

# **REFERAT PhD Committee for the Doctoral School of Social Sciences and Business d. 24-06-2024**

**Mødedato** Mandag d. 24. juni 2024 kl. 13:30

**Mødested** 25.1-003

# Indholdsfortegnelse

Approval of agenda (13.30 - 13.35) (Minutes approved by mail).....	3
Update from the Head of the Doctoral School - and news from RDS (13.35 - 13.45).....	4
Deliberation: PhD Day 2024 - when and how (13.45 - 14.05).....	5
Discussion: Minimum requirements for article-based dissertation (14.05 - 14.20).....	6
Inputs: PhD's part of larger, externally funded projects: Potential problems, strategies and input for Break (14.40 - 14.45).....	7 9
Inputs: Report from VIVE regarding well-being (14.45 - 15.05).....	10
Evaluation of courses from spring 2024 (15.05 - 15.10).....	11
Suggestions for upcoming courses (15.10 - 15.15).....	12
Future activities for PhD fellows (15.15 - 15.20).....	13
Misc. (15.20 - 15.30).....	14

## **Punkt 1: Approval of agenda (13.30 - 13.35) (Minutes approved by mail)**

Approval of agenda

### **Beslutning**

**Present:** Hanne Marlene Dahl (chair), Olivier Rubin, Johan Fischer, Peter Triantafillou, Ada Scupola, Trine Cosmus Nobel, Emilia Teresa Lewartowska, Svante Aasbjerg Thygesen, Jeppe Bay Lynggaard, Ida Marie Nyland Jensen,

**Not present:** Ada Scupola, Hanne Warming, Wladimir Santana Fernandes

*Observers:* Lars Buur

Item 5 will be split up to discuss issues regarding internally and externally funded PhD students separately (from now 5a and 5b).

The committee approved the agenda with the above-mentioned comment.

## **Punkt 2: Update from the Head of the Doctoral School - and news from RDS (13.35 - 13.45)**

### **Update from the Head of The Doctoral School and news from RDS**

#### **Beslutning**

Hanne Marlene provided the committee with updates on current themes:

- The three PhD courses running in the Autumn have been approved.
- In the last international evaluation of RUC's Doctoral School, the panel requested more coordination between the various parts of Roskilde University offering PhD courses. EAE and RDS has since then mapped the courses at EAE and the library, respectively and EAE is in an ongoing dialogue with the four Doctoral Schools about the course portfolio.
- ISE has suggested offering talks/seminar and/or Professional Development Seminars about tools to avoid stress and how to get support.
- ISE had just offered a professional development seminar regarding possibilities and challenges with open access.
- RUC's Doctoral School has a new course on research dissemination, e.g., on how to write, and how to present at conferences.
- There are presently ongoing discussions at RUC's Doctoral School regarding three issues:
  1. Plagiarism, where one of the issues are that RUC dissertations are not always finished products when the Royal library receives the thesis for check.
  2. A new scheme for reporting co-authorship. This comes from IMT practices as well as ISE discussions on minimum requirements. More and more publishers are having more specified schemes for this. ISE and RUC are coordinating the work.
  3. Regarding the legal hierarchy (University law, Doctoral School law, RUC guidelines), the university guidelines are currently being revised and updated. All rules and regulations are to be found in one place.

### **Punkt 3: Deliberation: PhD Day 2024 - when and how (13.45 - 14.05)**

**The Executive committee is open for ideas regarding the PhD Day 2024 from all members (both PhDs and VIP).**  
*Due to a big change in the Doctoral School with new Head of the Doctoral School, new co-programme leader and a return of PhD coordinator on a one-year parental leave all happening from 1st of August 2024, we suggest the PhD day will be planned to take place in October/November 2024.*

#### **Beslutning**

The committee discussed how to make use of the PhD day. The day was originally thought of as a day with PhD students and their supervisor. This was considered very time consuming. The last three years the day has been exclusively for PhD students and there has been PhD supervisory forums just for supervisors.

The committee was asked to consider what it wants from the PhD day and provided the following input:

- It should contain a forum just for PhD students without supervisors and administrative support arranged by a committee anchored in the executive committee. This could be combined with an 1 hour for the PhD students to meet themselves and discuss joint issues.. This in collaboration with the PhD students at ISE.
- Contents structured around reflecting on PhD student life. e.g. literature reviews, plagiarism, ideas for seminars, and others depending on where one is in the process.
- The supervisors could also reflect on, what they would look for and find relevant in a PhD day.

**Follow up:** Lars, Trine, and Ida will follow up, when Ida is back from maternity leave. The PhD day will probably be in November.

## **Punkt 4: Discussion: Minimum requirements for article-based dissertation (14.05 - 14.20)**

**The minimum requirements for the article-based dissertation has been discussed at a supervisor forum meeting held 13th of May.**

The supervisors across and within research environments did not agree on changing the current requirements for the article-based dissertation; some supervisors strongly requested keeping the requirement of minimum 2 single-authored articles, other supervisors strongly argued for a change to minimum 1 single-authored article, with the suggestion that the PhD fellow is first author on min. 2 co-authored articles. However, there were no agreement regarding the first or second-author part, because some supervisors were concerned there would be too much negotiation between the PhD fellow and supervisors. The supervisors were also worried this implementation could put extra pressure on PhD's to co-author with supervisors, who can have a hard time saying no to their supervisor.

No supervisors argued against peer-reviewed anthologies being part of the 3 articles written in the article-based dissertation.

### **Beslutning**

The committee discussed the revisional work focused on requirement for the number of single-authored articles in dissertations. The committee has previously had arguments both for and against it and couldn't previously agree. Hanne Marlene and Lars have therefore met with the Department Dean (Morten Frederiksen) and written a draft for a compromise. Hanne Marlene summarized that the draft is a good basis.

The Committee went through the suggested guidelines. The new minimum requirements are:

- Three scientific articles, where **one** is required to be a **single authored article**.
- The other articles can be co-authored, but the PhD student must be the **first author** in these other articles
- An edited chapter may be one of the three articles if there is tradition for this in the field and other academic traditions, and if it is approved by the supervisor. The interpretative perspective is important because the Doctoral School covers different scientific fields and traditions.

Besides that, the executive committee provided the following input:

- Regarding the wording with relationship with the publisher: instead of commercial, it should say academic.
- On the book chapter: it is not clear from the guidelines enclosed, whether a book chapter can replace the requirement of one single-authored article. Contributions to edited works should have the same outline. The wording should be "research chapter".
- A contribution to an edited work - and whether it counts - should be made in agreement between the PhD student and the supervisor based on whether it is appropriate within the field. It should be considered whether it might cause problems for the PhD student reaching international academic standards. The board acknowledges that it is important with the consensual aspect and that there should not be any more qualifications other than that the main supervisor should agree.
- All already enrolled PhD students adhere to the old guidelines.
- The rules should be listed as a table.
- Language should be harmonized throughout the guidelines

**Follow up:** Commenters forward their comments to Hanne Marlene and Andres.

**Decision:** With revisions the study approves that it should be the guidelines with effect from July 1 – or when made accessible on the intranet.

## **Punkt 5: Inputs: PhD's part of larger, externally funded projects: Potential problems, strategies and input for guidelines (14.20 - 14.40)**

1. The following agenda item is proposed by PhD representatives for the committee to discuss:  
Some PhD researchers struggle to navigate the various issues that may arise when they write dissertation as part of larger externally funded projects. The experienced difficulties are relating to some of the following examples:
  1. How to divide effort and resources between the dissertation and activities related to the larger research project and not the dissertation itself.
  2. Handling issues regarding data not collected by the Ph.D. researcher themselves, e.g., how to handle co-authorship under the current rules for authorship.
  3. Unclear in terms of what is expected from the Ph.D. researcher after their dissertation is complete, but the large project continues.
  4. Navigating the relationship with the supervisor, e.g., feelings of lack of autonomy and ownership over the thesis.

The PhD representatives suggest that the Executive committee discuss how to mitigate issues and how to formulate guidelines, that will make clear what is expected from the supervisors and PhD researchers.

### **Beslutning**

The item was split into two discussions, 5a and 5b, respectively.

#### **5a. Externally funded PhD students: problems, strategies and input for guidelines**

The PhD student members of the committee gave a short presentation on the issues they are mindful of regarding externally funded PhDs of which there currently are a large number of at ISE. A central concern for externally funded PhD students is maintaining their autonomy over the project and how it should be formed and being able to have influence in the demands on what to participate in. From the beginning it should be clear and the division of authority and responsibility throughout the project. It could be part of the onboarding process.

The committee had the following input:

- Research leaders should reflect more on, whether they need a research assistant rather than a PhD student.
- The Head of the Doctoral School should also have access to and approve that the project contains a PhD position.
- The positive elements of being part of a larger research project were also raised: being part of a group, which enabled more dialogue, seminars and networking. There will be fewer PhD students if there wasn't so much external funding.
- The departmental Research Committee has recently formulated good positions on the centrally formulated rules and guidelines. There should be more clarity as to who is responsible for dealing with these issues e.g. the shop steward (TR), the Head of the Doctoral school or ...?
- The delivery agreement which comes with the contract can be a tool for making more clarity. This also goes for the activities that need to be performed for external actors e.g. deliverables.
- The responsibilities of the PhD student should also be stated in the call and should be described in the PhD plan. The template could possibly be revised to include a section for externally funded PhD's tasks beyond the PhD project itself.

To sum up, the committee agreed to work on more formal alignment of expectations, PhD plans and making it part of the contract. Also on the responsibility of the research leader to deliberate more on whether a research assistant or a PhD student is needed.

#### **5b: How to proceed with the need for further funding by internally funded students and equality with externally funded PhD students**

The main issue for internally funded PhD students are that the lower limit of DKK 250.000 in applying for external funding can make it difficult for internally funded PhD students who need additional funding for travel, purchases, and editorial help to go beyond the DKK 65.000 that every student disposes of.

Hanne Marlene reminded the committee that she as Head of Doctoral School disposes of a sum of money to give to the PhD's that can cover some of this. The committee discussed whether to enlarge the fund with means from externally funded PhD students, that do not need the DKK 65.000. It was agreed to discuss this in the framework of the RUC Doctoral School.

The Committee awaits the meeting with the Dean to gain further input.

**Punkt 6: Break (14.40 - 14.45)**

## **Punkt 7: Inputs: Report from VIVE regarding well-being (14.45 - 15.05)**

See attached report from VIVE "Sexism and career path in Danish Universities".

The Executive committee members are invited to present inputs and suggestions regarding how this challenge can be handled both at Roskilde University and our Doctoral School.

It has not been possible to receive an overview of the gender composition at the department or RUC, however the gender composition at ISE Doctoral School is as the following:

### **PhD students:**

Women: 24

Men: 16

### **PhD supervisors:**

Women: 16

Men: 27

## **Beslutning**

The committee discussed the VIVE report on sexism and career part that has also been discussed in several other fora at RUC. In general, there is a higher degree of sexism in political science and business across Danish universities than in other academic fields.

The committee gave the following input to, what the department can do about it, and what the role of ISE Doctoral School should be:

- Having a person of reference for the PhD student. This should also be something for Roskilde Doctoral School and the deans to consider. Who to go to in case of sexism?
- Having a session among PhD students with an external facilitator - perhaps in relation to the PhD day. Lars and Trine will follow up on this.
- Creating a common language of what is and is not acceptable. This should the committee convey to the departmental counsel. This could be part of the hiring process/onboarding for new co-workers. This should also be a task for the new section leaders. Sexism could also be a subject for departmental seminar/day.

**Follow up:** The Head of the Doctoral School will convey the last point made to the department leadership.

## **Bilag**

3.1 Sexisme\_og\_karriereforl\_b\_p\_danske\_universiteter.pdf

## **Punkt 8: Evaluation of courses from spring 2024 (15.05 - 15.10)**

### **1. Qualitative Document Analysis**

See attached evaluation 7.1

### **2. Research Design**

See attached evaluation 7.2

## **Beslutning**

The committee went through the overall fine evaluations and had the following comment regarding the specific courses:

### **Qualitative Document Analysis:**

Dissatisfaction seem to come from a student outside of RUC and outside of the field of social science.

### **Research Design:**

The course teacher provided the committee with some context. There were 16 PhD students divided into two groups of 8. The group size were too big. A more constructive way could be to form smaller groups. Perhaps shortening the course and getting a couple of teachers more would help.

## **Bilag**

7.1 Evaluation\_ Qualitative Document Analysis.pdf

7.2 Evaluation\_Research Design course.pdf

## **Punkt 9: Suggestions for upcoming courses (15.10 - 15.15)**

Any suggestions?

### **Beslutning**

The committee discussed some suggestions for new courses:

- A course on how to write article for newly started PhD students, and a course on academic writing, were suggested. EAE has a course on academic writing and there is a course on how to get published. The PhD students believe that a course on getting started with writing is needed. It was commented that journal selection and article writing should also be part of the supervision. The PhD school management will stress this in meetings with PhD supervisors.

## **Punkt 10: Future activities for PhD fellows (15.15 - 15.20)**

Any future activities?

Feedback from the Writing Retreat held at Gavnø, Næstved?

### **Beslutning**

The committee provided feedback on the writing retreat at Gavnø, which went well. The place had great surroundings.

## **Punkt 11: Misc. (15.20 - 15.30)**

Misc.