

Date	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
26 November 24	Academic Council	15:00-17:30	1525-626	05-2024

Participants	<p>Sabine Ravnskov (AGRO), Frants Havmand Jensen (ECOS), Karen Thodberg (ANIVET), Anne Jensen (ENVS), Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen (BCE), Charles Møller (MPE), Søren Wandahl (CAE), Björn Andresen (ECE), Emre Karaman (QGG),</p> <p>Anna Elisabeth Kristoffersen (PhD), Muhammad Mohsin Nawaz (PhD), Frederik Lindberg Callesen (student), Lærke Dueholm Jensen (student)</p> <p>Ahmad Madary (TAP, MPE), Louise Fischer Koue (TAP, QGG), Thomas Kabel (postdoc), Zahra Esfahani (postdoc)</p> <p>Brian Vinter (vice dean), Mie Lundgaard (chief advisor), , Ida Marie Gerdes (secretariat)</p>
Apologies for absence	Dean Eskild Holm Nielsen (EHN), Litte Dalsgaard (TAP, ECE), Gertrud Lindberg Tefre (deputy head of administration), Hanne Lakkenborg Kristensen (FOOD), Kim Kusk Mortensen (interim vice deputy head of administration)
Guests	Peder Damgaard (item 3) Bo Bukh Linneberg, item 4 Pia Thystrup, item 4
Minutes	Ida Marie Gerdes

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>1</b>	15:00-15:05	<b>Approval of agenda</b> (5 min.)  (Appendix)	<b>AJ</b>
<p>All members attending the meeting understood Danish, and hence the meeting took place in Danish, while the minutes will be in English so all staff members can read them.</p> <p>Before the approval of the agenda, Anne said goodbye and thank you to Frederik and welcomed Thomas, who has taken over Riad's position as postdoc-observer in the Council.</p> <p>Anne informed that Brian Vinter would participate in the meeting instead of the Dean, who unfortunately could not be present. She also mentioned that the guests for today are Peder Damgaard (economy unit) for item 1, and Pia Thystrup (Nat-Tech HR) and Bo Buch Linneberg (faculty secretariat) for item 4.</p> <p>There were no comments on the agenda – it was approved.</p>			
<b>2</b>	15:05-15:10	<b>Approval of minutes</b> (5 min.)  (Appendix)	<b>AJ</b>
No comments to the minutes – they were approved.			
<b>3</b>	15:10-15:45	<b>ØR 3 and budget 25</b> (35 min.)  Peder Damgaard participates  (Appendices)	<b>BVI PD</b>
<p>Peder Damgaard reviewed the annual budget cycle using a new way to present the budget.</p> <p>First, revenues:</p>			

- Tech is growing, especially due to increase in external funds, approaching a turnover of 2.5 billion, and also due to an increase in educational funds
- Good flow in securing external grants.

Basic research revenues:

- Increasing because we are increasing in external funds.
- Increasing with a seven-year delay.
- Contract funds for government services are still declining due to the annual 2 % cut
- However, we are compensated for this with funds from the national research reserve. Also, funds targeted research on climate and agriculture were included in the new finance law (Finansloven), but these have come so late that they have not been included in Tech's budgeting for 2025. It is not yet known how they will be distributed.

Revenues:

- Peder presented the revenues and the allocation of the research reserve and expectations for use concerning the departments that provide government services
- We have budgeted 64 million, of which 36 million to strengthen the area of government advice.

Brian Vinter commented that we can probably expect it to shift between years, depending on which areas the government will prioritize.

The Council discussed the problematic issue that funding is on an ongoing basis and constantly reduced within the area of government advisory work which has been the case since 2008.

Costs:

- Relatively stable composition. A large part is used for salaries, rent, operations, and contribution to AU centrally.
- Made a new distribution of expenses for administration, as there is a greater need for support for Tech due to growth, while there are fewer TAP/VIP
- 35% of revenues are used for rent, faculty administration, building construction pool, etc.
- Efforts are made to reduce indirect costs.

Bottom line:

- "Technical" deficit, as funds can be transferred to AU centrally, and then returned the following year, where the funds can be used.
- We incur expenses far into the future to establish ourselves in connection with Campus 3.0.

Charles asked about MPE and how the numbers can change. Peder explained that we look more at the numbers in real-time, and that the indirect costs are included in the shown calculations. There is a group specifically looking at the development of MPE's economy.

Peder then explained how we can use earmarked savings and "internal bank" at the faculty level.

Significant risks:

- Sector dimensioning which is uncertain in the short to medium perspective.
- "Kandidatreformen" is also unknown in its consequences and especially how this will impact Tech's economy.

Brian Vinter explained that we could face a very significant problem within the engineering area, as many diploma engineers choose to become civil engineers, which they cannot become if the education is reduced by 15 ECTS.

Anne asked if there are other risks, to which Peder explained that there are good winds on the research reserve and contract funds.

Brian Vinter mentioned other unknowns, e.g., rent, Navitas, Campus 3.0, expenses rising faster than expected.

Anne complimented Peder on the presentation – very informative and well communicated!

4	15:45-16:05	<b>Discussion on proposal of amendment of the Ministerial Order on Job Structure for Academic Staff at Universities</b> (20 min.)  Bo Bukh Linneberg (faculty secretariat) and Pia Thystrup (Nat-Tech HR) participate  (Appendices)	BVI
---	-------------	--	-----

Anne welcomed Bo and Pia.

The Dean's office would like to work politically for a revision of the regulations on job structure for academic staff at the universities. This should lead to parity between teaching and science-based policy advice, so that the positions of researcher and senior researcher should be removed from the regulation and the holders of these positions should be named assistant professor/adjunkt and associate professor/lektor.

Pia explained that in 2020, the job structure was changed. The changes mean that there are minimal differences between senior researcher and associate professor descriptions due to the teaching requirement for senior researchers/researchers. However, it no longer makes sense to maintain the two different job types, especially considering that the world around us is constantly changing. Therefore, we will try to work towards changing the regulation on job description and title but would like to discuss it with the Academic Council. The aim is to achieve more equality between the tasks. Pia requested critical comments or remarks on what might be problematic.

Charles commented that more flexibility is a good idea. He also asked if something similar is being considered for diploma teachers. Pia replied that the description for diploma teachers is not what is being proposed here, as it belongs to a different job structure regulation.

Karen asked if it also affects whether one has to apply for own funding. Brian Vinter replied that at Tech, associate professors also have an obligation to apply for own funding. However, he would like the young ones to move onto this track, with international titles and offering a conversion option – however not mandatory – for the seniors.

Anne noted that it is nice and timely that this is being addressed. Anne mentioned that there could be dilemmas regarding associate professor positions where there is no teaching. She also asked if there could be a requirement for teaching in the positions and how teaching should be perceived in that case. Additionally, she mentioned that there will be a backlog for the assistant professor pedagogy course degree. Brian Vinter replied that 40% of people who sign up for the pedagogy degree do not attend. CED does not have the resources for offering the degree to all interested, which is unacceptable. Regarding the concept of teaching, it should be interpreted in a broad sense. We have a plan to become better at attracting Erasmus Plus programs, especially to the departments that currently do not have education.

Pia said that we will not get through with advertising positions without teaching, but we want more flexibility so that it becomes either/or, or both/and.

Anne believes that it makes sense to have teaching requirements. Brian Vinter mentioned that the dimensioning affects everyone – and we do not want to have to lay off people. Pia mentioned that we cannot answer the question about assessments.

Sabine said that she and other colleagues were reclassified as associate professor around 2010-2011: There had to be teaching experience, pedagogical experience, and a Ph.D. supervisor course. A special course was created at AU – a really good university pedagogical course – that was adapted for experienced researchers. To become an associate professor, the researcher had to have qualifications at

the level of associate professor. At that time, several researchers wanted to become associate professors but did not qualify. There may be some old material about this.

Charles noted that we must maintain the level of high qualifications and not lower the requirements. Brian noted that we must ensure that people have the competencies that are needed. Karen mentioned that everyone must create a teaching portfolio, and this can be used in this context. Brian Vinter mentioned "The same level" is an elastic concept, and we must be able to embrace the differences in our cultures, and we can do that. Pia asked the Council to consider if there are departments in lack of teaching opportunities. Brian Vinter noted that the ABC criteria do not discriminate between senior researchers and associate professors.

5	16:05-17:00	<b><u>Research practice:</u></b> (55 min.) <b>1. Follow up from Practice committee and from advisors on research practice (10 min.)</b> <b>3. Discussion on follow up from Faculty management (10 min.)</b> <b>4. Follow up from working group* (35 min. incl sandwich break)</b>	BVI, KTH, AJ
---	-------------	---	--------------

*\*Presentations and discussion of "Catalogue of suggested actions – inspiration for implementing and maintaining attention to Code of Conduct for Research Integrity at AU at local level in TECH"*

Anne mentioned that this item is a long item that is divided into three parts. First, Karen will give a short presentation about the annual reports from the AU Research Practice Committee and the advisors. Then, the Council is invited to discuss the follow-up from the departments and the suggestions/decisions taken by the Faculty Management. Finally, the Council will conduct group work to discuss and elaborate the catalogue made by one of the task groups.

**Part 1:** Karen reviewed the workflow for a case: First, one can go to the advisors. Then submit the case if there is suspicion of misconduct. Screened cases can be sent to NVU. If the case concerns academic freedom, then it should be treated in the AU Research Practice Committee. Karen reviewed the numbers regarding the number of cases and processing time, which have also been sent in the appendices and will not be repeated in the minutes.

Charles noted that it can seem a long waiting time for the parties involved. It was mentioned that only few requests come from the engineering departments, and that may be due to the fact that none of the advisors for responsible research practice are from the engineering departments.

**Part 2:** Suggestions from the Faculty Management based on the follow-up from the departments: Await the revised National Code for Responsible Research Practice before initiating new central initiatives at the Faculty. HE Dean Anne-Mette Hvass has been in the working group, Anne Jensen and Hanne Lakkenborg have given input in the AU backing group. Some of the new items included are AI, URIS, and security. We await the new code in the first part of 2025.

Generally, it appears that the work is progressing well in all departments. Some departments report that they do not have clearly aligned expectations for the role of research leaders and that there are very different ways in which this information is communicated. At the Faculty leadership meeting, it was mentioned that some guidance is needed regarding implementing a good culture around publications (also with external partners). Advice regarding predatory journals was also requested. Self-censorship was mentioned as something that should be discussed. In order to make sure that all departments maintain initiatives and actions within - and focus on - responsible conduct of research, the Faculty Management discussed and decided that the research committees at the departments are responsible for this. All departments have research committees, and the chairs of these committees form the Tech Research Committee.

The research committees must communicate to research leaders about their responsibilities regarding responsible conduct of research, including making sure that new staff and students are informed about responsible conduct of research and the rules within the area, including for publishing. The research committee, as well as the scientific staff, must be updated with the AU policies and principles for good research practice on an on-going basis.

Brian Vinter would also suggest that we discuss the collegial tone. It is okay not to agree scientifically, but it is not acceptable to be malicious when speaking to or about your colleagues. Brian Vinter would also like us to work towards a culture where we have a written policy at each department on how we publish. Some already have that. Initiatives should be shared in the Tech Research Committee.

The Academic Council supported the idea that the task is placed in the research committees as well as working towards a culture where publication culture is stated in a policy and accessible at the departments. New as well as more experienced researchers must be up-to-date.

**Third part:** The draft for a catalogue has been shared. The group work was planned so that each group discusses parts of the themes in the catalogue: General and cross-cutting, Publications – for juniors and seniors, Research and research proposals, Public consultancy work, and Business collaborations. There were 20 minutes of group work and 15 minutes of joint discussion. Written comments could be sent to Anne afterwards. The council discussed the catalogue and shared the comments – the catalogue will be updated with the comments.

<b>6</b>	17:00-17:10	<b>Status research evaluation</b> (10 min.)	<b>BVI</b>
<p>Brian Vinter mentioned that ECOS, QGG, FOOD, and ENVIS have now undergone the research evaluation, and the four engineering departments will be assessed in February, while AGRO and ANIVET are scheduled for evaluation next year.</p> <p>It is observed that the external panels tend to look backwards in their evaluations, i.e. assess past achievements, which is a challenge since the primary focus is explicitly intended to be forward-looking. It has been valuable for the departments to work on this at the section level.</p> <p>Anne mentioned that it has been valuable for them to look ahead and discuss future directions and opportunities, as these discussions have been used subsequently. There is a desire for the panels to apply a more critical – however still constructive - perspective, which will be communicated in relation to the assessment of the engineering departments.</p>			
<b>7</b>	17:10-17:15	<b>Meeting plan 2025</b> (5 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
No comments to the meeting plan.			
<b>8</b>	17:15-17:20	<b>Appointment of two members to Research Ethics Committee</b> <b>Appointment of members to NVU</b> (5 min.) (Appendix)	<b>AJ</b>
<p>Two candidates were discussed – no names will be mentioned in the minutes. Both candidates were nominated by the Council.</p> <p>Anne mentioned that candidates for NVU can be sent to her no later than December 15. Hanne Lakkenborg is already a member of NVU.</p>			
<b>9</b>	17:20-17:25	<b>PhD degrees since last meeting</b> (5 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
17 degrees have been awarded since the last meeting. Congratulations!			
<b>10</b>		<b>Announcements</b>  Final version of Tech Climate action plan  Results AU election	<b>AJ</b>
Please note the final Tech Climate Action Plan.			

Please note that Lærke has been reelected for the Council (congratulation)  
Two other new students have been elected: Adrian Borbolla Munoz (MPE) and Kira Gottlieb Køpping (CAE).

<b>11</b>	17:25-17:30	<b>Any other business</b> (5 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
-----------	-------------	---------------------------------------	-----------

It was mentioned that it would be appropriate to always include a link to the job posting when an email is sent regarding the approval of an assessment committee.

Brian mentioned that the URIS guidelines came into effect on November 1st. This means, among other things, that a travel laptop and travel smartphone must be brought along when, for example, traveling to China.