

Guidelines for the yearly ISP update and department representative talks

Cecilia Akselsson, director of postgraduate studies at INES, 2020-11-01, updated 2024-11-05

Introduction

At the end of each year, in connection with updating the study plan, the PhD student, the department representative and the main supervisor should meet. In cases where a co-supervisor takes a very active part in daily supervision, they should also take part. Two meetings should be held, first a meeting only involving the PhD student and the department representative, and then a meeting involving also the supervisor(s). It's best if the meetings are scheduled separately, meaning they should preferably not be held back-to-back. The meeting between PhD student and department representative should be scheduled to 30-45 minutes and the meeting where also supervisor(s) are participating should be scheduled to 1 hour.

Time frames

First half of November:

- PhD student goes through the ISP and updates the straight forward parts (courses taken, etc)
- Department representative schedules the times for the two meetings. They should preferably be held in the end of November or in December.

Mid November

PhD student and main supervisor meet and discuss the ISP.

Second half of November-Early December

PhD student and main supervisor continue discussions about the ISP and finalizes a draft that is sent to the department representative.

End of November - December

The two meetings are held. The department representative needs to get an updated ISP at least two days before the meeting.

January

- Updates of ISP based on department representative talk (PhD student, supervisor(s) and department representative needs to agree)
- PhD student locks the ISP, prints and signs it, and collects signatures from main supervisor, department representative, prefect and preferably also the co-supervisor(s)
- PhD student hands in the signed ISP to Asli (deadline 1st of February)
- Department representative sends a short report from the department representative talk to Cecilia (deadline 1st of February).

Meeting PhD student and department representative

Guideline questions:

1. How is the progress of your work going in general? (Details are saved to the second meeting)
2. How does the cooperation in the research group work? Any need for changes?
3. How is the physical and social working environment?
4. Do you think that you, as PhD students, have insight into the departmental work and the opportunity to influence?
5. Are there any problems in your environment related to equality?

Meeting with PhD student, supervisor(s) and department representative

The department representative should go through the ISP carefully before the meeting.

Important things to address are:

1. Has the ISP been filled in satisfactorily, i.e. with the required information and with enough details?
2. What is the status of the papers? Is the research plan reasonable and is the time plan followed? If not, why and what can be done about it?
3. What is the status of the problem analysis + first year seminar and the midway seminar?
4. How does supervision work? Is there any need for changes in the way of working and cooperating within the team?
5. What is the status and plans regarding courses? Have the mandatory courses been completed, and if not, when are they planned to be taken? How many course credits have been completed, and have they been reported to LADOK? (If not, please ensure this is done before finalizing the ISP) Is the plan for taking courses reasonable and is the time plan followed?
6. When is the defense planned to take place (needs to be less precise for 1st and 2nd-year students than for 3rd and 4th-year students)
7. Plans for teaching and other departmental tasks?

Report from the department representative talk

The department representative should take notes and write a short report after the meeting (preferably around 1 page). All points raised above should be addressed briefly or, if required, more in-depth. In the end of the report, the department representative should give advices on any measures that need to be taken under a separate heading, and indicate if a follow-up meeting with the director of studies is required. The report should be sent to the PhD student, the Main supervisor and to Cecilia.