REFERAT PhD Committee for the Doctoral School of Social Sciences and Business d. 06-03-2025

Mødedato Torsdag d. 06. marts 2025 kl. 13:00

Mødested 25.1-003

Indholdsfortegnelse

Punkt 1: Approval of agenda and attending (13.00 - 13.05) (Minutes approved by mail)

Approval of agenda: Approved

Online: Ida Bull
Attendees: Lars Buur, Jeppe Bay Lynggaard, Trine Cosmus Nobel, Mathias Thuen Jørgensen, Emil Bøgh Løkkegaard, Louise Wiuff Moe, Sally Andersson, Kristoffer Kropp, Peter Triantafillou, Ida Marie Nyland Jensen

Beslutning

Approval of agenda:

Approved

Online and taking down minutes: Ida Bull

Attending: Lars Buur, Jeppe Bay Lynggaard, Trine Cosmus Nobel, Mathias Thuen Jørgensen, Emil Bøgh Løkkegaard, Louise Wiuff Moe, Sally Andersson, Kristoffer Kropp, Peter Triantafillou, Ida Marie Nyland Jensen

Punkt 2: Decision: Our new standing order (13.20-13.30)

We've reviewed the old common standing order for whole of RUC and rewritten it to fit our PhD committee.
The standing order has been approved by central and the legal department.

It will come into effect when agreed upon.

It was agreed that Lars Buur (VIP) will act as chair person and Emil Bøgh Løkkegaard (Fellow) will act as vice-chair.

Beslutning

Chairperson is informing the committee about the proces of the standing order.

Comments:

1. It was noted, that 5 work days was a very short time to call in a meeting, and we should add to the order, that there should/could be a difference when calling in an extraordinary meeting.
2. It was noted, that section 9, Legal abscense, was not very specific.
3. It was noted, that we need to add that online participation is okay, if one can not attend in person.
4. It was noted, that there was a lack of differentiting between the full members and alternates.

It was agreed upon:

1. We will add to the standing order, that a normal meeting is called in a minimum of 14 days before the actual meeting. In case of an extraordinary meeting, 5 work days is okay.
2. Deadline for sending out the agenda before a meeting is 5 work days.
3. Chairperson and secretary will ask the legal department to specify and add what legal abscense entails.
4. We will add/specify when all members are needed for a decision and when alternates can posses mandate for a member.

Bilag

Mandate of the executive committee at ISE-PhD Feb 2025.docx

Punkt 3: Decision: Establishing a subcommittee (13.30-13.35)

We need to establish a subcomittee that will process all dispensations cases amongst other.

When agreed upon, this subcomitte will process all cases related to dispensation, exemptions, ect

The proposal for subcommittee is as follows:

The Sub-committee consist of the Chairperson (VIP) and Vice-Chair (PhD Fellow). The committee decide on all matters related to dispensations, granting of ECTS and merit. Information on decisions taken should be presented to the PhD committee at the regular meetings. The Sub-committee is assisted by the PhD coordinator.

Beslutning

Subcommittee will be process dispensations, urgent matters and inform the committee in every committee meeting about number and perhaps also reasons why.

The proposal was agreed upon and the subcommittee will concist of the chairperson and vice-chair, Lars and Emil, and will be assisted by Ida Bull (phd coordinator) as secretary

Chairperson informs about the 15 extra hours for the vice-chair who will take notes on time use and evaluate at the end of this spring.

Punkt 4: Update from the Head of the Doctoral School - and news from RDS (13.05 - 13.15)

News

Enrolled

New PhDs

PhD Positions live

New template for half yearly evals

Beslutning

Briefing on new PhDs, the active listings, the PhD cohort rigt now and the new evaluation form.

PhD Coordinator asks the PhD fellows to talk about our mentorship for new PhDs with their colleagues as not enough has signes up for september 1st 2025.

PhD comments on the new evaluation form:

1. It's an improvement, but there's still a lot of double work/double information written elsewhere.
2. There is a need for an open channel the fellows can go through with sensitive matters.
3. The use of the evaluation is still unclear.

Agreed upon:

1. When the fellows find double work/double information, they show it to Head of School and PhD coordinator for improvement on the evaluation form. We need to improve on this double work.
2. The main use of the evaluation is to look for things that stick out and needs a follow up. For the majority of the fellows, the use will not neccessary be seen/heard of.

Update from the Head of the Doctoral School:

1. Common rules and that process.
2. Supervisor forum - we'll have something about conflict mediation and also something about the how/why the cluster are not functioning right now.
3. Supervisors who don't live up to the role as supervisor, ex related to teaching and supervision.
    1. Short discussion about the change of format on the masterclasses at EAE.
    2. Longer discussion about the role of the study leaders related to teaching. One comments about how the study leaders can be known to go directly to the PhD Fellow with changes.

Follow ups for next time

1. For next meeting, and maybe as an ongoing part of the briefing, the PhD Coordinator will give an overview on the division of fellows between our own stipends, co-finaced and embedded in bigger projects.

Bilag

New template for half yearly evaluations.pdf

Punkt 5: Orientation about dispensations (13.15-13.20)

Cases since last meeting in November 2024

4 about extension of enrollment or acces to the RUC systems

1 about the minimum requirements of articles (exemption from the new rules)

1 about granting ECTS for a conference

1 about exemption from the screening process

Beslutning

No comments just briefing.

Punkt 6: Planning: reading through Common Rules (13.35-13.45)

We need to make a plan on how to go about reading through the new Common Rules and applying them in the committee.

Lars Buur suggested we plan two extraordinary meetings in March and April in the exe comm where we only process the Common Rules as to not have too extensive meetings until deadline 24th of April.

All of the committee members will read through the common rules on their own and send comments to 4 representatatives, 2 VIP and 2 Fellows (cc. Ida Bull). (we will choose the representatives)

Then the 4 representatives will be called in to two extraordinary meeting to gather the discussion perspectives and compile the consultation responses.

Message from RDS on 05.02.2025

As previously announced, you are hereby receiving cases for discussion and consultation in your PhD committee.

The following cases are included:

1. **General Regulations for PhD Education at Roskilde University** a) Discussion of the revision of the General Regulations for PhD Education at Roskilde University (cover) b) General Regulations_revision for consultation c) Template for submitting consultation responses

2. **Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders in the PhD Education at RUC** a) Discussion of the revision of the Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders in the PhD Education at RUC (cover) b) Roles and Responsibilities_revision for consultation c) Template for submitting consultation responses

3. **Template for Co-Authorship Declaration** a) Discussion of the Template for Co-Authorship Declaration (cover) b) Declaration of co-authorship_for consultation c) Template for submitting consultation responses

After consulting your calendars regarding the expected dates for your PhD committee meetings over the next few months, it is deemed reasonable to set a deadline for the submission of consultation responses on April 24th.

We have an RDS meeting scheduled for May 5th, and the plan is to discuss the received consultation responses there before any revisions are made, and the documents (the general regulations and the roles and responsibilities document) are forwarded in the process to UL and AR.

As mentioned in the most recent RDS meeting, I am happy to make myself available, as far as possible, and I am willing to attend your PhD committee meetings to present the cases. I have already received invitations to attend meetings at both IKH and IMT.

As you can see from the above and the attached, the case regarding the possibility of awarding PhD degrees within knowledge areas will not be sent for consultation in the PhD committees. The matter was discussed among the deans at a meeting in the Research Strategic Leadership Forum (FoLF), where it became clear that there is currently no support to proceed further with the process. This does not mean that the matter has been completely shelved, but it is also evident that we, within the RDS framework, can no longer drive the process. Instead, it will need to be discussed among the deans in FoLF and UL.

In accordance with the general regulations and the consultation process that you are now engaged in within the PhD committees, it will still be possible to raise any points of concern regarding degree awarding, major areas versus subject areas, etc.

Best from RDS

Beslutning

Chair person sums up the proposal about the extra meetings.

The proposal is approved.

VIP members: Lars Buur and Peter Triantafillou

Lars will discuss with Morten about the role of the dean.

PhD: will decide outside of the meeting on who the representatives are.

- Emil and Selene will represent the PhD Fellows

PhD Coordinator will book the extra ordinary meetings.

Follow up from PhD coordinator after the meeting:

An email was circulated to all members and alternates about dates and representation. It was as follows:

Dear all members of the PhD committee

(cc. alternates for information only)

It was agreed upon to go through the common rules and compose the consultation responses as follows:

1. All members of the committee will read through the material and send their comments to their representatives **before their preliminary meeting**.
    1. Emil and Seline represent the fellows and Lars and Peter represent VIP.

1. The four representatives meet up in parties for at preliminary meeting to gather the responses from Fellows and VIP.
    1. Lars and Peter have already decided on a preliminary meeting on the 26th March.
    2. Emil and Seline have been booked for a preliminary meeting on the 25th of March.

1. Then all four representatives join in a second meeting to compose and gather the consultation responses and to circulate them to all members of the committee.
    1. The second meeting has been planned to 3rd of April.

1. After circulation the responses will be sent to Cecilie in the central admin.

Bilag

Discussion of revision of the Joint regulations for the PhD Programme at Roskilde University.pdf

Joint regulations for the PhD programme at Roskilde University_revisions for consultation_revsions for consultation.pdf

Template for the consultation responses regarding the Joint regulations for the PhD programme at Roskilde University.docx

Discussion of revisions to the Division of roles and responsibilities for actors in PhD at RUC.pdf

Division of roles and responsibilities for actores within the PhD programme at RUC_revision.pdf

Template for consultation responses regarding the division of roles and responsibilities.docx

Discussion of template for Declaration of co-authorship.pdf

Declaration of co-authorship_for consultation.pdf

Template for consultation responses regarding the template for declaration of co-authorship.docx

Punkt 7: Break - if needed (13.45-13.55)

Punkt 8: Further Discussions: ECTS and mandatory courses (13.55-14.05)

At last meeting ECTS and mandatory courses were discussed. An agreement or final decision was not made.

Discussion from last meeting

Discussion point from the PhDs;

We would like to discuss whether it should be a requirement for PhD students to take both quant and qual courses.

Regarding the quant course, several people say that:

- "It's a waste of time - few don't use methods at all.
- People sit in the back because they have to take the course - the teachers know that
- PhD students are under time pressure, so the course is not prioritised
- There is no feedback on the written reflection paper. So you don't know if you've understood the methods correctly or not.
- You can't learn the methods in a 2 ECTS course - what's the purpose of the course?

At the same time, we are in a large department that works in many different directions and with very different prerequisites, which is difficult to accommodate in the organisation of such a course.

The discussion about quant/qual courses plays into a larger discussion about what should be mandatory courses. Compulsory courses include:

- Research Design (5 ECTS)
- Ethics (1 ECTS)
- Data management (½ ECTS)
- Screening and plagiarism (½ ECTS)

A total of 7 ECTS, which corresponds to what you are required to take at RUC. In addition, there are the quant/qual courses (minimum 2 ECTS each), and we are encouraged to participate in WIP seminars and present at conferences. So, it's approaching 15 ECTS, which is predetermined in advance what the PhD students should spend their time on.

There is little room to design and plan your own PhD process. For whose sake are these courses? Is it an institutional requirement? A deliberate schooling of PhD students?

The discussion perspectives from the PhD Fellows were as follows:

- Highlighted the importance of flexibility in mandatory PhD requirements.
- Criticized the pedagogical hours, suggesting they are less useful compared to practical teaching strategies like “Teaching – Tips and Tricks” or WIP sessions. Suggesting a yearly “WIP-Teaching”. Proposed an initial session clarifying PhD teaching rights and responsibilities
- Suggested improving quantitative/qualitative courses to better engage students
- Questioned the lack of qualitative courses for quantitative (when we have quantitative for qualitative).
- Engaging with quantitative or qualitative and MA-level is a good idea.

The discussion perspectives from the VIP members were as follows:

- Emphasized the need for students to master quantitative and qualitative methods but supported exemptions for experienced candidates.
- Makes sense to have quantitative. Suggested that MA-level courses could suffice for some students.

One disicion could be to revisit the course on Quant to make it more hands on.

Beslutning

Chairperson gives a short run through about previous discussion.

Lars propose to meet the coordinators of the affected courses and try to make the program more relevant/hands on and useful for our PhD Fellows.

Comments form PhDs:

It was also a point that the mandatory amounts in themselves limits the phd process for the fellows.

It's also important to have a qual for quants.

Generic courses are not specific enough.

VIP-comments:

It's still a school and there is requirements you need to meet, minimum of schooling.

Decision:

Lars Buur will talk with coordinators about the courses involved.

Punkt 9: Discussion: Evaluation of courses (14.05-14.15)

Teaching Tips was cancelled again. Should we do something about frequency or plan the date better compared to when new fellows start at ISE?

Cancelled Courses in fall 2024
Social Network Analysis
Introduction to Research Design
PDS: Weird and wonderful work

Courses in fall 2024 evaluated at last meeting
Intro to Quantitative Methods
Writing a Kappe/Frame
PDS: How to publish your PhD thesis as a book

Courses in late fall 2024 to be evaluated now (appendices)
Analysing the power of idea and knowledge
Challanges to academic freedom (few responses)

Beslutning

Evaluations approved

Bilag

Analysing the power of ideas - course evaluation.pdf

Challenges to academic freedom - course evaluation.pdf

Punkt 10: Future courses and activities for PhD fellows (14.15-14.25)

<u>Courses in spring 2025</u>
Qualitative Research Interviews
PDS: Fieldwork - Dealing with the challenges of the Fieldwork
PDS: Defense - tips and tricks of the trade
PDS: Reflexivity in qualitative research
PDS: Examinations - tips and tricks of the trade
PDS: How to present a paper at a conference
Research Design
Getting Published in Social Science and Business Journals
PDS: Doing a PhD while the house is on fire? (online)
Writing Retreat in Byens Hus

<u>Other activities</u>
PhD Day in late spring?

Punkt 11: Misc. (14.25->)

Maybe you'd want to read the results from the yearly Alumni Survey 2024?

Beslutning

Comments from PhDs:

1. a lot of the alumni have jobs afterwards, but almost none of them stated they received formal career guidance. We're not taught how to apply for funding, building a career in academia.

Decision:

1. We could develop a course or hold yearly meetings
    1. The career subject will be a discussion point at next meeting.

Bilag

PhD Alumni Survey - Status on PhD education at RUC 2024.pdf