

Date: 22 September 2025
Reference: FK/suba

**Minutes of the Faculty PhD Committee meeting on 22 September 2025
kl. 09.00 – 12.00 in FKF meetingroom (Ø10-412-2)**

Participants: Professor Frank Kjeldsen (chair), Head of the PhD School Barbara Guerra, Associate Professor Kasper Reitzel, Associate Professor Yuri Goegebeur, PhD student Alexander Lukas Oskar Degner, PhD student Maiken Westen Holm Svendsen, PhD student Aylin Seren Güler and Vice Head of the PhD School Suba S. Lindholm (minute taker).

Absence: PhD student Yen-Ting Chen and Associate Professor Erik D. Hedegård.

Agenda

1. Approval of the agenda

Minutes:

The chairman opened the meeting by noting that item 6 (Initiative on co-supervisors) would be postponed to the next meeting, as the VIP representative from FKF was not attending the meeting. With this change, the agenda was approved.

2. Observations and feedback on teaching during the PhD Programme

Minutes:

The committee discussed the possibility of integrating observation and feedback into the existing PhD teaching course offered by SDUUP. The proposal was that feedback training be included in Module 2, where second-year PhD students observe and provide feedback to first-year students as part of the ECTS-credited activities.

The PhD School will follow up with SDUUP to clarify whether this can be implemented.

The item will be reviewed at the next meeting.

3. New administrative practice regarding recruitment of PhD students

Minutes:

The chairman explained the new practice, which means that applications will be shortlisted by the recruiting supervisor before being sent to the department's PhD study board for approval. The committee acknowledged that the new process is timesaving but expressed concern about a lack

of transparency and fairness in the procedure.

The committee agreed to forward this concern to the management group. The chairman will draft an email to the management group on behalf of the committee.

4. Guidelines for the use of AI in PhD theses

Minutes:

The committee decided to refer to the Vancouver guidelines in relation to the use of AI in PhD theses.

The PhD School will make the guidelines available on its website and insert a link to them in the current regulations.

5. Status report in the 4+4 programme and clarification of the guidelines

Minutes:

Alexander (FKF) presented the issue of discrepancies between the formal guidelines (research article approx. 30 pages) and practice (often 100+ pages in chemistry).

The committee stressed that the qualifying exam is an evaluation of the process and the status of the PhD project – not a product (the report).

To clarify is, the committee wishes to specify in the guidelines that the status report can be 20-30 pages in length, and that the format must follow the rules for writing a PhD thesis. The guidelines will include a clear reference to the relevant sections. It must also be stated as in the thesis guidelines that: *"This serves as a guideline, not a strict rule"*.

6. Initiative on co-supervisors – FKF (postponed to next meeting)

Minutes:

The item was postponed to the next meeting. It was noted under this point that there is strong support for the initiative among PhD students at FKF. Suba added that the PhD School has begun receiving requests to assign postdocs as co-supervisors.

7. Addition of a member to the PhD study board at IMADA

Minutes:

Professor Connie Svabo was approved as a new member. It was also decided that the approval procedure should henceforth be with the chairman of the department's PhD study board and the Head of the Department rather than with the Faculty PhD Committee.

8. Approval of NAT201 Practice-based Science Education Research and Communication as a preapproved course for NAT PhD students

Minutes:

The course was approved as a PhD course for all NAT PhD students, including those in the 4+4 programme.

9. Course applications approved by the department's PhD study boards

Minutes:

The Faculty PhD Committee took note of the cases.

10. News from the Head of the PhD School/PhD School

Minutes:

Barbara reported on the meeting with SDUB, where the PhD School was informed of a change in practice regarding plagiarism screening.

The main change compared with earlier practice is that theses will now receive a yellow screening result if the PhD student reuses text verbatim from their own articles without quotation marks, direct reference, or similar. It is no longer sufficient to simply declare at the beginning of a section that text has been reused from a previous publication.

In addition, the PhD School's mailbox will be cc'd when the PhD student and supervisor are informed that a thesis has received a yellow screening result. The Head of the PhD School may overturn the supervisor's decision in cases where the supervisor deems a yellow screening result unjustified.

11. Any other business

Minutes:

Suba informed the PhD student members of the upcoming election. Those wishing to stand for re-election should simply send an email to the PhD School to learn more about the procedure. Those not wishing to run again were encouraged to talk to fellow students and recommend the role to them. New members were also welcome to contact the PhD School for more information about the role.

Suba also informed the committee that the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity is under revision.

Furthermore, Suba reported on the change in the SU Act and its implications for the 4+4 scheme. The new rules mean that students can receive SU for three years of a bachelor's degree and two years of a master's degree. PhD students on a 4+4 scheme will therefore lack SU for the final year of the programme. The management group has been informed of this issue.

The meeting ended at kl. 11.47