

Meeting date: 3 May 2024

Meeting place: 1443/440

Meeting subject: Ordinary PhD Committee meeting, Arts

Attendees:

PhD representatives: Catrine Sundorf Kristensen (vice chair), Rithma Kreie Engelbreth Larsen, Malis Ravn, Hatice Nuriler, Niclas Nørby Hundahl, Jonathan Mastai Husum.

Academic representatives: Anders-Christian Jacobsen (chair), Katja Brøgger, Magdalena Regina Tyzlik-Carver, Camilla Skovbjerg Paldam.

Observers: Head of Graduate School Anne Marie Pahuus, Anders Gade Jensen (minutes) and Anna Louise Plaskett/PhD Admin team.

Absent: Kirsten Elisa Petersen, Charlotte Appel

1. **Approval of agenda**
2. **News from the Graduate School**
3. **Meeting structure and digital participation**
4. **Distribution of departmental hours**
5. **Completion time and dropout, the Graduate School's annual report (2023) to the Academic Council**
6. **Report from VIVE**
7. **Any other business (eventuelt)**

1. Approval of agenda

Agenda approved without comments.

2. News from the Graduate School

Anna Plaskett (ALP) gave notice of status of current casework and current GSA data. The recruitment of 5+3 students had been limited to once per year for a period. This will be reversed, and 5+3 candidates will be enrolled twice a year from now on.

Anne Marie Pahuus (AMP) gave a briefing on the status of the reform of the MA in relation to procedural matters regarding PhD recruitment. The main concern is the cap on enrolment. Ensuring funding for academic disciplines with potentially shortened MA educations is a national priority. There is a high degree of agreement on the PhD



programme issues nationally across disciplines in this regard. Keeping the 4+4 scheme alive and well could become a key to solving some issues.

Anders-Christian Jacobsen (ACLJ) gave notice on the decision on the supervisor's role in assessment committee.

3. Committee meeting structure and digital participation

Suggestion about increasing the physical attendance might benefit cohesion in the group. The ability to attend online ensures possible participation while away is also beneficial. Especially the campus Emdrup-participants are affected. We continue in this current format. The Emdrup staff are encouraged to discuss options of participating from the same room.

4. Distribution of departmental hours

ACLJ gave a short motivation outlying different responsibilities between the heads of departments and the Graduate School management.

The PhD students express concern that less study relevant workload may trickle down to PhD students during economic tight times. Better communication regarding guidelines in the department environments should be part of the solution.

It is unclear in the guidelines if the teaching fraction is calculated before or after deduction of the 100 hours. Overall, there are a few spots of vagueness in the guidelines. Some students report a general sense of increased workload the past few months. The Graduate School has received applications from several students regarding leave in order to take up teaching at the departments in excess of the department hours. The main supervisor has a key role as the person responsible for the entire education layout. Engaging supervisors in this negotiation is paramount.

In conclusion: Clearer communication of supervisor responsibility and organisational role.

AMP will take the issue politically and cautions against increased bureaucracy as a solution.

5. Completion time and dropout, the Graduate School's annual report (2023) to the Academic Council

AMP motivated: Arts is falling behind on completion rates in relation to other faculties.

The question is if Arts sustains a culture of expecting students to work for free after enrolment end to improve academic quality of the dissertation. Students report that the supervisors are not actively encouraging moving deadlines, but that a general culture in this direction might be prevalent in some areas. Focus on academic quality

might in some environments overrule the urgency of finishing on time. Career perspectives and expectations regarding academic tracks after the PhD degree are also part of the equation.

International students report a sense of increased pressure to finish on time in relation to Danish students. In departments with many external students, workload at the external employer might both be an incentive to submit on time, but in cases where the deadline is not met, it might prolong a delay significantly.

The admin staff suggests that PhD students use the “Concerned”-status on evaluation if they realise that they are not able to submit on time. This can be done safely without fear of any repercussions.

6. Report from VIVE

ALP explained administrative procedures in place regarding the issues on offensive behaviour mentioned in the VIVE-report.

AMP noted that the timeslot for real discussion on this issue is not sufficient at this meeting. More feedback and input from the PhD committee to the departments would be most welcome.

The schooling of the students takes place within the departments. Any issues regarding work culture are to be addressed at the School and Department levels.

Concrete cases of offensive behaviour will be handled at the employer’s level (in- or outside of AU) ALP is the point of contact in these cases.

The committee notes that the statistics are overwhelming, and that Arts should not look at this with any kind of complacency – there are almost certainly issues at the faculty which should be handled. It is important that the responsibility of following up on this is handled at the correct levels. The PhD students should not be made responsible for addressing issues along these lines.

This will be elaborated at a later meeting. A more elaborated discussion on the subject will be put on the agenda of a subsequent meeting.

7. Any other business (eventuelt)

Nothing to add.