

Department Seminar, August 2021

PhD Fellowships 2022

Group 1:

Hallgjerd et al.

Positive to the new way of delegating the positions to the departments

Option 1 is too broad and too difficult for applicants to identify with

It might be harder to apply if it's too broad. Easier to apply if the position is more defined.

We suggest one position per main research area:

- Music cognition
- Popular music research
- Music history

Each group can write a suggestion for one announcement

Technology is an overarching theme that can go into all announcements

We see advantages to include projects that meet societal challenges from strategic document

Gruppe 2:

Catherine et al.

Thematic diversity in the cohort is good

Cater to different research and teaching needs

Completely open call: get the very best people, but perhaps so many good people that it's difficult to choose? One single committee would determine the direction of the department

Advantage to link the positions to particular research areas we have the expertise to supervise this on hand

Are the positions meant to build IMV's future, how we want IMV to develop, or to build the candidate's own future

Gruppe 3:

Peter et al.

Good that faculty allocated the positions to the departments.

We suggest three separate announcements with positions that are aligned with the faculty's strategic goals:

- 1) Music and politics/democracy/free speech. (Should perhaps require knowledge of Norwegian society? Not much academic work in this field despite the media attention and pressures that exist even in Norway)
- 2) Sustainability: music and sustainability clearly important field

- 3) Culture, creativity and societal change. Fairly broad – connected with artistic performance and practices – new ways of creating music etc.

General remarks:

How open should announcements be?

If we don't have broad announcements, we might miss out on things going on that we don't know about. However: There are stronger arguments against it, and three clear profiles and three different committees is better:

To signal to the world that we know where we want to go, we have strategic aims at IMV.

Target announcements more carefully. Who do we envisage might apply

Make sure we don't duplicate projects. How do ongoing projects contribute to the long-term vision of the Department.

Inspiring announcements. Descriptions have a tendency to get watered down in committees and in the board – difficult to do when many are involved

Consider potential supervisors during the writing of the announcements (who has capacity/need supervising experience).

Gruppe 4:

Johanna et al.

Very open announcements are not good – positions should be connected to ongoing projects or staff members

Connect the topic to broader things going on at UiO

Positions can be open methodologically (instead of thematically)

Connect the positions to each other and to the broader topics

Consider teaching opportunities when announcing the positions – we are supposed to have research-based teaching and the PhD can contribute here

We should also connect master projects to ongoing projects to bring more students into research.

Teaching and research are quite separate at IMV

Gruppe 5:

Eirik et al.

The group discussed choosing one thematic area, and though that was a good idea. We suggest choosing technology as a form of culture and life. How technology has changed/is changing how music is made (i.e. internet culture). The pandemic shows importance of technology, new ways of making music, connecting with others etc.

Gruppe 6:

The group focused the discussion on the three suggestions:

- 1) Common overall theme for three PhD positions
 - a. Might be too vulnerable in terms of supervision capacity. And with teaching opportunities in the PhDs fourth year – will that be affected. Could also lead to over-concentration and a less diverse applicant pool
- 2) Three independent thematic announcements based on initiatives mentioned in strategic documents.
 - a. Will help develop the department's research. Natural opportunity for diverse applicant pool.
- 3) Announcements based on the research areas at the department.
 - a. Risks contributing to an underdevelopment at the dept. Reduce our ability to become more robust. We must base on the competence we have for supervisors

Combination of 2 and 3 would be best.

Plenary discussion

Zafer: Open announcements make it more difficult to compare applicants. But there might be ways of mitigating this.

Hallgjerd: completely open announcements are not a good idea. Might lose the best applicant if calls are too open.

Alexander: Traditionally many researchers have worked alone, but should we think about people working together, in innovative collaborations. Could we create/facilitate multidisciplinary research groups with these calls?

In teaching, we combine the academic and the artistic at IMV - especially in bachelor programme. Many of our researchers have artistic competence, but we don't often exploit this in research projects. Worth thinking about.

We also need to make sure we use the labs and studios – use the equipment/infrastructure if we want to have funding for new equipment/infrastructure in the future.

Hallgjerd: societal challenges: (right-wing) extremism - aligns with strategic document – can include popular music and music history, reflect on our past on how music was exploited in the inter-war period and how music is used by extremist groups today.

Zafer: This creates connections with many fields and is very interdisciplinary - good idea to explore

The Faculty is involving the department very actively – I think we'll get the same number of PhD fellowships allocated in the coming years – should we think in three-year perspective?

Alexander: This is first time we have got 3 PhD fellowships in the allocation process. I don't think we can expect to get 3 every year moving forward. We should still think strategically about where we want to go forward in the department with these three positions.

Zafer: Earlier the Faculty suggested that we take our extra available funds to announce extra PhD position. They have made it clear that that will not affect how many PhD positions the Faculty will allocate to IMV.

HF Strategy 2021-2030

Group 1:

David et al.

Document is missing a clear focus on recruitment and relevance, both for the humanities in general, and for potential student

Tension between the humanities' principles and the values in the document – many hollow statements

Wording of the document – sustainability a catch-all phrase. Can we be more precise.

Room to sharpen and make the document more explicit

Group 2:

Kjell Andreas et al.

The document worked well as an unspecific over-arching fluff-piece

Would be hard to make it more concrete

What does the strategy actually mean and how we will it use

For example: Flexibility: Will this mean that it will be easier to connect across disciplines, or more flexible work-situations (temporary positions)

Possible consequences of the document?

Structure of the document, could it be a better idea to summarize the document first?

Technology: The pandemic is not mentioned, even though it's had an impact on how we use technology differently now. It affects the use of technology, flexibility, work-life etc.

Group 3:

Emil et al.

Overall nice document with nice words, also addresses societal challenges that we are meeting in the world and at the faculty

Says very little about how we can academic ambitions, ambitions for better research, new perspectives. More about how the institution can adapt to changing society, not how we can change the society

The university as an autonomous institution – should be the focus

Sustainability and digitalisation – no critical perspective on how/why we are using these terms – why are we using these terms, why do we want these things?

Much is taken for granted in the document, for example that open research is always good

Should be reflected that technology isn't necessarily changing people's lives for good

The university as a flexible institution: This can be interpreted as flexibility in terms of being able to change employees more often (more temporary positions). This paragraph should be reformulated to not allow misinterpretation

Integration of students in research: Good that the document addresses this. There should be commitments made from faculty and departments of what they want to achieve here, so it's not vague

Group 4:

Peter et al.

Agree with many of the previous points. Not much substance, much of the language is passive or vague (i.e. sustainability)

There are some omissions – not pointing to HF's strategies for diversity in the Diversity paragraph

Humanities discussion – there isn't enough understanding of the subjects and the different fields the humanities encompass. Maybe HF can have a brief faculty strategy and have more substance and details in the department's strategies. Or the document can point to where can a reader find more substance.

Group 5

Cathrine et al.

Advantages: Not just a list of things we've done/are doing. Forward-looking. The focus on gender and diversity.

Disadvantages: Empty/obvious introductory sentences. Could be more courageous and challenge the status quo. Not clear how strategies can be implemented. Highlight examples from IMV.

Suggestions: Student/research relationship should be more highlighted. Students will benefit from being more aligned with the research at the department. How do we interpret sustainability?

Flexibility: Collaboration can be made difficult by bureaucratic systems. We need to find ways to facilitate cross-faculty/cross-disciplinary courses. We need to rethink settled rules.

Plenary discussion

Zafer: We should request clarification of flexibility

The document calls for strong discipline-based research, but also flexible organization – there has to be more in the document to initiate the process, or the faculty must make clear that the departments need to do this.

Alexander: The document is more radical than it might seem. The most radical would be: abandoning the structure of departments or faculties

However: If you want to have inter-disciplinarity, you first need disciplinarity

It's possible to do both with a more flexible organization

Need to be facilitated both structurally and culturally within the organization

Zafer: Flexibility and collaboration: intention is there, wish is there, but difficult when you want to act. If we are to fulfil the ambitions of the Faculty in this area, we need more than IMV to be successful. We've met with hurdles every step

Wording: the use of passive voice

Should it be more specific or is it good that it's over-arching? Should we rather focus on an implementation strategy rather than a strategy document?

Peter: All strategic documents should have an idea on how to implement. Should be a part of the strategy document.

Zafer: How do we make sure we follow up on the strategy and evaluate our work? Many strategy documents just disappear when we start working on the next strategy.