Minutes - Aarhus Universitet

Meeting	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
April 27, 2022	Academic Council	16:15-18:45	1525-626	2022-2

	·
Participants	Dean Eskild Holm Nielsen (EHN), Anne Jensen (ANJ/ENVS), René Gislum (REG/AGRO), Jens Malmkvist (JEM/ANIS), Björn Andresen (BJA/ECE), Annette Baattrup-Pedersen (ABP/BIOS), Hanne Lakkenborg Kristensen (HLM/FOOD), Søren Wandahl (SWA/CAE), Martin Heide Jørgensen (MHJ/MPE), Ozgenur Coskun (OZC/FOOD), Ahmad Madary (AHM/TAP), Stine Wendelbo Bjorholm (SWB/TAP), Louise Fischer Koue (LFK/TAP) Stine Munkholm Jespersen (SMJ/stud.), Aske Høj Merrild (AHM/stud), Brian Vinter (BVI/Tech dekn)), Hanne Vester Rasmussen (HVR/ADM) Substitute for Emre Karaman: Guillaume Paul Ramstein
Apologies for absence	Emre Karaman (EMA/QGG)), Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen (TLS/BCE), Mie Lundgaard (MLU/Tech DKN) Not present: Emil Lunau Bentsen (EWLB/stud.), Hadi Sehat (HAS/ECE)
Guests	
Minutes	Ida Marie Gerdes (IMG)

Ite	m #		Time			Item and	append	lices	Owner	
		 •		-						

Anne Jensen welcomed everyone and mentioned that Eskild Holm Nielsen would join the meeting later which was why the order of the items has been changed. Anne Jensen also mentioned that Björn Andresen would join the meeting later, and that Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen, Mie Lundgaard and Emre Karaman were unable to participate. Guillaume Ramstein participates as substitute for Emre Karaman. Anne Jensen then thanked Ozgenur for her high engagement and contributions to the Council. Ozgenur will soon finish her PhD and is therefore leaving the Council.

1	16:15	Approval agenda	Anne Jensen		
The adopted agenda was approved					
2	16:20	Approval minutes	Anne Jensen		
There were no comments	16:20 for the minutes. The parts	Approval minutes with the yellow markings was a second or second o	Anne Jensen will be corrected when Ida		

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
3	16:25	New advisor for	Anne Jensen
		responsible research	
		practice and research	
		freedom	

Knud Erik Bach Knudsen has become section leader and can therefore no longer serve as advisor. The members of the Academic Council have been invited to send in suggestions for a new candidate for the remaining period. Department of Agroecology has suggested associate professor Bo Melander. René Gislum motivated the nomination. The nomination was supported by several other members. The entire Council approved to nominate Bo Melander.

4	16:30	Professor promotion	\mathbf{BV}
		programme - discussion	

Before giving the floor to Brian Vinter, Anne Jensen mentioned that Brian has been involved in the work with the procedures and finalization of the Tech version of the professor promotion programme.

Brian mentioned that we need a model for both Nat and Tech that administratively works for the Nat-Tech HR underlying support structures. The model is not intended to describe the common way of becoming a full professor; the common way is still to apply in open, international calls for professor positions. The model is expected primarily to be used for recruitment and in some cases for retaining staff. The programme can only be granted by the Dean and will be only be used rarely.

Brian presented the model. There will be internal evaluations of the candidate in the programme at least every year to check that milestones and plans for the programme are satisfactory met and adheres to TECH's existing high standards. The template for the development plan can be found on the AU website.

The development plan can be used in Medarbejderudviklingssamtaler/Staff development dialogues as transparent criteria for associate professors to see and discuss what is required to become full professor. Brian Vinter mentioned that if you have become associate professor through a Tenure Track programme you are not eligible to become a full professor through this programme. Nat will have a midterm evaluation with external assessment, and we may choose to have the same system later on, if we so wish, but it is not a part of the programme for now.

The Dean is very aware that this must not lead to inbreeding. The programme is not made in order to retain or recruit staff at *specific* departments with recruiting problems. It can be used at all departments. Anne Jensen commended the transparency but was slightly concerned that it would be far more than one candidate per year. Brian Vinter stressed that that the intention is one candidate per year for the faculty but perhaps two candidates some years. He also stressed that the development plan can be used for aligning expectations with Tech associate professors and senior researchers in order for making an open call that they can apply for. All AU faculties are developing professor promotion programmes. The programme replaces the professor MSO.

5	16:45-16:50	Quarterly meeting with Rector	AJ

The five chairs of the Academic Councils have a meeting with rector every quarter. At the last meeting the following topics were discussed: Economy, the final Statement of freedom of speech as approved by the AU Board, where some of the inputs provided by the Academic Councils have been integrated. Finally, the Chairs discussed research evaluation and this will maybe be the topic for the seminar in September. Jens Malmkvist mentioned that "impact" would be a good topic to include.

6	16:50-17:30	Funding	BV
		Options/challenges	
		(discussion/group	
	16:50: Presentation	work). Based on a	
	17:00: Group Work	presentation the	
	17:20: Joint	council (in groups)	
	discussion	should discuss	
		options and	
		challenges in the	
		current funding	
		situation	

Brian introduced the theme of funding by mentioning that the ordering of things is important. We are not doing the science to get the money, but we get the funding to do the science. We must do what we can to direct the money and affect which calls are announced, nationally and at EU and international level. Brian showed a presentation on the funding situation and the Faculty's funding obtained from the relevant public and private research foundations. Derived cost are expensive and the AU Research Committee is working

on a full cost model, while some foundations (e.g. Novo Nordisk) have introduced the possibility of covering bench fees. Brian Vinter stressed that we have to continue the high level of Horizon Europe proposals because of the missions selected for the Horizon Europe programme, where TECH has a great position to make an impact through collaboration. He also stressed that chances of obtaining funding from the Innovation Foundation are better with internal collaboration, rather than through collaborations involvoing several universities. He also mentioned that if anybody has problems with the Innovation Foundation, they should contact him.

He also mentioned that this autumn we will start a training programme for the next generation of research leaders on how to run mission driven projects.

The Academic Council then had a group work on options and challenges in the current funding landscape.

The inputs from the groups were:

- More and more funding from private companies, this can challenge the freedom of research
- Some research topics are not suitable for private foundations as it is difficult to make a business
 case
- It is a challenge that most often, it is the older staff that receive the funding and that younger researchers have problems with getting funding
- We should discuss how we develop the capacity for applications of the younger staff
- We get more money, have a higher income, but do we deliver more value?
- A lot of funding is product related not system related, which makes the system related research difficult to fund from these foundations
- It is difficult to obtain funding from Novo Nordisk. The foundation is the largest private research foundation and this puts a lot of pressure on the scientific landscape
- It is important that the management discusses funding with Novo Nordisk and discuss important research areas with the foundation
- It seems like there is less money for the applied research than for basic research

EHN added that within the next 5-7 years, Novo Nordisk will contribute 10 billion DKK for research funding, for instance targeted research in sustainability, which is an important research area within many of the TECH departments. The synergy projects are important as well projects in collaboration with the Faculty of Health. We already have very productive dialogues with Novo Nordisk on for instance living labs. There are plenty of opportunities. The same applies other research funding foundations such as the Villum Foundation. But it is important that we continue to apply! We have also been invited for the Novo Nordic strategy day to provide input for their strategy.

	17:30-17:35	BREAK	
7	17:35-18:00	Strategy:	Eskild Holm Nielsen
		Interdisciplinary and/or	Anne Jensen
		mission driven research	
		and entrepreneurship	

Eskild started by thanking for the activity within and contributions to the self-evaluations at the TECH departments, in line with the strategy (especially partnerships) for the pillars of digital and green transformation, entrepreneurship, research and quality assessment, and in our way of 'meeting the students where they are'. Eskild stressed the importance of the departments' strategies being aligned with the Tech Strategy and the AU Strategy. The strategies provide many opportunities to conduct mission-driven and interdisciplinary research. We should discuss how our international cooperation can be coherent with the pillars of the TECH Strategy, how we establish links to The Kitchen from our different locations, and how we can institutionalize the cooperation with companies.

Anne Jensen described Circle U, which is a cross-institutional collaboration to form an alliance of 9 universities in Europe with a focus on establishing a European Campus with a focus on global health, democracy and climate.

The Dean added that he would like to get some advice on how he can communicate the Strategy so that it is vital to the researchers and students.

Jens Malmkvist mentioned that in order for the Strategy to be vital it is important that the heads of Department translate the Strategy to the department level.

The Dean added that that the Strategy should also inspire the departments and make them consider how they meet the students for instance in the establishment of AU Viborg. This should lead to a shift in content and in the educational paradigm.

Jens Malmkvist agreed that the time is right for such a shift and that there are positive expectations for the future.

Annette Baastrup-Petersen added that it is important that VIP's feel ownership of the Strategy and that this probably will require a bottom-up process. Many VIP's are not aware of the strategy according to the APV.

The Dean agreed that a bottom-up process is important and that there is a match between the APV and the Strategy, and furthermore that communication is important in order to improve the work place culture.

Aske asked how the students are involved. The Dean would like the students to share both their expectations and their suggestions, this particularly concerns the current curriculum, way of teaching and the study life. We need to know this from the students so we avoid copying the educations that the senior staff at the Faculty took themselves as students.

Anne Jensen mentioned that also the chair persons of the Academic Councils have discussed this with involving the students more in the research.

Stine Munkholm Jespersen mentioned that the students are invited to meetings and are actually included as experts.

The Dean and Anne added that if there are additional topics that should be discussed then the topics should be send to

Anne/Eskild or Ida.

8 18:00-18:05 AU Viborg - status Eskild Holm Nielse

The Dean introduced the item by mentioning that the political agreement is to promote a chance towards a more balanced faculty. He also mentioned the associated economic discussions, the investment and long-term contribution from the Danish Parliament for the plan. He explained that Viborg is more widely known as place than Foulum, and that it is expected that the students will have residence in Viborg, which is why it is named AU Viborg. He also mentioned that members from both sides of the Parliament are very supportive. The first batch of vet students are expected to start in 2023 and the full programme with animal science and agrobiology is expected to be running in 2032, where we expect between 700-1000 students. The educational platform will be redesigned, and the students will be at the center of the buildings.

Stine Munkholm Jespersen asked how many animal science students are expected? The Dean answered that we expect them to start in 2024, but it has to be clarified how to handle the graduate programme, and specifically if the theses can be made with joint supervision from both Copenhagen and AU Viborg, and hence we still await the exact numbers. Finn Borchsenius added that no students that have been admitted to University of Copenhagen will be forced to replace to Aarhus University. It will be a negotiation, but the Minister of Research and Education takes the decision. We are open to students who want to be moved to AU.

Eskild stressed that the animal science education will be transferred from KU to AU (AU Viborg/Foulum). The existing Vet education in Copenhagen will be phased out as we establish a new vet education in AU Viborg/Foulum and the agrobiology education in Aarhus will be moved to AU Viborg/Foulum as well. Students from the agrobiology programme in Aarhus will not be forced to relocate to AU Viborg but we will secure a coherence between the "new" and the "old" students within the agrobiology education.

9	18:05-18:20	Handling	Finn Borchsenius
		employment within	
		the diploma	
		engineering job	
		structure	

Anne introduced the item by introducing Finn Borchsenius.

Finn Borchsenius mentioned that the Academic Council has been presented to the work at an earlier stage. The working group have made a structure and formal guidelines for the diploma engineers similar to the ABC-criteria we already have for the VIP staff. The most important document for the Academic Council is

the document named *Informationer on bedømmelsesudvalg appendix 9a* in the meeting material which the Council must use in their evaluation of the candidate. The aim of the documents is to obtain parallelism between the two hiring processes with respect to the different requirements for the two different job structures.

Brian Vinter mentioned that a year ago, he had asked the Council to hand hold this model, but now we have these rules.

Martin Heide Jørgensen complimented the work, especially that there are guidelines but still room for making assessment.

Finn Borchsenius mentioned that we will continue to use both structures.

Everybody knows when to use the one set and when to use the other.

10	18:20-18:30	Input for Follow up	Brian Vinter
		AU Action plan for	
		gender equality -	
		discussion	

Anne mentioned that the follow up on the gender equality plan has been send to all departments for comments. Brian added that all departments take the work serious. The council were invited for commenting on the three initiatives suggested by the faculty: Exit interviews, summarized group H-index and workshops for young researchers.

The Dean mentioned that the way we work with our APV is also very important. We need a very inclusive work culture that is appealing to all. It is important that all Tech departments work with this.

Annette Baattrup-Petersen mentioned that women are less satisfied in the APV.

It was underlined that the exit interviews apply for both men and women.

Anne Jensen supported the exit interviews and the workshop in order for us to gain knowledge and data in order to identify the blind spots.

The Dean concluded that even though we have achieved significantly during the last years, we will continue to improve the work environment.

11	18:30-18.35	Sanctions against	Eskild Holm Nielsen
		Russia	

The Dean outlined that the Minister has announced that the Universities should stop any cooperation with institutions in Russia and Belarus. Since then, it has been discussed among Danish universities how ongoing non-institutional collaborations should be handled. Here, it also became clear that the Danish universities are unable to reach consensus on this.

At Tech, it is up to the individual researcher to discuss with his or her immediate leader whether specific research collaborations should continue and no further rules are needed.

It is very important that we balance things and close down the institutional parts. But having a Russian passport at AU and Tech must not be stigmatizing. It is important to make a distinction between the individuals and the Russian system.

Due to the conflict, there must be an increased awareness on cyber security, espionage and hacking. We must not be naïve. There is a folder on espionage from PET in the appendix. This folder can be shared with all colleagues.

Brian mentioned that the two-phase log in on the IT system is important due to the IT security of the university. We can publish research based on existing data that has been conducted with Russian researchers and institutions but we should not start up new research projects or collaborations with Russia or Belarus.

12	18:35-18:40	PhD degrees since last	Anne Jensen
		meeting	

Since last meeting, 18 PhD degrees have been awarded at Tech. As mentioned earlier, the plan is to have a more thorough discussion about the PhD area at the meeting in June including a discussion about transparency and procedures.

Aske Høj Merrild asked if it is true that we want more PhD scholarships awarded to AU graduates? Brian Vinter explained that this only means that we would like more PhD students on the 4+4 programme (the flexible programme), and sometimes the consequence is that they come from AU.

Anne encouraged everybody to come up with suggestions for a new candidate instead of Ozgenur, who will soon hand in her PhD and therefore is leaving the Academic Council. The rest of her period in the Council runs from now and untill the end of January 2024.

We have one candidate who was not elected in November, and due to the way the election system is organized, he was not elected as substitute, but we must appoint a candidate instead of Ozgenur. He or she must be an AU employed PhD student.

13 18:40-18:45 AOB			
	13		

The new procedure for the announcements is that instead of going through them all, announcements are circulated with the agenda and questions can be raised at the meeting if there are any.

But please notice that we must soon suggest candidates for Honorary Doctors. All members of the Council are encouraged to consider suitable candidates within their departments' fields of expertise and network. Please see the meeting bilag circulated.

Brian raised a comment that all departments must be more aware when we have calls for prestigious grants, for instance for the EliteForsk Travel grant and the EliteForsk Prize. Eskild Holm Nielsen mentioned that it is a general problem that we do not present enough candidates for different prestigious grants and that the other faculties are much better at that.

Stine Munkholm Jespersen would like that the material for the meeting to come out earlier.

Eskild Holm mentioned that for good scientific practice, the University Management has suggested that we should use the research committees for having a dialogue with the departments, and that the committee should report back to the Academic Council on an annual basis. Eskild suggested that we can have this item in the Academic Council annually, where we invite members from the research practice committee. Jens Malmkvist is in the committee as well as in the Academic Council.

14 Announcements FYI	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
		Professor Emerita (new	Anne
		possibility)	
		Tips and advice from	Eskild
		PET on avoiding foreign	
		interference and	
		espionage for	
		researchers and other	
		staff	
		Honorary doctors	Anne
		New Tech Advisory	Eskild
		Board	
		Final AU Expression on	Anne
		Freedom of Speech	

	Final AU Travel Policy	Anne
	APV follow-up process	Eskild