

Date: 20 January 2025
Reference: FK/suba

Minutes of the Faculty PhD meeting on 20 January 2025 kl. 09.00 – 12.00

Participants: Professor Frank Kjeldsen (chairman), Head of the PhD School Barbara Guerra, Associate Professor Thomas A. Rytto, PhD student Aylin Seren Güler, PhD student Alexander Lukas Oskar Degner, PhD student Yen-Ting Chen and Vice Head of the PhD School Suba S. Lindholm.

Absence: Associate Professor Yuri Goegebeur, Associate Professor Kasper Reitzel and PhD student Maiken Westen Holm Svendsen

Dagsorden

1. Approval of the agenda

Minutes:

The agenda was approved without comments.

2. Introduction of new PhD committee members

Minutes:

The chair welcomed the new members, provided a brief introduction to the committee's work, and explained the role of the PhD students within the committee. It was also mentioned that before each committee meeting, the PhD students send the agenda to their department and collect input from their colleagues. The purpose is to actively involve the opinions, perspectives, and wishes of PhD students in the PhD program.

The chair also informed the members that the working language of the committee is English due to the many international members. However, meeting materials will continue to be in Danish in accordance with SDU's language policy. Members are encouraged to use available translation tools for materials without confidential information. Minutes will be prepared in both Danish and English.

3. The PhD School at the Management group meeting

Minutes:

Head of the PhD school Barbara Guerra provided a brief summary of the meeting with the management group. Topics discussed included the number of extensions granted to PhD students and the fact that most PhD students do not wish to pursue a career in academia.

Teaching workload was also addressed, highlighting that many PhD

students teach subjects outside their core areas and rarely consult their supervisors for input on teaching preparation. Barbara proposed that a mentor be present during the PhD students' teaching sessions to provide feedback and support their development as educators.

It was emphasized that supervisors should inform candidates during recruitment about the requirements of the PhD program, including the mandatory teaching hours.

Additionally, a potential revision of publication requirements was discussed. The management group noted that any changes to these requirements should be carefully evaluated to ensure the PhD program remains competitive and maintains a high standard of quality compared to other PhD programs.

Regarding teaching, Michele (IMADA) mentioned that it should be emphasized during the PhD supervisor course held by the PhD School that supervisors have a responsibility to assist PhD students in preparing for their teaching tasks. At the same time, it should be ensured that the responsible course instructor actively supports the PhD students in their teaching duties.

4. Publication requirements

Minutes:

The chair provided a brief introduction to the topic and explained the process leading to the draft that was to be approved at today's meeting.

The committee discussed whether it should be up to the individual PhD student to decide whether their dissertation should be formatted as a synopsis or a monograph. The chair suggested that the committee continue with the current wording and assess at a later stage whether changes are necessary.

The draft presented was approved. Once the guidelines are officially approved and implemented, an email will be sent to the PhD students with information about the changes.

The changes will apply to all PhD students as of today.

5. MUS concept at BMB for PhD students

Minutes:

The chair provided a brief introduction to the topic for the new members of the committee, followed by a summary of the evaluation with the management group. The MUS (employee development dialogue) concept for BMB involves PhD students having their MUS conversation with their supervisor, the option of a well-being conversation with the department's

PhD study committee, and a GRUS (group development dialogue) conducted by the head of department with the PhD students.

To ensure that supervisors are well-prepared for their role, it is recommended that they participate in an MUS training course offered by HR.

The conclusion of the evaluation is that BMB will continue with the new MUS concept for PhD students, while the three other departments will continue unchanged.

6. New administrative practice for the recruitment of PhD students

Minutes:

The chair introduced the topic. Suba informed the committee that the management group had implemented the change involving shortlisting, and that department heads were responsible for informing the relevant parties about the change.

Michele pointed out that the role of the department's PhD study committee should be removed, as its purpose and function are unclear. The chair expressed concern about whether the shortlisting of candidates is being conducted in a fair manner.

Each member of the departments' PhD study committees was encouraged to discuss their role with their department head in light of the changes to the recruitment process. The topic will be revisited at the next meeting.

7. Assistant Professor with a positive Associate Professor evaluation as main PhD supervisor

Minutes:

The committee approved that assistant professors with a positive evaluation of their qualifications for associate professor can act as main supervisors. In such cases, there must be a co-supervisor who is an associate professor or professor to ensure the best possible support for the PhD student throughout the program.

Suba will draft a precise formulation and send it to the committee members for approval via email.

8. Course applications approved by the departments' PhD study committees

Minutes:

The Faculty PhD committee took note of the cases.

9. News from the Head of the PhD School/The PhD School

Minutes:

Nothing new.

10. Any other business

Minutes:

The chair mentioned that the academic members of the committee would be up for election later this year. Current members were encouraged to consider whether they wish to run for re-election.

Michele suggested that the PhD school could conduct an evaluation of PhD supervisors, with the results being published on the PhD school's website. He noted that instructors have their courses evaluated, and a similar process could be implemented for PhD supervisors. It was decided to include this topic on the agenda for the next meeting. Suba was asked to contact the other PhD schools to find out whether they conduct end-of-program evaluations or other forms of evaluations for their supervisors.

The meeting ended at kl. 11.03