

# Stipendiatororganisasjonene i Norge

## Board meeting

Date: 16.02.2021

Time: 17:00

Place: Zoom

## Agenda

1. Quarterly meeting
2. Events attended by SiN
3. Spring semester plan
4. Update round
5. Proposed collaboration of Mental Health working group with AYF
6. UHR survey on handling of corona delays
7. Potential membership of inter-university organisations
8. Event on stealing research ideas
9. Budget and financial reporting
10. Dialogue meetings with AYF and unions
11. Guidelines for the board
12. Statements on higher education and research policies

## Attendees

- Sin board: Yannik, Ingvild, Camilla, Enrico, Miro, Bikal, Idd, Margret

## Minutes

*Meeting start: 17:04*

### *1. Quarterly meeting*

The next quarterly meeting will take place on the 18th of February and the agenda is online. Enrico will present the results of his working group. We will also discuss the preferred communication with the local organisations, including how to gather input for hearings, how to nominate candidates for delegate and representative functions, as well as how to coordinate the position of SiN on various higher education policies.

Camilla returns to the point that was addressed last time, which was brought up by Margret but there was not enough time to discuss it in detail. It concerns the different ways that local organisations are being compensated. Camilla suggests to create a common document where local organisations can share how they are compensated for their work hours, so we can potentially benefit from it.

### *2. Events attended by SiN*

The “kontaktkonferanse for forskning of høyre utdanning” took place on 12 January, but unfortunately no one was able to attend.

The Swedish doctoral organisation (SFS-DK) organised a meeting on 2 February to discuss the effects of corona on PhD students in Sweden; delegates from the Norwegian and Danish parter organisations (SiN and PAND) were also invited. Miro, Margret and Ingvild attended; Yannik was prevented. The meeting was attended by a diverse group of temporary and permanent research staff as well as university administrators. Since the group was large (more than a hundred participants), the discussion was held in moderated break-out rooms, with the first session focusing on summarising common problems with PhD education during corona and the second on finding common solutions. The results from the breakout rooms will be summarised by the Swedish doctoral organisation, who will share a report by the end of February. Margret mentions this a good format to gather different perspectives on complex problems, and we could potentially consider doing a similar focus group like this in the future.

### *3. Spring semester plan*

Yannik shares a template that he made in Google sheets, which can be used to summarise the timeline of various activities throughout the year and would be useful for future boards to see at a glance what was done in the past. Margret mentions that this seems specific for a given board year and looks more like a Gantt chart, which could theoretically be compiled in hindsight and be used in the annual report. In addition, we could have a more general document with important calendar dates for any board year. This would directly benefit the planning of the current board.

### *4. Update round*

In the spirit of having a better overview of what the board does, Camilla proposes an impromptu round to hear what all board members have been working on.

Miro: joined the mental health working group, and has started a new working group on intellectual property (together with Olga and Lasse from UiODoc), which will be organising the event on stealing research ideas, and has plans to conduct a survey as well.

Camilla: has been working with Hui on the website to incorporate all feedback from last time, which will be finished this weekend. She has also been passing around a lot of news to the board.

Margret: has no other updates apart from what is on the agenda.

Ingvild: was in the UHR meeting last week. There was not a lot of interest, but universities have been invited to share how things are going with contract prolongations at their institution, since this is very much designed per institution.

Enrico: presented the results of the career in academia survey to a research group at UiO. With his working group he also wrote an article for Khrono detailing their perspective on the status of postdocs.

Bikal: had a meeting with Yannik and Idd about the career outside academia survey. they will not do a new survey, but make a report about the first one.

Idd: has no update apart from what Bikal mentioned, but she notes that meetings seem to run longer than the allocated one hour. Idd suggests to stick to the allotted time by keeping the agenda shorter, or allocating more time in the calendar invitations. She also proposes to stick to the agenda.

How to organise the meetings will be an additional agenda point for the next board meeting, where we can discuss whether to do a round (and if this should be done for individuals or rather working groups), and how people can add items to the agenda (whether by doing it themselves or by asking Yannik to add it).

#### *5. Proposed collaboration of Mental Health working group with AYP*

Following the COVID-19 panel discussion hosted by UiODoc, Margret has been in touch with Ingrid Lossius Falkum, the leader the Young Academy Norway (AYF), who seemed similarly interested in the effects of the pandemic on mental health. They briefly discussed respective plans of AYP and SiN to conduct surveys and are wondering whether they might benefit from joining the efforts of the AYP and SiN working groups on mental health and corona. This collaboration could consist of co-designing the survey and jointly presenting and disseminating the results. It is mentioned that AYP has had a greater constitutive voice in the past on topics touching on young researchers. Since they are relatively visible in the national arena, Camilla thinks we can benefit from their collaboration. No one objects to the collaboration, so Margret will confirm that they can continue working together.

#### *6. UHR survey on handling of corona delays*

SiN has been granted permission to submit a response to the UHR survey on the handling of the corona pandemic by institutions in Norway. The survey deals with the guidelines for extensions and how they have been implemented by various universities. Margret has asked all leaders of member organisations to give input to the two open questions of the survey. Almost all organisations have replied by now, except for UiS and NMBU. The deadline is on 19 February. Margret will forward the email to Hui (UiS) and Bikal (NMBU), so they can make sure someone from their board replies. One of the problems is that not all board contact information is up to date. It is proposed we ask all local organisations at the next quarterly meeting (which is to be held later this week) to supply an up to date contact person and email address, and where possible also an email list that addresses the entire board or president/secretary.

#### *7. Potential membership of inter-university organisations*

Since this is a topic that touched on our current and aspirant members, this will be discussed with the leaders of all local organisations at the quarterly meeting this week.

#### *8. Event on stealing research ideas*

Miro updates that Lasse and Olga from UiODoc joined as external organising members. They propose to conduct a survey prior to the event, to map e.g. how important the phenomenon is and how often it occurs. Margret suggests that the event can also be used as a sort of focus group to do preliminary scoping before designing the survey. Camilla suggests that the survey, if it is short, can also be integrated in the registration form for the event. The people who register should already be interested and might have some ideas. Miro will discuss this internally and report back at the next SiN meeting what they have decided.

### *9. Budget and financial reporting*

Yannik and Grace just had a meeting with our contact person at DIKU to discuss the financial reporting of 2020, and will prepare the report together. The deadline is 15 March. The report is a deliverable to justify the budget that we received last year. For this year we received 260,000 NOK; this budget will have to be justified in the reporting of 2021 by the next board.

### *10. Dialogue meetings with AYF and unions*

Since we are already in touch with AYF concerning the pandemic and mental health, it is suggested we do not need to schedule additional dialogue meetings with them. We can decide later whether we want to include Forskerforbundet in these discussions.

### *11. Guidelines for the board*

Yannik and Margret had a meeting about the guidelines and are currently in the process of writing. They will share a draft version before the next meeting.

### *12. Statements on higher education and research policies*

A lot of issues come up regularly in the media that are relevant to PhDs and postdocs. Camilla asks whether we should prepare some statements about what our standing is on some of these topics. This makes it possible for people to look it up whenever they are in touch with the media, but also for the media to look it up on our website. Examples of topics we might want to prepare a statement on are: tenure, postdoc positions, PhDs starting under COVID-19, etc. At the next quarterly meeting, we could bring up the question of what sort of positions we represent our local member organisations in. Enrico suggests that each working group can list one priority issue as a starting point. Margret or Yannik will send an email to the board to ask for this input before the next SiN meeting. The next meeting will be on the 9th of March.

*Meeting end: 18:45*

