

# Stipendiatororganisasjonene i Norge

## Quarterly meeting with the local organizations 31.05.2022

Time: 18:00

Location: Zoom

### Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Updates from the board
  - a. PhD Day
  - a. Mental Health Survey
  - b. Internationalization
  - c. Compensation for local boards
2. Research Theft
  - a. Introduction
  - a. SiN's Position

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MdcSBxaqp7KBaNYgYOwUgzRQguuPX0yYFvKUOUGrZhl/edit?usp=sharing>
- i. Comments in the document or separately are fine
  - a. Explanation for the position
  - b. Discussion
  - c. Further Action
- .Collaboration with PAND (Denmark)?
- i. Survey?
- ii. Collection of experiences?
  2. Forskningsrådet board statement
    - a. Already gave an interview
    - b. Position statement?
  2. Slack
    - a. Do local organizations want more members on SiN's Slack?
  2. Additional meetings with Local Organizations and SiN
    - a. Yes or no
    - a. How often
    - b. Who should attend?
  2. Eurodoc
    - a. Intro to Eurodoc
    - a. Eurodoc AGM and elections, are there any interested candidates?
  2. Next Meeting
    - a. August 30th, 6:00 - 8:00
  2. SiN AGM
  3. Additional issues?

## Minutes

Present: Sanja, Chris, Anna, Friederike, **Runa (UiBDoc)**, **Regina (DION)**, **Margrethe (NIH)**, **Stian (OsloMet)**, **Martin (UiADoc)**, **Koen (UiT)**, **Christina (UiO)**.

**Additionally: Anna presenting UiO and Sanja presenting UiS**

Sanja leading the meeting, Friederike taking notes.

### 1. Introductions

- a. Runa Falck, UiBdoc
- b. Regina Matveena, DION
- c. Margrethe Voll Storaas, Sport university
- d. Stian Brynlidsen, PhD Forum OsloMet
- e. Martin Holen, UiAdoc
- f. Koen, UiT
- g. Christina Johansson
- h. SiN: Sanja, Anna, Chris, Friederike

### 2. Updates from the board

#### a. PhD Day

- i. reorganize PhD day according to the feedback
- ii. location at University of Oslo
- iii. distributed through 3 days
- iv. divide financial burden between the hosts (SiN, UiODoc, PhD Forum at OsloMet)
- v. divide topics by days
- vi. stream the PhD day so that the others can take part in it as well
- vii. career possibilities for PhDs and Postdocs
- viii. invite unions to talk about the rights for international PhDs and benefits for Norwegians as well
- ix. PhD day should be held at a different university every year
- x. during Forskningsdagene in the end of september

#### b. Mental Health Survey

- i. in the process of analyzing the data
- ii. results can be shared with local organizations

#### c. Internationalization

- i. position statement published on the website in English and Norwegian

#### d. Compensation for local boards

- i. how does compensation for the local boards work
- ii. document on the GoogleDrive which needs to be found
- iii. DION: 1 month compensation for board members and 2 months for president
- iv. UiBdoc: they don't have any compensation -> wish that this changes
- v. NIH: president: duty work deduction of 40 hours
- vi. OsloMet: different kind of compensation - dependent on the contract: 4 year contract - deduction of the duty work hours which were logged; 3

year contract - contract extension; but this should be changed by next year that is a fixed a number of hours

- vii. UiAdoc: monetary compensation and no extension possible
- viii. UiT: 2 weeks contract extension or deduction of duty work,
- ix. UiOdoc: 10000 NOK per board member but this includes taxes, try to increase this monetary compensation, president 20000 NOK
- x. UiS: 8 weeks extension president, 4 weeks extension board members, representatives in committees get further one to two week of extensions

### 3. Research Theft

#### a. Introduction

- i. initiative from the Danish organization
- ii. we decided to take part in the discussion

#### b. SiN's Position and

#### c. Discussion

- i. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MdcSBxaqp7KBaNYgYOwUgzRQguuPX0yYFvKUOUGrZh/edit?usp=sharing>
- ii. **Comments in the document or separately are fine**
- iii. A culture of research theft has been allowed to exist for too long in both Norwegian and global academia -> this can be misunderstood
- iv. common Norwegian guidelines are difficult to implement - authors on a paper are dependent on the field (in some it is very common to have the funding responsible person on the paper)
- v. NIH: there should be a method in place for reporting research theft - UiT is working on save channels, but it is not in place yet
- vi. supervisor might have the idea -> so they have the intellectual property rights even if they do not the work in the end
- vii. it is also research theft if data is used generated Bachelor and Master students when they are not on a published paper
- viii. discussion at OsloMet: should there it be included into general research ethics channels or should it be a seperate one
- ix. UiBdoc: anecdotal evidence is not enough to say that research theft is so widespread -> should be rephrased
- x. a survey would be good to understand the widespread of the issue
- xi. it is very difficult to know what research theft is, because it is high dimensional (when is it research theft and when not? also dependent on the field)
- xii. Example of guidelines from UiT: (At least in this document it specifies that supervision on its own is not enough to justify co-authorship.)
- xiii. [https://uit.no/Content/171815/UiT\\_S53-16\\_EtiskRetnRettleing%20161027.pdf](https://uit.no/Content/171815/UiT_S53-16_EtiskRetnRettleing%20161027.pdf)

xiv. **Explanation for the position**

d. **Further Action**

- i. **Collaboration with PAND (Denmark)?**
- ii. **Survey?**
- iii. **Collection of experiences?**
- iv. UiBdoc: collaboration is good, but survey not so motivated (people who have not experienced it will not be motivated to answer - strong bias), experiences should be published - good way to go from here
- v. DION: positive towards the survey -> motivation with some gift cards; idea: local events where they try to collect local data
- vi. Koen: anecdotes best to from here; against survey
- vii. UiS: struggle to get response on the covid survey; start debate with anecdotes
- viii. check if PAND did a survey or not? Base our discussion on possible data from them

4. **Forskningsrådet board statement**

a. **Already gave an interview**

- i. <https://khrono.no/statssekretaer-om-forskningsradet-dette-handlar-berre-om-ein-einaste-ting/688742>

b. **Position statement?**

- i. UiBDoc: difficult to make a large statement since the situation is unclear; what are the important things in Forskningsrådet that we should care about; Research council should keep in mind the opportunities for early career researchers in Norway -> not a position statement, but commenting
- ii. OsloMet: cuts need to be made, focus should be on the cutting part rather than on the dismissal of the board -> comment publically; make sure that PhDs and early career researchers are treated equally

5. **Slack**

a. **Do local organizations want more members on SiN's Slack?**

- i. UiBdoc: person dependent if only one person is on Slack from the board -> more robust if the whole board is on Slack
- ii. UiAdoc: same opinion as UiBdoc; suggested discord
- iii. Margrethe: what's the role of Slack? Why should we be there? Main communication channel is and will be email; some organizations have issues receiving emails, Slack: board uses it for 'daily' communications -> reach everyone in a short time -> Slack supports email communication, but does not replace it
- iv. UiT: local organizations could take up the task for updating the active members
- v. small step would be to have 2 people on Slack (president + vice president/treasurer)

6. **Additional meetings with Local Organizations and SiN**

- a. **Yes or no**
- b. **How often**
- c. **Who should attend?**

- i. UiBdoc: wish to have more meetings to be better aware of what SiN is doing - SiN has also the possibility to grow from UiBdoc; more meetings at UiBdoc would be more efficient
- ii. UiODOc: no need for more regular meetings; but irregular meetings if there are pressing things to discuss
- iii. OsloMet: challenging to add more meetings; invite representatives from SiN to local organization events - better outreach and representation
- iv. Koen: short, informal meetings would be good if things come up that should be discussed
- v. SiN doesn't have the budget to have more than one physical meeting (AGM) per year

## 7. Eurodoc

### a. Intro to Eurodoc

### b. Eurodoc AGM and elections, are there any interested candidates?

- i. please distribute the information that will come via email
- ii. it would be nice to have applicants from Norway

## 8. Next Meeting

### a. August 30th, 6:00 - 8:00

- i. receive Zoom link well in advance

## 9. SiN AGM

- a. plan to have it in the beginning of November
- b. not in Oslo or Bergen since it was in the last two years
- c. Stavanger and Trømso have not had an AGM
  - i. Tromsø not a good place in November, but likes the idea and worried about the workload -> we would be welcome; a lot of flying needed -> carbon footprint is extrem for this location
  - ii. Trondheim could be an alternative: would be great to have the elections here (Gjørvik & Ålesund could also be a location)
  - iii. Stavanger: should be feasible
  - iv. write a document on the responsibilities and expectations of what is needed for co-hosting the AGM and see who would be interested in it (access to buildings, assistance in food)
  - v. UiA: event managers already are interested in hosting the AGM (Kristiansand)

## 10. Additional issues?

- a. NIH: freedom of speech - is this a topic?
  - 10 rules for freedom of speech given from NTNU (on basis of some report)
- b. UiT: working on this year: more contact and events with the various campus around the northern region. What issues do others have? struggling that nothing is happening at the smaller ones - that they get forgotten -> tried to travel to the
  - i. UiA: smallest campus started UiAdoc - also the most active ones
  - ii. NTNU: large issue to motivate people to join DION on the small campuses; try to attract attention with an event before the AGM -> now board members of all campuses

Meeting ended: 19:55