



Møteinnkalling

Utvalg: **Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet**
Møtested: Digitalt møte i Teams
Møtedato: 01.06.2021
Tidspunkt: 09:15-11:30

Eventuelt forfall må meldes snarest på epost til Olav Skare (olav.skare@uit.no) med kopi til Mayvi B. Johansen (mayvi.johansen@uit.no) Vararepresentanter møter etter nærmere beskjed.

Saksliste

<i>Saksnr</i>	<i>Tittel/beskrivelse</i>	<i>U.off.</i>	<i>Arkivref.</i>
Orienteringssaker			
OS 3/21	Referat og meldinger - Ph.d.-utvalgets møte 1. juni 2021	X	2021/946
Ordinære saker			
PHD-U 10/21	Søknad om opptak til ph.d.-programmet i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap - Ida Soltvedt Hvinden	X	2021/1981
PHD-U 11/21	Ekstraordinær innmelding av ph.d.-emne ved HSL-fakultetet våren 2022		2021/613
PHD-U 12/21	Evaluerings av emnet SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling		2020/971
PHD-U 13/21	Evaluerings av emnet GEN-8001 Take Control of your PhD Journey		2020/971
PHD-U 14/21	Fremdriftsrapportering for 2020 - instituttrapporter etter gjennomførte forskersamtaler med ph.d.-studentene	X	2021/947
PHD-U 15/21	Møtedatoer høst 2021		2020/2397
	Eventuelt		

Orienteringssaker

**OS 3/21 Referat og meldinger - Ph.d.-utvalgets møte 1. juni 2021
2021/946**

SAKSFRAMLEGG

Ekstraordinær innmelding av ph.d.-emne ved HSL-fakultetet våren 2022

Innstilling til vedtak:

Ph.d.-utvalget ber administrasjonen om å tilrettelegge for at følgende emner opprettes og arrangeres våren 2022:

HIF-8039 Language technology for minority languages (5 stp.)

Emnet skal evalueres i slutten av semesteret det tilbys, da praksisen er at alle nye emner skal evalueres etter første gangs gjennomføring.

Bakgrunn:

Institutt og senter ved HSL-fakultetet har en årlig frist for å melde inn ph.d.-emner for det påfølgende studieåret. Ved fristens utløp 15. januar 2021 var det bare meldt inn 4 fagspesifikke/valgemner, noe som er langt færre enn det som vanligvis meldes inn. Som en følge av det lave antallet innmeldte emner ble i møte i ph.d.-utvalget ved fakultetet den 23. februar (ePh.ref. 2021/613-1) vedtatt at enhetene skulle få en ny og ekstraordinær frist for innmelding av emner som skulle tilbys våren 2022. Ved fristens utløp 10. mai 2021 var det meldt inn ett emne fra Institutt for språk og kultur.

Nytt emne:

HIF-8039 Language technology for minority languages (5. Stp.)

Institutt for språk og kultur

Fagansvarlig: Trond Trosterud

Administrasjonens kommentar til det innmeldte emnet

Administrasjonen har kontrollert det innmeldte emnet, og ser at det samsvarer med fakultetets utfyllende regler for oppretting og innmelding av ph.d.-emner.

Synnøve T. Andersen
prodekan forskning

Olav Skare
seksjonsleder
—
lena.bogstrand@uit.no
77 64 52 69

Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur

Saksbehandler: Lena Bogstrand, rådgiver

Vedlegg:

- 1) Emnebeskrivelse HIF-8039 Language technology for minority languages

HSL Faculty, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, 2.10.2017	TEMPLATE FOR COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR PHD COURSES, THE HSL FACULTY Please see explanation to each point below. The template is based on requirements for modules within the UiT quality system.
Name	Bokmål: Språkteknologi for minoritetsspråk Nynorsk: Språkteknologi for minoritetsspråk English: Language technology for minority languages
Course code and level	HIF-8039
Type of course	The course may be taken as a single course.
Scope of course	Amount of ECTS points: 5
Required / recommended previous knowledge	<p>PhD students or holders of a Norwegian Master's Degree of five years or 3+ 2 years (or equivalent) may be admitted. PhD students must upload a document from their university stating that they are registered PhD students.</p> <p>Holders of a Master's Degree must upload a Master's Diploma with Diploma Supplement / English translation of the diploma. Applicants from listed countries must document proficiency in English. To find out if this applies to you see the following list: http://www.nokut.no/Documents/NOKUT/Artikkelbibliotek/Utenlandsk_utdanning/GSUlista/2016/GSU_list_English_14112016.pdf</p> <p>For more information on accepted English proficiency tests and scores, as well as exemptions from the English proficiency tests, please see the following document: https://uit.no/Content/254419/PhD_EnglishProficiency_100913.pdf</p>
Course contents	<p>The course will provide an introduction to relevant language technology methods for minority languages and the prerequisites for being able to prepare language technology tools. It will also provide an overview of existing language technology tools for the language that are relevant to the course. Then the course will show how the language technology tools can contribute to analyzing language and language use.</p> <p>The course will as far as possible be based on topics relevant to the participants in the course. Relevant topics can be: Different approaches to language technology, prerequisites for building language technology tools, programs supporting the writing process, corpus analysis and platforms, dictionary platforms, synthetic speech and speech recognition, machine translation, machine readability, access to and ownership of resources.</p>
Learning outcomes Be concise and consequent: Outcomes should relate to each other as well as to the teaching methods and the coursework requirements / examination form. Learning outcomes should be formulated in such a	<p>The students have the following learning outcomes:</p> <p>Knowledge The student has knowledge of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> language technology resources and methods relevant to minority languages ways to use language technology tools and their effect on the language communities <p>Skills The student is able to / can:</p>

<p>way that they may be checked.</p> <p>Make sure the outcomes are realistic and in accordance with the amount of ECTS (they must not be too ambitious).</p> <p>Description of competence is not required for 10 ECTS courses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use language technology resources when working with analysis of his or her language material <p>Competence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student can consider language technology tools in relation to the language situation • The student has some understanding of the technologies behind the different language technology tools.
Relevance in the degree program	The course is relevant for analysis of linguistic data using computer methods, for language planning, and language revitalization, and research on the role of language technology in language communities.
<p>Teaching and working methods</p> <p>Teaching methods, scope and frequency should be described. Also provide information about the number of lectures / classes.</p>	The course runs over a week. It consists of at least 15 hours of lectures in the morning, with discussions, group assignments and presentations in the afternoon.
Practice	
Quality assurance of the course	All courses will be evaluated once during the period of the study program. The board of the program decides which courses will be evaluated by students and teacher each year.
<p>Coursework</p> <p>The required coursework must be clear and feasible. Keep the scope of the course in mind.</p>	<p>The following coursework requirements must be completed and approved in order to take the final exam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student must give an achievement on a given topic during the course, and write an article of 10-15 pages related to the post on the course afterwards.
<p>Assessment and exam</p> <p>Provide clear information about exam form(s). The amount of hours/days/weeks must be given.</p> <p>In the case of written assignments, please provide the required amount of words. If desired: provide information about line space, font etc. (standard: 1 ½).</p> <p>A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail</p>	<p>The exam will consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • writing and submitting an article of approximately 15 pages relevant to the content of the course. The topic is chosen in consultation with the lecturer on the course, and the article is submitted before a deadline after the course. <p>The exam will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.</p>
Retake	Retake is offered in in the beginning of the following semester in cases of grade F or Fail. Deferred examination is offered in the beginning of the following semester if the student is unable to take the final exam due to illness or other exceptional circumstances. Registration deadline for retake is January 15 for autumn semester exams and August 15 for spring semester exams.

Syllabus	ca. 700 pages
Language of instruction and examination	According to students (North Saami, Scandinavian, English). The examination can be written in either of the listed languages.

EXPLANATION OF TEMPLATE BASED ON REQUIREMENTS IN THE QUALITY SYSTEM

Contents requirements	Detailed information and comments
Title	The course should have a clear title that provides information about the course contents to both students and professionals. The course title should be given in Bokmål, Nynorsk and English.
Course code and level	Each course must have a course code (e.g. GEO-3104); the letters being an abbreviation of the name of the subject (GEO = geology). The courses fall within seven general levels: 0000 - 1000 - 2000 - 3000 - 5000 - 6000 - 8000. The code number indicates the <i>academic level</i> of the course. 0000 courses are introductory courses, 1000 courses are first and second year courses on BA level, 2000 courses are specialisation courses on BA level (usually third year), and 3000 courses are courses on MA level. 5000 refers to courses within the practical pedagogical education, 6000 to further education courses, and 8000 refers to PhD courses.
Type of course	Information about whether or not the course may be taken as a single course should be provided. Text suggestion: "This course is obligatory for students who belong to the degree program (<i>name of degree program</i>)" or "This course may be taken as a single course (by students who meet the admission requirements for the degree program in (<i>name of degree program</i>))".
Scope	Indicate the scope of the course in ECTS points.
Required / recommended previous knowledge	Previous knowledge requirements must be indicated. In cases where previous knowledge is desired but not a requirement, it should be clearly indicated that this knowledge is <i>recommended</i> , but not required.
Course contents	A description of the course contents, minimum 50 words, maximum 300 words.
Relevance in the degree program	The relevance of the course in the degree program to which it belongs should ideally be provided, but is not a requirement.
Learning outcomes	<p>Learning outcomes should be clearly formulated and described in bullet points under the categories <i>understanding</i>, <i>skills</i>, and <i>competence</i>. A description of competence is not required for smaller courses of 10 ECTS points. Learning outcomes should be formulated in such a way that they may be checked, and there should be a clear connection between learning outcomes, teaching methods, and the type(s) of assessment/examination. If linguistic competence is part of the objectives of the course, this must be included in the course descriptions and the program descriptions.</p> <p><u>The descriptions should have the following structure:</u></p>

	<p>By the end of the course the student has obtained the following:</p> <p>Knowledge: The student has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - knowledge about / understands / insight about / overview on etc. <p>It is possible to grade: i.e. Wide knowledge / good understanding / (especially on Master's level:) deep / thorough knowledge, deep/specialized insight etc.</p> <p>At least three points.</p> <p>Skills: The student is able to / can</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - analyse / consider / assess / formulate / discuss / conclude / summarize / recap - <p>Competence: The student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is able to / may
Teaching and working methods	Scope of teaching, teaching and working methods, and teaching frequency should be described. If the course is not offered every semester, the description should provide information on whether or not it is possible to take the exam during semesters where the course is not taught. There should be a clear connection between the expected learning outcomes of the course and the chosen teaching and working methods.
Practice	Information on practice, reference to practice plan if relevant. Arrangement and completion of practice should be clearly connected to the expected learning outcomes of the course, other teaching, and the expected obtained competence at the end of the course.
Quality assurance of the course	Information on how the students may assess and give feedback on the quality of the course (evaluation, reference groups, student representatives, etc.)
Coursework requirements	Information on coursework requirements, the scope of these requirements, and whether or not they are obligatory (e.g. lecture attendance, methodology courses, exercises, practice, field work courses, excursions, lab work, security training, group assignments, semester assignments and other written assignments. Assessment of coursework should be on a Pass/Fail basis.
Security training	For courses including lab work, excursions, field work, studies abroad, etc., any security training necessary to complete the course should be indicated. This should be formulated as a coursework requirement in the course description.
Examination and assessment	<p>Type of examination and assessment, including information on which assessments that will appear on the transcript of records or will form part of the basis for the final grade which will appear on the transcript of records, should be indicated. Type of assessment should also be indicated (A-F grades scale or Pass/Fail). There should be a clear connection between the expected learning outcomes and the chosen form of examination and assessment.</p> <p>Course descriptions for courses operating with two or more exams during the course should include the following: information on whether separate grades are given for each exam or if one final average based grade at the end of the course is</p>

	given, how the various exams are weighed in the case of a final average grade, information on type of examination and assessment for each exam and the course in its entirety, information on possibilities for retake examinations and which exams that need to be retaken in order to pass the course. The duration of the exams (amount of hours/days) and the required amount of words in written exams should be indicated.
Retake	Information on possible admission and completion of retake examinations should be given.
Syllabus	A reading list is not obligatory in the course description. However, it is nevertheless a requirement that a syllabus is developed for each course, and that an up-to-date reading list is accessible by the beginning of the semester in which the course is being taught. If the organised part of the course (lectures, lab work, seminars etc.) is to be considered as part of the syllabus, and exams may be given on this basis, this must be clearly indicated in the description of the syllabus.
Language of instruction and examination	<p>During the spring of 2007, the University of Tromsø passed the Guidelines on language policy (case S 28-07, DocuLive 200603903-18).</p> <p>Indication of <i>Language of instruction</i> is obligatory information in all course descriptions. The language of instruction should as a rule be Norwegian. In order to achieve instrumental objectives and develop competence in professional English among Norwegian students and/or integrate students with another native language than Norwegian/another Scandinavian language, the language of instruction may also be English.</p> <p>Indication of <i>Language of examination</i> is obligatory in all course and program descriptions. The individual faculties may choose the language of examination, but as a rule, students should not be required to take their exams in English unless English forms an integral part of the course and/or its learning outcomes.</p> <p>Special regulations for language of instruction and examination may apply for courses within language and linguistics.</p>
External candidates for examination	Each faculty must decide on possible examination methods and examination fees for external candidates who are not admitted to the course. However, this needs not be described in the course description.
Other regulations	Other regulations relevant to the completion, quality assurance and evaluation of the course should be described.

SAKSFRAMLEGG

Evaluering av emnet SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling

Innstilling til vedtak:

Ph.d.-utvalget tar tilbakemeldingen i studentevalueringen til etterretning og ber om at faglærers kommentarer tas med videre. Administrasjonen bes om å legge til rette for at det legges inn et ekstra arbeidskrav i emnet, som går på obligatorisk oppmøte i 80 % av undervisningen. Dette vil også gjelde for den engelskspråklige varianten av emnet – SVH-8002 *Research dissemination*.

Bakgrunn:

Institutt for arkeologi, historie, religionsvitenskap og teologi (AHR) har våren 2021 arrangert undervisning og eksamen i emnet SVH-8002 Forskningsformidling (5 stp.). Dette er et obligatorisk emne i opplæringsdelen for ph.d.-studentene ved HSL-fakultetet. Emnet har kapasitet på 15 plasser, og det var 15 stykker som fikk plass våren 2021, og 14 som fulgte emnet.

Førsteamanuensis Christina Lentz hadde det faglige ansvaret for emnet.

Studentevaluering:

Studentevalueringen ble sendt ut via Nettskjema etter at undervisningen var over, og 9 av studentene responderte. Studentene var veldig fornøyd med egen læring, emnets innhold, undervisningen og med faglæreren. De var også veldig fornøyd med læringsmiljøet, og syntes at det var en fin kultur for å presentere og diskutere med andre studenter og faglærer. Presentasjonene, gruppediskusjonene og tilbakemeldingene var noe flere trakk frem som noe som fungerte spesielt godt i dette emnet.

Av forbedringspotensialer er det flere som nevner nødvendigheten av pauser, og at det skal være «inaktive» pauser. Dette er noe faglærer er klar over, og det har også vært problematisert tidligere.

Faglærerevaluering:

En engelskspråklig variant av emnet ble tilbudt høsten 2020, og faglærer har tatt med tilbakemeldingene fra studentevalueringen som ble gjennomført, inn i planleggingen av emnet dette semesteret. Blant annet ble workshoper med Twitter og podkast innført dette semesteret, som følge

av ønske fra studentene forrige semester. De norske studentene var ikke like interessert i dette som de internasjonale, men faglærer kommer likevel til å fortsette med disse workshopene.

En av tilbakemeldingene forrige semester var at det var for stort fokus på populærvitenskapelig forskningsformidling i stedet for på akademisk formidling, så dette semesteret var faglæreren opptatt av å balansere forholdet mellom de to formene for formidling bedre.

Faglærer vil fortsette med fokuset på presentasjoner, tilbakemeldinger og diskusjoner, da det fungerte veldig godt. Studentene fikk både tilbakemeldinger fra hverandre, i tillegg til tilbakemeldinger fra faglærer.

Obligatorisk oppmøte som arbeidskrav

Faglærer foreslår at man legger inn obligatorisk oppmøte på 80% av undervisningen som et arbeidskrav. Dette emnet har ikke noe pensum, og emnet er basert på deltakelse. Det er derfor nødvendig at alle studentene deltar i undervisningen. Dette vil også gjelde for den engelskspråklige varianten av emnet, som går om høsten – SVH-8001 *Research dissemination*.

Faglærers forslag om endring i prioritering av søkere

Faglærer foreslår også at man bør vurdere om studenter som har kommet lengre i studiet sitt skal prioriteres over de som nettopp har begynt, eventuelt at man ikke tar opp de som akkurat har startet på sin ph.d.-utdanning. Undervisninga i emnet tar utgangspunkt i studentenes egen forskning, så dersom de er tidlig i løpet har de ikke nødvendigvis så mye forskning å vise til.

Dersom man skal legge større vekt på hvor i studieløpet studentene har kommet, må man gjøre noe med rangeringen ved opptak. Ved de to opptakene som foreløpig har vært i dette emnet har det vært så mange søkere at vi kun har tatt opp egne studenter fra HSL-fakultetet, altså det som ligger til kategori 1 (se beskrivelse under).

I henhold til ph.d.-forskriftens §10, fjerde ledd, har fakultetene mulighet til å fastsette spesielle opptakskrav innenfor opptaksramma for opptak til emner i opplæringsdelen. Dersom man vil prioritere studenter som har kommet lengre i utdanningsløpet sitt, kan man legge det inn som et krav i opptaksinformasjonen til emnet. Eksempelvis kan man si at studenter må ha fullført to semester av sin ph.d.-utdanning for å få opptak. Bakdelen med å gjøre det slik er at man da risikerer at egne studenter fra HSL-fakultetet, som har kommet kortere i studieløpet, vil måtte vike plassen for studenter fra andre fakultet/institusjoner som har kommet lengre.

Beskrivelse av den eksisterende opptaksinformasjonen i emnebeskrivelsen til SVH-8002:

Kategori 1: Personer som er tatt opp på et ph.d.-program ved HSL-fakultetet i humanistiske og samfunnsvitenskapelige fag

Kategori 2: Personer som er tatt opp som ph.d.-studenter ved UiT

Kategori 3: Deltakere på førstelektorprogrammet som oppfyller utdanningskravet

Kategori 4: Doktorgradsstudenter fra andre universitet.

Dersom det er flere enn 15 ph.d.-studenter ved HSL-fak som søker opptak vil de som er kommet lengst i studieløpet prioriteres til disse plassene. Dersom noen står likt vil opptak avgjøres ved loddtrekning. Studenter som ikke har norsk som morsmål prioriteres ved opptak til høstens engelskspråklige emne (SVH-8001). Minste antall deltakere er 5.

Synnøve Thomassen Andersen
prodekan forskning

Olav Skare
seksjonsleder

Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur

Saksbehandler: rådgiver Lena Bogstrand

Vedlegg:

- 1) Studentevaluering
- 2) Faglærerrapport
- 3) Emnebeskrivelse SVH-8002
- 4) Emnebeskrivelse SVH-8001

Rapport fra «Forskningsformidling»

Innhentede svar pr. 20. mai 2021 14:22

- Leverte svar: **9**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvaer

How do you respond to the following statements, in connection with the Covid-19 situation?

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 strongly disagrees and 5 strongly agrees:



Svar fordelt på antall

	1	2	3	4	5	Not relevant
I would have preferred a digital organization of the class	6	2	0	1	0	0
I can learn better with in classroom teaching	0	0	2	2	5	0
The Covid-19 situation did not affect my participation in the class	1	0	1	2	5	0
The Covid-19 situation did not affect my learning progress	1	0	0	3	5	0
The overall handling of the Covid-19 situation was satisfactory	0	0	0	1	8	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1	2	3	4	5	Not relevant
I would have preferred a digital organization of the class	66,7 %	22,2 %	0 %	11,1 %	0 %	0 %
I can learn better with in classroom teaching	0 %	0 %	22,2 %	22,2 %	55,6 %	0 %
The Covid-19 situation did not affect my participation in the class	11,1 %	0 %	11,1 %	22,2 %	55,6 %	0 %
The Covid-19 situation did not affect my learning progress	11,1 %	0 %	0 %	33,3 %	55,6 %	0 %
The overall handling of the Covid-19 situation was satisfactory	0 %	0 %	0 %	11,1 %	88,9 %	0 %



How do you evaluate your own efforts in the course?

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Very satisfied	7	77,8 %	
Satisfied	2	22,2 %	
Slightly satisfied	0	0 %	
Not satisfied	0	0 %	

If you are not satisfied with your own efforts in the course, state the main reason for this.

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Private matters	0	0 %	
The structure of the course	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

How do you evaluate your learning progress in the course?

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Very satisfied	6	66,7 %	
Satisfied	3	33,3 %	
Slightly satisfied	0	0 %	
Not satisfied	0	0 %	

Teaching and academic content

On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very bad and 5 is very good:

Svar fordelt på antall

	1	2	3	4	5	Not relevant

The course has covered the expected content	0	0	0	4	5	0
I benefited from presenting in front of the class	0	0	1	2	6	0
I think the discussions worked well	0	0	0	3	6	0
The teacher has been helpful and available for questions	0	0	0	2	7	0
The teacher explained the content well	0	0	0	3	6	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1	2	3	4	5	Not relevant
The course has covered the expected content	0 %	0 %	0 %	44,4 %	55,6 %	0 %
I benefited from presenting in front of the class	0 %	0 %	11,1 %	22,2 %	66,7 %	0 %
I think the discussions worked well	0 %	0 %	0 %	33,3 %	66,7 %	0 %
The teacher has been helpful and available for questions	0 %	0 %	0 %	22,2 %	77,8 %	0 %
The teacher explained the content well	0 %	0 %	0 %	33,3 %	66,7 %	0 %

About the course

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is to a very small degree and 5 is to a very large degree:

Svar fordelt på antall

	1	2	3	4	5
The course has met my expectations	0	0	0	4	5
The course requires more time than other courses	5	0	4	0	0
The course is perceived as demanding	3	2	3	1	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1	2	3	4	5
The course has met my expectations	0 %	0 %	0 %	44,4 %	55,6 %
The course requires more time than other courses	55,6 %	0 %	44,4 %	0 %	0 %
The course is perceived as demanding	33,3 %	22,2 %	33,3 %	11,1 %	0 %

Learning environment

To what extent do you use the following in your work with the course. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is to a very small degree and 5 is to a very large degree:

Svar fordelt på antall

	1	2	3	4	5	Not relevant
Participation in study groups	0	0	5	2	2	0
Canvas/digital learning resources	1	3	1	2	1	0
The material provided within the course itself	0	1	2	3	2	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1	2	3	4	5	Not relevant
Participation in study groups	0 %	0 %	55,6 %	22,2 %	22,2 %	0 %
Canvas/digital learning resources	12,5 %	37,5 %	12,5 %	25 %	12,5 %	0 %
The material provided within the course itself	0 %	11,1 %	22,2 %	33,3 %	22,2 %	11,1 %

Assessment and assessment methods

How do you respond to the following statements about the course's atmosphere

Svar fordelt på antall

	Agree	Slightly agree	Disagree
I am encouraged to speak and present the results of work tasks	9	0	0

There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the fellow students' side	9	0	0
There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the teacher's side	8	1	0
The overall atmosphere of the class was friendly and I was looking forward to attending class	9	0	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	Agree	Slightly agree	Disagree
I am encouraged to speak and present the results of work tasks	100 %	0 %	0 %
There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the fellow students' side	100 %	0 %	0 %
There is a good culture of debate and feedback from the teacher's side	88,9 %	11,1 %	0 %
The overall atmosphere of the class was friendly and I was looking forward to attending class	100 %	0 %	0 %

Syllabus

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 completely disagrees and 5 completely agrees:

Svar fordelt på antall

	1	2	3	4	5
The syllabus has a suitable scope	0	0	1	3	5
The syllabus has a suitable degree of difficulty	0	0	1	3	5
The syllabus is relevant in relation to the course content	0	0	1	2	6

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1	2	3	4	5
The syllabus has a suitable scope	0 %	0 %	11,1 %	33,3 %	55,6 %
The syllabus has a suitable degree of difficulty	0 %	0 %	11,1 %	33,3 %	55,6 %
The syllabus is relevant in relation to the course content	0 %	0 %	11,1 %	22,2 %	66,7 %

Was there anything that worked particularly well with the course?

- The interview session, writing the text and giving/receiving feedback and the poster were the most relevant for me. The teaser I also kind of liked, but I was not completely happy with mine.
- the course focus on learning by doing. That this could be done in the class-context with following discussion and feedback worked very well. Also the draft (opposed to perfect result) focus was very refreshing. I also liked that the course was given in Norwegian. For this amount of feedback/discussion/activity it was good to do it in my native language.
- Jeg er veldig fornøyd med kurset. Det er nyttig å kunne bruke ulike metoder for forskningsformidling, og kurset presenterte en god variasjon. En godt forberedt lærer som selv ga konstruktive tilbakemeldinger på presentert arbeid og engasjerte medstudenter som vil deg vel, var med å heve kvaliteten på kurset. Å se andres måter å lage intervju, teasere osv. har gitt meg gode ideer til hvordan jeg selv kan gjøre det. Jeg er også fornøyd med å bli introdusert for Twitter og Podcast selv om jeg kanskje ikke vil benytte meg av det selv. Tusen takk til kursleder for godt gjennomført kurs. Jeg ville ikke ha gjort mye annerledes til neste år. Godt jobba!
- Jeg likte at det var praktisk og at vi jobbet med alle oppgaver i mappa PÅ kurset. Gruppa var en fin gjeng og kulturen for å snakke og dele var god. Jeg likte også at det var et strikt fokus på å være presis til timene.
- The practical tasks and group/plenary discussions worked very well.
- Interviewsituation with fellow student. Feedback from students on article etc. Interesting to notice the discourses and discussions on social media Twitter, podcast etc.
- I think the course leader made the entire course in the way she presented each topic and followed us through the different tasks.

Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the course?

- First of all, I think it is problematic to encourage researchers to use social media, and to focus on the benefits, quite uncritically. During the lecture on SM I was really struggling because I think the the university should be the place where people would hold back and think long-term, and not give in just like the rest of the population. But besides from that I really enjoyed the course, and the teacher has been really really great to lead us through it.
- Time management. We need the breaks, the course is intense. The first two days was the worst. We had very little breaks and they were all "active". It was better the two last days. The relevancy of some of the external lectures could also have been better - I'm specifically thinking about the museum lecture.
- Det minst interessante var kanskje forelesningen knyttet til museumsformidling. Den kan vurderes. Kanskje erstattes med at Torjer Olsen får mer tid? Ellers vil jeg anbefale at studenter som legger fram får et visst antall minutter og klar beskjed om at det som er interessant er strukturer eller selve metodikken, ikke innhold. Det er kanskje det som gjør at det blir vanskelig å holde tidsrammen. Og jeg tenker at formidling også handler om å greie å formidle på tilmålt tid. Det i seg selv er en øvelse.
- Include more "general/normal" ways of resesarch dissemination. What can YOU and I do today to distribute our research here in Tromsø for example.
- Ja til INaktive pauser :) Ta vekk "how to" audacity. Alle sånne gjennomganger av hvordan man bruker IT-verktøy er unødvendig fordi man ikke får det med seg før man faktisk skal jobbe med det selv. Sett heller inn en halv dag med presentasjonsteknikk.
- Since many of the tasks (e.g. the pre-course submission, first "panel presentation", the one-minute explanation of a chosen term, the teaser, the twitter text, etc. and perhaps to lesser degree, the interview) all involved making a short "elevator-pitch", it can easily become repetitive unless you make the effort to choose something new each time. Many of the aforementioned tasks all revolve around a similar format, and I felt I was struggling at times to come up with a new way of saying what I felt I already had said, and not simply repeat what I previously did. While all the different tasks are relevant and interesting, perhaps they can be oriented slightly differently, so as to not simply be about creating a 1min. elevator pitch over and over. The course could have something on "presentation technique", such as the use of body language, tips for not seeming stressed, how to "memorize" a manuscript, etc. The lecture on participation in public debate could have been made more out of. Some questions that might be relevant can be: are you required to participate if it is a controversial topic? If not, where do you draw the line? If there is factually wrong information being used in a current heated debate, can you expect to be able to only weigh in with factual information to clear up misunderstandings and back out, or can you be expected to participate in the wider discussion?
- no active breaks, the tasks to be done should not be done when there is a break.
- More holistic approach to what is expected by a person affiliated to a university doing research. Using the "differences" between internal university research contexts (scientific conferences etc.) versus outside life context (popularization) in order to learn more on the role.
- It could have had more time available i class for the important discussions and feedback on assignments from teh group.

Which of the "external" contributions (Research dissemination in a museum context/ participation in a public debate/ podcast workshop/ twitter workshop) was particularly helpful?

- participation in a public debate
- Podcast/twitter but.. Maybe using slightly less time?
- participation in public debate, podcast & twitter
- Twitter (but way shorter, 30 min max)
- public debate
- Participation in public debate
- All parts!
- All were good
- The Twitter Session

Which other content should be part of the class in the future?

- power point, and rethorics
- How to present efficiency (tackeling nerves, using voice and body language etc.) That would be great :)
- Gerne litt mer Torjer!
- See above
- presentasjonsteknikk (som jo faktisk også er en viktig del av forskningsformidling)
- Presentation technique
- no idea
- How to communicate
- How the communication department can be of best use as a resource to us phd-students.

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema](#)

Report “forskningsformidling SVH-8002-1 21V

Christina Lentz

About the course

The course is intended to give (Norwegian) UiT PhD students an introductory overview over possibilities of research dissemination in regard to a scientific as well as to a general audience. The students should acquire knowledge about different forms of research dissemination, see what works best for them, get out of their comfort zone and be inspired to get active in disseminating their research. There were 14 participants from different fields of research, such as pedagogics, philosophy, tourism, politics, theology etc. The course put a specific focus on the following topics:

- The Why and How of research dissemination
- How to write scientifically and for general audiences
- How to verbally present research to a scientific and general audience in short presentations and interviews
- How to visualize research in form of poster presentations
- Different ways to disseminate research “traditionally” and “digitally”

In addition to course and group discussions as well as different in- and out-of-class assignments there were some external contributors to the class.

- Petter Snekkestad was talking about “research dissemination in a museum context”
- PhD student Geneviève Godin was talking about Twitter and twitter conferences
- Torjer Olsen contributed with a talk about “participating in a public debate”
- Karine Nigar Aarskog, Thomas Rolland and Nora McLaren gave an introduction into podcasts
- PhD student Ingri Løkholm Ramberg supported me with the conduction of the interview segment.

Aims of the course:

The main aim was to let the students work on different ways to disseminate their own research. Therefore, there was no general pensum, but a focus on practically working on own projects. Furthermore, the course gave lots of space for discussions, work on projects and mutual feedback.

In the course of the seminar the students worked on the following assignments:

- A short 20-30 second video teaser about their research
- An article about their research directed towards a general audience
- A draft of a poster presentation for a conference of their own field
- A mutual interview with a fellow student
- A draft for a podcast
- A draft for a twitter conference

With every assignment also came the request to think about the potential “use”, so that the work done in class would actually contribute to distribute their research.

A. Reflections on my conduction of the course

1. Content and the “problem” of a heterogeneous class

Choice of the content

After having taught the course before, I thought I had a good idea about what the students already knew and what they were interested in. It turned out though, that this (Norwegian) group had entirely different backgrounds and interests than their (international) predecessors.

Due to the wishes of the fall-class I organized a workshop about twitter and podcasts for the spring class, but these students didn't seem particularly interested in this. I still don't regret having organized these workshops because they triggered good discussions about research ethics (especially the twitter one), but I definitely planned in too much time for them with 2 hours each. The workshop approach should give the students an opportunity to do some practical work, but in both cases, there was little time for this. The students therefore rightly criticized that fact that the “workshops” were actually not really “workshops”.

The contribution about research dissemination in a museum context also turned out to not be a perfect fit, because most of the students worked in a field where this kind of research dissemination is not the most relevant one. In this context I would like to mention a general problem about the organization of the course: In order to get good contributors, I have to plan months ahead of time. In this case the course was fully planned in November/December 2020. But I only learned which students were accepted to the class at the beginning of February. This makes a “customized” design, fitted to the needs and interests of the students, almost impossible. I do think that the contributions still were of interest for a general PhD student audience, but I nevertheless would have liked to be able to plan more according to the participants' backgrounds.

Different from the last course, the Norwegian PhD students had much more “general” requests, like getting better in free speech and learning more about expressing things “easily” for a popular audience. In a final discussion they suggested to invite for example an actor to give some general advice on presenting. I like the idea and will see if I can find someone who can do this.

Composition of the group

The difference in research backgrounds is a challenge but also a blessing when it comes to trying out how to convey content to a general audience. But it also makes it harder to work on scientific dissemination within the own field, because not all of the students had “partners” from their own background in the class.

The difference in age and interest is another challenge. There was an age range of roughly 20 years among the students in this particular class, and it was harder to get some of the “older” students on board when we had projects like “creating a teaser”, “drafting a twitter conference paper” or “planning a podcast”. I can imagine that not all in this age group – but neither all of the younger students – were happy with this selection of topics. I nevertheless will stick to including both, the “traditional” and the “digital” approach to research dissemination, because to my understanding the course should give students insight into what is possible and what is practiced nowadays. One of the students didn't even know what an academic poster was, and I think that even if you don't need it in your own field, you should have some knowledge about it.

The different approaches to research dissemination led to several discussions if this was too “superficial” and a bad development. I told the students that the course was meant as an introduction

into various ways to disseminate their research and not all ways are similarly appropriate for all subjects. But I also made clear that I appreciated that the students had a very critical approach and actually encouraged them in that attitude. Without any doubt, there is a tendency towards a more superficial way to disseminate research. Presenting yourself and what you do in the right light becomes increasingly important, and this can be both, positive and negative. I will carry the students' input into the next class, because I think we should not only celebrate for example digital media as a way to distribute research but also think about ethical implications and our responsibility as researchers.

Balance of content – academic vs. popular research dissemination

In the last course, I was unsatisfied because I put too much focus on research dissemination towards a popular audience. I wasn't sure on how to create a better "balance" and if this was possible at all. This time, I succeeded much better with that. The focus still was on dissemination for a popular audience, because this is more "unknown" to the students and it was easier to realize in a relatively heterogenous group. But most of the content gave the students a choice if they wanted to create it for a popular or a scientific audience and most of the projects – except from the popular article – could be used in both contexts. There was a big focus on discussions on how to use the "products" and we for example came to the conclusion that even something like the popular teaser could be used as an intro for a contribution to a scientific conference. The twitter conference gave new insights into ways of scientific research distribution and it was made clear that something like a podcast could be designed for a popular and a scientific audience.

Another change I made due to the request and criticism of the last course was that I put an even bigger focus on mutual feedbacks and gave a short introduction on how to do a feedback at the very beginning. I actually don't think that PhD students should need this kind of introduction, but I still (briefly) did it, because of the importance of feedbacks during class and as a consequence of the last students' wishes. I have to mention that in the fall feedback survey also were students who thought that there was too much focus on feedback, but I decided to go with the ones who wanted more: It doesn't make any sense to let the students produce a teaser and not show it to the class and discuss it. Seeing and evaluating other students' work can be a powerful source for improvement and inspiration and this classes' students seemed to have agreed with me about that. Nevertheless, took the feedback sometimes too much time and I will honor one students' advice to limit feedback timewise in the future.

2. Hybrid organization of the class

The entire course had to be organized in a hybrid format because two students participated from outside of Tromsø. I was honestly not happy about this at all, because last time I had major technical difficulties and it is a challenge to take care of and engage students on Zoom and in the classroom equally. Luckily, I got much better support from Orakelet this time and it worked out much smoother than in fall.

I still would like to say something about hybrid teaching: From a didactical view, digital and physical teaching require very different approaches. Therefore, hybrid teaching doesn't make too much sense, and research dissemination class is designed as a physical class, not a digital one. Unfortunately, I additionally had very bad experience with some of the students participating digitally. It seems, they don't take it as seriously as the students in the classroom. One of the two digital students submitted extremely bad assignments and announced a couple of hours before the last day of class that he wouldn't participate because he actually had travelled to a workshop in Kirkenes. While he couldn't come to Tromsø, he obviously could travel to Kirkenes and did not even feel the need to find an agreement with me beforehand. Something rather similar happened with one of the "digital" students

last year, who similarly performed very badly and missed out on large parts of the class. That is why I attribute this behavior to the digital participation.

I see that the hybrid class was due to the Covid-19 situation and that I have to become more flexible when it comes to digital formats. But I also want to guarantee a high quality of the class and equal treatment of all students and experience shows me that with hybrid teaching this is not possible. Unfortunately, some students even take advantage of the potential freedom of digital participation.

3. *Time management and breaks*

Time management is not my strength and it wasn't in this course either. I can see that I tend to plan too much and never get through all of the content I have. Even though I shortened the content quite a bit compared to the fall class, I even had bigger time struggles, especially the first day of class. This left me personally very unsatisfied, because I had the feeling of not preparing the students sufficiently for the assignments of writing a popular science piece and creating a teaser. After I have been in that situation many times before it looks as if I finally have to take a class about time management to improve in that respect.

On a positive note: The students don't seem to have perceived a deficit in preparation but gave me positive verbal feedback. The results of the assignments are significantly better than in the last class, even though the students were in my perception, less prepared. And the reason for not getting all the content taught was that the students were engaged in very good discussions, so that I deliberately decided to rather let them discuss instead of pushing them through my PowerPoint. But: especially the first two days, the discussions evolved very much around the specifics of the different PhD projects and therefore the course got the character of a research seminar rather than a "how to" seminar. I tried to interfere whenever this happened, but I didn't do well and will have to be stricter next class. The idea would be to point out right at the beginning that in class we focus on the how and not on the what, so that I can refer to that initial remark whenever it happens. But I also have to say that this was new and rarely ever appeared as a problem in the previous course. An explanation could be that I had quite a lot of students of philosophy in this class.

A note on breaks: I know now that in Norway there are 15-minute breaks after each 45 minutes and I again – deliberately – did not stick to this. First of all, do I think that good group work and discussions need more than 45 minutes time to go into depth. An interruption after 45 minutes would be a disruption to intensive work. Secondly, I think that PhD students should learn to focus more than 45 minutes on a task. Thirdly, breaks should not be organized according to timeslots, but according to when they actually make sense content-wise. Especially in a very interactive seminar like research dissemination, I think that it is absolutely doable to work for 60 to 90 minutes without a break. This does not mean that there shouldn't be breaks at all, there absolutely should be, and we even ordered coffee and tea to make the breaks as comfortable as possible. I included some regular breaks, but when it came to (group) assignments like preparing an interview or drafting a poster, I encouraged the students to take their own breaks. I know that not all students were happy with this, but I fully take the responsibility for this deliberate decision. Pleasantly, there were way less debates and complaints about that than last class.

Reflection on the students:

I taught a very open minded, friendly and motivated group of students at different stages of their PhD research, some of them still at the very beginning, some of them further advanced. In this context, I

would like to recommend that the course should be only open to more advanced PhD students, because it builds on the students' own research and without yet having too many results, it is difficult to design the sort of output that is demanded in this class.

Unlike in last class, the assignments that the students submitted were on an almost evenly high level. Of course, there were again students who put lesser effort into it or were less capable of submitting high quality assignments, but I was surprised by the overall creativity and independence of this group! Most of them worked on their assignments with a concrete idea in mind of what to use it for. This is in sharp contrast to the last group, where lots of time was lost by discussions about the exact length of the articles, the "how to do it right" and the formalities on submission. This was not a "problem" at all with this group even though I don't think I did things too differently. The only reason I can imagine for this stunning difference is that I, after having gone through the class and the formal process once before, conveyed more authority and sovereignty and therefore the previous classes' level of uncertainty did not arise in first place. When it comes to independent working it must have either something to do with the Norwegian background of the participants or with the academic composition of the group, but I am glad to say that it went much more smoothly than last time!

What would I handle differently or do the same way

As I wrote, I will draw conclusions from my time management problems by putting stricter time limits to the students' contributions and feedbacks, doing some restructuring of the content, as well as by potentially taking part in a class about time management.

I will also think about how I can include a part on practical tips for independent speech and performance. But I also learned that the wishes of the class depend very much on its composition and I will therefore stick to some elements – like twitter or podcast – because I think they are important. That of course does not mean that I don't respect the students' input.

I was unsure if creating a poster draft within the short time of 60-90 minutes actually made sense. But the students liked the idea of presenting something unfinished to the class and I have to agree that it is important to learn sharing research work in the progress. I will therefore keep this element.

The students seemed to have enjoyed the feedback and I also want this to be a crucial element of next class, even though I can imagine that some students might perceive it as a waste of time. I am fully convinced that this is a great way of learning. I also organized the feedback on the popular articles differently this time, so that the students got a feedback partner assigned by me and therefore received feedback by their partner and by me. I got the feeling that this worked really well.

Overall, I am satisfied with how the course went, even though I still see room for improvement.

I have three specific suggestions for the course:

- An 80% mandatory attendance **MUST** be included in the course requirements. There is no pensum to read at home and the course is based on participation.
- It should be considered to admit students who are more advanced in their PhD or to **NOT** admit those who just started.
- I can see that there probably are organizational issues, but the earlier the emne ansvarlige knows about the participants, the easier it is to customize the class.

Christina Lentz

Navn	Bokmål: Forskningsformidling Nynorsk: Forskningsformidling English: Research dissemination
Emnekode og emnenivå	SVH-8002
Emnetype	Emnet kan tas som enkeltemne.
Omfang	5 studiepoeng
Opptakskrav	<p>Ph.d.-studenter og deltakere i førstelektorprogrammet ved UiT som har avlagt mastergrad kan søke opptak. Gyldig dokumentasjon er en bekreftelse fra din utdanningsinstitusjon på at du er aktiv ph.d.-student inneværende studieår. Deltakere i førstelektorprogrammet må dokumentere at de har avlagt mastergrad på fem år eller 3 +3 år (eller tilsvarende) for å være kvalifiserte søkere.</p> <p>Maksimum antall deltakere er 15. Opptak foretas etter følgende prioritering: Kategori 1: Personer som er tatt opp på ph.d.-program ved UiT i humanistiske og samfunnsvitenskapelige fag Kategori 2: Deltakere på førstelektorprogrammet som oppfyller utdanningskravet Kategori 3: Doktorgradsstudenter fra andre universitet. Kategori 4: Personer med minimum mastergrad (eller tilsvarende grad) i humanistiske eller samfunnsvitenskapelige fag.</p> <p>Dersom det er flere enn 15 ph.d.-studenter ved HSL-fak som søker opptak vil de som er kommet lengst i studieløpet prioriteres til disse plassene. Dersom noen står likt vil opptak avgjøres ved loddtrekning. Studenter som ikke har norsk som morsmål prioriteres ved opptak til høstens engelskspråklige emne. Minste antall deltakere er 10.</p>
Faglig innhold	<p>Emnet tematiserer forutsetninger for velfungerende og ansvarlig forskningsformidling. Det er innrettet mot de utfordringene doktorgradsstudenter og forskere i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap står overfor. Praktiske øvelser i formidling fra egen forskning vil være utgangspunktet for teoretisk refleksjon.</p> <p>Kommunikasjon av egen forskning er en integrert del av den vitenskapelige aktiviteten, og formidling av forskningens resultater mellom fagfeller er en forutsetning for vitenskapens utvikling. Forskingen er også en integrert del av samfunnet, og både universitetet og forskeren er pålagt å formidle forskning til allmennheten.</p> <p>Forskningsformidling er en kompleks aktivitet som foregår i en rekke ulike typer av situasjoner, relasjoner og kontekster. Det kan være etisk utfordrende og reiser ulike normative spørsmål. Forskningsformidling kan rette seg mot ulike typer av samtalepartnere og publikum, og dens former vil variere med ulike formater og medier. Både kommunikasjon med fagfeller internt i forskerfellesskapet og med den allmenne offentligheten forutsetter en bred forståelse av sjangerkrav og at man evner å rette seg inn mot mottakerens forutsetninger. Samtidig dannes egen forskeridentitet gjennom de valg man står overfor og de beslutninger man tar underveis.</p> <p>Emnet tar utgangspunkt i disse kjennetegnene og forholder seg til ulike disiplinære innretninger innen samfunnsvitenskapelig og humanistisk forskning. Det skal støtte opp under den enkeltes utvikling som forskningsformidler.</p>
Læringsutbytte	<p>Etter bestått emne skal studentene ha følgende læringsutbytte:</p> <p>Kunnskaper og forståelse Studenten har kunnskap om:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • universitetets og forskerens samfunnsoppdrag og ansvar for formidling • normer for akademisk redelighet, saklig argumentasjon og vitenskapelig diskusjon • ulike sjangre, formater og plattformer for vitenskapelig og allmennrettet forskningsformidling • kriterier for velfungerende og ansvarlig forskningsformidling i ulike sjangre, fora og for ulike målgrupper

	<p>Ferdigheter Studenten kan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> formidle forskning gjennom tekst, tale og visuelle uttrykk delta i intervju og samtaler om sin forskning tilpasse formidlingen til ulike målgrupper og medier delta som fagperson i offentlig debatt delta i debatter innenfor eget fagområde i nasjonale og internasjonale fora <p>Kompetanse Studenten kan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> tilpasse og gi form til formidling i forskningsprosjekter vurdere og reflektere over egen og andres forskningsformidling formidle forsknings- og utviklingsarbeid med akademisk integritet, gjennom anerkjente nasjonale og internasjonale kanaler kjenne igjen og uttrykke forskningens potensielle påvirkning på, relevans for og tilknytning til samfunnet
Relevans i studieprogram	Emnet oppfyller kravet om formidling i opplæringsdelen til ph.d.-programmet i humaniora og samfunnsvitenskap ved UiT.
Undervisnings- og arbeidsform	Undervisningen består av forelesninger, seminar, gruppearbeid og øvelser, og er innrettet mot både felles menneskevitenskapelige og disiplinspesifikke utfordringer. Emnet blir gjennomført som 4 hele dager fordelt på to samlinger. Et av arbeidskravene gjennomføres på forhånd, noen utføres i samling, noen som mellomperiodearbeid.
Kvalitetssikring av emnet	Alle emner evalueres én gang i løpet av programperioden. Programstyret avgjør hvilke emner som skal evalueres av studenter og emneansvarlige per år.
Arbeidskrav	<p>Obligatorisk forarbeid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> utkast til presentasjon av eget forskningsprosjekt for allmennheten, maks 1000 tegn (ca en halv side), leveres før undervisningsoppstart <p>Obligatorisk arbeidskrav for alle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppmøte på minimum 80% av undervisningen. <p>Minst 3 av følgende arbeidskrav må være gjennomført og godkjent før man kan fremstille seg til eksamen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> utkast til abstract for artikkel / paper (300 ord) utkast til vitenskapelig poster utkast til bokanmeldelse eller fagfellevurdering av artikkel utkast til avis-kronikk eller blogginnlegg eller serie av mikroblogginnlegg muntlig fremføring av miniforedrag (med innlevering av skriftlig materiale – handout, presentasjon eller notat - i etterkant) eller innspilling av podcast deltakelse i intervju samtale <p>Det gjennomføres hverandrevurdering i mindre grupper etter gitte kriterier under ledelse av en erfaren forsker.</p>
Eksamen og vurdering	Eksamen består av innlevering av en mappe med utvalgt materiale fra tre av de tidligere innleverte arbeidskravene, samt oppsummering av hverandrevurdering og egenvurdering (refleksjon over styrker og svakheter i eget arbeid ut fra anerkjente og på forhånd gitte kriterier). Minst en av innleveringene skal være allmennrettet og minst en skal være rettet mot fagfeller. Eksamen vurderes med “Bestått” / “Ikke bestått”.
Kontinuasjoneksamen	Ved karakter ikke bestått tilbys kontinuasjonseksamen i begynnelsen av påfølgende semester. Ved gyldig forfall tilbys utsatt eksamen i begynnelsen av påfølgende semester. Frist for oppmelding til kontinuasjonseksamen er 15. januar for eksamen i høstsemesteret og 15. august for eksamen i vårsemesteret.
Pensum	Om lag 400 sider. Emnet er praktisk rettet og har omfattende egenaktivitet i form av øvelser med påfølgende skriftlig refleksjon.

Undervisnings- og eksamensspråk	Undervisningen foregår på norsk i høstsemesteret og på engelsk i vårsemesteret. Eksamensspråk er norsk, andre skandinaviske språk eller engelsk.
--	--

SAKSFRAMLEGG

Til:
Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet

Møtedato:
01.06.2021

Sak:
13/21

Evaluerings av emnet GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey

Innstilling til vedtak:

Ph.d utvalet tek evalueringane frå faglærar og studentane til etterretning og ber om at dei blir tatt med i vurderinga ved vidare utvikling og revisjon av emnet.

Bakgrunn:

GEN-8001 er eit tverrfagleg studieemne retta mot studentar som er inne i sitt første år som ph.d studentar. Studentane skal auke sin kompetanse i ærlegdom, kjeldebruk, publisering og handtering av forskingsdata. Emnet inneheld viktige reiskapar som alle ph.d studentar kan få nytte av. Emnet gjev studentane kjennskap til akademiske normer, korleis ein hentar, evaluerer og handsamar kjelder og også kjennskap til «open access» publisering og kunnskap om korleis ein handsamar forskingsdata på ein best muleg måte.

HSL-fakultetet administrerer emnet på vegner av UB i samarbeid med High North Academy.

Emnet har normalt plass til 30 studentar, men dei siste to semestera har alle som har søkt, og som har vore kvalifisert til emnet, fått plass. Grunnen til dette har vore at nettbasert undervisning har gjort dette muleg.

Faglærarevaluering:

Evaluerings frå emneansvarleg, Helene N. Andreassener, er den første som har blitt skreive av emneansvarleg på emne. Dette er ein grundig gjennomgang av kva som har vore situasjonen på emnet, og kva for utfordringar som har vore, samt kva for endringar som ein eventuelt kan gjere for dei framtidige kursa. Vi har difor ikkje valt å gå inn på alle aspekta når det gjeld dette kurset i dette saksframlegget sidan dette er grundig handsama i notatet frå emneansvarleg.

Studentevaluering har blitt gjennomført av faglærar kvart semester slik at det er muleg å få eit betre bilete av korleis studentane har opplevd kurset over tid.

I sitt notat (rapport) har faglærer analysert og lagt ved studentevalueringane frå haust 2019 til og med vår 2021, dvs. 4 semester.

Studentevaluering H19, V-20, H20 og V-21

Evalueringsrapporten for dei 4 siste semestera er lagt ved dette saksframlegget. Det er ingen store forskjellar når det gjeld fordeling av svar over tid. Godt over halvparten er svært nøgd med emnet når ein ser på emnet under eitt, og dei vil anbefale andre ph.d studentar å delta.

Sluttkommentar

Hausten 2021 vil det bli ein gjennomgang og revidering av utgreiinga til emnet og pensumlista. Det vil her bli tatt utgangspunkt i tilbakemeldingane frå ph.d-utvalet, studentevalueringane og tankar og erfaringar dei som er ansvarleg for kurset.

Faglærer vil gå attende til fysisk undervisning når dette er muleg og vil vurdere å tilby undervisning på digital plattform til dømes ein gong pr. år.

Det er ingen ting som tyder på at nettbasert undervisning fungerer dårlegare enn fysisk undervising, men ein miss det sosiale som også kan ha noko å seie i denne samanheng (jf. notat faglærer).

Emneansvarleg får tilbakemelding frå ein del studentar om at det er få studiepoeng i emnet i forhold til det arbeidet som må leggjast ned. Emneansvarleg ser det ikkje som aktuelt å redusere mengda på undervisning eller pensum, men stiller spørsmål om talet på studiepoeng bør aukast.

Det har kome signal frå rektoratet til UB om at dei ønskjer at flest mulege ph.d studentar skal ta GEN-8001. Spørsmålet er korleis ein kan opplyse om kurset slik at alle kjenner til dette tilbodet.

Synnøve Thomassen Andersen
prodekan forskning

Olav Skare
seksjonsleiar

Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur

Sakshandsamar: Martin-Arne Andersen, rådgjevar

Vedlegg:

- 1) Evalueringsrapport, GEN-8001 v/fagansvarleg Helene N. Andreassen
- 2) V-21_Evaluering_Deltakarar

- 3) V-21_Evaluering_eksamen_Deltakarar
- 4) H-20_Evaluering_Deltakarar
- 5) V-20_Evaluering_Deltakarar
- 6) H-20_Evaluering-eksamen_Deltakarar
- 7) H-19_Evaluering_Deltakarar

Emneevaluering, GEN-8001: Take control of your PhD journey

Helene N. Andreassen, ph.d.

Emneansvarlig for GEN-8001 og leder for UBs faggruppe for undervisning og læringsstøtte

Tromsø, 21. mai 2021

1. Introduksjon

Denne rapporten er den første som er skrevet for GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey. Den er delt inn i 12 deler og har 6 studentevalueringssrapporter som vedlegg.

For å vise utvikling over tid, og for å avdekke eventuelle ulikheter før og etter korona, har vi inkludert data fra de to akademiske årene 2019/2020 og 2020/2021.

2. Deltakere: Antall

Tabellen under er tenkt å illustrere (mangel på) frafall fra oppmelding til eksamen.

Antall	H-19	V-20	H-20	V-21
Antall oppmeldte	31	32	53	52
Antall deltakelse*, **	30 (4 Jurfak)	31	48 (4 Jurfak)	45 (4 Jurfak)
Antall levert eksamen	24	31	40	39
Antall bestått eksamen	24	29	36	37

*«Antall deltakelse» viser antallet studenter som har deltatt på nok undervisning til å kunne gå opp til eksamen.

**Deltakere fra Jurfak skriver ikke eksamen på GEN-8001. Per tiden har vi en overgangsordning, hvor ph.d.-studentene på Jurfak obligatorisk deltar på deler av GEN-8001-undervisningen, som et alternativ til et undervisningsopplegg tidligere gitt av UB til Jurfak. Avtalen med Jurfak er at deltakerne fra dette fakultetet skal delta på lik linje med andre ph.d.-studenter på GEN-8001 (følge all undervisning, skrive eksamen) når revidering av ph.d.-programmet deres er ferdig.

Antall oppmeldte tilsvarer de som har søkt opptak og takket ja til å delta på studieemnet. Vi setter vanligvis et tak på 30 deltakere, men utviser en viss fleksibilitet. H-19 og V-20 fikk alle som søkte, delta. De to siste semestrene (H-20 og V-21) har vi kjørt undervisningen på Zoom. Søknadsmassen har da vært større, men vi har allikevel sagt ja til alle kvalifiserte søkere. Dette fordi plassmangel ikke lengre har vært en utfordring, men også fordi vi ikke har hatt noen forutsetning for å anta det *ikke* ville fungere med en større deltakermasse, all den tid vi tok i bruk interaktive funksjoner på Zoom.

Hvert semester er det noen ansatte/ph.d.-studenter ved UiT som ønsker å delta, som ikke er kvalifiserte. Vi blir også kontaktet av ansatte/ph.d.-studenter ved UiT som ønsker å delta kun på deler av studieemnet. Disse to gruppene har vi sagt nei til, da vi ønsker at plassene fylles opp av ph.d.-studenter som ønsker å følge all undervisning, pluss ta eksamen. Vi tenker også at det er bedre for læringsmiljøet på emnet at alle deltakere er på samme nivå, og at de deltar på akkurat den samme undervisningen.

Vi vil fortsette å holde muligheten åpen for at andre kan delta hvis de 30 plassene ikke skulle fylles opp, men frem til nå har dette ikke vært tilfelle.

For å kunne gå opp til eksamen, må studentene delta på fire obligatoriske seminarer: 1) academic integrity and the transparency of science, 2) literature search, 3) open access publishing, 4) research data management. Vi mener at studentene lærer best ved å delta på undervisningen, men vi ønsker

samtidig at flest mulig skal få muligheten til å gå opp til eksamen. Vi utviser derfor en viss fleksibilitet ovenfor studenter som må melde fravær fra ett av seminarene på grunn av sykdom, reiser/tokt eller andre oppgaver som det er vanskelig å be seg fri fra.

3. Deltakere: Tilhørighet

Vi har ikke komplette data på hvilket ph.d.-program de ulike deltakerne tilhører, heller ikke hvilken campus de tilhører. Oversikten under baserer seg derfor på hvilket litteratursøkekurs de har registrert seg på i forkant av undervisningen. Deltakerne kan velge mellom tre disiplinspesifikke kurs: 1) Humaniora, samfunnsfag og jus, 2) medisin og helsefag, 3) teknologi og naturvitenskap. Deltakerne står fritt til å bytte kurs helt frem til undervisningen starter. Mange deltakere jobber interdisiplinært, og det er vår erfaring at særlig disse kan være usikre på hvilket kurs som er mest relevant for dem på det stadiet i forskningen de befinner seg på.

Disiplinspesifikt søkekurs	H-19	V-20	H-20	V-21
Humanities, Social Sciences & Law	58%	25%	24%	25%
Medicine & Health Sciences	14%	47%	29%	42%
Technology & Natural Sciences	28%	28%	47%	33%

Tabellen over viser at det er god faglig spredning på ph.d.-studentene, med en relativt jevn fordeling over tid på de tre kursene. Som en kommentar til fallet i deltakere på medisin og helse i høstsemestrene: Vi forsøker alltid å unngå at undervisningen på GEN-8001 kolliderer med store, obligatoriske ph.d.-emner på UiT. I noen tilfeller er dette uunngåelig, enten på grunn av lærerstabens tilgjengelighet eller på grunn av undervisningskalenderen til øvrige studieemner på High North Academy.

Det er også god spredning med tanke på type data ph.d.-studentene jobber med, se oversikt under.

Type data*	H-19	V-20	H-20	V-21
Data with sensitive information	35%	56%	55%	50%
Data without sensitive information	65%	44%	45%	50%

*Seminaret om forskningsdatahåndtering har to deler: En fellesdel og en del hvor deltakerne splittes i to grupper: «data with sensitive information» og «data without sensitive information». Dette grepet er fortsatt for grovkornet, men gjør det likevel lettere å fokusere på aspekter som er relevante for den aktuelle studentgruppen. For eksempel kan vi bruke tid på sikker lagring og deling i gruppen med sensitive data, mens vi kan bruke mer tid på strukturering og dokumentasjon i gruppen med ikke-sensitive data (dette er typisk deltakere med kvantitative data).

4. Eksamen

Formålet med eksamensoppgaven som gis på GEN-8001 er å få ph.d.-studentene til å reflektere over hvordan de kan gå frem for å gjøre sin egen forskning transparent og tilgjengelig. Dette gjør de ved å bruke eget ph.d.-prosjekt og fagområde som utgangspunkt for et essay på 1000-1500 ord. De kan velge mellom to oppgaver, om hhv publisering og håndtering av forskningsdata (tekst fra V-2021):

- 1) Evaluate 3 publication channels* that publish research within your field. Describe the evaluation process, using what you consider to be the most important criteria (2-3) for publishing/not publishing here. 1 of the publication channels you evaluate should be an open access, peer reviewed journal. The text must contain reference to at least one source on the GEN-8001 reading list.

*The term *publication channels* is open for interpretation. You might, for instance, want to evaluate 3 different journals or 3 different types of publications (e.g. journal articles, anthologies/proceedings, public or social media).

- 2) Open Science and sharing of research data presently receive much attention within and outside Academia. Reflect on what you consider to be the main challenges for sharing research data in your field. Irrespective of the degree of sensitivity of your (future) research data, include in your reflection some thoughts on how you can proceed in your research data management in order to make your data safely archived, yet visible to others. The text must contain reference to at least one source on the GEN-8001 reading list

Vi har valgt å benytte de samme oppgavetekstene (med små justeringer og presiseringer) flere ganger. Ved å måtte skrive om publisering eller forskningsdatahåndtering, får studenten jobbe dedikert med temaer som er relevant for ph.d.-arbeidet og forskerutdannelsen, temaer som er høyaktuelle i UiTs strategidokumenter, og temaer som kanskje ikke har like mye fokus i alle forskningsmiljøer.

Fordelingen på valg av oppgavetekst har lenge holdt seg jevn, men det siste semesteret ser vi en tydelig økning i antall studenter som velger å skrive om håndtering av forskningsdata.

Oppgavetema	H-19	V-20	H-20	V-21
Publisering	71%	71%	73%	49%
Forskningsdata	29%	29%	27%	51%

Intern sensor på emnet er Helene N. Andreassen (emneansvarlig), mens ekstern sensor er Michael Grote (UiB). Samarbeidet har fungert veldig godt, og det har aldri vært uenighet om karakterene. Så vidt vi vet har det aldri vært noen som har klaget på karakteren, men flere har bedt om begrunnelse for strykkarakteren. I disse tilfellene har eksamenskommisjonen levert en rapport i WISEflow. Bruken av sistnevnte har også fungert fint. Det har blitt innrapportert ett tilfelle hvor det har vært mistanke om fusk (plagiat) – avdekket ved hjelp av likhetsrapporten i WISEflow/Ouriginal.

Flere av studentene som har strøket har gått opp til eksamen på nytt semesteret etter. Vi har ikke tilgang til data som sier hvorvidt disse studentene har bestått på andre forsøk.

Angående faglig nivå og kvalitet på eksamensbesvarelsene, henviser vi til en kommentar fra ekstern sensor (Michael Grote), overlevert på bestilling 19. mai 2021:

Som de fleste poenggivende ph.d.-kurs ved universitetsbibliotek i Norge har GEN-8001 over de siste årene hatt en heterogen målgruppe med internasjonale deltakere fra forskjellige fagområder. Dette medfører et heterogent kunnskapsnivå hos deltakerne. Med valgmulighet mellom to forskjellige oppgavesett har kursoppgaven vært godt tilpasset målgruppen, og besvarelsene viser at minst en av oppgavene har vært relevant for alle deltakere. Sammenlignet med andre tilsvarende kurs i overførbare ferdigheter viser besvarelsene i GEN-8001 generelt et høyt refleksjonsnivå. Det er bra at oppgavene inviterer til personlige, prosjekterelaterte svar og med dette til refleksjon over eget arbeid og etiske aspekter ved egen forskningspraksis. På denne måten har oppgavene ikke bare en evalueringsfunksjon, men også egen læringseffekt for deltakerne.

5. Pensum

Pensumlisten til GEN-8001 skal til enhver tid inneholde oppdatert litteratur, og dette er særlig viktig for pensum knyttet til seminarene Open access og research data management, felter som er under stadig utvikling.

Vi har fått blandet respons på pensum, se punkt 9, men vi har ikke data på hva i pensumlista som vurderes positivt vs. negativt. En positiv kommentar vi kan merke oss er at deler av pensumlitteraturen har blitt delt med andre i fagmiljøet. To negative kommentarer vi kan merke oss er at pensum blir

vurdert som for omfattende, og at det er for lite korrespondanse mellom den totale pensumlitteraturen og undervisningen.

6. Kommunikasjon og tilgjengeliggjøring av undervisningsmateriale

Canvas fungerer som primær informasjonskanal, og har fungert godt siden vi tok dette verktøyet i bruk i 2018. Canvas-rommet er delt inn i en seksjon om studieemnet (inkl. eksamen) og deretter enkeltseksjoner for hvert av de fem seminarene. Disse igjen inneholder en «om seminaret», leseliste, eventuelle forberedelsesoppgaver, undervisningsmateriale og en punktvis oppsummering av seminaret. Undervisningsmaterialet legges ut tett etter undervisningen. I tillegg deles PowerPoint-presentasjonene på UBs nettside, og er dermed tilgjengelig for de som ikke ønsker eller ikke kan delta på kurset.

7. Underviserstaben: Deltakere og arbeidsflyt

Da vi startet arbeidet med studieemnet, tilbake i 2015, jobbet vi mye med å forstå behovet hos ph.d.-studentene, samt finne vår nisje i undervisningstilbudet på ph.d.-nivå ved UiT. Vi kjørte interne lesegrupper og innhentet tilbakemeldinger fra studentene, samt kommentarer fra faglig ansatte v/HSL, High North Academy og Forskningsstrategisk utvalg.

Selv om vi nå er i driftsfase, jobber vi fortsatt med kvaliteten på undervisningen vår. Blant annet kjører vi kollegaveiledninger med jevne mellomrom. Til dette benytter vi et skjema utviklet av Result, som er delt inn i tre deler: 1) planlegging/formøte, 2) observasjon, 3) egenvurdering. Noen ganger er det erfarne GEN-8001-kollegaer som evaluerer, mens det andre ganger er nyansatte ved Universitetsbiblioteket som evaluerer. Angående sistnevnte: I tillegg til å bidra med et friskt øye, fungerer kollegaveiledningen som opplæring i temaer Universitetsbiblioteket er opptatt av (f.eks. åpen vitenskap og kildebruk), og også i noen tilfeller som en forberedelse til egen undervisningsinnsats på GEN-8001.

Hvert seminar ledes av et undervisersteam på to personer, med spesialkompetanse på feltet. Alle undervisere er ansatt ved Avdeling for publikumstjenester ved Universitetsbiblioteket. I tillegg bidrar en ansatt fra ITA med undervisning på håndtering av sensitive data. Omrokeringer og utskiftninger skjer naturlig, f.eks. ved kapasitetsutfordringer, oppsigelser/nyansettelser, individuelle ønsker om nye utfordringer. Kontinuitet sikres imidlertid ved at det alltid er én underviser i paret som har undervisningserfaring fra det gjeldende seminaret.

Selv om studieemnet har en emneansvarlig, er det underviserparene som har ansvar for å sikre kvalitet og relevans på undervisningen, samt sikre at det er samsvar mellom undervisningen og emnebeskrivelsen. Emneansvarlig støtter opp om dette arbeidet ved å ha en tett dialog med underviserne, både gjennom semestervise fellesmøter, uformelle samtaler og generell informasjonsflyt.

8. Kollegaveiledninger

Høsten 2020 kjørte vi kollegaveiledning på samtlige kurs. I tillegg til at alle undervisere fikk tilbakemelding på undervisningen sin, var det et knippe kollegaer som på denne måten fikk en oppfriskning (eller innføring) i temaene det ble undervist i. For at kollegaveiledningen skulle bli best mulig, ble underviserne bedt om å indikere punkter til kollegaveilederen de ønsket å bli evaluert på. Det var litt variabelt hvor stor innsats underviserne la i dette, så her er det rom for forbedring. Kollegaveilederne gjorde en god innsats, og kommenterte på alt fra innhold, organisering og studentdeltakelse til formidling, både det som gikk bra og det som kunne forbedres. I mange tilfeller ble den skriftlige observasjonsrapporten komplettert med et oppsummeringsmøte med underviserparet i etterkant av undervisningen.

God kollegaveiledning fordrer et trygt kollegium, hvor man tør å komme med kritiske kommentarer. Alt tyder på vi har fått dette godt til på Universitetsbiblioteket. Det vi må sikre er at vi bruker evalueringsrapportene for alt de er verdt i videre arbeid med de enkelte seminarer. Det krever at underviserne setter av nok tid til revidering av undervisningen, noe som ikke alltid er tilfelle.

9. Studentevalueringer

Vi kjører studentevaluering hvert semester. Skjemaet som brukes tar utgangspunkt i et skjema utviklet ved High North Academy, som vi gjorde noen justeringer på allerede i 2018. Høsten 2020 gjorde vi en komplett revidering av skjemaet, med den hensikt å bedre evaluere korrespondansen mellom forventede læringsutbytter, undervisning/pensum og vurdering.

Evalueringsskjemaet sendes ut umiddelbart etter undervisningen, og det purres én gang cirka en uke før fristen. Et oppfølgingsskjema, som fokuserer på eksamen, sendes ut umiddelbart etter fristen for innlevering av oppgave. Antallet deltakere som evaluerer varierer noe, se under.

Type evaluering	H-19	V-20	H-20	V-21
Generell evaluering	37% (11/30)	61% (19/31)	46% (22/48)	58% (26/45)
Evaluering av eksamen	-	-	31% (15/48)	33% (15/45)

Evalueringsrapporter fra de fire semestrene er vedlagt denne rapporten, og sammenliknbare tall på tvers av rapportene er relativt jevne over tid. Hvis vi konsentrerer oss om de siste to semestrene, hvor vi har benyttet det reviderte skjemaet, ser vi at godt over halvparten er (svært) fornøyd med studieemnet i sin helhet, og vil (absolutt) anbefale andre ph.d.-studenter å delta. De fleste har fått informasjon om studieemnet via andre ph.d.-studenter, UiTs nettsider eller epost.

På spørsmålet om i hvilken grad kurset har hjulpet studentene å oppnå forventet læringsutbytte, er svarene veldig variable, men de aller fleste plasserer seg i spennet 3-5 (av 1-5, hvor 5 er høyest), og det på tvers av alle forventede læringsutbytter. Når det gjelder ulike undervisning- og læringsaktiviteter, skårer pensum og forberedende oppgaver lavere enn forelesninger og gruppearbeid. Mange kommenterer at de har nytte av gruppearbeid og diskusjoner, men flere kommenterer at det er for lite tid, og at noen aktiviteter kunne vært tydeligere introdusert. Når det gjelder egeninnsats, vurderer godt over halvparten at de har bidratt (svært) godt i gruppearbeid, mens det er veldig variabelt hvor mye den enkelte har bidratt i plenumssesjoner.

Godt over halvparten mener eksamensoppgaven fungerer (svært) godt for å måle læring på studieemnet, og at kurset har forberedt dem (svært) godt til å kunne svare på oppgaven. Godt over halvparten mener også at eksamensarbeidet har vært (svært) nyttig for ph.d.-prosjektet. En kommentar å merke seg er at det tar litt tid å forstå eksamensoppgaven og hva som er forventet.

Det siste semesteret har omtrent alle deltakere vært (svært) fornøyd med organiseringen av kurset. De hadde litt mer variabel erfaring høsten 2020, men fortsatt da var godt over halvparten (svært) fornøyd.

Vedlegg:

- H-19_Evaluering_Deltakere.pdf
- H-20_Evaluering_Deltakere.pdf
- H-20_Evaluering-eksamen_Deltakere.pdf
- V-20_Evaluering_Deltakere.pdf
- V-21_Evaluering_Deltakere.pdf
- V-21_Evaluering-eksamen_Deltakere.pdf

10. Samarbeid mellom Universitetsbiblioteket, HSL og High North Academy

Universitetsbiblioteket har samarbeidet om GEN-8001 med HSL og High North Academy siden det ble planlagt som et poenggivende kurs. Etter at studieemnet gikk over i driftsfasen, har samarbeidet med High North Academy ikke vært særlig aktivt utover det å avklare undervisningsdatoer, men dette kan skyldes hyppige utskiftninger i staben deres. Nå er en ny koordinator på plass, som vi allerede har etablert et godt samarbeid med. High North Academy anbefaler GEN-8001 som forkunnskaper til FSK-8002 Scientific Writing, og vi jobber for tiden med å rendyrke innholdet på de to studieemnene slik at de blir mest mulig komplementære.

Samarbeidet med HSL har fungert veldig fint hele veien. Den studieadministrative støtten har vært solid og uvurderlig, og den tette dialogen og den tydelige ansvarsfordelingen mellom studiekonsulent og emneansvarlig har sterkt bidratt til at rutinene rundt dette studieemnet har falt relativt kjapt på plass. Det har vært noen situasjoner hvor studentene har vært usikre på datoer for oppmelding, og det har også vært noen situasjoner hvor det har vært uklart hvem som er kvalifiserte for deltakelse (f.eks. de som tar en dr. philos, de som er forskerlinjestudenter). Vi har alltid klart å løse det, men vi bør jobbe for å unngå slike situasjoner.

Vi takker også for muligheten til nå å bli evaluert av ph.d.-utvalget på HSL, og ser frem til tilbakemeldinger på hvordan studieemnet GEN-8001 kan forbedres. Hvis mulig, stiller vi gjerne til et oppfølgingsmøte for å diskutere konkrete punkter.

11. GEN-8001 fremover: Planer og mulige diskusjonspunkter

- Høsten-21 vil vi gjøre en gjennomgang og revidering av emnebeskrivelsen og pensumlisten, med utgangspunkt i tilbakemeldinger fra ph.d.-utvalget, studentevalueringer og våre egne tanker og erfaringer.
- Når det er tillatt, vil vi gå tilbake til fysisk undervisning. Vi vil allikevel vurdere å tilby undervisning på digital plattform med jevne mellomrom, f.eks. 1 gang per år. Den økende deltakermassen vi har sett det siste året kan nemlig tyde på at det er ph.d.-studenter på andre UiT-camper som ser det vanskelig å delta på tre dager undervisning i Breivika.
- Med jevne mellomrom får vi kommentarer fra deltakere om at GEN-8001 innebærer mye arbeid for få studiepoeng. Vi ser det ikke som aktuelt å redusere på mengden undervisning eller pensum, så spørsmålet er da om antallet studiepoeng bør økes. Dette ønsker vi å diskutere med HSL.
- Det har kommet signaler til UB fra rektoratet om at de ønsker at flest mulig ph.d.-studenter skal ta GEN-8001. Vi tar gjerne en diskusjon med HSL og High North Academy om hvordan vi kan gjøre dette. To punkter å trekke frem allerede nå:
 - Studentevalueringene indikerer at veldig få deltakere får informasjon om GEN-8001 fra sine ph.d.-veiledere og lokale forskningsmiljøer. Hvordan kan vi jobbe for å få ph.d.-veilederne til å oppmuntre sine studenter til å delta?
 - I de aller fleste tilfellene har det vært plass til alle kvalifiserte som har søkt opptak. Vi må vurdere hva vi gjør hvis søkermassen øker betraktelig.
- Mens noen deltakere setter pris på å diskutere med ph.d.-studenter fra andre fag, er det andre som ønsker mer disiplinkonsentrerte gruppearbeider. Vi har lagt til rette for sistnevnte i litteratursøkekurset og til en viss grad i deler av forskningsdatakurset, men det har alltid vært vår tanke at ph.d.-studentene skulle møtes på tvers av fagfelt og løfte diskusjonen til et mer overordnet nivå. Vi ønsker å diskutere med HSL hvorvidt dette er noe vi skal holde på, og i hvilken grad vi kan påvirke de ulike forskningsmiljøene til å følge opp diskusjonene lokalt.

12. Sluttkommentar

GEN-8001 er et tverrfaglig studieemne rettet mot førsteårs ph.d.-studenter ved UiT, hvor de skal heve sin kompetanse i akademisk redelighet og åpen vitenskap, kildebruk, publisering og håndtering av forskningsdata. Studieemnet skal føles nyttig for stadiet deltakerne er på, og det skal føles relevant ved at de forventes å bruke sine erfaringer og perspektiver i interaksjon med undervisere og medstudenter.

En jevn tilstrømning av deltakere hvert semester og (svært) gode tilbakemeldinger tyder på at innholdet treffer. Et tett samarbeid mellom undervisere, emneansvarlig og studieadministrasjon, og regelmessig formidling om studieemnet i ulike fora på UiT bidrar til at studieemnet holder god kvalitet og er tidsriktig.

Overgangen til Zoom, enten den er midlertidig eller permanent, har vært mer eller mindre uproblematisk for underviserne – dette takket være sterkt fokus på digital undervisning etter nedstengingen våren 2020. For studentene, så har vi ingen data som antyder at læringsutbyttet er bedre eller dårligere med nettbasert undervisning. Men vi mister det sosiale aspektet når vi benytter Zoom. Kaffepausene, minglingen og småpraten er en stor trivselsfaktor som vi tror bidrar til større trygghet og interaksjon i studentgruppen. For underviserne, så blir vi mer og mer erfarne med interaktiv undervisning i Zoom, men svarte skjermer og manglende feedback under plenumssesjonene er fortsatt en stor utfordring. Vi ser at instruerte gruppeoppgaver er nøkkelen til god, aktiv deltakelse i plenumsdiskusjonene, så dette vil vi fortsatt ha sterkt fokus på fremover, uavhengig av om undervisningen er digital eller fysisk.

Rapport fra «Evaluation of GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey (Spring 2021)»

Innhentede svar pr. 18. mai 2021 22:57

- Leverte svar: **26**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar






Dear participant,

We have developed this questionnaire as a means to improve the quality of the course GEN-8001. We sincerely hope you wish to contribute with your opinions.

On behalf of the teachers' team,

Helene N. Andreassen (course responsible)




1) Which PhD programme are you admitted to? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Engineering Science	3	11,5 %	
Health Sciences	12	46,2 %	
Humanities and Social Sciences	5	19,2 %	
Law Studies	1	3,8 %	
Natural Sciences	5	19,2 %	
Nautical Operations	0	0 %	
Science	0	0 %	
I am admitted to the Associate Professor programme	0	0 %	
I am admitted to a Student Research programme	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

2) For how long have you been a PhD candidate? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
I am in my first year	15	57,7 %	
I am in my second year	8	30,8 %	
I am in my third year	3	11,5 %	
I am in my fourth year	0	0 %	
I have been working on my PhD project for four years or more	0	0 %	

3) Where did you hear about the course (GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey)? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Supervisor	0	0 %	
Research group	0	0 %	
Other PhD students	4	15,4 %	
University Library	1	3,8 %	
Administration	3	11,5 %	
UiT webpages	11	42,3 %	
Email	5	19,2 %	
Social media (Facebook, info screens, etc.)	0	0 %	
Other	2	7,7 %	

4) Please state the three most important things you have learned as a result of participating in this course. *

- 1. Excellent sources for my phd journey 2. Confidence to gather literature review for my ongoing research 3. Knowledge on Endnote and its wide variety of applications in research
- How impact factor is a flawed measure (did not know this), I learnt many things from the papers about writing and plagiarism. I really enjoyed the essay about goals of scientists vs. goals of science, and learnt much about Open Science from it. I have shared this essay with several colleagues.
- More about open access More about academic integrity More about literature search

- more insight into how to structure a search a better understanding of the publication channel system information about the university policy for archiving
- 1) Emphasis on Open Access research 2) The publishing process 3) How diverse all participants' PhD projects are
- 1. Importance of literature review on the topic of corresponding work and its impact. 2. Use of web of science and archive data 3. inserting citation, reference and use of endnote
- Open access system Systematic searches EndNote
- 1) How to find open access journals and find open access agreements with journals to make sure my research is accessible while still published in relevant journals. 2) How to fine-tune database searches to deliver new, relevant publications to my inbox. 3) The subtle ways in which the academic system can create integrity problems and how to spot and consider them.
- Smart search strategies to use in database searches. Endnote tips. Open Access Publishing.
- 1.The evolving position in Europe regarding the status of 'citation score, impact factor etc., in determining the statute of a researcher. I think this evolution is progressive and much needed. 2.The importance accorded by the EU in general and Norway in particular to keep research data open and accessible and an overview of how this is being implemented. 3.The utility and sometimes complexity of tools like EndNote in managing references to research literature.
- feel more secure in using Oria and literature search feel more secure in using EndNote feel more secure about which tasks I have to do concerning data-management and how to find the most suitable journals to publish in
- To be open and transparent in both how the research is done, and in how the analysis is conducted. Also, to be open about my sources, sharing the data that can be shared. Learned about different databases to do my literature search in. How to manage sensitive data.
- How to decide on a publication channel, research data management, how to securely conduct interviews (which could contain potentially sensitive data) digitally
- Searches in databases Better understanding of data management
- Forskjellen på open access gold og green Hvordan man søker opp informasjon om ulike tidsskrift At Prosquest og webofscience egentlig fungerer som en søkemotor til flere søkemotorer
- DRM, specifically Data Sharing
- data management, Open source, literature search
- Navigate through UiT system. Data management. Open access publishing.
- How open access publishing works (different types, how to find out whether a journal fits the requirements, the process of publishing), how to do a good literature search (which repositories to use, how to search for optimum results), how to manage my research data
- options for data management some new search tools
- Data privacy, Open science publishing, literature search
- 1. Data management 2. Various sources 3. Important aspects of research publication
- I learned interesting and valuable information about open science practices
- Academic Integrity. How to use Endnote. Good research data management.
- Nice tips for Endnote Thoughtful discussions about picking a journal to publish in Nice to learn about open access
- 1. publishing options in UiT 2. searching for proper references 3. the data management method

5) How satisfied are you with the course in general?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
How satisfied were you with the course in general? *	0	0	6	10	10

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
How satisfied were you with the course in general? *	0 %	0 %	23,1 %	38,5 %	38,5 %

6) Would you recommend GEN-8001 to others?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (absolutely not)	2	3	4	5 (absolutely)
Would you recommend GEN-8001 to others? *	0	0	4	6	16

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (absolutely not)	2	3	4	5 (absolutely)
Would you recommend GEN-8001 to others? *	0 %	0 %	15,4 %	23,1 %	61,5 %

7a) How satisfied were you with the different seminars?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	Not applicable
Academic integrity and the transparency of science *	0	0	8	6	10	2
Literature search (Humanities, Social Sciences and Law) *	0	0	2	2	5	17
Literature search (Medicine and Health Sciences) *	0	1	1	5	5	14
Literature search (Technology and Natural Sciences) *	0	0	0	4	5	17
Open access publishing *	0	0	3	9	13	1
Research data management part I *	0	2	5	8	10	1
Research data management part II: Data with sensitive information *	0	2	3	5	6	10

Research data management part II: Data without sensitive information *	0	2	2	4	8	10
Endnote basic *	0	1	2	3	8	12
Endnote advanced *	1	0	2	4	6	13

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	Not applicable
Academic integrity and the transparency of science *	0 %	0 %	30,8 %	23,1 %	38,5 %	7,7 %
Literature search (Humanities, Social Sciences and Law) *	0 %	0 %	7,7 %	7,7 %	19,2 %	65,4 %
Literature search (Medicine and Health Sciences) *	0 %	3,8 %	3,8 %	19,2 %	19,2 %	53,8 %
Literature search (Technology and Natural Sciences) *	0 %	0 %	0 %	15,4 %	19,2 %	65,4 %
Open access publishing *	0 %	0 %	11,5 %	34,6 %	50 %	3,8 %
Research data management part I *	0 %	7,7 %	19,2 %	30,8 %	38,5 %	3,8 %
Research data management part II: Data with sensitive information *	0 %	7,7 %	11,5 %	19,2 %	23,1 %	38,5 %
Research data management part II: Data without sensitive information *	0 %	7,7 %	7,7 %	15,4 %	30,8 %	38,5 %
Endnote basic *	0 %	3,8 %	7,7 %	11,5 %	30,8 %	46,2 %
Endnote advanced *	3,8 %	0 %	7,7 %	15,4 %	23,1 %	50 %

7b) Feel free to add comments about the different seminars.

- recorded lectures could be useful to us in the future, as they might help us during the next years of research
- In general I'm very satisfied with all the seminars! The different topics are all very interesting, and I think that you should add more hours to the course so we could discuss more! :) (that is why I chose 4, and not 5). I think the exercise in the Open access publishing where we were supposed to all work on the same online document was a little bit "messy". Maybe it could be better that the groups worked alone with it. Before the course, I prepared well and read all the syllabus. You have selected very relevant and interesting papers. I think that the papers should be discussed more in the seminars.
- The literature search for humanities, social sciences and law was so fast. maybe
- I had a problem of downloading the endnote. I called orakelet and asked for help. the lady asked me to mail the problem as she was not relevant to the problem I had. I followed the seminar for endnote but missed maximum things.
- None
- I got a little lost in EndNote seminars as I have carried out the purported tasks manually. This is because I am in the very beginning of my Ph.D.
- the teachers were very knowledgeable and it seemed like they had put a lot of work into their preparation.
- Basic definitions would have helped (for most seminars)
- Føler at vi spesielt første dag ville hatt større utbytte av å diskutere i grupper med like fagfelt, også bli delt opp i ulike fagfelt etterpå. på mine grupper ble det egentlig bare konstatering av ulikheter mellom felt i stede for gode diskusjoner
- I see that a course on academic integrity is important but most of the content is already familiar and it then seems redundant.

8a) To what extent did the course help you obtain the intended learning outcomes?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Not applicable
Explain correct use of sources in an academic publication and questionable research practices. *	0	0	4	13	9	0
Explain the purpose of literature search for the research process. *	0	0	3	9	14	0
Explain the purpose and advantages of open science, for research and society in general. *	0	0	2	10	13	1
Explain the main sections of a data management plan. *	1	1	5	9	10	0
Cite academic work, including published research data, in line with existing norms and conventions. *	1	0	5	8	10	2
Select and use scientific databases for advanced literature searches. *	0	2	2	10	12	0
Build advanced searches, using operators (AND, OR, NOT) and search history. *	0	1	3	7	15	0
Evaluate and select suitable publication channels for own research. *	0	0	5	10	10	1
Find and use repositories for archiving text (publications/manuscripts) and research data. *	0	1	6	11	7	1
Structure and document research data in line with good academic practice. *	0	0	6	13	6	1
Carry out research with academic integrity. *	0	0	5	8	12	1
Disseminate academic work in line with current publication trends and requirements. *	0	0	8	7	10	1
Communicate with peers and the larger scholarly community about the concept of transparency of science. *	0	0	7	10	8	1
Use the research support services at the University Library. *	0	0	7	9	9	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Not applicable
Explain correct use of sources in an academic publication and questionable research practices. *	0 %	0 %	15,4 %	50 %	34,6 %	0 %
Explain the purpose of literature search for the research process. *	0 %	0 %	11,5 %	34,6 %	53,8 %	0 %
Explain the purpose and advantages of open science, for research and society in general. *	0 %	0 %	7,7 %	38,5 %	50 %	3,8 %
Explain the main sections of a data management plan. *	3,8 %	3,8 %	19,2 %	34,6 %	38,5 %	0 %
Cite academic work, including published research data, in line with existing norms and conventions. *	3,8 %	0 %	19,2 %	30,8 %	38,5 %	7,7 %
Select and use scientific databases for advanced literature searches. *	0 %	7,7 %	7,7 %	38,5 %	46,2 %	0 %
Build advanced searches, using operators (AND, OR, NOT) and search history. *	0 %	3,8 %	11,5 %	26,9 %	57,7 %	0 %
Evaluate and select suitable publication channels for own research. *	0 %	0 %	19,2 %	38,5 %	38,5 %	3,8 %
Find and use repositories for archiving text (publications/manuscripts) and research data. *	0 %	3,8 %	23,1 %	42,3 %	26,9 %	3,8 %
Structure and document research data in line with good academic practice. *	0 %	0 %	23,1 %	50 %	23,1 %	3,8 %
Carry out research with academic integrity. *	0 %	0 %	19,2 %	30,8 %	46,2 %	3,8 %
Disseminate academic work in line with current publication trends and requirements. *	0 %	0 %	30,8 %	26,9 %	38,5 %	3,8 %
Communicate with peers and the larger scholarly community about the concept of transparency of science. *	0 %	0 %	26,9 %	38,5 %	30,8 %	3,8 %
Use the research support services at the University Library. *	0 %	0 %	26,9 %	34,6 %	34,6 %	3,8 %

8b) Feel free to add comments about the intended learning outcomes.

- -
- The course is well structured and there is so much information that I think a few more minutes should be allocated to each section of the course.
- None
- I guess the more or less feedback is also a factor of how attentive I was at the particular time of delivery of the seminar. I am a full time employee juggling a few other things in addition to the research project. However, I very much liked the rigour adopted by all the resource persons.
- feel more secure about my research and how to do it
- Veldig nyttig å bli introdusert til nettstedet der man kunne lete opp tidsskrift å publiserer i samt å finne relevante parametre å vurdere hvorvidt de er lurt å sende inn sitt manuskript der
- I said not at all for citing things because I have taught lectures on this before and knew everything

9a) To what extent did the reading list help you obtain the intended learning outcomes?**Svar fordelt på antall**

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	I didn't read it all
To what extent did the reading list help you obtain the intended learning outcomes of the course? *	1	0	6	6	5	8

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	I didn't read it all
To what extent did the reading list help you obtain the intended learning outcomes of the course? *	3,8 %	0 %	23,1 %	23,1 %	19,2 %	30,8 %

9b) In case your answer was "I didn't read it all", please explain why.

- I did not have time to read all articles on the list, but the ones I did read were in line with what was taught in the course
- I spent more time trying to get myself acquainted with the practical aspects of the course such as trying to use oria, searching for publication channels, endnote trick etc, but I the articles that I have read so far are very informative and precise!
- I read most of it but some texts were very long, so I just scanned the material
- The week during which I had the course overlapped with an afternoon conference and having to ship samples for my first paper. As a result of that and my personal life there were simply not enough hours in the day to read the entire reading list and I was forced to prioritize sources that sounded most relevant to my current field and circumstances.
- I am a full time, mid career employee having this research project based Ph.D. as one part of the whole and a young family to manage after work hours. So, I couldn't complete all the suggested reading. But I will complete the suggested reading before I submit my assignment for which the course provides sufficient time.
- I didn't have time. I learned a fair bit from the parts that I read.
- Life happened
- I was too busy in the weeks leading up to the course to read all the material
- The course was ministred right after the course Philosophy of Science and Ethics, a mandatory course at UiT. I had to work on the assignment for the mentioned course alongside my own project and other chores regarding my PhD. I did not have time to read the material.
- Too much to read

10a) How will you rate the following teaching and learning activities? To what extent did they help you learn?**Svar fordelt på antall**

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Didn't attend/didn't do it
Course readings *	2	1	9	5	8	1
Preparatory tasks *	1	2	9	7	7	0
Direct instruction/lectures *	0	0	5	8	13	0
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0	3	4	10	9	0
Polls in classroom *	0	0	6	8	11	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Didn't attend/didn't do it
Course readings *	7,7 %	3,8 %	34,6 %	19,2 %	30,8 %	3,8 %
Preparatory tasks *	3,8 %	7,7 %	34,6 %	26,9 %	26,9 %	0 %
Direct instruction/lectures *	0 %	0 %	19,2 %	30,8 %	50 %	0 %
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0 %	11,5 %	15,4 %	38,5 %	34,6 %	0 %
Polls in classroom *	0 %	0 %	23,1 %	30,8 %	42,3 %	3,8 %

10b) Feel free to add comments about the different teaching and learning activities.

- The group activity on searching for publication channels was a great initiative but there wasn't enough time. Direct instruction/lectures: I really liked the fact that there was someone from the IT department to talk about how to handle sensitive data.
- The course was very interesting
- The breakout room group activities should all have been actively timed. Only one breakout group activity had an active timer present for the entire exercise, and it helped in keeping our time budget.
- Direct instructions and Questions and Answers were the most effective to me as I was able to give the fullest attention when the classes were actually in session.
- I liked the breakoutrooms and the discussions there. Maybe we could have had a bit more time in those. it takes time to establish a Group. Maybe we should be the same Groups for some activities. We then don't need the introductions on what are subjects are etc.
- Some of the group activities was hard to do because of the limited timeframe, and also some of the activities themselves was difficult to understand properly to answer. Especially, for me, I found the task of evaluating how to (or not to) publish work in different journals according to what information found on <https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>.
- A lot of very relevant information was just said. It wasn't included in the presentation. I wasn't able to take notes fast enough and so I missed the information. Presentations could have been provided before the seminars.
- They were well balanced.
- I think the group discussions were the best part of the course- especially how they were set up on day with good instructions about what to discuss. However the break out sessions were very short and we never got a chance to get through the intended discussion questions.

11a) How will you evaluate your own contribution during the following teaching and learning activities?**Svar fordelt på antall**

	1 (very low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
Cours attendance *	0	0	4	6	16
Course readings *	3	3	6	8	6
Plenary discussions *	2	3	7	9	5
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0	0	6	9	11

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (very low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
Cours attendance *	0 %	0 %	15,4 %	23,1 %	61,5 %
Course readings *	11,5 %	11,5 %	23,1 %	30,8 %	23,1 %
Plenary discussions *	7,7 %	11,5 %	26,9 %	34,6 %	19,2 %
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0 %	0 %	23,1 %	34,6 %	42,3 %

11b) Feel free to add any comments on your own contribution.

- I had some technical problem during two of the group sessions and one of the lectures
- I enjoyed the short break out sessions with different other Ph.D. students.
- Was forced to abandon some of the Friday Endnote seminars due to emergencies in the lab and didn't have time to read it all. Felt like I participated actively otherwise.
- None

12) How will you rate the quality of the following aspects on course organisation?**Svar fordelt på antall**





	1 (not good at all)	2	3	4	5 (very good)
Timeliness of information *	0	0	3	9	14
Accuracy/clarity of information *	0	0	1	11	14
Communicativeness of teachers *	0	0	3	12	11
Communicativeness of administrative support staff *	0	0	3	9	14
Utilisation of Canvas *	0	0	0	13	13
Overall organisation of the course *	0	0	0	14	12

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not good at all)	2	3	4	5 (very good)
Timeliness of information *	0 %	0 %	11,5 %	34,6 %	53,8 %
Accuracy/clarity of information *	0 %	0 %	3,8 %	42,3 %	53,8 %
Communicativeness of teachers *	0 %	0 %	11,5 %	46,2 %	42,3 %
Communicativeness of administrative support staff *	0 %	0 %	11,5 %	34,6 %	53,8 %
Utilisation of Canvas *	0 %	0 %	0 %	50 %	50 %
Overall organisation of the course *	0 %	0 %	0 %	53,8 %	46,2 %

13) Exam assignment: Do you believe the course has made you equipped to answer it? *

Comment: We will send out a short questionnaire after the exam deadline, to learn more about your experience with the exam assignment.

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Absolutely	12	46,2 %	
Absolutely not	0	0 %	
I am not sure yet	11	42,3 %	
I will not take the exam	1	3,8 %	
Other	2	7,7 %	

14) Do you have any thoughts about how we can improve the course?

We would appreciate advice on all levels: Objectives, reading list, teaching, activities, exam, organisation, etc.

- see comment above
- Smaller groups. More about academic integrity and more overview lectures about some of the other subjects, to many details about publisher fees...
- Objectives: the objectives are great. I just wish it was given a bigger credit than 2 ect because there is so much that could have been expanded on. Reading list: There is more reading lists on open access publication than publication channels in general Activities: very good activities. more time should be allocated to the activities with more than 2 people in a group.
- None
- May the survey can be taken on the very same day for each day of the course and make it a part of deeming the 'attendance' on that day adequate. That way, you get better recall and the feedback might be more detailed.
- I was hoping to have more information on how to do the literature review, and not only the search - because of the reading list connected to that module :)
- muligens gå mer inn på noe av det viktigste i et phd løp, nemlig samarbeid veileder og student? Veiledere blir jo kurset i å veilede, men phd studenter har ingen opplæring i å være en del av dette teamet og løpet. Man blir kanskje derfor i all for stor grad avhengig av at veileder er god til å begynne med, før man selv kommer litt inn i gamet? en liten introduksjon til hvordan man selv kan ta tak i rammene for phd løpet sammen med veileder hadde kanskje ikke vært så dumt i et kurs som dette?
- longer group discussions. This questionnaire was quite long. I think a shorter questionnaire would prompt more people to finish it.

15) Do you have comments on topics not covered by the other questions? Feel free to share them here!

- Can't think of any.
- This course would be more useful as an obligatory course for new PhD students than the actually obligatory courses I had to take.
- None

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema](#)





Rapport fra «Evaluation of exam: GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey (Spring 2021)»

Innhentede svar pr. 18. mai 2021 23:04





- Leverte svar: **15**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar

1) Which PhD programme are you admitted to? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Engineering Science	3	20 % 	
Health Sciences	5	33,3 % 	
Humanities and Social Sciences	4	26,7 % 	
Law Studies	0	0 %	
Natural Sciences	3	20 % 	
Nautical Operations	0	0 %	
Science	0	0 %	
I am admitted to the Associate Professor programme	0	0 %	
I am admitted to a Student Research programme	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

2) For how long have you been a PhD candidate? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
I am in my first year	11	73,3 % 	
I am in my second year	2	13,3 % 	
I am in my third year	1	6,7 % 	
I am in my fourth year	0	0 %	
I have been working on my PhD project for four years or more	1	6,7 % 	

3) About the exam assignment

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)
a) Do you feel that the exam assignment constitutes a fair assessment of your attainment of the relevant intended learning outcomes of the course? *	0	1	1	7	6
b) Do you feel that the course made you equipped to answer the exam assignment? *	0	0	1	6	8
c) Do you feel that working with the exam assignment has been useful to your PhD project? *	0	1	2	5	7

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)
a) Do you feel that the exam assignment constitutes a fair assessment of your attainment of the relevant intended learning outcomes of the course? *	0 %	6,7 %	6,7 %	46,7 %	40 %
b) Do you feel that the course made you equipped to answer the exam assignment? *	0 %	0 %	6,7 %	40 %	53,3 %
c) Do you feel that working with the exam assignment has been useful to your PhD project? *	0 %	6,7 %	13,3 %	33,3 %	46,7 %

4) Feel free to add any thoughts or comments you may have regarding the exam!

- The exam made it easy to revise what was taught in class and read more on the chosen topic. It was however difficult writing an essay which requires so much explanation of concepts within the limited number of words.
- I was forced (in a positive way) to check many things regarding data that I would have otherwise omitted. I am glad I took this course and the assignment.
- A word or two about the exam tasks would have helped (me at least) to understand the general aim. It took me a while to understand both tasks (due to lack of prior knowledge on both topics).
- The exam only dealt with a small part of the course so it is debatable how well such an exam can test total attainment. It was difficult to know what was expected

of the assignment. A more detailed description would have been appreciated.

- A Very good start for our PhD program..Thank You
- It is always good when one can relate the exam to your own project

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema](#)

Rapport fra «Evaluation of GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey (Autumn 2020)»

Innhentede svar pr. 18. februar 2021 08:12

- Leverte svar: **22**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar

Dear participant,

We have developed this questionnaire as a means to improve the quality of the course GEN-8001. We sincerely hope you wish to contribute with your opinions.

On behalf of the teachers' team,

Helene N. Andreassen (course responsible)

1) Which PhD programme are you admitted to? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Engineering Science	4	18,2 %	<div><div></div></div>
Health Sciences	7	31,8 %	<div><div></div></div>
Humanities and Social Sciences	5	22,7 %	<div><div></div></div>
Law Studies	0	0 %	
Natural Sciences	6	27,3 %	<div><div></div></div>
Nautical Operations	0	0 %	
Science	0	0 %	
I am admitted to the Associate Professor programme	0	0 %	
I am admitted to a Student Research programme	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

2) For how long have you been a PhD candidate? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
I am in my first year	12	54,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
I am in my second year	9	40,9 %	<div><div></div></div>
I am in my third year	1	4,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
I am in my fourth year	0	0 %	
I have been working on my PhD project for four years or more	0	0 %	

3) Where did you hear about the course (GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey)? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Supervisor	1	4,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
Research group	1	4,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
Other PhD students	8	36,4 %	<div><div></div></div>
University Library	0	0 %	
Administration	1	4,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
UiT webpages	6	27,3 %	<div><div></div></div>
Email	5	22,7 %	<div><div></div></div>
Social media (Facebook, info screens, etc.)	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

4) Please state the three most important things you have learned as a result of participating in this course. *

- - How to use databases to safely store research data, and where to find the correct one for my needs - How to be more efficient in literature search - The different requirements from UiT regarding the PhD program, as well as the tools provided by UiT to help us along the way
- It is a very informative course, I learned a lot during the course, but the most important are * advanced searches, using operators (AND, OR, NOT) *finding open access journals *UiT open research data
- a b c

- 1. Systematic research of an article via WoS, Scopus, etc 2. Open access journal searching and DOAJ 3. Research data management and storing
- How to determine open publishing alternatives for a journal. That I should create a readme-file for my data. Combining several concepts in a literature search (at least at Web of Science).
- Effective ways of searching for literature as well as data; The different publication pathways; and data management plans.
- Literature search, the importance of open access and the importance of academic integrity.
- As I have worked for a few years in academia after finishing my masters I did not find the course to provide much new information. However, it would be very nice to have the information presented as a flyer or similar.
- Literature Search, Open Access, EndNote
- How the assessment of journals work, how to publish open access, tricks for literature review
- .
- What you have to think about to compose a good literature search What open access is and what you have to think about before you chose a journal to submit your article to Some functions in endnote I didn't know in advance
- Advanced literature research, better awareness of citing other researchers, advanced End Note
- - More techniques for searching - Introduction to endnote - Handling research data
- How to do better systematic searches How to evaluate different journals and their degree of "openness" How to share various data and supplements in repositories
- Research data management Library services
- EndNote, new literature search portals, technicalities about working with sensitive data
- Data Management plan Web of Science and literature search importing and exporting references
- Scientific transparency Open data Literature search
- The use of Endnote A better understanding of how to archive data. A better understanding of how to do a scientific search
- The university library can help with a great diversity of tasks. The importance of open science. The importance of continuously update and improve a data management plan.
- To share ideas, that there are different routes to the goal, share the knowledge and spread it as much as we can, there are many things to consider during every part of the project.

5) How satisfied are you with the course in general?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
How satisfied were you with the course in general? *	0	1	4	10	7

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
How satisfied were you with the course in general? *	0 %	4,5 %	18,2 %	45,5 %	31,8 %

6) Would you recommend GEN-8001 to others?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (absolutely not)	2	3	4	5 (absolutely)
Would you recommend GEN-8001 to others? *	0	1	4	8	9

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (absolutely not)	2	3	4	5 (absolutely)
Would you recommend GEN-8001 to others? *	0 %	4,5 %	18,2 %	36,4 %	40,9 %

7a) How satisfied were you with the different seminars?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	Not applicable
Academic integrity and the transparency of science *	0	4	3	8	6	1
Literature search (Humanities, Social Sciences and Law) *	0	0	2	4	5	11
Literature search (Medicine and Health Sciences) *	0	0	2	3	5	12
Literature search (Technology and Natural Sciences) *	0	0	1	4	5	12
Open access publishing *	0	0	5	6	9	2
Research data management part I *	0	1	4	5	10	2
Research data management part II: Data with sensitive information *	0	1	3	5	7	6
Research data management part II: Data without sensitive information *	0	0	1	4	5	12
Endnote basic *	1	0	2	5	4	10
Endnote advanced *	0	0	4	2	3	13

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	Not applicable
Academic integrity and the transparency of science *	0 %	18,2 %	13,6 %	36,4 %	27,3 %	4,5 %
Literature search (Humanities, Social Sciences and Law) *	0 %	0 %	9,1 %	18,2 %	22,7 %	50 %
Literature search (Medicine and Health Sciences) *	0 %	0 %	9,1 %	13,6 %	22,7 %	54,5 %
Literature search (Technology and Natural Sciences) *	0 %	0 %	4,5 %	18,2 %	22,7 %	54,5 %
Open access publishing *	0 %	0 %	22,7 %	27,3 %	40,9 %	9,1 %
Research data management part I *	0 %	4,5 %	18,2 %	22,7 %	45,5 %	9,1 %
Research data management part II: Data with sensitive information *	0 %	4,5 %	13,6 %	22,7 %	31,8 %	27,3 %
Research data management part II: Data without sensitive information *	0 %	0 %	4,5 %	18,2 %	22,7 %	54,5 %
Endnote basic *	4,5 %	0 %	9,1 %	22,7 %	18,2 %	45,5 %
Endnote advanced *	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	9,1 %	13,6 %	59,1 %

7b) Feel free to add comments about the different seminars.

- A lot of technical issues during the Endnote Advanced course
- ok
- I feel as though it was unnecessary to show us proper citations and convince us about the value of open science. At least in my field these are already somewhat self-evident. Other than that I enjoyed the course and like that you differentiated the different search seminars and the endnote into basic/advanced.
- please make either this course or scientific writing course a mandatory course for all phd student

8a) To what extent did the course help you obtain the intended learning outcomes?**Svar fordelt på antall**

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Not applicable
Explain correct use of sources in an academic publication and questionable research practices. *	1	1	3	7	7	3
Explain the purpose of literature search for the research process. *	0	0	6	8	7	1
Explain the purpose and advantages of open science, for research and society in general. *	0	0	3	5	12	2
Explain the main sections of a data management plan. *	0	2	6	8	5	1
Cite academic work, including published research data, in line with existing norms and conventions. *	0	1	6	7	5	3
Select and use scientific databases for advanced literature searches. *	0	0	3	7	10	2
Build advanced searches, using operators (AND, OR, NOT) and search history. *	0	0	4	6	11	1
Evaluate and select suitable publication channels for own research. *	0	2	6	7	6	1
Find and use repositories for archiving text (publications/manuscripts) and research data. *	0	1	7	7	5	2
Structure and document research data in line with good academic practice. *	0	2	6	9	4	1
Carry out research with academic integrity. *	0	0	4	11	6	1
Disseminate academic work in line with current publication trends and requirements. *	0	3	3	11	4	1
Communicate with peers and the larger scholarly community about the concept of transparency of science. *	0	1	5	12	3	1
Use the research support services at the University Library. *	0	0	3	9	9	1

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Not applicable
Explain correct use of sources in an academic publication and questionable research practices. *	4,5 %	4,5 %	13,6 %	31,8 %	31,8 %	13,6 %
Explain the purpose of literature search for the research process. *	0 %	0 %	27,3 %	36,4 %	31,8 %	4,5 %
Explain the purpose and advantages of open science, for research and society in general. *	0 %	0 %	13,6 %	22,7 %	54,5 %	9,1 %
Explain the main sections of a data management plan. *	0 %	9,1 %	27,3 %	36,4 %	22,7 %	4,5 %
Cite academic work, including published research data, in line with existing norms and conventions. *	0 %	4,5 %	27,3 %	31,8 %	22,7 %	13,6 %

Select and use scientific databases for advanced literature searches. *	0 %	0 %	13,6 %	31,8 %	45,5 %	9,1 %
Build advanced searches, using operators (AND, OR, NOT) and search history. *	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	27,3 %	50 %	4,5 %
Evaluate and select suitable publication channels for own research. *	0 %	9,1 %	27,3 %	31,8 %	27,3 %	4,5 %
Find and use repositories for archiving text (publications/manuscripts) and research data. *	0 %	4,5 %	31,8 %	31,8 %	22,7 %	9,1 %
Structure and document research data in line with good academic practice. *	0 %	9,1 %	27,3 %	40,9 %	18,2 %	4,5 %
Carry out research with academic integrity. *	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	50 %	27,3 %	4,5 %
Disseminate academic work in line with current publication trends and requirements. *	0 %	13,6 %	13,6 %	50 %	18,2 %	4,5 %
Communicate with peers and the larger scholarly community about the concept of transparency of science. *	0 %	4,5 %	22,7 %	54,5 %	13,6 %	4,5 %
Use the research support services at the University Library. *	0 %	0 %	13,6 %	40,9 %	40,9 %	4,5 %

8b) Feel free to add comments about the intended learning outcomes.

- ok

9a) To what extent did the reading list help you obtain the intended learning outcomes?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	I didn't read it all
To what extent did the reading list help you obtain the intended learning outcomes of the course? *	0	0	5	7	3	7

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	I didn't read it all
To what extent did the reading list help you obtain the intended learning outcomes of the course? *	0 %	0 %	22,7 %	31,8 %	13,6 %	31,8 %

9b) In case your answer was "I didn't read it all", please explain why.

- Am still in the process.
- I only read the listed texts for the first two days because the texts for the two last days seemed quite introductory and I am in my second year so I figured I wanted to hear the presentations first.
- There is too much to read on the list and the effort required to read it does not reflect the 2 ECTS the course provides.
- I did not read anything from the reading list before the course because I was very pressured on time, due to other obligations.
- I prioritized my time to other tasks that I felt was more relevant at the time. But I do keep some of the references for future use.
- I actually had a lot of work to do
- lack of time
- Too much semester work which left me with little time to read the literature on this.

10a) How will you rate the following teaching and learning activities? To what extent did they help you learn?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Didn't attend/didn't do it
Course readings *	0	1	6	6	3	6
Preparatory tasks *	0	2	7	10	2	1
Direct instruction/lectures *	0	2	1	12	7	0
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0	0	6	10	6	0
Polls in classroom *	2	2	2	12	2	2

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)	Didn't attend/didn't do it
Course readings *	0 %	4,5 %	27,3 %	27,3 %	13,6 %	27,3 %
Preparatory tasks *	0 %	9,1 %	31,8 %	45,5 %	9,1 %	4,5 %
Direct instruction/lectures *	0 %	9,1 %	4,5 %	54,5 %	31,8 %	0 %
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0 %	0 %	27,3 %	45,5 %	27,3 %	0 %
Polls in classroom *	9,1 %	9,1 %	9,1 %	54,5 %	9,1 %	9,1 %

10b) Feel free to add comments about the different teaching and learning activities.

- I didn't quite understand the meaning of using breakout rooms in the Endnote basic seminar. The assignment was not so clear and that made it difficult to keep up and understand what we were actually going to do and learn. I think the seminar would be much better if it was organized the same way as the advanced seminar where the lecturer just step-by-step explained how to do things.
- ok
- The poll used for open publishing did not work.
- The prep-tasks were sometimes unclearly communicated or difficult to understand. I personally think prep-tasks should be very clear and restricted in scope.
- The teaching may have been a bit too rushed up – we are mostly switching between a variety of courses and technical information can be hard to catch up with amidst so much mental load.
- I think there could have been more interactive tasks, or discussion of preparatory tasks. The course participants varied in the preparedness which made it difficult to keep a good discussion going.

11a) How will you evaluate your own contribution during the following teaching and learning activities?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (very low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
Cours attendance *	0	0	3	7	12
Course readings *	5	2	5	8	2
Plenary discussions *	1	4	6	6	5
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0	1	2	10	9

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (very low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
Cours attendance *	0 %	0 %	13,6 %	31,8 %	54,5 %
Course readings *	22,7 %	9,1 %	22,7 %	36,4 %	9,1 %
Plenary discussions *	4,5 %	18,2 %	27,3 %	27,3 %	22,7 %
Group/pair activities in classroom *	0 %	4,5 %	9,1 %	45,5 %	40,9 %

11b) Feel free to add any comments on your own contribution.

- Break-out groups was very much fun, nice to talk to other students even though the course is digital this year!
- Although i did try to contribute as much as possible, I did not feel that there was sufficient time to complete the grop/pair activities in some instances. In other instances, the instruction was somewhat unclear.
- Perhaps the Zoom effect was present, but I felt the discussions was ok in plenary, but a bit less stimulating in groups. Paris worked better.

12) How will you rate the quality of the following aspects on course organisation?

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not good at all)	2	3	4	5 (very good)
Timeliness of information *	0	2	4	9	7
Accuracy/clearness of information *	0	2	4	9	7
Communicativeness of teachers *	0	0	4	9	9
Communicativeness of administrative support staff *	1	0	3	10	8
Utilisation of Canvas *	1	0	2	11	8
Overall organisation of the course *	0	1	5	8	8

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not good at all)	2	3	4	5 (very good)
Timeliness of information *	0 %	9,1 %	18,2 %	40,9 %	31,8 %
Accuracy/clearness of information *	0 %	9,1 %	18,2 %	40,9 %	31,8 %
Communicativeness of teachers *	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	40,9 %	40,9 %
Communicativeness of administrative support staff *	4,5 %	0 %	13,6 %	45,5 %	36,4 %
Utilisation of Canvas *	4,5 %	0 %	9,1 %	50 %	36,4 %
Overall organisation of the course *	0 %	4,5 %	22,7 %	36,4 %	36,4 %

13) Exam assignment: Do you believe the course has made you equipped to answer it? *

Comment: We will send out a short questionnaire after the exam deadline, to learn more about your experience with the exam assignment.

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Absolutely	12	54,5 %	<div><div></div></div>
Absolutely not	0	0 %	
I am not sure yet	9	40,9 %	<div><div></div></div>
I will not take the exam	0	0 %	

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Other	1	4,5 %	

14) Do you have any thoughts about how we can improve the course?

We would appreciate advice on all levels: Objectives, reading list, teaching, activities, exam, organisation, etc.

- As a general comment, the course in itself was interesting from start to finish, and having the activities in break rooms disseminated throughout was a good idea: it allowed me to stay focused, rather than have 3h of lectures in a row then the activities at the end where I would have drifted off at some point. One "negative" point is that the reading list felt more like a "if you want to know more, read this" rather than "this will be useful for the course, you should read it before coming".
- no
- I do think the texts in the reading list were too long considering this is "just" a 2 ECT course, texts on 40 pages will not be read. Either shorter or fewer readings.
- None to add
- Maybe allocate a bit more time to questions and answers.
- For me, the course did not work out at all. I am sure there was some good information there but the format of zoom does not fit very well with how things were presented and the time given for the tasks was too short. Most of all 3 hours are far too long. By the end of each day, I had a cracking head ace and were nauseous. In my opinion, zoom should only be used if strictly necessary. If needed I would really limit the time to 1.5 hours (absolute maximum). An alternative could be to have a 2-3 hour break between two sessions and by that manage 3 hours per day. I found it rather bad to send out tasks and information that should be read on Friday evening and Sunday. You should not expect people to work during the weekend or corroborate the expectation that one should.
- Compromise it to longer and fewer days
- Change the lecture related to referencing techniques and academic integrity so that it is more relevant, and perhaps at a higher level. I may come from a very different discipline, but these concepts seem self-evident to most in my field.
- In my opinion, Either this course or the Scientific or hybrid of both course is very essential for every phd student. It is wise to make one of this course mandatory together with research ethics course.
- More preparatory tasks and follow-up help/discussion on advanced searches and citation. Publish the course material/preparatory tasks well in advance to make everyone have a chance to come prepared.

15) Do you have comments on topics not covered by the other questions? Feel free to share them here!

- The course was really well organized!
- ok

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema](#)

Rapport fra «Evaluation of GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey (Spring 2020)»






Innhentede svar pr. 15. april 2020 00:00

- Leverte svar: **19**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar

Dear participant,
The purpose of this survey is to improve the quality of the course. Your opinion counts!

1) What is your scientific background? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Faculty of Biosciences, Fisheries and Economics	2	10,5 %	
Faculty of Engineering Science and Technology	2	10,5 %	
Faculty of Health Sciences	9	47,4 %	
Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education	4	21,1 %	
Faculty of Science and Technology	2	10,5 %	
Faculty of Law	0	0 %	
The Arctic University Museum of Norway and Academy of Fine Arts	0	0 %	
The University Library	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

2) Scientific background, specified:

- Space physics
- Public Health nutritionist
- Research year student
- Masters in Biology
- Biology
- Political Science
- Mechanical engineering
- Photoacoustics
- Art history
- MA in community planning, work as scientist
- Bachelor i ergoterapi
- omic data analysis
- Educational Science
- Physics
- master in Health science
- Biology and community health
- dentistry

Svar fordelt på antall

	None	Less than 25 %	25-50 %	over 50 %	all/almost all	Not applicable to this course
3) How much of the provided literature had you read by the time the lectures and group work ended?	1	8	3	3	4	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	None	Less than 25 %	25-50 %	over 50 %	all/almost all	Not applicable to this course
3) How much of the provided literature had you read by the time the lectures and group work ended?	5,3 %	42,1 %	15,8 %	15,8 %	21,1 %	0 %

4) In case your answer was not “all/almost all”, please explain why this was the case

- Something wrong happened With my registration for the course, so I did not have Access to the course material before the course started.
- I did not have enough time to prepare due to other duties.
- Other work-related obligations had to be prioritized, and 4-5 hours of sleep per night is at the borderline to what is necessary for my brain to function at a higher level.
- Some of the literature was either a) not relevant or b) on topics that I already have been coursed on.

- There were many material to read
- Jeg har orientert meg i pensumlitteraturen, men ikke tatt meg tid til å lese alt. Jeg har prioritert å bruke mer tid på andre arbeidsoppgaver som har ventet.
- I did not get the time.
- Time issues - worktime ahead of course did not go as planned / other things was prioritized.
- I had a very busy schedule the week before the course and did only read the mornings before the lectures.
- Unfortunately I didn't take the time as I had other obligations with deadlines.
- Time constraints in preparation for the course

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
5) How will you evaluate your own contribution (i.e. course attendance, reading literature, active participation during group-work) in order to gain new knowledge during the course?	0	0	8	9	2

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
5) How will you evaluate your own contribution (i.e. course attendance, reading literature, active participation during group-work) in order to gain new knowledge during the course?	0 %	0 %	42,1 %	47,4 %	10,5 %

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
6) How satisfied are you with the course in general? (1 = not satisfied, 5 = very satisfied)	0	1	4	8	6

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
6) How satisfied are you with the course in general? (1 = not satisfied, 5 = very satisfied)	0 %	5,3 %	21,1 %	42,1 %	31,6 %

7) Please state the three most important things that you have learned as a result of participating in this course:

- Open access, End Note, look for scientific documentation
- Literature search and open access
- 1. To learn more about making a good literature search in the databases where very helpful. 2. The lectures about open Access publication was useful and important. 3. Data storage
- The rules and guidelines around open science and publishing, academic integrity in terms of co-authorship, and managing research data in terms of were to publish data and repositories.
- 1) Information on databases (e.g. literature databases, journal databases etc). 2) Tips to a more structured literature searches than what I have done before. 3) The range of problems and dilemmas within and outside my field.
- Literature reviewing
- 1) Litteratursøk og bruk av MeSH-terms. 2) Open Access 3) Mulighet for å legge ut datasett som en publikasjon
- How to look for literature How to avoid plagiarism How to use endnote
- Gained knowledge of EndNote Raised awareness of publishing process Better understanding of OpenAccess
- 1. UiT publication fund 2. Broader overview of literature databases 3. UiT guidelines on secure data handling
- the need of data management plan for my phd a better understanding of open access and the issues around how to make use of endnote
- More knowledge about the debate around Open access, a more thorough understanding of searching, better understanding of data security
- More info about literature search and litteratur review, etics in science. Finally I will also mention that i got some good practical advices, like where to do and how to do find good sources for my dissertation.
- 1. how to search literature 2. open access policy 3. about plagiarism
- I learned a lot from all the lectures. In particular the lecture about open aces was interesting and new to me. In the leclures about literature search I got a confirmation about having done my own search right.
- 1. How to perform a comprehensive literature search using directory terms (such as MeSH) to best reproduce good searches consistently over a period of time such that new, relevant publications come to our attention 2. How to use various criteria for deciding which journal(s) to publish in 3. Strategies for thinking through ethical dilemmas we might face
- Open access publishing Literature search Research data management

8) What parts of this course (if any), did you enjoy the most? Please specify.

- End Note
- Literature search and open access
- To learn about making a litterature search in the database. It was very helpful for me as I am in the start of my Research career. It was well organized With good Teachers and practical excersice With good help from the Teachers.
- The seminar on academic integrity - I found it interesting and interactive in the way the lectures gave us tasks to solve/discuss during the seminar.
- Scientific integrity
- Open access and research data management
- Litteratursøk: det var konkret og direkte anvendelig mot mitt daglige arbeid.
- How to look for literature and articles because I learned different things
- Group work with assigned tasks EndNote, hands-on, very useful to work directly from my project/files. That the corona scare was included in the material, made the course up-to-date. Coffee/tea/fruit, thank you!
- Literary search - End note advanced - Both had motivated course-leaders, they worked well together and had a good dialouge with the students
- Data searching
- litterature search
- literature search

- The open access part
- - morning of the first day : was great to have the opportunity to discuss very real ethical/academic/scientific dilemmas with other PhD students from diverse disciplines. It is not often we get to see how our journeys might be shared since we are often working in our respective institutes - literature search (afternoon of the first day): the two instructors were fantastic and managed to keep literature search interesting and fun. They were very supportive individually. This was also made possible by the somewhat small class size.
- Sessions on Wednesday

9) What parts of this course (if any) did you enjoy the least? Please specify.

- I don't know.
- Literature search - I consider myself skilled in literature search, so in my case it did not add more to my previous knowledge in the field.
- Research data management
- Literary research
- Research data management, part two: Da vi delte oss i grupper basert på sensitiv/ikke-sensitiv data. Jeg følte at det ble mye "uinspirert" opplesing av manuset på tavla. Denne delen føler jeg var mindre bearbeidet og mindre inspirerende enn de øvrige kursene.
- When it was a monologue and not involving students
- The section on DMP, uninteresting presentation. No group work.
- Seminar on literature search. Way too long and way too general and simple - the "exercises" were way too long, especially compared to exercises in the other parts of the course, which were too short.
- Research Data management (this was useful, but still felt a bit overwhelming for me personally)
- Academic integrity, because it overlaps a lot with the obligatory course HEL-8040 at The Health Faculty. Also the part around data management as data management plans for most of us is already developed.
- data management
- I found everything important
- - Open Access publishing (morning of second day) : while some segments of their lectures were helpful (such as criteria for evaluating scientific journals), the promotional aspect of open access publishing verged on the edge of "preachy", using very extreme examples to demonstrate the advantages of open access. It may have been more constructive to look at the pros and cons of open access as well as subscription based journals such that we can make our own informed decisions (I say this despite preferring the idea of open access compared to subscription). Some interesting discussion could take part here. - data management/reproducibility (afternoon of second day): unfortunately dry, to a large degree. There was minimal participation despite class size being very manageable for a participation-based segments.

10) Please tell us what you think we can do to improve these aspects of the course.

- I don't know
- I can't come up with something in particular, because in general I found all parts of the course important.
- - A more engaging group task - More compressed lecture
- I wish literary research was optional, seeing as I have attended courses on the same topic both on my bachelor and master's degree, and there wasn't really anything new for me to learn on this topic.
- Mer konkret gjennomgang av hvordan man faktisk arkiverer data, samt bearbeider datasettet slik at det kan lagres og publiseres.
- You can have a session where you give a 500 words article and ask students to write in their own words to give a feel of how to avoid plagiarism.
- Perhaps incorporate group work or tasks into the DMP section?
- More time for the group work in the academic integrity seminar, 10min was too little. In general, the course can easily be shortened by a fair bit - especially the literature search seminar was way too long, and the same amount of info could have been given in less than 1 hour. An overview of databases can be useful, but how to use operators and the left-hand menu is something people should have learned during their master studies.
- maybe a hand-in task in advance?
- It should be highly recommended to attend this course during the first semester of the PhD, while the research protocol, and applications to NSD (and/or REK) is in progress. It would be very helpful!
- It was a good course, but it was a lot of retelling and I felt the last part was just repeat of information that we had already received.
- It was already good
- I liked it as it is!
- See above.
- If possible use more time for research data management and open access publishing.

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
11) How satisfied are you with the course coordination and information flow in general (1= not satisfied, 5= very satisfied)	1	1	2	5	9

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
11) How satisfied are you with the course coordination and information flow in general (1= not satisfied, 5= very satisfied)	5,6 %	5,6 %	11,1 %	27,8 %	50 %

12) Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied.

- I was satisfied. It was a short and straight to the point course with a lot of coffee in the morning.
- Easy to get contact With course leaders on mail. They were flexible and helpful.
- No comments here.
- I got the information I felt was necessary
- 1) Informasjon ut i god tid, både på mail og i Canvas. 2) Ryddig og vel bearbeidet Canvas-rom og kursinnhold
- I think things were organized quite well
- Relevant information for my research project, especially information on publishing.
- Necessary information given in due time.
- The course coordination was good - enough information ahead and well organized.
- Good information, very good coordination between the different lecturers - an example to follow for other courses.
- I was satisfied because it was well organized
- The information about the course in advance came a little late, and we had to confirm several places that we actually planned to participate in the course that we had ask to join.
- Excellent communication from course leader in person, quick response via email, and timely upload of readings as well as exam in Canvas/WiseFlow.

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
13) How satisfied were you with the lectures in general? (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied)	0	1	5	8	5

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
13) How satisfied were you with the lectures in general? (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied)	0 %	5,3 %	26,3 %	42,1 %	26,3 %

14) Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied.

- The Teachers were in my view very competent and well prepared.
- Most seminars and lecturers were interesting and interactive with us students.
- Some were not so engaging to me, probably because I have already attended som lectures/information meetings about research data management, open science and plan S.
- 1) Fint at det settes opp to lærere sammen, som kan utfylle hverandre. 2) Alle lærerne virket engasjert, motivert og godt forberedt for undervisning - bra! 3) God faglig tyngde på alle lærere. 4) Godt og relevant innhold i timene 5) Bra med små diskusjonsutfordringer undervegs i kursene. Dette får oss til å reflektere mer rundt temaene, samt komme i prat med de på sidene.
- The lectures were interesting.
- Either too general and too long (lit. search) or too short (integrity).
- Course leaders were motivated, those who were several, worked well together, variation between the modules / days are fine.
- The lecture was detailed and informative.
- The teachers were good and the lectures were interesting

15) How satisfied were you with the different modules of the course? (1 = not satisfied at all - 5 = very satisfied)

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	6 Not applicable
Academic integrity	0	0	3	8	7	1
Literature search	0	2	1	4	11	1
Open access publishing	0	1	3	4	9	2
Research data management part I	0	1	9	3	4	2
Research data management part II	0	5	8	1	3	2
Endnote basic	0	1	1	1	5	8
Endnote advanced	0	0	2	1	5	7




Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	6 Not applicable
Academic integrity	0 %	0 %	15,8 %	42,1 %	36,8 %	5,3 %
Literature search	0 %	10,5 %	5,3 %	21,1 %	57,9 %	5,3 %
Open access publishing	0 %	5,3 %	15,8 %	21,1 %	47,4 %	10,5 %
Research data management part I	0 %	5,3 %	47,4 %	15,8 %	21,1 %	10,5 %
Research data management part II	0 %	26,3 %	42,1 %	5,3 %	15,8 %	10,5 %
Endnote basic	0 %	6,2 %	6,2 %	6,2 %	31,2 %	50 %
Endnote advanced	0 %	0 %	13,3 %	6,7 %	33,3 %	46,7 %

16) In case you were not satisfied with some of the modules, please explain why.

- Some of the information given in the lectures was already known to me.
- Research data management part 2: Dette er begrunnet lengre opp i besvarelsen
- See previous comments.
- data management because you poor lecture content.

17) How satisfied were you with the organised activities (i.e. discussions) in general? (1=not satisfied, 5=very satisfied)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not satisfied at all)	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	5	26,3 %	
4	6	31,6 %	
5 (very satisfied)	8	42,1 %	





18) Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied the with the organised activities.

- It was very interesting to talk to people from other fields, and hear their point of view.
- Dette får oss til å reflektere mer rundt temaene, samt komme i prat med de på sidene. Fint at det også blir gjennomgått i plenum etterpå. Det er også bra at det var tydelig avgrenset tidsramme til de ulike diskusjonsdelene.
- See previous comments.
- The activities were helpful because they were related to my PhD journey. I learnt a lot.

19) How satisfied were you with the material (lecture and seminar handouts, reading material) provided during the course? (1: not satisfied, 5: very satisfied)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not satisfied)	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	4	21,1 % 	
4	9	47,4 % 	
5 (very satisfied)	6	31,6 % 	
6 Not applicable to this course	0	0 %	





20) Was the course content relevant to your work? (1 = not relevant at all, 5 = very relevant)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not relevant at all)	0	0 %	
2	2	10,5 % 	
3	2	10,5 % 	
4	7	36,8 % 	
5 (very relevant)	8	42,1 % 	

21) How can relevance and applicability be improved?

- Mer konkret demonstrasjon av hvordan man akriverer, klargjør og publiser datamaterialet
- See previous comments.
- I think interactive discussion between teacher and student can help.

22) With respect to time-allocation, how do you evaluate the balance between lectures and group-work? (1 = not balanced at all, 5 = very well balanced)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not balanced at all)	1	5,6 % 	
2	0	0 %	
3	3	16,7 % 	
4	6	33,3 % 	
5 (very well balanced)	8	44,4 % 	






23) Do you have other suggestions for improving the course?


- No
- A short break (i.e. 5-10 minutes) around every hour. Some lectures were a bit long, and it would have been nice to be able to go to the toilet and/or grab some coffee.
- See previous comments.
- No

24) Would you recommend this course to others?

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	16	94,1 % 	
No	1	5,9 % 	

25) Where did you hear about the course?

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Supervisor	1	5,3 % 	
Research group	0	0 %	
Other PhD students	6	31,6 % 	
University Library	1	5,3 % 	
Administration	0	0 %	
UiT webpages	6	31,6 % 	
Email	4	21,1 % 	

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Social media (Facebook, info screens, etc.)	0	0 %	
Other	1	5,3 % 	

Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema (v945_0rc1)





Rapport fra «Evaluation of exam: GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey (Autumn 2020)»

Innhentede svar pr. 18. februar 2021 08:20



- Leverte svar: **15**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar

1) Which PhD programme are you admitted to? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Engineering Science	3	20 % 	
Health Sciences	4	26,7 % 	
Humanities and Social Sciences	3	20 % 	
Law Studies	0	0 %	
Natural Sciences	5	33,3 % 	
Nautical Operations	0	0 %	
Science	0	0 %	
I am admitted to the Associate Professor programme	0	0 %	
I am admitted to a Student Research programme	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

2) For how long have you been a PhD candidate? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
I am in my first year	10	66,7 % 	
I am in my second year	3	20 % 	
I am in my third year	2	13,3 % 	
I am in my fourth year	0	0 %	
I have been working on my PhD project for four years or more	0	0 %	

3) About the exam assignment

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)
a) Do you feel that the exam assignment constitutes a fair assessment of your attainment of the relevant intended learning outcomes of the course? *	0	0	4	9	2
b) Do you feel that the course made you equipped to answer the exam assignment? *	0	0	1	8	6
c) Do you feel that working with the exam assignment has been useful to your PhD project? *	0	4	3	5	3

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a very high degree)
a) Do you feel that the exam assignment constitutes a fair assessment of your attainment of the relevant intended learning outcomes of the course? *	0 %	0 %	26,7 %	60 %	13,3 %
b) Do you feel that the course made you equipped to answer the exam assignment? *	0 %	0 %	6,7 %	53,3 %	40 %
c) Do you feel that working with the exam assignment has been useful to your PhD project? *	0 %	26,7 %	20 %	33,3 %	20 %

4) Feel free to add any thoughts or comments you may have regarding the exam!

- I think the course is essential for all phd candidates. the university should plan to combine three PhD courses(philosophy of science and ethics, take control of your phd and scientific writing) into one and make a mandatory course for every phd students
- I was glad to have an exam that was actually aligned with my goals as a PhD student. Many PhD-course exams feel arbitrary and not at all relevant for my PhD journey.
- All good
- testing testing

[Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema](#)

Rapport fra «Evaluation of GEN-8001 Take control of your PhD journey (autumn 2019)»





Innhentede svar pr. 31. januar 2020 14:43

- Leverte svar: **11**
- Påbegynte svar: **0**
- Antall invitasjoner sendt: **0**

Med fritekstsvar

Dear participant,
The purpose of this survey is to improve the quality of the course. Your opinion counts!

1) What is your scientific background? *

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Faculty of Biosciences, Fisheries and Economics	1	9,1 %	
Faculty of Engineering Science and Technology	3	27,3 %	
Faculty of Health Sciences	3	27,3 %	
Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education	4	36,4 %	
Faculty of Science and Technology	0	0 %	
Faculty of Law	0	0 %	
The Arctic University Museum of Norway and Academy of Fine Arts	0	0 %	
The University Library	0	0 %	
Other	0	0 %	

2) Scientific background, specified:

- .
- nurse/sociologist
- building technology
- Mechanical Engineering
- Pharmacy
- Utdanningsledelse
- Fisheries Biology
- Master
- Electrical Engineering
- Social anthropology
- Tourism

Svar fordelt på antall

	None	Less than 25 %	25-50 %	over 50 %	all/almost all	Not applicable to this course
3) How much of the provided literature had you read by the time the lectures and group work ended?	2	0	0	6	3	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	None	Less than 25 %	25-50 %	over 50 %	all/almost all	Not applicable to this course
3) How much of the provided literature had you read by the time the lectures and group work ended?	18,2 %	0 %	0 %	54,5 %	27,3 %	0 %

4) In case your answer was not “all/almost all”, please explain why this was the case

- I didn't have the time. There was an exam in another course going on at the same time.
- due to parallel classes, also wit literature lists and exam.
- Time...
- Dersom det er forventet, eller anbefales, at litteraturen skal være lest før, så er det lurt at det står det i innledningen til kurset. På dette kurset stod det ikke required pensum, men ser i ettertid at dette kunne vært lurt.

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
5) How will you evaluate your own contribution (i.e. course attendance, reading literature, active participation during group-work) in order to gain new knowledge during the course?	0	0	4	7	0

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (low)	2	3	4	5 (very high)
5) How will you evaluate your own contribution (i.e. course attendance, reading literature, active participation during group-work) in order to gain new knowledge during the course?	0 %	0 %	36,4 %	63,6 %	0 %

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
6) How satisfied are you with the course in general? (1 = not satisfied, 5 = very satisfied)	0	0	2	6	3

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
6) How satisfied are you with the course in general? (1 = not satisfied, 5 = very satisfied)	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	54,5 %	27,3 %

7) Please state the three most important things that you have learned as a result of participating in this course:

- Open Access/publication Literature search Endnote
- I did not know much about data sharing, or data management plans.
- endnote, data searching, publishing process
- Deeper knowledge of the Tools UiT is giving to PhD students and researchers - How to manage data - Deeper knowledge of the world of publications
- How to find information about the journals How to build a search Smart tricks in endnote
- End note - Literature search - Literary reviews
- Journal open access End Note Munin Data management
- Mange aha-opplevelser koblet til diskusjoner i forskningsmiljøene og hvorfor ting er som de er. Open access og Data management spesielt interessant.
- Academic integrity and the transparency of science, Literature search, and why open access
- The importance of transparency in science. I got some tips about how to store research data securely. How to improve my literature search.
- Research portals Open Access Datahåndtering

8) What parts of this course (if any), did you enjoy the most? Please specify.

- As mentioned above.
- data research management, IT and sensitive data
- research data management
- Literature search
- Literature search - Thorough review of how to build a search for various projects. Learned new things about how to get the most out of a search.
- EndNote and literature search - very useful
- EndNote learning
- Academic integrity and the transparency of science
- Literature search, data management and End Note.
- About open Access- very useful, and great excersises

9) What parts of this course (if any) did you enjoy the least? Please specify.

- Parts of the "academic integrity". Some of it is already covered in HEL 8010
- Perhaps the open access part. I think it might have been challenging for the teachers as well, because we (the students) had really different background-knowledge on the topic. For me it was perhaps a bit advanced. I am still not quite sure if the articles you cannot read - without access true the university library- really are open access.
- Academic integrity and the transparency of science
- End Note
- The part about open science had too much history and information around it. The more practical part was better and I would spend more time on that.
- Nothing really...
- The data management because it is abstractly covered. I wish we had a class to help to actually make a data management plan.
- End Note basics ble veldig rotete. Her burde det vært strengere regi første del. Språk har mye å si for at det ikke blir stakkato. Her var det lagt opp mye bedre for siste del av dagen.
- The very beginning of the course was mainly repetition for me, therefore it was a bit boring.

10) Please tell us what you think we can do to improve these aspects of the course.

- There could have been more time to ask questions
- I think that is fine already. It is just because I have less interest in that section.
- Focus more on the practical work and discussions.
- Can't think of anything. Keep up the good work!
- I hope there is more time to cover data management plan and sharing data through the university website.
- Viktig at engelsk er god nok og flytende. Burde brukt helt konkrete eksempel med å legge inn referanser i tekst, endre referanse etter at satt inn, enkle veier inn i EndNote når man jobber etc. Heller ved å gjøre det enn å vise menyene...
- How to review literature efficiently and effectively
- Maybe talk more about the data management plan. If there was enough time, it would have been great to discuss our projects with you.

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
11) How satisfied are you with the course coordination and information flow in general (1= not satisfied, 5= very satisfied)	0	0	2	5	4

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
11) How satisfied are you with the course coordination and information flow in general (1= not satisfied, 5= very satisfied)	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	45,5 %	36,4 %

12) Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied.

- I did learn a lot that is important to the work as a PhD student. I would call the course an "eye-opener! I would have preferred to have more time to read the literature
- We got all the information we needed, I think.
- I am satisfied with the course because I obtained new skills on research and literature management
- The course was very interesting not only for the contents but mainly because of the speakers
- We got all information needed.
- The course was very useful to me!
- God info i forkant.

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
13) How satisfied were you with the lectures in general? (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied)	0	0	1	5	4

Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)
13) How satisfied were you with the lectures in general? (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied)	0 %	0 %	10 %	50 %	40 %

14) Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied.

- good teachers
- The lectures are interesting and have interaction and discussion sections
- In general lectures cover many important topics for newly PhD stipendiats which help to achieve future goals.

15) How satisfied were you with the different modules of the course? (1 = not satisfied at all - 5 = very satisfied)

Svar fordelt på antall

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	6 Not applicable
Academic integrity	0	2	1	4	4	0
Literature search	0	0	1	1	9	0
Open access publishing	0	1	1	6	2	1
Research data management part I	0	0	2	7	1	1
Research data management part II	0	1	2	4	3	1
Endnote basic	0	1	2	3	3	1
Endnote advanced	0	0	0	2	3	3




Svar fordelt på prosent

	1 (not satisfied at all)	2	3	4	5 (very satisfied)	6 Not applicable
Academic integrity	0 %	18,2 %	9,1 %	36,4 %	36,4 %	0 %
Literature search	0 %	0 %	9,1 %	9,1 %	81,8 %	0 %
Open access publishing	0 %	9,1 %	9,1 %	54,5 %	18,2 %	9,1 %
Research data management part I	0 %	0 %	18,2 %	63,6 %	9,1 %	9,1 %
Research data management part II	0 %	9,1 %	18,2 %	36,4 %	27,3 %	9,1 %
Endnote basic	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	30 %	10 %
Endnote advanced	0 %	0 %	0 %	25 %	37,5 %	37,5 %

16) In case you were not satisfied with some of the modules, please explain why.

- Explained earlier
- Literature search - fant veldig lite reiselivsrelatert stoff i de kanalene vi gikk gjennom, og google scholar, som jeg oftest bruker, var ikke nevnt i kurset uten at vi i klasserommet tok det opp. Litt rart. Lurer da på om man gjør noe feil. Flere nevnte det samme i pausen. EndNote basic var for ustrukturert lagt opp. For dårlig språk kanskje? Burde brukt eksempel for å vise menyene, ikke bare peke på menyene.




17) How satisfied were you with the organised activities (i.e. discussions) in general? (1=not satisfied, 5=very satisfied)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not satisfied at all)	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	1	9,1 % 	
4	8	72,7 % 	
5 (very satisfied)	2	18,2 % 	




18) Please explain why you were satisfied/not satisfied the with the organised activities.

- nice to learn true group activity, nice exercises
- Should be more discussions.

19) How satisfied were you with the material (lecture and seminar handouts, reading material) provided during the course? (1: not satisfied, 5: very satisfied)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not satisfied)	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	1	9,1 % 	
4	5	45,5 % 	
5 (very satisfied)	5	45,5 % 	
6 Not applicable to this course	0	0 %	



20) Was the course content relevant to your work? (1 = not relevant at all, 5 = very relevant)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not relevant at all)	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	1	9,1 % 	
4	5	45,5 % 	
5 (very relevant)	5	45,5 % 	

21) How can relevance and applicability be improved?

- more time to ask questions
- In general, a lot of the information and work in courses deal with patients. For those of us that do not have any patients or data from patients, this can be less relevant. In many of the cases it would be easy to make the sessions more about data/work without patients.

22) With respect to time-allocation, how do you evaluate the balance between lectures and group-work? (1 = not balanced at all, 5 = very well balanced)

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
1 (not balanced at all)	0	0 %	
2	0	0 %	
3	0	0 %	
4	6	54,5 % 	
5 (very well balanced)	5	45,5 % 	



23) Do you have other suggestions for improving the course?

- I have no idea.
- Online course

24) Would you recommend this course to others?

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Yes	11	100 % 	
No	0	0 %	

25) Where did you hear about the course?

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Supervisor	1	9,1 % 	
Research group	0	0 %	
Other PhD students	2	18,2 % 	
University Library	0	0 %	

Svar	Antall	Prosent	
Administration	1	9,1 % 	
UiT webpages	5	45,5 % 	
Email	1	9,1 % 	
Social media (Facebook, info screens, etc.)	0	0 %	
Other	1	9,1 % 	

Se nylige endringer i Nettskjema (v837_0rc1)

SAKSFRAMLEGG

Til:
Ph.d.-utvalget ved HSL-fakultetet

Møtedato:
01.06.2021

Sak:
15/21

Møtedatoer høst 2021

Innstilling til vedtak:

Ph.d.-utvalget samler seg om følgende møtedatoer i høstsemesteret 2021:
21. september, 26. oktober og 7. desember.

Bakgrunn:

Det holdes normalt to-tre møter i ph.d.-utvalget i høstsemestrene. Fast ukedag er tirsdager og fast klokkeslett er normalt 09:15-11:30.

Det foreslås følgende datoer for høstens møter 2021 i Ph.d.-utvalget:

21. september

26. oktober

7. desember

Synnøve Thomassen Andersen
prodekan

—

Olav Skare
seksjonsleder

—

Dokumentet er elektronisk godkjent og krever ikke signatur