

Meeting	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
<b>30 November 2022</b>	<b>Academic Council</b>	<b>16:15-18:45</b>	<b>1525-626</b>	<b>2022-5</b>

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), Martin Heide Jørgensen (MHJ/MPE), Emre Karaman (EMA/QGG)  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 dek), Hanne Vester Rasmussen (HVR/ADM),
Apologies for absence	Mie Lundgaard (MLU/Tech DKN), Maria Holst Kjeldsen, Hadi Sehat (HAS/ECE)
Absent	Emil Lunau Bentsen (ELB/stud.)
Guests	Peder Damgaard (item 3), Finn Borchsenius (item 11)
Minutes	Ida Marie Gerdes (IMG) and Hanne Vester Rasmussen

Before the approval of the minutes and agenda, Anne mentioned that Aske, Emil and Stine have all been reelected as student members of February 1<sup>st</sup>. Anne also announced the new elected student, Matous Najman.

The Dean thanked everyone for their engagement in the Council in 2022. The Dean also mentioned that Niels Kanstrup from Department of Ecoscience has been awarded the higher doctoral degree. Finally, he mentioned that the Head of Department at Department of Ecoscience Ole Hertel is now our new Vice Dean for the Public Sector consultancy, as of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2023.

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>1</b>	<b>16:15-16:20</b>	<b>Approval of agenda</b>	<b>AJ</b>
The agenda was approved			
<b>2</b>	<b>16:20-16:25</b>	<b>Approval of minutes</b>	<b>AJ</b>
The minutes were circulated in advance of the meeting. No comments have been received before the meeting. There was a small discussion about the social media accounts. The minutes were approved.			

For discussion:

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>3</b>	<b>16:25-17:00</b>	<b>ØR 3 and 2023 budget</b> <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b>	<b>EHN</b> <b>Peder Damgaard</b>
The item was confidential as ØR3 and TECH budget had not yet been approved by the Board.			
4	17:00-17:25 (25 min.)	Recap of Sandbjerg seminar, preliminary discussion of research evaluation	AJ

The 2022 seminar at Sandbjerg with all five Academic Councils centered on research assessment and evaluation. A system for research assessment will be implemented across AU and the purpose of the seminar was to critically discuss and develop research assessment at AU, and collect inputs for specifying the system. Research assessment must be meaningful and contribute to research at all levels. Most research assessments are based on bibliometrics, citations, funding etc. This type of assessment does not inform fully about what is good research, including impacts, i.e. the contribution of research to society as well as academia. Reform of research assessments are in process in different foras, including at EU level, and this will also affect AU. By starting the discussions now, AU can better shape and guide these discussions. The way we are evaluated affects academic practice and our very opportunity to conduct research.

After the seminar the five Academic Council chairs formulated the following principles as input for the University Management:

- Transparency
- Local deliberations and reflexion
- Peer assessment
- Impact
- Recognition of academic citizenship
- Stability in aims
- Desired behaviour of researchers

Anne Jensen listed the challenges and attentions points that were raised at the seminar:

- Balancing inclusion of diversity in assessment criteria and the need to apply generic and comparable criteria
- Determining impact qualitatively – what count as high level impact, etc.
- In research (debates, infrastructure) and societal use
- Ensure that locally determined criteria cannot end up in personal games
- Balancing objectives of the research assessments – learning, management, AU reputation
- Inclusion of teaching – how and where?
- Awareness on unconscious – and filtering – bias in determination of assessment systems and criteria

Comments/inputs:

- Björn Andresen: At which level should the assessment be conducted?  
Anne Jensen replied that the recommendation is to anchor the assessments locally, and include different levels at each department.  
The Dean added that he would recommend that it is done at the department level as a tool to develop the department, the research environment, the education programmes and our graduates. The assessment of the individual researcher is a task for the management at the department. The Dean sees the evaluation as a good opportunity to have someone from the outside to provide input for the department. The Dean also mentioned that he would like to work with a group H-index.
- Søren Wandahl: Supports the idea mentioned by James Hicks from UC Irvine on considering impact in a broad sense
- Thomas Lykke Møller Sørensen: It is important to consider it as a learning, as a way to make the department better. Numbers must be secondary
- Anne Jensen: The result should uncover unused potential

<b>5</b>	<b>17:30-18:00 (30 min.)</b>	<b>Research practice, groupwork/inputs for follow up workshops at the departments</b>	<i>AJ/EHN/BV</i>
----------	----------------------------------	---	------------------

AU management has decided that that the individual departments from now on has a duty to keep a focus on the responsible conduct of research.  
It has also been decided that the Academic Councils must do an annual follow up on local initiatives and make a report from the faculty to the University Management.

In addition to that the Faculty Management has decided that all scientific staff members must take the online course every fifth year and that new staff members should take the course within the first year of their employment

In this matter the Academic Council can suggest to the Dean how we can ensure that the departments keep a focus on responsible conduct of research and research integrity and what we find is important in this matter

The groups should discuss the following questions:

- How do your department work with Responsible conduct of research and freedom of research?
- Which initiatives should be taken - if any apart from the online course - in order to ensure that all staff members are aware of Responsible conduct of research and freedom of research?
- What would be a good way to do an annual follow up at the departments that can be discussed in the Academic Council?
- Would it be a help if the faculty developed a frame for an annual follow up, e.g. a workshop with discussions of dilemmas?

Group 1:

- Important to spend time on research practice in all kinds of supervision and that it is integrated far better in courses, it should be a living part of the culture

Group 2:

- Good idea with workshops including presentation and real dilemmas
- FAIR principles should be disseminated at the departments (webinars)
- Perhaps there should be some kind of scientific officer at each department as a supplement to the two Tech advisers
- There should be either some kind of course for Master students on research integrity or discussions on research integrity should be included in the courses where relevant (or both)

Group 3:

- Not much have happened at the departments (!)
- The research committee of the departments could both focus more on the subject but could also “take the temperature” in order to take local initiatives
- Should be included in the onboarding procedures, also for guests

<b>6</b>	<b>18:00-18:05 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Hearing – Action plan for gender equality, diversity and inclusion</b>	<b>AJ BVI</b>
----------	---------------------------------	---	-------------------

Anne Jensen had made a hearing response based on the inputs from the Council which was discussed. After the input at the meeting, the letter will be amended and circulated for final comments. Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen mentioned that it is important that the focus in the action areas ‘culture’ is on targets. If the focus is only on numbers, it will hardly change anything.

<b>7</b>	<b>18:05-18:10 (5 min.)</b>	<b>New member for Research Ethics committee</b>	<b>AJ</b>
----------	---------------------------------	---	-----------

The Council recommended Derek Byrne from Department of Food Science for the Committee.

<b>8</b>	<b>18:10-18:15 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Tenure track: Time frame and member for working group</b>	<b>BVI</b>
----------	---------------------------------	--	------------

Timeframe and member for working group with the purpose to review and evaluate the current tenure track model and propose supplements, or alternatively another tenure track model, were discussed.

<p>In the evaluation process, a main point is the need for earlier career support, and ensuring better support to young researchers. Brian asked if there were suggestion on further participants of the working group in order to make sure we have a broad perspective as well as a transparent process. Academic counsel suggested Søren, who agreed to participate.</p> <p>•</p>			
<b>9</b>	<b>18:15-18:20 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Board meeting, evaluation meeting with the students</b>	<b>AJ</b>
<p>Anne elaborated items discussed at the Academic Chairs' annual meeting with the AU Board, including research evaluation, GDPR, the political decision to move educations to smaller towns, the cut-downs in Faculty of Arts were discussed.</p> <p>The student representatives in the Board raised questions, and Anne would like the help from the TECH Council to ensure inclusion and good collaboration with the students at TECH. Academic Council agreed that communication to student body should be considered.</p>			
<b>10</b>	<b>18:20- 18:25 (5 min.)</b>	<b>PhD degrees since last meeting</b>	<b>AJ</b>
No comments			
<b>11</b>	<b>18:25-18:40 (15 min.)</b>	<b>Quality assurance of exam questions</b>	<b>FBO SMJ and AHM</b>
<p>Stine and Aske introduced the item, and emphasized the serious impact the reexam had made, and stressed that the reexamination had not only affected the students' studies in the autumn semester, but also created mistrust to the system. They supported strongly Finn when he stressed the vital importance of efficient, transparent and aligned procedures to avoid similar incidents in the future as well as ensuring that students can rely on quality in preparing exams.</p> <p>Finn agreed that it is a core principle to ensure the quality in the system for VIP's preparing exams, including exam questions.</p> <p>The Educational Committee has made at task force to elaborate on practice, and to identify the dos and don'ts. Many educations have established a systematic sparring concerning exam questions.</p> <p>We are going to implement that the departments ensures that all staff with tasks and responsibilities in preparing exams will be further made aware of the expectations to comply with the pedagogical approach and make sure there is ample security in discussion an sparring in preparation stages. It was also established that external examiners have no chance to identify possible reuse of exam question.</p> <p>One question that will be further clarified is the definition of what is "reuse" Other faculties have been consulted on this, and Faculty of Health have supplied valid input, which we include in the work with the systematic sparring.</p> <p>Finn added that some students but not all had seen the questions before, and it had become apparent that students in total need to have equal access/availability to former exam questions for everyone as a general rule. Stine and Aske commented that they appreciate the decision to share old exam questions and found it was a very good idea.</p> <p>The next steps are further work with this in the Educational Committee; rewriting guidance material; and bring suggestions to the Faculty Management.</p> <p>Søren suggested that "copy paste errors" on exam questions maybe could be checked by the system. Finn commented that he is not sure whether the system is feasible for exam questions.</p> <p>The Council agreed that a sparring discussion is very important as well as the definition on what is reuse.</p> <p>Students commented that reexamination in the autumn break was a very unfortunate situation for students and had great impact on preparations for other courses of the autumn semester as well asfor planned</p>			

holidays. Finn acknowledged the inconvenience but in the case in question, there had been no alternative ways.			
<b>12</b>	<b>18:40-18:45 (5 min.)</b>	<b>AOB</b>	<b>AJ</b>
No comments			

Announcements

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Item and appendices</b>	<b>Owner</b>
No comments			
13		Workplace assessment (JBJ)	EHN/JBJ