

Aarhus Universitet MINUTES

Meeting	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
13 september 2023	Academic Council	15:30-18:00	1525-626	2023-4

Participants	<p>Dean Eskild Holm Nielsen (EHN), Anne Jensen (ANJ/ENVS), Jens Malmkvist (JEM/ANIS), Björn Andresen (BJA/ECE), Aliakbar Kamari (for Søren Wandahl (SWA/CAE)), Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen (TLS/BCE), Emre Karaman (EMA/QGG), Aske Høj Merrild (AHM/BCE), Maria Holst Kjeldsen (MHK/ANIVET),</p> <p>Ahmad Madary (AHM/TAP), Stine Wendelbo BJORholm (SWB/TAP), Louise Fischer Koue (LFK/TAP),</p> <p>Stine Munkholm Jespersen (SMJ/stud.), Emil Lunau Bentsen (ELB/stud.)</p> <p>Brian Vinter (BVI/Tech dekn.), Mie Lundgaard (MLU/Tech DKN) Hanne Vester Rasmussen (HVR/ADM)</p>
Apologies for absence	Annette Baattrup-Pedersen (ABP/ECOS), René Gislum (REG/AGRO), Matouš Najman (MAN/stud.), Hanne Lakkenborg Kristensen (HLM/FOOD), Martin Heide Jørgensen (MHJ/MPE), Matouš Najman (MAN/stud.)
Guests	Finn Borchsenius, item 5 Peder Damgaard, item 7 (Budget)
Minutes	Ida Marie Gerdes (IMG)

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>1</b>	<b>15:30-15:35 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Approval of agenda</b>	<b>AJ</b>
The agenda was approved, During the meeting the order of the items were changed due to external guests.			
<b>2</b>	<b>15:35-15:40 (5 min.)</b>	<b>Approval of minutes</b>	<b>AJ</b>
The minutes were approved			

For discussion

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>3</b>	<b>15:40-15:50 (10 min.)</b>	<b>Follow up Sandbjerg seminar</b>	<b>AJ</b>
<p>The group of Academic Copuncil Chairpersons found it very rewarding with the engaged and lively discussions at the seminar, also that the students contributed to the discussions. The Chairpersons will make a summary of the seminar.</p> <p>The Chairpersons are considering having a discussion across the Councils about external funding, difficulties and opportunities, as follow up to the seminar and to harvest from the discussions. Stine Munkholm Jespersen suggested to discuss the ethics in relation to collaborations with funders. Brian Vinter mentioned that within some research areas there are problems with research findings that can not be published. This clashes with the entire concept of freedom of research and is not acceptable.</p>			

Aske Høj Merrild mentioned that it is a really good idea if all Academic Councils gets more information about external funding and more transparency in AU budget – especially when it comes to the distribution of internal expenses associated with it.

Jens Malmkvist suggested that a clear legal standard for ethics should be made for collaborations with private companies so that it is not up to the individual researcher to make such one.

Some found the timing of the seminar bad as because the DHL run takes place the same days.

Anne mentioned that the seminar has recently been moved to August to accommodate for semester start and deadlines in the national research councils, in order to make it easier to participate also for students. It is impossible to meet the interests of all and apologized for the DHL participants.

<b>4</b>	<b>15:50-16:05 (15 min.)</b>	<b>Honorary Doctorates CONFIDENTIAL</b>	<b>AJ</b>
----------	------------------------------	---	-----------

The discussions were confidential. Two candidates were nominated.

<b>5</b>	<b>16:05-16:20</b>	<b>Presentation of template for self- evaluation - consultation</b>	<b>BVI</b>
----------	--------------------	---	------------

Anne passed the word to Brian. Brian explained the purpose of the evaluation (to give input to the strategy process for the Board of the University).

At Tech, the evaluation scheme is designed in a way that enables us to look forward, not just backward, and thus use the research evaluation progressively.

The management at Tech has discussed it and decided that the scheme has to point forward. It is made as a SWOT. It goes out to the individual units. There will be one report from each department.

Questions: How do we best reflect where we are headed in a way that leads the Board in the right direction? Both at individual unit-level, at department level and at Faculty level.

We are moving away from H-indexes – each department should list the five most important papers, which is not the same as the five most cited papers.

The Dean added that an interpretation of the questions is allowed so that they fit into the reality of the department and that we recognize that departments and disciplines differ. It must be beneficial for the individual researcher.

The Council members are VERY welcome to share this with their department and send in comments to Anne no later than September 27.

Jens Malmkvist recognized the way it was presented – that it is NOT an exam – but also commented that it could be difficult agreeing upon which papers are the most important.

The Dean added that the papers should reflect the status of the department and the research areas not H-indexes as they will reflect an evaluation of the individual level.

Thomas proposed to skip A and B in the material and just do C and then focus and secure that everyone at the department is involved.

<b>6</b>	<b>16:20-16:35 (15 min.)</b>	<b>Students item: Artificial Intelligence (AI)</b>	<b>Students: SMJ, MAN</b>
----------	------------------------------	--	---------------------------

Anne welcomed Finn Borchsenius (Vice-Dean for education) as guest.

Stine introduced the item of AI, and raised a concern about a lack of discussion about how we should use AI at AU in a constructive way to ensure the quality of the students' work.

Maria mentioned that PhD students also use AI for writing things like abstracts but also noticed that sometimes AI makes mistakes.

Louise mentioned that the secretariats will try to use it for minutes and the like.

Mie mentioned that it will be part of our future so we should learn to use it not deflate its potential use.

Eskild thanked the students for taking up the subject and mentioned that it also can be used as an inspirational tool for formulations etc., as a kind of learning tool instead of a "fixing problems-tool".

Thomas mentioned that it can be used for language and communication, but it very often lies about facts. Jens mentioned that a white paper should be made on responsible research practice and chat GBT. In order to be able to use it for examinations, we must learn how to use it correct. Anne mentioned the moral aspect, AI is not neutral but is learning while we use it. There is also a risk that we lose the ability of doing things ourselves if we always use AI instead of figuring things out ourselves. Brian Vinter mentioned that PhD students are allowed to use AI to present the science not to make the science. Ali mentioned that this is the future and that it must be incorporated into our teaching, but we must make sure that we do not lose our critical thinking or become lazy. Important to think about the solutions ourselves instead of asking AI. But we must also remember to trust our students. Finn concluded that we must incorporate this in our teaching, but we must also teach the students and the academic staff how this can be used as a tool. Finn also mentioned that perhaps we should not look at this as cheating but as poor quality (if the references do not exist etc.).

Anne invited Finn to come back as soon as a policy for this is made. AU should have a policy and each academic area should implement and integrate it in teaching in a reflexive and critical manner to harvest the benefits of AI .

7	<b>16:35-16:50 (15 min.)</b>	<b>Annual follow up:</b> <b>A:</b> - Research practice committee (JEM) - Advisers on the responsible conduct of research and freedom of research  <b>B:</b> <b>Process for annual follow up follow up on the departments work with responsible conduct of research and freedom of research</b>	<b>AJ og JEM</b>
---	------------------------------	--	------------------

The item has to parts:

Jens Malmkvist presented the Research Practice Committee and the purpose for the Committee and explained what kind of cases the Committee handles (research misconduct, questionable research practice pressure on freedom of research) and how the system and the Committee works. Then he gave a status on how many cases the Committee has handled in 2022 and the results of the Committee’s work. Since 2018, Tech has had six cases, and no common features/pattern are discernible between the cases. In the period from 2018-2022 AU has send 19 cases to NVU, of which 2 were deemed research misconduct (in 2020). Many cases at the university level concern scientific disagreement rather than misconduct. On average, a case at AU takes 59 days to handle but in NVU 397 days. This is problematic for the involved people, due to the stressful situation induced by the allegation.

Only a few cases are initiated from the outside.

For the second part of the item, it was decided that the annual follow up from the Research Practice Committee and the advisers should be done at the same time as the follow up from the departments. This year it will be done in two steps and the Academic Council approved the process for the follow-up from the departments. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

Anne also mentioned that we must find a new advisor instead of Annette Baattrup-Pedersen. The Council was asked to suggest candidates and send these to Ida in advance of next meeting 22 November.

	16:50-17:00 (10 min.)	BREAK	AJ
<b>8</b>	<b>17:00-17:30 (30 min)</b>	<b>Budget 2024 CONFIDENTIAL</b>	<b>EHN/PD/AJ</b>

<b>9</b>	<b>17:30-17:40 (10 min.)</b>	<b>Postdocs in Academic Council</b>	<b>AJ</b>
The suggestion for the process for inviting post docs in the council was approved, Ida will invite post docs via the departments and will host the first meeting. Jens Malmkvist mentioned that it would be a good idea to encourage diversity.			
<b>10</b>	<b>17:40 - 17:50 (10 min.)</b>	<b>Advisory board</b>	<b>EHJ</b>
The Council will receive a written sum up of the Advisory Board meeting at the next meeting in the Academic Council.			
<b>11</b>	<b>17:50-17:55 (5 min.)</b>	<b>PhD degrees since last meeting</b>	<b>AJ</b>
Since last meeting 14 PhD have been granted their degrees. No comments. Anne added that we will discuss recruitment and assessment committees (including concerning co-authorships) at the next meeting.			
<b>12</b>	<b>17:55-18:00 (5 min)</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
Anne encouraged everyone to consider if they want to join the council again, and to also encourage colleagues at their departments. Ali mentioned the problem that Sandbjerg seminar is in Danish so he would like to know if it is a requirement that you speak Danish to be in the Council. The Dean mentioned that it is important that we have diversity in the Academic Council. English speaking members are very welcome in the Academic Council. Mie suggested that perhaps the Sandbjerg seminar could have slides in English or a translator for English speaking members. Anne will bring this to the chair group for preparing for the next Sandbjerg Seminar			

Announcement:

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
		AU elections	AJ