## Agenda - Science Faculty Council <br> 2024 March 27th, kl.16:30

## 1. Opening of the meeting

a. Round of presentation
2. Samyuktha Rajan
3. Kelsey Moreland
4. Despoina Kouvousi
5. Anna Halkalouskaya
6. Ezra Eisbrenner
7. Robert Dunst
8. Erik Schwarz
9. Felix Almay
10. Yasmini Portes
11. Panagotis Kalogeropoulos
12. Anaswara Sugathan
13. Sarah Morron
14. Daniella Lillieroth Charalambou
15. Maarie Heene
16. Devika Sunil Kumar
17. Linnea Andersson
18. Nielja Knecht
19. Matilda Johansson (SUS)
20. Dario Giandinoto (online)
21. Bart van Baal (online)
a. Election of chairperson
b. Election of secretary
c. Election of adjuster
d. Approval of the agenda
e. Approval of last meeting's minutes

## 22. Reports from boards and committee and by-elections of NFR representatives

## Stockholms

 universitets studentkårBrief reports from those bodies which have convened since last meeting, and by-election of representatives

1) SUS
a) Bylaw change
i) Bylaws that govern how union is organized and what work will be conducted
ii) Change of bylaws with regard to student union representative assembly (highest decision making council; decides on budget, activities, and strategic operating plan)
iii) Representative assembly elects the board and the presidium (vice- and president of SUS)
iv) Earlier: only student union election parties (political parties) were part of electoral assembly
(1) The assembly meets 4-5 times per year
v) Future: both faculty clubs, faculty councils, and student union councils will hold positions in assembly
(1) So only half of the positions will go to political parties, the other half will go to councils etc.
(2) Each of these organizations will be able to elect two student representatives to be part of the representative assembly
vi) Impact on NFR: we will be able to elect two students to represent us in representative assembly and thus influence SUS strategical direction more directly
vii) Problem: currently, working language is Swedish, which the ombuds will take up with the board to hopefully be changed
viii) This proposal will be voted on on May $23^{\text {rd }}->$ will probably pass, as there has not been a lot of opposition so far
(1) But will only take action in 2025
ix) This will probably have large impact on NFR, as we will have more influence on the direction of SUS's work
x) Motivation behind this: decrease in political engagement amongst students in the past years -> this proposal
hopefully brings student voices more directly into student union
b) Upcoming student union election
i) To vote in these elections, you need to be a member of SUS (at latest April $10^{\text {th }}$ )
(1) Voting is online!
ii) Election is held between April $18^{\text {th }}$ and April $25^{\text {th }}$
iii) There are only four parties (Liberals, Social Democrats, Student Association of the Left, Student Party); Conservative Party disappeared since last time
iv) On the SUS website, there is a banner (Kårval) showing information on election programs etc.
2) Central PhD-Council
i) Election meeting
ii) Meeting of chairs with local PhD council heads to discuss important topics for this year
iii) Next meeting April 4th
b) Area Board/Områdesnämnden
i) No representative
ii) Problematic that we don't have access to outcomes, we might be able to get their agenda in the future
c) Arbetsutskottet
i) No representatives
d) Central student council
i) Only election meeting
e) Grundutbildningsberedningen
i) Goal to have common statistics course for all students
(1) Departments were not very supportive of this
ii) Instead, draft on common examination goals for all Bachelors programs at the Science Faculty
iii) UTKAST för gemensamma examensmål: För kandidatexamen ska studenten 1. Programmering - visa grundläggande förståelse för programmeringsspråk och deras tillämpning i praktiken 2 . Hållbarhet - visa förståelse
för hållbarhetsbegreppet och förmåga att kritiskt förhålla sig till dess relevans för huvudområdet 3 . Vetenskaplighet visa insikt i begreppet vetenskaplighet och utveckla ett vetenskapligt förhållningssätt till kunskap 4. Statistik - visa grundläggande förståelse för statistiska begrepp och metoder för att kunna självständigt (samla in och) analysera och tolka data, samt kunna dra relevanta slutsatser
iv) Discussion about Tentamensservice and what the Faculty needs to ask for and/or adapt to, to enable this service to be used more frequently (since we are paying for it). Better planning is requested and it is discussed if it is possible to let Tentamensservice get access to classrooms at the departments to book for examinations.
v) What issues dealt with in the committee in question do you think should be discussed in the upcoming NFR meeting?
vi) What can the departments do to get more students active in the student councils and as student representatives? Input will be brought to the next GB meeting in May.
(1) Suggestion to integrate the local student councils better with PhD councils -> many PhD students are not aware that student council even exists
(a) This would also facilitate contact and exchange between PhD students and Bachelors/Masters
(2) Provide overview of achievements that have been made by student council in the past to get people motivated
(3) Departments should help spread information on existence of student councils
f) Department \& Section Committees

Stipendibergen: Fillipo- Assignment of Högskoleföreningens pris (there were three candidates), winner will be publicly announced
g) Other boards: nominees for election
1.Tarfala board: Daniella as alternate member, instead of Ulrika

## Gomm. Elected.

2. Yasmini Portes Abraham Silva as second PhD rep for Success.

Elected.
3. Miren Urrutia Iturritza from MBW as PhD rep for scholarship committee. Elected.
4. Kanwal Tariq from MBW and Panos (maybe Panagiotis

Kalogeropoulos) as PhD rep for academic appointment committee.
i) Panos elected.
5. Ulrika Gumm (Masters student) nominated for advisory committee and scholarship committee. Elected
6. Unnemaia (maybe Unnimaya Thalakkale Veettil) as PhD rep in CDR. Elected.

All vacant positions for ordinary groups and committees are found at the NFR site at sus.su.se (https://sus.su.se/rad-och-natverk/nfr). The language requirement is also mentioned on this website.

## 23. Joint discussion

a. When to declare the usage of AI in thesis writing/manuscripts
i. This was discussed at the zoology department. Is there any centralized guidance at other departments?
ii. Erik: At their department, a working group was established whose goal is to establish guidelines
iii. GB: discussions on guidelines. There are central guidelines at SU level by the principal, but these are apparently quite vague.

## 1. Split discussion:

## 1. Information from student councils

We had a brief discussion on the draft of common examination goals for the Bachelors. All agreed that it was good and that it's needed for some departments.

We also discussed the possibility to motivate the departments/course
responsible to have recordings of their more basic lectures for students to watch back.

Here's the link to the guidelines on AI in Swedish
https://www.su.se/medarbetare/r\�\�d-
st\%C3\%B6d/undervisning/v\%C3\%A4gledning-om-anv\%C3\%A4ndning-av-ai-drivna-chattbotar-vid-utbildning-och-forskning-1.648977
2. And in English
https://www.su.se/staff/services/teaching/guidelines-on-using-ai-powered-chatbots-in-education-and-research-1.649009
3. We had a discussion about funding and the issues of shrinking budgets, elevated rent levels from Akademiska hus and reductions in courses.

## 2. Information from PhD councils

a. Poll from departments on how much each department provides for printing theses/hiring an opponent and also other costs-such as for going to conferences, courses etc.
a. Some departments have set a cap of 35000 SEK for all expenses related to the defence (hiring opponent, printing thesis, housing opponent). This was not discussed, but just announced at the department board. There was also some opposition from professors.
i. This could lead to unfair treatment of different PhD students of PIs with varying amounts of funding. Also particularly problematic for niche fields.
ii. Not clear how this decision came about, zoology department was the only one that this was implemented in.
iii. Other departments don't have a cap or representatives are not aware.
iv. Doktorandpeng

1. MBW: 20000 SEK available but that can only be spent once
2. SRC: 7000SEK per year to spend on additional books and conferences.
3. Physics department: Most people are funded by external funds,
a. Department has fund to pay for difference between train and flight travel.
4. IGV
a. New regulation: department pays for all train travel (overall cap for entire department)
5. Stipend offers are often specific to departments and topics, so maybe not useful to have a centralized list.
a. Maybe we could contact the stipend representatives of different departments to make information more available.
b. How are PhD teaching duties are managed at different departments
i. Physical geography department: PhD students are very engaged in teaching, because there are not enough lecturers
6. This has in some cases even led to people having to teach courses they have no background in.
7. There is a requirement to teach (or at least this is how department board has been interpreting contracts).
a. This is defined in regulations for $3^{\text {rd }}$ cycle assessments
b. Other departments have the same contract and this has not been interpreted the same way.
8. People are assigned to different courses to help out on. These are associated with a specific amount of time you will get back, but this does not necessarily reflect the actual amount of time this takes.
9. Problem at this department: research direction and teaching are diverging, for some areas, there are no people doing research on this.
ii. Zoology: no requirement to teach.
10. PhD students are encouraged to help with the field courses, but encouraged against lecturing, because in the past this led to students feeling exploited as they did not get back enough time for this.
iii. CPG: students were asked to design the lab part of a course, which is technically not allowed.
11. The university is by law not allowed to ask PhD students to be in charge of designing a course. They are allowed to ask you to teach, but you are not obligated to say yes.
12. Recommendation: if you are asked to do anything that's outside the scope of what is allowed, you should talk to the person who is responsible for teaching.
iv. MBW: it's mandatory to teach, and they get one year of prolongation.
13. They are hired on a 5 -year contract.
14. PhD students are just assigned to courses
v. IGV: Very dependent on the supervisor how the time back regulation is implemented and how this is documented.
vi. CDR has been made aware of this issue and will be discussing about this and how to address this at a higher level.
vii. At NFR, this could be raised in Forskarutbildningsberedningen (Ellen Maria Riefel, PhD student at Fysikum)
viii. In zoology, they have a teacher's board with 3 student representatives, where teaching issues can be brought up. This has led to changes due to student pressure last year.
ix. Next steps: will be asked for clarification in OM.
x. Problem: if you teach in the first two years, you will be held back at a lower paygrade for longer.
xi. Case where somebody was pressured to teach in their last year even though this is technically not recommended.
xii. It would be good to have a central rule beyond the $20 \%$
15. Summary of issues to discuss at next meeting
16. Meeting closed
