PhD Council meeting  
Department of Psychology  

Minutes from the PhD student council meeting, April 20, 2011  

Present:  
Marianne Jakobsson  Joakim Norberg  
Aram Sedigh  Constance Eib  
Gustaf Thörngren  Marie Gustafsson  
Roberto Riva

1. The meeting was opened by Joakim at 11.00  
2. Marianne Jakobsson was chosen as secretary: Roberto Riva as certifier.  
3. The minutes from the last meeting were approved after minor clarifying revisions.  
4. The agenda was approved with the initial point of Pehr Granqvist, new studie-director of the research-education, in august, 2011, introducing himself.  
5. Pehr will from the autumn sit in house 14, room 128. He told that he has worked at the SU-institution as a lecturer since autumn 2009 mostly in development psychology but also in other courses. He disputadet at the Psychological Institution of Uppsala 9 years ago on attachment theory appicatur to religion. Pehr tells that it is a little premature for him to present visions but he still has some thoughts of Freedom of thoughts and Independence and new thinking and one way to open up for that is according to Pehr to be open to new ways of financing. The question of more courses for PhD-students was briefly discussed. Pehr also wanted to join in again or in another forum to discuss further. One occasion that was discussed was the doctoral meeting in September and another was the doctoral/super wiser-dinner. The issue  
6. Reports:  
   a. JÄMO: The gender course is through and was nice and well performed. JÄMO has started a contact with “psychologists without boundaries, which has actively worked with the issue of heteronormativitet and the issue of nobody being discriminated
during their time as a student at the institution. They contributed to the course with cases that they had experienced during their time at the institution and which were worked with at the course.

The last JÄMO-meeting in held a going through of the personnel enquiry from a gender perspective. Women at the institution experienced in general their working environment as poorer than the men. At the ratings of organization and leadership there was no differences.

The checklist concerning 2011 is still not online since there has been too few on the meetings.

b. ITB: Not represented and no information.

c. SAMFAK: The issue of compensation for teaching was brought up at the last SAMFAK-meeting. The doctoral students at the meeting will check how it is handled at their home institutions and get back with information at the next meeting.

The library is about to implement a new system for sorting new books. The old system has sorted the books at among others thematically. The new system means that the new books will only get at number in accordance to when they get into the system and be sorted by that. For example will this give problem to find extra editions and also there will be problems to get an overview of the subject. The employed study guards at Samfak will check into if the decision is possible to appeal against.

d. IS:

i. The issue of compensation for teaching was raised in last IS-meeting. At the meeting there was cleared that no decision about lowering the compensation when the “prolongation-alternative” is chosen has been made. The information at the IS-meeting is that the compensation is like it has been for a long time and changes will be handled by SAMFAK. At the PhD-student meeting there was agreed that information was needed by responsible to all PhD-students and administrative personnel in the issue since there is unclearties. The information question is to be raised in-between meeting or at next IS-meeting.
ii. The question whether substitutes/PhD students should have responsibility for a course or part of a course was discussed. The decision was that the circumstances should stay as they are which means that Ph-D students like before might have course-responsibilities.

iii. A course in techniques of presentation will be held for interested PhDs.

e. PROFESSORS’ GROUP: There was a longer discussion about open access which was considered positive and the downside of it that it means extra fees for the researcher in form of fees, see protocol PG, April.

f. Work environment group:

i. Invitation to summer party has been to the personnel and PhDs. The initiative has been taken by the AT-personnel, which are also hosts of the party.

ii. The information from last meeting see below. There has been a meeting in a smaller workgroup since the larger meeting concerning the enquiry but the issue will be forwarded to the next meeting as some core people in the issue is missing in today’s meeting. Gustaf has been in contact with the responsible for the enquiry and has some information on the issue of index, which is an important question to review again in coming meeting.

Info from PhD meeting March.
The results from the work environment survey were reported in a workshop March 22. Only six PhD students were present. A summary of the workshop is attached to these meeting minutes. Aspects of the culture, which the PhD students in this forum as well as in other have pointed out as an issue, became evident during the workshop.

The Council’s view on the results is that they are alarming. The main points of concern are the lack of open climate and fear of retributions for voicing critique and the lack of clarity with regards to leadership for the PhD students, especially in relation to the responsibility for psychosocial issues in a situation where the supervisory relationship is poor or lacking. The council also found that although comparisons are difficult, this survey does not seem
to show any improvement over last survey. The Council sees the department board as responsible for taking action to improve the situation.

It was unclear how the overall “kvalitetsområdesindex” were calculated. Gustaf will investigate.

It seems that only 47 of the 65 PhD students received the survey and were invited to fill it out. The council wondered why that was, and how the split was made?

g. CDR: Nothing to report (Ninni not present)

7. Project person. Malin Mattson not present.

8. Representatives have met the union March 25. The result was:
   a. That there should be an MBL-negotiation with the union from the employment part when making changes in the compensation system. There should also be information contacts from the institution in how they handle salaries. At the 25th the PhD council was informed that the Union would take contact with the institution in the issue. The union has raised the question with the institution and at this meeting had not still gotten an answer. See also point 7D, IS.

   b. The Union finds that confiscating salary from teaching Ph-D students that has been teaching and saved prolongation in case of attending another service before the prolongation term is finished seems very awkward and should instead be given out in monetary compensation. These PhD-student-teachers are welcomed to the union to get the matter negotiated.

   c. At the meeting with the union the question was discussed that there is a low salary for teaching when teaching as a PhD-student in comparison with equally educated people that are hired for teaching and are not listed for research-education.

   d. The administration is in the work of identifying teachers/PhD’s that has gotten to low compensation the last period.

9. Other issues: There was a decision made that there is a good idea to have a June meeting as a closure for the semester and apply for some money to get together an activity after the
meeting. The date of suggestion was June 16th and a possible activity was to go to Gröna Lund or Kakanstornet with some eating in-between.

10. The meeting closed at 13.00.

Marianne Jakobsson
Roberto Riva