




Rapport fra «Seminar for PhD supervisors - Faculty of Social Sciences»

Innhentede svar pr. 30. oktober 2020 10:51

- Leverte svar: **21**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar




I am satisfied with the seminar *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
Strongly agree	5	23,8 % 
Agree	15	71,4 % 
No opinion	1	4,8 % 
Disagree	0	0 %
Strongly disagree	0	0 %

Do you have any comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the seminar?

- The afternoon session could have been more tightly presented.
- Strengths: Lot of relevant issues and challenges, good with possibilities for discussions, useful comments and responses to discussion points within the groups and from those in charge of the seminar. Useful to hear other supervisors' experiences. Weakness: Some issues were really pertinent and central and would have been really interesting to discuss in more detail (however, the variation in issues covered was important). The differences between departments (rules, culture) made it difficult to discuss issues with the same background understanding of its meaning/challenges (but on the other hand, it was interesting to see how different departments are in terms of "culture" and expectations. Looking forward to a next time and hopefully non-digital solution!
- Was good as a first introductory seminar, but would be even better if it is followed up by seminars that go in depth in the different areas of ethics, with more case studies and discussion, as well as new areas such as concrete ways to prevent and address ethics-arising conflicts etc (strategy development at institute, faculty and UiO level)
- The examples for discussion were interesting and led to good discussion of issues I had not considered previously
- It was a great seminar, but it was too long for an online course (though great to have frequent breaks and breakout rooms). The session from NESH was fantastic, and the discussion exercises great.
- A bit basic, perhaps.
- I liked all the sessions and found the one from NESH particularly helpful. Despite the reactions to the contrary, separating ethics from data protection is a good "tool to think with".
- They all did a great job but I was in particular impressed with Elisabeth Staksrud presentation. Her contribution filled a large, important knowledge gap and her way of handling the Zoom format was excellent!
- I think that the seminar was very good and so was the seminar leaders. I really enjoyed Staksrud's presentation of the Research ethics system and its challenges. I would have benefitted from more detailed discussions on phd supervision and the different dilemmas related to that as well as different strategies for supervision. As it is now it is not much knowledge transfer that exist on this issue, at least not through formal channels, and it would be very useful as a totally inexperienced supervisor to get ideas on how to think about process and practice.
- Jeg likte at det var mulighet til aktivitet i breakoutrooms
- Gode refleksjonsoppgaver som ga stor læring - både å diskutere i breakoutrooms og høre refleksjonene over i plenum i etterkant. Forelesningene mer varierende kvalitet.
- The seminar raised many important questions but also remained vague with regard to constructive solutions. Many discussion points remained superficial, for example what constitutes a good supervision relationship. The opportunity to exchange experiences with colleagues was valuable. A 2-day seminar might be more appropriate for this important topic.

The themes adressed in the course were relevant *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
Strongly agree	10	47,6 % 
Agree	10	47,6 % 
No opinion	0	0 %
Disagree	1	4,8 % 
Strongly disagree	0	0 %

Please explain why. Do you have suggestions for other themes? *

- The discussion of the adjudication committee was a waste of time.
- Personally, I gained more from the first half of the seminar. Groups were fine. Would have been good to have even more time to discuss our own experiences/challenges we have faced.
- I believe the theme for this seminar is a great choice. Though it might have broader value if Nature Science related ethic can be touched upon as well.
- Useful clarifications and reminders (= well-known issues and themes), but dilemmas and challenges are always useful to discuss and reflect upon with others with similar or different experiences.
- Please see my answer further up on possible additional themes
- It would be good to discuss more practical issues such as how to best motivate students in terms of writing the thesis.
- Supervisors' role in career advice
- Project coordinator and supervisor: Should the two roles be distinct, or can the same person do both?
- The chosen themes clearly spoke to the experiences of many participants.
- A good reminder of relevant guidelines and rules to follow
- First half did not concern supervision. Perhaps focus the whole day on supervision ethics.

- It was a good mix of potential issues I haven't considered (e.g., using publically available materials) and problems I have faced (e.g., co-authorship issues).
- Elisabeth's contribution was detrimental for the impression I am left with.
- The themes were relevant but the question of good supervision also encompasses other aspects and more practical questions of how to structure supervision well.
- Important reminder of key issues and also gave up-to-date info on ongoing debates. I guess special seminar on the role of the supervisor when supervising could be useful (e.g. on the topic of guidance/discussion partner/steering etc.).
- Nei, fine og relevante temaer
- I think the theme of ethics/research ethics is very good as it opens up so much for discussion and it is also easy in one way to get interested in this topic. Other themes: See comment above
- Inclusion in Norwegian society. Esp relevant of intl phds
- Interessante problemstillinger. Jeg har ikke data som samles inn via sosial medier eller digitalt, men ok å høre problemstillinger om det likevel.
- I do not have suggestions for other themes. The topics were relevant.
- Not really

Any other comments?

- The morning session was very good.
- Break-out rooms and mixing up teams great ideas to minimize zoom fatigue 😊 thank you also for keeping everything so well timed!
- The first part of the course (before lunch) was better organized and managed than the second part (after lunch).
- I would like to ask Knut and Bjørn to consider including UiO's responsibilities to protect our phd-students and us, and inform us of the pathways available (in the case of conflict) for phd's and supervisors in these courses. In our discussions it became apparent that many of us have (first- and secondhand) experience with our departments not being able to sufficiently help when conflicts arise, and while many ethical issues are indeed dilemmas, many are also covered by legislation and regulations. However, the way these issues are handled differ a lot between departments and cases. This needs to be communicated to all parties involved. I know an email was recently sent out about this, but it required quite some effort to process (which probably doesn't happen unless someone really needs it at that exact moment ;-)). Perhaps spending some time on this information and discussing how we can best handle such situations would be preventative? (here the link sent out: Les mer om hva varsling er og hvordan du kan varsle på UiOs sider om varsling: <https://www.uio.no/om/hms/si-fra/varsling/>). Anyway, it was a very interesting seminar, so a big thank you to both the organizers and contributors :-). I would actually like a "Part 2" of this seminar :-)
- The seminar was useful and relevant also for supervision of MA students in my (department's) case. I think the breakout rooms with specific questions/cases worked better than the ones addressing more general questions .

Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema (v1039_Orc261)