

Meeting	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
February 2, 2022	Academic Council	16:15-18:45	Zoom	2022-1

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), Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen (TLS/BCE), Emre Karaman (EMA/QGG), Hadi Sehat (HAS/ECE) Ahmad Madary (AHM/TAP), Stine Wendelbo Bjorholm (SWB/TAP), Louise Fischer Koue (LFK/TAP)  Stine Munkholm Jespersen (SMJ/stud.), Aske Høj Merrild (AHM/stud), Emil Lunau Bentsen (EWLB/stud.)  Mie Lundgaard (MLU/Tech DKN), Brian Vinter (BVI/Tech dekn)), Hanne Vester Rasmussen (HVR/ADM)
Apologies for absence	Ozgenur Coskun (OZC/FOOD), Anna Wehrs (ANW/stud.), Martin Heide Jørgensen (MHJ/MPE)
Guests	Finn Borchsenius (FBO), Vice Dean for education
Minutes	Ida Marie Gerdes (IMG)

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>1</b>	<b>16:15-16:20 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Approval of Agenda</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
<i>Approved</i>			
<b>2</b>		<b>Approval of minutes 24 November</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
<i>Approved</i>			
<b>3</b>		<b>Approval of minutes from joint Nat-Tech meeting 24 November</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
<i>Approved</i>			
<b>4</b>	<b>16:20-16:25 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Welcome to new members</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
Anne Jensen welcomed the new members: Hadi Sehat, PhD student from Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Emil Lunau Bentse, who studies electronic engineering, Aske Høj Merrild, who studies biotechnology and Anna Wehrs (substitute for Stine Munkholm), who studies agrobiolgy. The new members will be invited to a meeting, where Anne Jensen will introduce them to the work in the Council.			

## Items for discussion

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>5</b>	<b>16:25-16:50 (25 min.)</b>	<b>Campus Foulum</b>	<b>FBO</b>
Vice Dean for Education at TECH Finn Borchsenius gave a presentation on: The political plan and the AU ideas for Campus Foulum: It will be a campus with both many students and strong research environments. The plan is supported by Viborg city, where most students will live. Economic perspectives: It will be expensive to run the educations, renovate and transform buildings, facilities, equipment and hire new staff. The AU management and especially the TECH Faculty are still negotiating financing details with the Ministry. They are hopeful that an economically feasible agreement will be reached.  The plan is to offer the VET-education on the basis of a distributed model, with clinical training in cooperation with existing private veterinary clinics.			

The Council was introduced to the plan that was initiated in summer 2021 and runs until August 2023. By the fall semester 2023, the first students are expected to start though the full intake will take place over the coming years

Finn Borchsenius presented the organization of campus Foulum, which consists of a steering group, a coordination group, and additionally one group for each: VET medicine, animal science and agrobiolgy 2.0.

**Questions/comments:**

Hanne Lakkenborg expressed the concerns from FOOD: The department has just moved location and established itself next to the food industry in Skejby. FOOD is worried what will happen with the department and the students/study environment which are now part of the agrobiolgy education if/when the education is moved from Aarhus to Foulum.

Finn Borchsenius responded that he is well aware of the concerns, and understands the need for the department to secure their interest. Finn Borchsenius will continue a close coordination and intense dialogue with the department.

René Gislum asked about the thoughts/possibilities for integrating the engineering and the agrobiolgy educations.

Finn Borchsenius answered that we are in a situation, where we have the option to rethink everything. All of our educations have important roles to play in connection with the green transition.

René Gislum mentioned that new educations should be advertised and announced well in advance to increase visibility and promote higher numbers of student uptake.

6	16:50-17:10 (20 min.)	Guidelines for hiring within the diploma engineering job structure	FBO
---	-----------------------	--	-----

Finn Borchsenius accounted for the two different stillingsstrukturer (job position structures), the one for employees who mainly teach programmes and innovate in collaboration with industry at the diploma engineers, and the one for scientific personnel at the rest of the Faculty. The former stillingsstruktur was the one used at Aarhus School of Engineering. A very large part of our students are taught by teachers employed under the diploma engineer. We will keep using both “stillingsstrukturer”, since they complement each other and we need both the scientific and the teaching/industry perspectives – and the synergy and relations between the two, which was one of the reasons for creating the new departments.

The task group has worked on formulating Guidelines and ABC-criteria. The group has held three meetings and expect to present the material in three weeks.

**Questions/comments:**

The council welcomed the plans. It was mentioned that the material did not express the synergy-perspective. Finn Borchsenius mentioned that the material should mirror the ABC-criteria and guidelines used for the scientific staff and agreed that those documents are very technical.

Eskild Holm Nielsen emphasized that a dialogue with the Academic Council or a hearing is important. The council approves the committees, and thus a broader discussion of how we can use and benefit from the two job structures must be taken. From the managements perspective, the Dean mentioned that the management will use both structures in order to achieve the best from the two “worlds”, and that it is important to have that discussion in the Academic Council.

Finn Borchsenius mentioned that the management and the group see a third path by using the synergy between research, development and innovation– the faculty hereby get a complete set of competences.

7	17:10-17:20 (10 min.)	Education report	FBO
---	-----------------------	------------------	-----

Finn Borchsenius presented the annual education report. The annual report is both for faculty management and other leaders for an overview and status of the education area and the quality of the

educations. It gives a summary of all the quality assurance processes e.g. results and actions from the action plan from the previous year, results of the yearly status meetings for all educations and the results of education evaluation (run in 5-year cycles).

The quality assurance process contains a number of indicators that give an overall view of how we are doing:

The process shows that our dropout rates need special attention, some students might have problems going from being high school pupils to university students. We are keeping an eye on the biotech education (challenges with employment rates). Our high intake should go along with employability.

As follow up on the educational report, an action plan has been made. The plan can be found in the appendix to the minutes.

Stine Munkholm Jespersen asked how corona has affected the dropout rates.

Finn Borchsenius answered that corona affected the 2020 intake, because the world was closed for travelling, it was difficult to get a job and so on. Until now, the dropout rate for that intake is low, but there might be a back flow, when the world opens more again.

Finn Borchsenius mentioned that it is important that we preserve and strengthen the connection between what the students are taught and the projects they work with. He also mentioned that perhaps Academic Council could be included at an earlier stage next year.

<b>8</b>	<b>17:20-17:30 (10 min.)</b>	<b>Consultation AU travel policy Consultation letter</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
----------	------------------------------	--	------------

The hearing material has been circulated. Based on the input, Anne Jensen has drafted a hearing response. The new hearing response will be revised and circulated.

Jens Malmkvist mentioned that overall it is a good plan, but also that tax rules prevent staff members to take home the AU cars, which is problem since in many cases going directly from home could save CO2.

Hanne Vester mentioned the ongoing working group that looks into the company car-problem.

Thomas Lykke Møller Sørensen added that the document could be greener and that there are schemes for green hotels – these should be included.

Further comments should be send Comments no later than Monday.

	<b>17:30-17:35 (5 min.)</b>	<b>BREAK</b>	
<b>9</b>	<b>17:35- 17:55 (20 min.)</b>	<b>Evaluation of Ground rules for responsible conduct of research and research freedom in regard to collaboration with external parties</b>	<b>EHN</b>

The university's "*Ground rules for responsible research practice and research freedom in collaboration with external parties*" were entered into force in June 2020. At the same time, the university management decided that the implementation of the Ground Rules should be evaluated.

As part of the evaluation, the Faculty has been asked to formulate answers to four questions (circulated with the agenda).

The Council discussed whether there are further more general remarks to the ground rules that the council wish to include in the feedback from TECH.

Eskild Holm Nielsen: Important to the university management to get a feedback on how the ground rules are implemented and how they are being dealt with. The important principles are the freedom of research, the arm's length principle and impartiality, honesty, transparency and responsibility.

Then there is the part with Categories of research collaboration with external parties, for which the ground rules are aimed, and finally we have the part that describes the different procedures to ensure responsible conduct of research and freedom of research in collaboration with external parties.

The Dean emphasized the importance of Academic Council discussing whether there are further and/or more general remarks, which the Council wishes to be included in the overall feedback from Faculty.

**Comments/questions:**

Jens Malmquist commented that activities like workshops, internet courses, TTO can help in setting up contracts, and also that quality assurance is very helpful. The freedom of research can be hard to tackle and/or maintain, especially when stakeholders or other organizations find the results problematic. Some research staff members are nervous that they will be black-listed. One solution to the problem could be to secure representation in important agencies, influential bodies, councils etc. Colleagues have also raised the concern for PhD students – how do they handle the situation, if they experience pressure from leaders?

René Gislum mentioned that at a departmental VIP meeting they had discussed how funding is most often attached to topics selected and defined by the funding agencies. Hence, it is difficult to follow ideas for which there exists no calls or targeted funding, even if the research ideas are innovative, groundbreaking, critical and/or solid.

Anne Jensen mentioned that there are similar discussions at ENVS.

Hanne Lakkenborg stressed that we have the right to publish our results, however some feel that they should ask for permission, and which indicates a need to change the culture such that people do not feel that they have to ask for permission. Hanne Lakkenborg also mentioned that we have a whistleblower scheme.

Anne Jensen commented that it is important that the right to publish is in the contracts.

Brian Vinter stressed that freedom of research means the freedom to formulate your own hypotheses, to select theories and analytical approaches, to choose the methods and the freedom to publish the results. We fight for the freedom to do our work respecting academic standards, do it correctly, and producing the most innovative and robust new knowledge – not to do whatever we like as university researchers.

Jens Malmkvist mentioned that it is difficult to keep anonymity in the whistleblower scheme due to “parts-høringer” etc.

Annette Baattrup-Pedersen asked if there are any standard contract templates for AU cooperation with companies and the ministry, and if such templates specifies or have reference to freedom of speech. Researchers at the department are unsure if contracts with high overhead (115%) have a higher level of restrictions regarding freedom of research/speech/publishing than contracts with lower overhead (44%). Some of the researchers seem to have experienced that this may be the case.

Eskild Holm Nielsen said that we never should compromise our right to publish, while there can in some cases be a negotiation about when to publish, and on selling the IPR – however always remembering never to compromise our right to publish.

Hanne Lakkenborg mentioned that after the “meat scandal” (“*oksekøds-skandalen*”), new collaboration agreements and standard collaboration agreements were developed between SEGES, KU and AU for relevant projects. These were made respecting the arm’s length principle and reseachers’ right to publish. Very good with the advisor scheme.

Else Thordahl Meyer confirmed that in the whistleblower scheme you’re entitled to be anonymous in the beginning, but at a certain stage, if the case proceeds to formal institutions, anonymity cannot be preserved.

Brian Vinter mentioned that this puts a limit to what we can act on within the whistleblower scheme, if you opt to stay anonymous.

Eskild Holm Nielsen mentioned that we have the system in order to secure that researchers and the university is following good scientific practice and also that we have a system that handles violations.

Anne Jensen commented that for the evaluation to be an effective measure we should follow up on a regular basis (workshops, discussions etc.).

<b>10</b>	<b>17:55-18:20 (25 min.)</b>	<b>Consultation Ytringsfrihed/freedom of Expression</b>	<b>EHN/AJ</b>
-----------	------------------------------	---	---------------

The consultation invitation and the document *Aarhus University Freedom of Expression* have been circulated before the meeting, and the Academic Council members have been invited to provide inputs. Anne Jensen stressed that freedom of speech is very important in an academic context, and critical not only for us as researchers to conduct robust work but also for assuring the highest quality of knowledge production and fulfill our vital role in society.

Anne Jensen has circulated some points that could serve as point of departure for the debate in the Council.

Concerning thje process for adopting a consultation response in the Council, the suggestion is that the Council agrees to a small writing group, which will draft the consultation response on behalf of the Council

following the February 2<sup>nd</sup> discussion. After this, the draft will be circulated in the Council for comments/edits, before final approval and submission prior to the March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

The Council approved the process. The following members agreed to participate in the writing group: Jens Malmkvist, Hanne Lakkenborg, René Gislum, Emil Lunau Bentsen, and Anne Jensen. The writing group will settle whether a zoom meeting should be arranged, or if comments for the revised consultation response can be circulated, edited and adopted via email. Comments can be send to Anne Jensen.

Discussion/comments:

Brian Vinter mentioned that the Deans office has prepared a consultation response as well. Furthermore, that the context links to Chicago Declaration while this however is not mentioned anywhere in the document. The Council could have this in mind.

Eskild Holm Nielsen added that the management of AU has noticed how the researchers/scientific staff from Aarhus University were not treated well by representatives of interest groups, organisations, public media etc. Therefore, the AU management needed a declaration for protecting the researchers.

The Dean also noted that the management emphasizes how there exists a difference in speaking on behalf of the university as researcher or express yourself as a citizen employed at AU. Researchers must follow the principles of good scientific practice when they represent the university as researchers.

Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen commented that he likes the uncompromising writing style of the document, and the fact that it covers all of our activities.

Emil Lunau-Bentsen complimented the wording in the last part of the document, which mentions that “freedom of expression takes presence over considerations of the individuals discomfort with ideas they might find offensive”. Research shouldn’t care about feelings/opinions.

Eskild Holm Nielsen clarified that the document will act as guiding principles but we have to be clearer on the framework for applying the principles. After the consultation across the university, the AU Board will consider whether an actual declaration and/or revision of is needed. The pressure from the outside world is increasing, and we need a clear declarations and principles to protect our researchers. This is done by setting up a framework specifying how we perceive and position freedom of expression at AU. Eskild further notes that it will be discussed in the AU management and the AU Board whether to revise the AU Declaration on responsible research practice.

The document takes departure in the discussions on responsible conduct of research, and on harassment and violations of employees’ integrity that were heated half a year ago.

**11**

**18:20-18:25 (5 min.)**

**Professor promotion programme**

**BVI**

The Council should appoint a member for the task group #2 mentioned in the document. The task group is commissioned to specify how the professor promotion programme can be implemented at TECH.

Brian Vinter mentioned that the (administrative) process should be identical with NAT’s but the way we use the professor promotion programme can differ between the two faculties in terms of e.g. how, when, how often. Each faculty has a group, and these will cooperate on the shared process but with individual policies.

The Council appointed Søren Wandahl (SWA/CAE) for the task group. Thank you Søren, for talking on this important work.

<b>12</b>	<b>18:25-18:30 (5 min.)</b>	<b>PhD degrees since last meeting</b>  <b>Appendix: Over view of degrees</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
-----------	-----------------------------	--	------------

Anne Jensen mentioned that she and Brian Vinter have agreed that we will take a more thorough discussion about the PhD area on our June meeting, where we will also discuss the quality assurance of procedures for and practices of awarding the PhD degrees.

Since our last meeting on November 24, 2021, 14 PhD degrees have been awarded. There were no comments from the Council.

#### Announcements (18:30-18:40):

Item #	Time (10 min)	Item and appendices	Owner
Anne Jensen went through the announcements			
13a		One pager – FYI (in Danish and English)	BVI
13b		Action plan PhD school – FYI (draft in English)	BVI
13c		Updated: Guidelines for applicants for Academic Positions - FYI (in Danish)	BVI
13d		Tech strategy has been launched - FYI	EHN
13e		Whistleblower scheme (link)- FYI	EHN
13f		New research ethics committee - FYI	EHN
13g		Equality conference Written follow up - FYI	ANJ
13h		Written update from quarterly meeting with the vice chancellor - FYI	ANJ
13i		Updated meeting plan - FYI	ANJ

<b>14</b>	<b>18:40-18:45 (5 min.)</b>	<b>AOB (any other business)</b>	<b>ANJ</b>
-----------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------