



Minutes from PhD-committee meeting

Date: 3/2 2014 from 13-15

Present: Anni H. Andersen, Søren Borg, Ditlev E. Brodersen, Ernst-Martin Füchtbauer, Bernt Guldbrandtsen, Charlotte R. Knudsen, Claus Oxvig, Bo Thomsen, Lei Wang, Janus A. Schatz-Jakobsen, Rasmus K. Flygaard, Chris Kjeldsen (for item 1) and Line L. Dvinge (minute taker)

Not present: Just Jensen, Bjarne J. Bonven

Item	Minutes	Responsible
1	<p><i>Minutes of the last ordinary meeting</i></p> <p>Minutes approved</p>	
2	<p><i>Report from Lis Wollesen de Jonge about the experience with mandatory personal confidential meetings (video conference)</i></p> <p>Since Lis was not able to attend the meeting, Chris was kind enough to fill in for her.</p> <p>Chris told the committee about Agroecology's experiences with mandatory personal meeting between the Ph.D. students and a member from their Ph.D. committee. They have the meeting twice a year and they last as long as it is needed, most often between 10-15 minutes, but if the student are experiencing problems the meeting may last as long as 35-45 minutes.</p> <p>Each member of the committee has between five or six students assigned to them in random order. The only rule is that they can't have the meetings with their own students.</p> <p>Their experience is that they discover problems before they get out of hand, and that it is easier to solve the problems at this state.</p> <p>The committee discussed the possibility of introducing the same meetings at our Department. Ernst-Martin suggested a trial period but the rest of the committee was reluctant to this. They argued that the amount of time spent on the meetings did not match the amount of students with problems.</p> <p>Rasmus suggested that a meeting could be held between the supervisor and the student within the first two or three month of the student's employment. The meeting should include an alignment of expectations as well as a more personal talk about the student's wellbeing, and then the relationship might change so that they can talk about personal things as well. The talk could be in the form of the mandatory Annual Appraisal talk (MUS in Danish)</p>	



	<p>It was argued that at some locations of the Department the Annual Appraisal talks is not held by the supervisor, thus the committee agreed on the following: It should be a formalized conversation between the student and supervisor, when it is meaningful, it can be held with the Annual Appraisal.</p> <p>Ernst-Martin will write a memo regarding this, and send it to the committee members for approval, before making it public</p>	Ernst-Martin Füchtbauer
3	<p><i>Survey "Quality in Ph.D. education"</i></p> <p>The survey has first been made public at this date, so the committee has only seen a small selection. It can be part of the agenda at the next meeting.</p> <p>However it was generally agreed that MBG is not in all areas as good as we would hope. There was also agreement that the quality of supervision should get more focus. Ernst-Martin has planned to set up meetings with MBG supervisors in the near future to increase their problem awareness.</p> <p>Link to survey: Danish: http://www.au.dk/kvalitetiphd/rappporter/ English: http://www.au.dk/en/quality-in-the-phd-process/reports/</p>	Ernst-Martin Füchtbauer
4	<p><i>Journal clubs' as Ph.D. courses</i></p> <p>Ernst-Martin informs that the committee can approve courses, but formally it is the Faculty that approves courses.</p> <p>Journal clubs can be Ph.D. courses. In order to be approved, each course should have a course description and should be open to all PhD students and should be announced on the Departmental- and Faculty websites.</p> <p>According to the new ministerial order, Master courses can only as an exception be approved for PhD students. In order for a Ph.D. student to take a Master course on a more regular basis, The course should contain some extra 'quality' for PhD students. Ernst-Martin suggested that it could e.g. be extra responsibility, for instance could the student give a lecture at one of the lessons. The exam form needs not to be the same for Master and PhD students, e.g. might a passed / not passed grading be sufficient for PhD students even if the Master students are graded by the 7 grade scale.</p> <p>Ernst-Martin will send a mail to all labs with information about journal clubs</p>	Ernst-Martin Füchtbauer



5	<i>Kjeldgaard Lectures</i> Pushed to the agenda for the next meeting	
6	<i>New rules and regulations. (finished, but not approved)</i> The rules will soon be approved by the Dean, and then published.	
7	<i>Any other business</i> The Department has asked for help with finding new candidates for the Departmental Forum (Institutforum). Ernst-Martin suggests that an election is to be held after the next Kjeldgaard Lecture. He asks of Lei, Rasmus and Janus to help with this. Line will send out a mail to all Ph.D. students with information as to what it means to be a member of the Departmental Forum. The ideal would be two part A and one part B from Aarhus and one part B from Foulum or Flakkebjerg. As Lei is finishing her Ph.D. soon, she will also initiate that a successor for her in the program committee is found among the Ph.D. students from Foulum/Flakkebjerg. The meeting ended at 14:55	Line L. Dvinge