AUDIT REPORT 2016-2017

1. Objective and scope

This is an audit report for the THS PhD Chapter 2016/17. It is based on and analyses:
- The Chapter’s accounting records for 2016/17
- The Chapter’s annual report for 2016/17
- The Chapter meeting protocols 2016/17
- The Chapter’s board meeting protocols for 2016/17
- The Chapter’s board meeting protocols so far for 2017/18 (see Appendix)

The purpose is to point out matters of concern for the members of the Chapter and suggest whether or not to free the Board 2016/17 from responsibility.

2. Audit observations

The accounting records include the usual debit and credit, e.g. food for board meeting, chapter meeting, working group expenses, costs for rooms and food when hosting events, as well as income from THS for PhD chapter members.

The annual report lists more integration with THS Central and with school representation. While there have been activities organised together with THS Central, e.g. the PhD Boot Camp, there have been less expenses for school representation. However, the passing of the PhD Chapter Bylaws can be seen as an effort towards future integration of work at school-level with the PhD Chapter at central level.

The annual report lists that there has been no great alteration in increase or decrease of its total economy. In the current situation, this is a cause of concern for two reasons. Firstly, the membership in the PhD Chapter is still decreasing, of which the exact number is not listed in the annual report. Secondly, reports from previous years have stressed that funding should increase to events that promote PhD participation in the PhD Chapter, hence increasing the chance for members to become involved and new PhD students to join. A lack of expenses does not reflect moderation on part of the PhD Chapter, but inability to make use of its resources. So while the economy of the PhD Chapter is sound, it is a warning signal for how active the PhD Chapter is for its members.

In terms of conducting activities, the annual report does not list who has been responsible for what. Although there is a list of board members, it is unclear to what extent these have been active in representation, visiting school councils, or organising events.

The board meeting protocols list numerous activities, for example representation and projects. What is recurring is that these have seldom led to results in terms of reports, regular updates on how to lobby errands from one forum to the next. What is missing is the usual movement of lobbying matters from the FA, through the UU/FR and lastly to the US. Similarly there are few updates about how to recruit people to groups such as AU/BN that historically have had problems finding representatives. The Chairperson have in some instances pointed to a lack of
time for doing regular work with respect to starting up projects but it is unclear how this has lead to reorganisation of work tasks or how the Board has tried to recruit additional people in its work.

The board meetings also point to some discussions regarding how KTH is reforming its prolongation procedures as well as its structure of schools. These are both likely to have an impact on PhD representation that deserves more information than is currently provided.

3. Recommendations

The audit report recommends the Board to produce documentation, reports, or summaries from representations, events, and meetings. The documentation can be attached to board meetings as an appendix. Documenting the work is particularly relevant at this point in time given that KTH is reforming both the prolongation system and its schools, which will impact PhD representation. While the Board has organised working group meetings regarding prolongation, there are as of yet few examples or little documentation regarding how PhD representations get prolongation. This is an activity that could be used for increased collaboration at school level and is a recurring question that every Board has to address, and determines how much people can be involved with the PhD Chapter, but so far the solutions to prolongation are settled at an individual level.

The audit report recommends that the Board provide updates on who has done what activities, e.g. representation, projects and events, writing reports. The purpose for increasing its detail is to track progress on areas of priority and identify irregularities in member conduct.

The audit report recommends that the board prepare and propose a procedure, in consultation with THS Central, for how to reorganise the Board in between the Chapter’s winter and summer meeting. When irregularities in the Board’s activities have been identified but do not improve, the recommendation is to reorganise the membership of the Board, the roles and responsibilities of specific members, or all of the above.

The audit report recommends that the PhD Chapter increase its expenses with respect to activities that promote PhD students to become representatives for the Chapter, either at the school- or central level. Examples on such expenses are PhD Boot Camp, board meetings, PAD elections.

4. Conclusions

The audit report recommend to the THS PhD Chapter that, with respect to the recommendations set forth above, free the Board 2016/17 from responsibility.

Signed by auditors,
Stockholm,
2017-12-05

Johan Gärdebo

Abbos Ismoilov
Appendix

The audit report has also reviewed board meetings protocols for 2017/18. These are not part of the audit report for 2016/17 but have been considered relevant due to the risk of having irregularities continue during 2017/18.

The board meetings 2017/18 list some members as being inactive, not possible to reach by communication, as well as having acted as representative for the PhD Chapter in matters not relating to THS or its members. There are also continued suggestions on arranging additional projects, while several positions and representations remain vacant or have been handed without greater motivation.