Get together for doctoral students and professors
10th May, 2019, at 11.30-15.00, Dipoli, Otakaari 24

12:15 – 12:30 Opening of the get together by the Dean Gary Marquis
12:30 – 12:45 Failures and findings - my steps to dissertation, DSc(Tech) Salla Puupponen
12:45 – 13:00 Research is seldom a 9-to-5 job – entrepreneurial approach to doctoral studies, DSc(Tech) Raine Viitala
13:00 – 13:15 “Aallon huiput” presentation, Vice President Abdollah Noorizadeh and doctoral student Pascale Blyth
13:15 – 13:30 ACRIS, open access and open data, Information Specialist Taija Tuo-resjärvi, Research and Innovation Services
13:30 – 13:35 Break
13:35 – 14:05 Personal Development as a target, HRD Specialist Riikka Rissanen
14:05 - 15:00 Ongoing issues about doctoral studies and graduated doctors´ feedback 2018, discussion, Head of Doctoral Programme of Engineering Harri Koivusalo
Ongoing issues about doctoral studies
- the midterm review
Graduated doctors’ feedback 2018
10 May 2019

Harri Koivusalo

Head of the Doctoral Programme in Engineering
prof. Water Resources Engineering
Department of Built Environment
Aalto University School of Engineering
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Doctoral Programme Committee

Harri Koivusalo (BE), chair
- Professor, Water Resources Engineering

Risto Lahdelma (ME), vice-chair
- Professor, Energy Systems for Communities, mathematical modelling and optimization

Seppo Junnila (BE)
- Professor, Real Estate Business

Marketta kyttä (BE)
- Professor, Land Use Planning

Jussi Leveinen (CIVE)
- Professor, geological engineering

Tuukka Mustapää (ENG)
- Student representative

See also https://into.aalto.fi/display/endooraleng/Doctoral+Programme+Committee
Doctoral programme

Programme services

Planning officer
Ritva Viero
room 233, Tietotie 1 E
tel. +358 50 597 0610

Coordinator, Study Affairs
Reetta Mannola
room 233, Tietotie 1 E
tel. +358 50 373 7702

See also
https://into.aalto.fi/display/endoctoraleng/Engineering
Web pages of ENG Doctoral Programme

duckduckgo.com
Search: aalto into eng doctoral

google.com
Search: aalto into eng doctoral
Engineering

A doctoral programme was established in the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture on the 1st of August 2009. With the President's decision on the 13th of December 2018, the programme became Aalto Doctoral Programme of Engineering. All the postgraduate students of the School of Engineering belong to the doctoral programme. There are two annual application periods for the programme: one at September and the other at March. The goal of our doctoral education is not only to educate researchers and future professors, but also experts and game-changers for the engineering industry and other sectors.

The Director of the doctoral programme is Professor Harri Kivivuori who is responsible for the programme activities and for developing and coordinating the doctoral studies together with the School of Engineering. Every year about 35-45 doctors graduate from the Programme.

The Doctoral Programme of Engineering consists of 8 research fields including land-use planning and transportation engineering, real estate economics, geoinformatics, civil engineering, water and environmental engineering, technology education, mechanical engineering and energy technology. Doctoral studies are available at all the departments of the School of Engineering: the Department of Mechanical Engineering, the Department of Civil Engineering and the Department of Built Environment.

News

Credits for the students of the Aalto ENG from practical training in Summer 2019
17 hours ago

Opintopisteitä työharjoittelusta kesäällä 2019 Aalto ENGin opiskelijoille
03.06.2019
Doctoral studies - process

Tasks of the Doctoral Programme Committee
- Prepare admission decision
- Develop course contents
- Approve thesis subjects
- Confirm study plans
- Appoint preliminary examiners
- Grant permission to print theses
- Grade doctoral theses
Midterm review of doctoral studies

The Aalto University School of Engineering launches a procedure for midterm review of all full-time doctoral students on 1 Aug 2016. The midterm review is aimed to improve organisation of doctoral studies and facilitate the evaluation of study progress within the objective time of four years of full-time doctoral studies.

The objectives of the midterm review are:
- Help outline structured studies and facilitate discussion about them with an aim to identify the needs toward publication review.
- Strengthen the link between student, supervising professor, and local identification of any problems.
- Provide training toward independence in key aspects of research, analysis, and presentation.
- Review the original study plans and research plan have been completed.
- Update research plan and outline table of contents for the final thesis.
- Offer general feedback from the research team.
- Allow early exit from doctoral studies if this proves to be in the best interests of the student.

Procedure

The midterm review is for doctoral students enrolled at the Doctoral Programme in Engineering after 1 Aug 2016. It is compulsory for full-time students, and recommended for part-time students (the deadlines are scaled accordingly in the latter case).

Doctoral students are initially hired on a contract from one to two years. The midterm review is completed during the second year. An exception can be an early midterm review in the end of the first year, if the starting contract is for one year.

The Doctoral Programme planning officer notifies the student and the supervising professor before the end of the second year, if the midterm review is not conducted at an earlier time.
Objectives of the midterm review

- Outline structured studies
- Steps toward publishable results
- Student - supervisor – advisors - link
- Training toward independence in research.
- Reflect original plans.
- Update plans.
- General feedback.
- Allow early exit.
Procedure

- Doctoral students enrolled at the Doctoral Programme in Engineering after 1 Aug 2016.
- Compulsory for full-time students, and recommended for part-time students.
- Doctoral students are initially hired on a contract from one to two years.
- The midterm review is completed during the second year. An early midterm review in the end of the first year, if the starting contract is for one year.
Midterm review reporting

- **Progress report** about timetable, credit status, publications, manuscripts, and a reflectance to the original plan.
- **Update of the research plan**
- The presentation of the review is optional and strongly recommended (following supervising professor’s instructions).
- **Supervising professor’s statement**
- Supervising professor makes a clear proposal about passing or failing the midterm review. Advisors may include their statements.
Decision

• The Doctoral Programme Committee makes a proposal, the Dean makes the decision:

• Case 1: Student’s review report demonstrates success and supervising professor’s statement recommends pass
  • Recommendation to the Dean about passing the midterm review.

• Case 2: There is a clear discrepancy between the student’s report and professor’s statement
  • More information may be requested, the head of department consulted, recommendation made about passing or failing the review.

• Case 3: Student’s review report is inadequate and supervising professor’s statement recommends fail.
  • Recommendation to the Dean about failing the midterm review. Full time doctoral study is terminated at the end of the current contract.
1. The Mode of my doctoral studies was mainly

Respondent #: 31

2. Gender
Where studies made

6. From which department (ENG) #: 31

9. Where did you mainly do the research for your doctoral dissertation?
10. Main Funding of doctoral studies:
Please choose a maximum of two main funding source. #: 31

Secondary funding:
Shorten salaried position at Aalto (5), project funding at the department (5)
12. How long did you study? Absences not counted towards the overall duration of studies include voluntary military service, conscription or non-military service and parental leave. #: 31

28 graduates in 2017:
Within 4 years: 7
4-6 years: 14
Longer than 6 years: 7
13. The normative duration for doctoral degree as a full-time student is 4 years.

If your study time was longer, why did your studies exceed 4 years? Please choose a maximum of two of the most important reasons.

#: 19
Objective after graduation

14. During your studies did you aim primarily to

# 29
### Aims/guidance

15. Please give your evaluation of the following statements concerning your doctoral studies: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Cannot say, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree, #: 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Yhteensä</th>
<th>Keskiarvo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The aims of my dissertation were clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for my doctoral studies, including the research work, was secured at the beginning of my studies.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received enough help and guidance on applying for personal grants/funding.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received enough guidance for my research work.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received enough guidance for writing the dissertation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received enough guidance for career planning during my studies.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral studies have given good qualifications for working life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3,56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2017 results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keskiarvo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>3,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>2,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>3,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>3,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>3,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>2,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskiarvo</td>
<td>3,75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. The objectives of scientific and artistic postgraduate education are defined in the Government Decree on University Degrees. How do you think you did in achieving these objectives?  

1 = Poorly, 2 = Fairly, 3 = Satisfactorily, 4 = Well, 5 = Excellently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Yhteensä</th>
<th>Keskiarvo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I became well-versed in my own field of research and its social significance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gained the knowledge and skills needed to apply scientific research methods independently and critically and to produce new scientific knowledge within my field of research.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I became conversant with the development, basic problems and research methods of my field of research.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gained such knowledge of the general theory of science and of other disciplines relating to my field of research as enables me to follow developments in them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have gained adequate knowledge of communication and language skills and other abilities in order to function in working life in extensive and demanding expert and development tasks and in international cooperation.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the field of art and design, I gained the knowledge and skills for independently conceiving methods of artistic creation or creating products, objects or works which fulfil high artistic demands. (School of ARTS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  1  3  8  60  88  160  4,24

2017 results

Keskiarvo

4,14

3,71

4,36

4,18

4

3,39

3,82

3,94
18. Where did you get information in matters concerning your studies? *Please choose the three most important sources.*

19. How would you evaluate the information and help you received from Doctoral Programme Services?
Comments

Positive palautetta:
- Programme has developed, became more professional.
- Sisältö oikein hyvä, kursseilla tulee paljon oppia, ohjaus on kiitettävää ja verkkosivuilla on selkeät ohjeet. Kiitos.

Needs development:
- No welcoming event or introductory week for doctoral students. To this day, I don't feel like I know the campus.
- Not any person from the university, much less a group, that's dedicated to supporting doctoral students. I don't know what the "Doctoral Programme Services" mentioned in Question 19 are (it cannot even be found on Google).
- The student has to make virtually all the arrangements for the defense, and cover the costs. This should not be the case.
- Overall, the university management has room to improve regarding welcoming and supporting doctoral students.
- In my case lack of guidance on publishing and steering in the right direction with the research was a problem.
- No guidance on how to apply for funding, where to apply it from, and how for international students, who do not have funding to complete their dissertation.
More comments

- I have succeeded well in my doctoral degree and writing process quite a lot based on my own personality - independently looking for information, going to events, courses, etc.
- Would be good to have even more information, for example, writing scientific publications, writing compilation part, funding opportunities, etc. More marketing on those events.
- Esimerkiksi opintojen hyväksyminen oli haastavaa - vastuuprofessorini oli hyväksynyt tietyt kurssit tieteenalan moduuliini mutta Aallon tohtoriohjelma ei.
- Väitöstyön viimeistelyyn kului paljon enemmän aikaa puutteellisten tietojen vuoksi, koska koulumme väitöskirjavaatimuksen olivat muuttuneet. Selvitä ajoissa työn vaatima byrokratia ja täytettävät lomakkeet, sillä ettei niiden kanssa tule kiire esim. työtä jätettäessä esitarkastukseen.
- When I was about to submit the work for pre-examination, the information concerning the tasks to be done were scattered in different places, which made it hard to find the answers.
- It would be good that there would be a lecture once a month were all the procedures would be explained.
Messages

- Role of Aalto research groups in educating doctors have become stronger.
- Supervision experience still varies.
  - Learn from groups with organised doctoral student network.
  - Midterm feedback?
- Study time still longer than 4 years for many.
- More focus needed on career planning.
  - Recognise what is an asset in different jobs after graduation.
- Many would like the program to organise more supportive courses/events.
  - Where are the resources for such events?
- Time management of students and professors.