it up with Mats Viberg.

It could maybe be interesting to follow intensive courses in Swedish before the PhD starts. This could even be paid for by Chalmers, or could be in the time of Chalmers. Possibly getting credits for it, since now the credits will not be transferred into look.
§12. Closing of the meeting

Linnée closed the meeting.

§13. TO DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible person(s)</th>
<th>Status/deadline:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting notes previous time still need to be signed</td>
<td>Previous secretary, chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Gustavos on continuation internationalization</td>
<td>Linnée</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for PHD representative from Computer Science, contact Fatemeh</td>
<td>Election board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIK – need for attending 100% meetings</td>
<td>Onur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite someone to present the results of the employee survey</td>
<td>Onur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview what departments have not had a PHD satisfaction seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check how to add activities to DS calendar</td>
<td>Linnée</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add the upcoming meetings with the place, and responsibilities, to common calendar</td>
<td>Linnée</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add the PHD Pub &amp; Introductions on day dates to common calendar</td>
<td>Elke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for research misconduct information on institute and link from DS web page</td>
<td>Linnée</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look up the contact person library council to ask for upcoming meetings</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template for DS member introduction for newsletter</td>
<td>Sankar to Linnée</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place newest newsletters on webpage DS</td>
<td>Thomasz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change plan of operations</td>
<td>Linnée with help of Oskar,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take task from notes, and assign them if possible</td>
<td>Elke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To add descriptions of committees on the webpage: Which are still missing? Add the available ones.</td>
<td>Thomasz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can PHD's go to akademihälsan?</td>
<td>Onur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should something about the department work be added in the employee survey?</td>
<td>Onur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatures:

[Signatures]

Chair, Linnée Opitzer

Secretary, Elke Miedema

Adopting minutes, Naghineh Taghavi