



Place: <https://kth-se.zoom.us/j/69633360195>

Time: 17:00-18:00, February 8th 2021

§1. Opening formalities [17:00-17:05]

- a. Meeting opening
The meeting was declared opened at 17.05.
- b. Invited: chapter board, head of educational affairs and chapter auditors
The meeting was attended by Gloria Samosir, Federico Izzo, Sofia Broomé, Jasmin Höglund Hellgren, Saiman Ding, Deniz Yildiz, Inês Lourenço
- c. Choice of meeting chairperson
Gloria was appointed as the meeting chairperson
- d. Choice of meeting secretary
Inês was appointed as the meeting secretary
- e. Choice of meeting minutes checker
Federico was appointed as the minutes checker
- f. Approval of meeting agenda
The agenda was approved with the addition of the discussion point 4.c. by Deniz and 4.a.iii by Gloria.
- g. The latest protocol checking and signing
The latest protocol has been signed and uploaded.

§2. Reports & updates [17:05-17:45]

- a. Board reports
Board reports have been submitted and are attached to the minutes.
- b. THS central (KL/KS) and KF
There will be a meeting next week, Feb 17th at 1pm. Issues up for discussion may include the budget proposition, the signing of the supervisor of the year award letter, and educational issues from the doctoral survey report. Board members are always welcome to bring up their own issues of interest.

Deniz talked to the THS Sustainability Council and there will be a continued discussion regarding collaboration with the PhD Chapter. For example, there is an idea to make the international reception and other events more sustainable.
- c. From KTH Central Organizational Bodies
 - i. Workgroup “Time Compensation for Doctoral Students’ Commission of Trust Assignments”



1. How many doctoral student representatives should there be?

Sofia started by recapping the meeting where the topic of time compensation for doctoral representation work was discussed for industrial and scholarship students. For the former, the possibility of including a section about commission of trust in the agreement that is set between the employer company and KTH was discussed. The group generally thought that it was a good suggestion. For the latter, it was mentioned that there is a problem with taxes. At the workgroup meeting, it was agreed that school councils should be included in the guidelines for student influence, but reservations were expressed about division-level issues/meetings. The question of how to report the hours came up. Someone in the workgroup said that we should report the hours as we go and, once the prognosis is exceeded this should be reported. However, Sofia believes that that might be unmotivating for future efforts. Jasmin recalled the discussion from our last board meeting, where we criticized Per Olsson's proposed method for counting days. Sofia says that in the workgroup meeting this issue was not given a lot of attention. It would still be good to keep an eye on when it comes time to draft the time compensation plan.

They asked for a recommendation of how many doctoral students there should be per school. Gloria thinks that it does not make much sense to put an arbitrary numerical cap (e.g. a suggested estimate of 1 representative per 50 students). The number of representatives should be related to the number of programs and associated forums, rather than the total number of students. Federico agrees with having a number per program. He suggests having a base number per program (e.g. 2) plus a certain number for a council (e.g. 5), to prevent students from being refused from being PADs even if they want to, to ensure some flexibility. Jasmin suggests turning this question back around on KTH, and have them come up with an estimate of the total workload for representational duties. The PhD Chapter agrees that, as per Swedish educational law, for all school meetings where PhD issues are involved, a PhD student representative should be invited. Deniz discusses the effects of



overcoming the percentage of time for departmental duties in the PhD study time.

- ii. SFS-DK: The intangible and tangible delays doctoral students experience due the corona pandemic
Gloria and Sofia attended the meeting, which had around 120 attendees from diverse backgrounds, including doctoral student representatives, university management/faculty, and representatives from UKÄ. Gloria mentioned the different points of views expressed by representatives from the student and management/faculty side. SFS-DK itself is advocating for the possibility of a blanket extension of 2 months for all PhD students in Sweden. A report summarizing the meeting and discussions will be compiled and circulated.
- iii. Board of Education (Sv: Utbildningsnämnden, UN)
Jasmin attended the meeting. KTH is doing a self-evaluation about broadening the recruiting, and are asking for people to participate and give input. The issue was raised that due to socioeconomic bias, KTH may not get the best students. However, broadening the recruitment of PhDs might be partially solved by broadening the bachelor and master's recruitment. They have asked for a report to be written together with THS and the PhD Chapter (roughly 10 pages, due in April). Jasmin suggests that we consider how important this issue is and how distinctly it affects PhD students (compared to master's and bachelor's students) when we decide how much of Chapter resources to invest in these efforts. Deniz believes that the recruitment of PhD students is mostly international, which increases the competitiveness. The majority of the student body not speaking Swedish and understanding the norms affects the work environment and that comes with a responsibility for the employer to make sure that international students get to know about these norms. Jasmin says that the issues related to international students are important, but "breddad rekrytering" as understood in Swedish more so has to do with students' socioeconomic backgrounds than nationality. Perhaps other KTH bodies would be more suited to handle the issues related to internationalization. The board agreed to pursue this issue of broadened recruitment on a on-demand basis by seeing if anything comes up that we can concretely do.
- iv. Open Meetings (every other Thursday) about "education during the pandemic." -- do we want to participate and/or present?



It is still unclear what exactly they want to discuss in these KTH-wise open meetings. Gloria indicates interest in keeping this possibility open for the future, but not in a mandatory way. Jasmin suggests attending one to see how it goes and if we are interested in participating.

§3. Decision points [17:45-17:50]

- a. [Time Compensation Prognosis for PhD Chapter Board Spring 2021 \(VT21\)](#)
The time prognosis was approved and will be signed.

§4. Discussion points [17:50-18:38]

- a. Chapter Meeting -- March 8th -- potential restructuring?
- i. Include agenda item for School Council Reports
Gloria suggests making space in the agenda of the Chapter Meeting to allow for an update report from the school councils. The board agrees.
 - ii. Approval of next year's Operational Plan/Budget in Chapter Meeting
Gloria suggests drafting the operational and budget plans to be approved in the Chapter Meeting, which the next board can inherit and alter as it sees suitable. The goal would be to make things easier for the next board to get started with their work. It also gives an opportunity for the Chapter members to give input to the operational plan. The operational plan was approved but the budget was tabled, with the argument that it is uncertain what the total Chapter's total budget will be in this upcoming year and the budget plan should probably be up to the new board to decide.
 - iii. Communication from the nominating committee
There are not currently enough people in the nominating committee to conduct the work, they need one more member. They are planning to pass a motion to be more inclusive to school council members and others. In relation to this, a conversation took place about doing a more significant reform of the statutes. The idea of creating a workgroup to reformulate the statutes in the long run was suggested. Any Chapter member could participate in this workgroup. We can write a post on Slack and create a channel for the workgroup. The board approves the creation of the workgroup.
- b. [Draft of motion to Saco-S](#) regarding the doctoral salary ladder criteria, initiated and circulated by a PhD Chapter member
This motion will be submitted in the near future and it is each Board member's



prerogative whether to sign it or not. Gloria poses the question of whether we can use PhD Chapter channels to communicate about the motion and convey the issues laid out in it to the broader PhD student community. Deniz believes that the document is extremely important, but wants to be sure that the language and formulation are on-point. She mentions some problems related to these issues and how the salary ladder impacts the student's studies. Jasmin suggests that the document seems to broach two distinct issues - the salary ladder criteria and salary ladder levels. She is unsure whether a wholly time-based model is necessarily preferable to alternative (e.g. examination-based) models. Deniz mentions that the problem with the examination-based model is that the criteria are oftentimes not communicated to the students. Jasmin wonders what we can learn from an institution that uses the time-based criteria, such as Karolinska Institutet. Gloria suggests that whatever system is used, the criteria for moving through the doctoral ladder need to be clearly and transparently laid out. The board approves the circulation of the motion through PhD Chapter communication channels.

c. Conditions for lab work

This discussion point was tabled for the next board meeting.

§5. Meeting closure [18:38]

The meeting is closed.

Protocol,
Meeting chairperson: Gloria Samosir

Signature: _____

Secretary of the meeting: Inês Lourenço

Signature: _____

Minutes checked by: Federico Izzo

Signature: _____



Attachments

Attachment: Board Reports

Written reports before the meeting

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Sofia Broomé | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethics committee meeting 26/1. Seminar series about ethics to be held. Probably with Stockholm Trio. - Time compensation workgroup 27/1. Preparation included writing a longer email summarising our points from the last meeting that Federico attended. Discussed situation for industrial and scholarship students. And some discussions of which roles should be compensated and again about time reporting. - SFS-DK seminar 2/2 about prolongation for phd students due to covid. |
| Gloria Samosir | <p>28/01 Meeting with PhD student advisor (Ingrid Iliou) to brainstorm about the seminar for doctoral student representatives</p> <p>02/02 SFS-DK Meeting on tangible and intangible impacts of COVID-19 on doctoral studies</p> <p>03/02 eISP Focus Group Meeting</p> <p>03/02 Language Committee Meeting</p> <p>04/02 inComm conference on designing an onboarding process for newly arrived (master's and) PhD students</p> <p>04/02 Meeting with Nominating Committee</p> <p>05/02 Meeting with Federico</p> <p>08/02 inComm conference on designing an onboarding process for newly arrived (master's and) PhD students</p> <p>Ongoing errands and correspondences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School council time compensation documents - Supervisor of the year award letter draft - Highlighting some issues based on the doctoral student survey report - Created a certificate template for doctoral student representatives (on the request of a former PAD) |
| Deniz Yildiz | <p>Attended Sustainability Council at THS and gave feedback on the workshop, Reviewed Arbetsmiljöverket policies that pertain to work place safety for laboratory workers to understand the corresponding aspects for PhD workers in lab spaces</p> |
| Jasmin Höglund Hellgren | <p>Attended workgroup meeting on "Individuellt åtagande" on 1 February, 1,5h.</p> <p>Attended UN meeting on 5 February, 3h.</p> <p>Attended to some emails and minor errands.</p> |



| | |
|---------------|--|
| Federico Izzo | Attended THS Ekonomiråd 27/01 Attended Anställningsnämnden 28/01 Attended Fakultetsrådet 3/02 Participated to the meeting with Nominating Committee 4/02 Attended ABE School Docent Interview 5/02 Participated to the Presidium meeting 5/02 |
| Inês Lourenço | Draft of the next steps in the to do list of the Supervisor of the Year award. Investigated the details regarding the diploma, and made a draft of a possibility. Began thinking about the alumni event, where the plan is to invite alumni from KTH that followed different areas after the PhD (industry, pos-docs, etc). Though about the related logistics and wrote down a list of question that could be of interest to discuss in this event. |