



Minutes from Central PhD Student Council (CDR) meeting nr 2

Monday 1th of March 2021, 15:00-17:00, Zoom, online meeting

Present

Chair, Pascal Meier, (NFR)
Vice Chair, Hari Nair, (NFR)
Julia Dahlqvist, (JMK)
Ali Mohamed (SFR)
Kate O´ Ferrell (HFR)
Amanda Almstedt Valldor, representative ON
Filippo Schiavo , representative CIVIS

Jenny Wirén, Head of Student Advocacy and Governance, secretary of CDR
Anton B Hjelm, Ombud at SUS
Sofia Holmdahl, President SUS (attended during 3.Information from OM-gruppen)

1. Formalities

a) Opening of the meeting

Meeting opened at 15:05.

b) Election of verifier

Julia was elected.

c) Approval of agenda

Agenda is approved with addition 5.j. Finding new representatives and 6.b. Budget within departments.

d) Co-option

No co-option.

e) Approval of minutes from last meeting

The previous minutes was approved.

2. Reports

a) University Board

The first meeting concerned the yearly report and budget discussion and approval of the last and coming years. The board discussed the proposal of rector for the upcoming rector mandate period, starting 2022.02.01. CDR stand behind and support the current rector Astrid Söderbergh Widding.

b) Humanities Faculty Council

Nothing to report, the faculty council has not had a meeting since the last CDR-meeting.

c) Social Sciences Faculty Council

Nothing to report, the meeting consisted mostly of reports.

d) Law Faculty Council

The faculty council have sent out a follow-up survey about the work conditions during the pandemic. Julia will share the result during the next meeting.

e) Natural Science Faculty Council

The last meeting was mostly an introduction of new members. They also discussed how they can fill the vacant student representative positions.

f) Student Union SUS

The student union informed about how they during the upcoming months have a special assignment to see how they can help the central council, such as CDR, in their work.

g) Others reports

i. REBUS

From written report: At the last REBUS meeting (Feb 15th) I raised the concern from the last CDR meeting about the equality of the assessment of mental illness for pandemic prolongation. Hans Hayden (vice dean HF) said that all universities and colleges in Sweden run with the practice that all institutions may make individual assessments for each prolongation case. However, he said that they are working on this issue at the central level in SU since they also see possible problems with it being up to the institutions to make an individual assessment, because it is then more difficult to know if everyone is treated fairly by the system. They find it difficult however to assess how they can give recommendations for how e.g. degrees of mental illness should be assessed fairly. It seems that they understand the situation, but they have difficulty defining at a central level how to ensure equality in the individual assessment.

In other news, REBUS is currently in the process of figuring out what it wants to work on for 2021-2022. One idea that seemed to gain traction at the last meeting is to use REBUS as a platform to have a cross-faculty dialogue about how the university will be changed by the pandemic once we are out of it.

ii. ON

The question of prolongation has been brought up by Amanda on every meeting but Områdesnämnden do not seem very interested in discussing the question. The overall stand is that it is up to the department to regulate the prolongation.

iii. CIVIS

Filippo has attended two meetings where focus has been on discussing how the group want to work going forward and introduction to new members. One of the issues discussed was how the group can spread information on what they to PhD student and how they can work with outreach.

3. Information from OM-gruppen

Sofia informed the council on what the group have been discussing and asked for feedback from CDR as to what they want her to raise at the next meeting. The question of prolongation due to the pandemic is raised and how it is very unclear for the PhD students how long they can report difficulties caused by the pandemic. For example if a PhD student notices that she or he has been affected two years from now during the end of the employment, it is unclear if compensation can be provided then.

4. CDR 2020

a) Annual report

No comment on the annual report. The annual report is approved.

5. Nominations CDR representatives

a) RASK

i. 1 ordinary member

1. Simon Ringqvist elected

ii. 1 secondary member

1. Vacant

b) Human Sciences preparational board for PhD education, BUF (swe)

i. 2 ordinary members

1. Vacant

ii. 1 secondary member

1. Vacant

c) Employer- and employee committee for RALV, AM-committee (swe)

i. 1 ordinary member

1. Vacant

what the different positions demand from them. Jenny will update the ads and sent it out to all councils again.

6. Discussion of issues raised by local PhD councils

a) Prolongation

This issue was discussed during 3. Information from OM-gruppen.

b) Budget within departments

There has been a discussion amongst some council concerning how the budget most PhD students have that were support do be used for conferences will be used instead. This issue has been discussed before within CDR. Until next meeting the members will raise this at faculty level and see if is an issue raised within more PhD councils.

7. Next meeting

Next meeting will be on the 12th of April between 15-17.

8. Other issues

No other issues were raised.

9. Closing of the meeting


The meeting was closed at 16:31

X 

Pascal Meier
Chair of meeting

X

Jenny Wirén
Secretary

X 

Julia Dahlqvist
Verifier