

## Meeting minutes: DS Board Meeting #VT22-5, 2022-05-24

**Time:** 13.00 - 16.00

**Place:** Delta, M-building, **Johanneberg**, same floor as Bulten and teams

### §1. Election of meeting officials and approval of agenda

Chair: Elin

(vice-chair: Masoud)

Secretary: Andrea

Reviewer: Ariadna

### §2. Meeting notice

The meeting was announced in time.

### §3. Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes from previous meeting are up on the DS webpage.

Minutes are approved.

### §4. State of the departments – round table

MC2: We had the DOMB for fika and it was very nice. Short summary: 1) No PhD students knew about the Rules of Procedure. We will start giving copies around to everyone, specially at our introduction session in September. 2) Discrepancies in expectations from student and from supervisor seem to be one of the main problems at MC2, which end up snowballing. We found a document in intranet aimed at solving that (<https://intranet.chalmers.se/media/2047/expectations-supervisor-phd-student.pdf>) but no one has ever seen this before, and it is aimed at supervisors. We will start distributing these around new PhD students. Could we add this to the ISP, so that it has some validity? And more items like expectations on number of conferences, summer schools, collaborations with other groups, etc? We can make a comprehensive list of potential issues with Pascale.

Also, there is a growing interest for a Chalmers-wide mentorship program, which could help a lot with supervision problems. Is this doable? A mentor could be requested at the ISP meeting and found through a database of volunteer mentors.

E2: Planned a visit to Liseberg, buddy program running in E2

IMS: Relaunching the PhD survey. Lot of pressure on the chair, no meetings have been organized in the local PhD council in the last few months.

F: We had an Introduction day for new students, every new student has a buddy. The director of studies have developed a new tool similar to the “Professional and personal development tool” to match the requirements to graduate with the tool that can be found in the intranet. Still voting for the restructuring of FFF.

BIO-K: PhD activities: PhD pub event, around 30 people from various divisions, PhD fika and PhD barbeque will be held. Department day went good. FOFU team suggests some activities, such as

“lunch with professor”, alumni activities, and some activities in the Nordic framework. Maybe a booklet summarizing PhD projects will be made to enhance mutual understanding of PhD students. Name change (maybe) for BIO.

M2: Not much news

TME: New head of department, there will be a new vice-head of department. New survey for alumni to know where alumni go after TME.

## §5. General Assembly

- Recap: Generally the elections have been around 3 H, this year it was quicker (1.5H). First time in years with an external meeting official. We announced the date earlier than we usually do. We have a new board, bigger than usual. New procedures for the meetings could be introduced.
- Potential suggestions for next year (Discussion):
  - Schedule assembly for longer so that people can stay for longer.
  - Announce the nominees via email early in advance, so we do not have to announce it at the meeting, saving 15 minutes.  
The nomination committee should suggest a number of representatives from each department and recommend a number of auditors, as is already stated in the statutes.
  - Alternatively, the nomination committee should have a clear idea of how to do things so that there is a little less chaos at the actual meeting.
  - Nomination committee could send the nominations out before (they do already?).

In summary we suggest for next year:

(something was already in the statutes, something can be implemented)

- Send out nominees early
- explain what are the rules clearly to the nomination committee – how much should the board in general interfere with assigned tasks?
- maybe add a small suggestion on what has been done before
- plus explain what happens when you nominate someone at the general assembly

Generally, it is very good that many people wanted to be part of the board. We have a board that really wants to be a board. On this, the election was very good. Also, good that people were aware of the possibility of nominating themselves at the GA.

## §6. POO Reporting

- Every person at the meeting (individuals or small groups) went through the POO and checked that everything needed was included
- After, we had a discussion all together about proposed changes
- Each group checks that all information is there (bullet points are good enough) and if there's anything they think should be added

1) Group 1 (Elin, Paul, Gustav, Daniel, Ariadna, Chris)

- 2) Group 2 (Adriana, Masoud, Yin, Omkar, Andri)
- 3) Group 3 (Thomas, Andrea, Masoud, Anna, Jingnan)

#### §7. Workshops for future work (ideas/suggestions for new board – Lead by Daniel)

- Main points of discussion:
  - Meeting efficiency
  - Workgroups and tasks
  - Continuity (chair/task leader)
  - External communication (DS to the students)
  - Internal communication (among DS members)
  - Team building activities

#### §8. Other matters

- Chalmers-wide Mentorship program:  
There is a growing interest for a Chalmers-wide mentorship program, which could help a lot with supervision problems. Is this doable? A mentor could be requested at the ISP meeting and found through a database of volunteer mentors (From MC2 – Ariadna).
- Email-list issues: still ongoing. The situation has not changed much but we hope everyone is ok.

#### §9. Actions for the next meeting

#### §10. Closing of the meeting

The meeting was closed at 16:02