

ESKILD Date	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
16 April 2024	Academic Council	15:30-18:00	1525-626	02-2024

Participants	Dean Eskild Holm Nielsen (EHN), Sabine Ravnskov (AGRO), Frants Havmand Jensen (ECOS), Hanne Lakkenborg Kristensen (FOOD), Karen Thodberg (ANIVET), Anne Jensen (ENVS), Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen (BCE), Charles Møller (MPE) Søren Wandahl (CAE), Björn Andresen (ECE) Emre Karaman (QGG), Ahmad Madary (TAP, MPE) Louise Fischer Koue (TAP, QGG), Litte Dalsgaard (TAP, ECE), Anna Elisabeth Kristoffersen (PhD) Muhammad Mohsin Nawaz (PhD), Lærke Dueholm Jensen (student), Riad Sahli (postdoc), Arman Fathollahi (Post Doc, Zahra Esfahani substitute)  Brian Vinter (vice dean), Mie Lundgaard (chief advisor) Hanne Vester Rasmussen (deputy head of administration)
Absent without substitutes	
Apologies for absence	Frederik Lindberg Callesen (student), Zahra Esfahani (Post Doc)
Guests	Peder Damgaard (item 3)
Minutes	Ida Rudolph Greisen

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
<b>1</b>	15:30-15:35	<b>Approval of agenda</b> (5 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
<p>Anne welcomed all and asks for a minor change of the agenda before approval: Item 1.a: Formal consensus approval by VIP members of new member Karen Thodberg to stand in for Jens Malmkvist (ANIVET), and further that item 9 is expanded.</p> <p>New agenda was approved.</p> <p>1.a Consensus approval of new member from ANIVET</p> <p>ALL VIP members of Academic Council unequivocal agree to the appointment of Karen Thodberg, new member from ANIVET. Karen Thodberg was hereafter welcomed as a new member of the council.</p> <p>Anne also welcomed new head of Nat-Tech Administrative Center, Gertrud Lindberg Tefre, as observer in the Council. Karen and Gertrud introduced themselves.</p>			
<b>2</b>	15:35-15:40	<b>Approval of minutes</b> (5 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
The minutes were approved.			
<b>3</b> <b>CONFIDENTIAL</b> <b>(numbers are left out in the minutes)</b>	15:40-16:20	<b>Presentation of new budget model - consultation</b> (40 min.)  Guest: Peder Damgaard	<b>EHN</b>
<p>Anne introduced the item. She stated that at the meeting in February, Peder went through the general principles and many questions were discussed. Now the model has been revised and discussed in the Faculty Management and now the Council are invited for comments.</p> <p>Eskild noted that the rationale behind the model is to provide simple and transparent model.</p> <p>Anne noted that the hand-outs are confidential until further notice.</p>			

Peder presented the background for the model and the timeline for the discussions and decision. The model is expected to be implemented for the 2025 budget. Peder presented four general principles for the model.

The Council discussed the distribution of the budget, allocation of funding with the changing of the size of departments, bibliometrics and the size of the annual recalculation.

Eskild mentioned that it is a model to which the departments can gradually accommodate.

Anne noted that the Council is invited to add comments to the model by sending them to Anne or Ida. The Council are invited to give comments today and then the members can send further comments until the 30th of April (2 weeks from now). Then Anne will collect them and send them to the Dean. The members of the Council can discuss the generic principles with their colleagues.

Eskild mentioned that it is confidential until further notice. He mentions that the principles of the model are not confidential, but the numbers are. Eskild mentions that it is important to note that the changes that can be adjusted are minor.

Anne mentioned that the simplicity of the model is important and that it is important to clarify that the contribution from the department to the faculty is not some kind of tax. Rather, it is the departments' contribution to fundings administrative parts of the university such as HR, IT, legal department, EU proposal support, etc.

4	16:20-16:35	<b>VIVE report</b> Presentation and establishment of working group (appendices) (15 min.)	AJ
---	-------------	---	----

Anne introduced the report and the email that the AU management has sent out. Anne went through the main point of the report and mentioned that the Faculty agrees that the topics raised and the problems presented in the VIVE report are totally unacceptable. TECH and AU truly aim for diversity and an inclusive environment. All departments and units must be attractive no matter your nationality, gender, age, position, sexuality, religion, etc. Anne suggests that the Council establish a working group to come up with ideas for actions and initiatives at especially but not limited to department level on how we can support an inclusive work culture, and how we make sure that if anybody experience sexual harassments and violations like the ones mentioned in the report, that person should feel safe in expressing it to a manager or another relevant person.

Little mentioned that data is pre “MeToo”. Brian agreed and mentioned that sexism is a problem in the whole country not just in the universities sector/AU and that all have to work against it at the university.

Eskild mentioned that there is a need for a change in culture and that we all have a responsibility. Anne commented on the methods of the report. Thomas Sørensen agreed that it is unacceptable and that everybody has a responsibility, but that management has a responsibility to set the framework for good culture. Eskild agreed and said that we have a responsibility for an inclusive environment. Muhammad asked about the local numbers and committees. Brian mentioned that the APVs do not show the same numbers. Eskild mentioned that there need to be adjustments to the APV so that they can see the cases and that it is very important that you report the incidents that occur and that they are trying to change the MUS (Annual Employee Development Talk) so that there will be career developmental talk with someone else than your supervisor. Anne suggested that maybe the general environment for PhD students should be an item for a new meeting.

The council formed a working group with Anna Elisabeth, Søren Wandahl, Zahra and Emre, and perhaps Muhammed, who will return with an answer.

Anne thanks the people who volunteered to be a part of the working group.

5	16.35-16:50	<b>URIS</b> Presentation by Brian Vinter and comments/inputs from the council (15 min.)	<b>BVI</b>
---	-------------	--	------------

Brian presented URIS and the background check in the recruitment procedure. AU has 117 employees from risk-countries. Brian stressed that the URIS procedures are implemented and conducted to protect employees against being in a position where they can be put under pressure by colleagues serving ta risk country, or by accident reveal risk research/knowledge. Brian presented a specific process, which has to be carried out before an interview for a position at AU. Brian does not want to delay the process, but in practice it happens.

Brian mentioned that as a researcher you do not have a chance or are in a position to know what information is sensitive and that less than 10% of applicants are rejected because of this. Anne asked if there are any examples of bad experiences from the 117 colleagues. There is not. This process functions as due diligence so that colleagues can trust each other.

The URIS procedures at AU covers onboarding (also of guests). Therefore, colleagues have to ask for guest access cards as well as filling out a form well in advance. This is not expected to lower the number of guests significantly.

URIS rules also applies for PhD students.

Brian noted that you have to inform your head of department at least two weeks before you start it if you get secondary employment involving risk countries. This is to shield and protect employees from risk. The same goes for collaborations with colleagues from risk countries.

Louise asked about travel guidelines as there seem to be different guidelines for each department. If anyone has difficulty with this, they should contact Brian. Eskild mentioned the essential need to conduct these checks. It is PETs responsibility to catch actual spies, not ours.

Anne thanks Brian. Anne asks for comments. No one has comments.

<b>6</b>	16:50-17:00	<b>Preparing the chair for the meeting with the Board of AU</b> Annual report (appendix) (10. min.)	<b>AJ</b>
----------	-------------	---	-----------

No one had comments for the report.

Anne explained that all five academic councils collect their report and they are presented in writing to the Board.

In addition, the five chairs have the opportunity to raise topical questions with the Board. Anne told that the plan this year is to discuss AI, GDPR (again), the increase in dimensioning of educational programs, and maybe the changed role of university in society. Anne asked for ideas about topics. They can be sent to Anne within the next week or two. Hanne Lakkenborg asked if the GDPR is necessary to discuss with the board. Anne explained why it is important. The problem has never been solved. Sabine asks for the 2% cut down to be on the agenda and starts the dialogue. She mentioned cuts in budget are frustrating. Eskild explained about political action.

Riad said that for PostDocs, it is difficult to apply for grants in Denmark when you don't have a permanent contract (as a postdoc). Eskild mentioned that there are some funds that give grants to postdocs. This isn't clear in Riad's department.

**17:00-17:10 Break with sandwich**

<b>7</b>	17:10-17:15	<b>VIP Candidates for Omnibus</b>	<b>AJ</b>
----------	-------------	-----------------------------------	-----------

Anne introduced the item about VIP candidates for Omnibus. She explains that the Council should suggest candidates. Anne explains that Omnibus is an independent university newspaper. No one has suggestions.

<b>8</b>	17:15-17:55	<b>Preparing the Sandbjerg seminar</b> (10 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
----------	-------------	---	-----------

Anne introduced the concept of the seminar, and the selected theme "AI in knowledge, research and teaching at AU" prompted by that AI is rapidly gaining a larger role in research and teaching. The seminar will also address the multiple dilemmas linked to the introduction of AI.

Anne asked for suggestions for speakers. In addition, the Council is invited to provide input on relevant, interesting sub-topics related to AI in knowledge, research and teaching. The speaker doesn't have to be from AU.

Mie noted that they are working on solutions to make the seminar more accessible for non-Danish speaking members.

Thomas Sørensen mentioned that the timing for the seminar is bad. It should be before the start of the semester. Anne recognizes this and will bring it to the group of chairs, and stresses that at this point in time, little can be changed, but it will be considered for the coming years' seminars.

Karen asks if a program will be sent out. Anne replies that a draft program exists and is being finalized – it still needs confirmation from some speakers.

Hanne Lakkenborg said she really wants to promote this event for the discussions on significant and important topics at AU level and for being a very pleasant seminar. Anne agreed and adds that

the seminar is an excellent opportunity to meet and exchange with the Academic Councils at the other four AU faculties and the University Management, and furthermore, the outcome of the seminar has nourished and influenced important activities at AU level. Better solutions has been pushed based on the seminar.

9	17:25-17:45	<b>Inspiration catalogue regarding Responsible conduct of research</b> Establishment of working group (20 min.)	AJ
---	-------------	---	----

Anne explained that one of the tasks of the Council concerns the annually review of activities for responsible conduct of research taking place in the departments. All departments are obliged to ensure the ongoing focus on responsible conduct of research among all research employees, from PhD to established professors. Previously, we have discussed that the Council, jointly with the Faculty Research Committee, should propose ideas for a catalogue of activities to ensure responsible conduct of research which the departments can use for inspiration. Some of the departments need more inspiration for activities and ideas on how we can secure focus. Anne proposes the establishment of a working group that can develop a draft for the catalogue and align with the Research Committee. The draft can subsequently be discussed at in the Council. At the first meeting after the summer holiday, we must both do a follow-up with the departments and the advisors. Furthermore, the request from Anne Mette Hvas (dean, Health) on input the revision of the Codex for research integrity can be handled in the working group.

A working group was established with participation of Sabine Ravnskov, Hanne Lakkenborg, Muhammad Mohzin Nawas and Anne Jensen. Anne asks for further comments. There are no comments.

10	17:45-17:50	<b>PhD degrees since last meeting</b> (5 min.)	AJ
----	-------------	---	----

Anne says 31 PhD degrees have been awarded since last time. Anne reminded the Council that the Council has a duty to speak up if there are exceptional reasons. Examples of exceptional reasons are significant processing errors (including but not limited to competence, conflict of interest, or unfairness) or a suspected breach of the responsible conduct of research (including but not limited to fabrication, falsification and plagiarism).

Charles asked who grants the PhD. Anne explained that the Head of PhD school grants them. But the Council has to comment on them and that if you know something is up, then you need to contact Brian. Charles is concerned about the delay in the process because of this.

A lot of PhD students are here on a visa. Charles asked how this can be improved. Louise mentioned that she does not think it is a problem if you have a statement saying when you will defend the thesis. Charles mentioned that SIRI will not accept such a statement.

Karen asked who is held responsible if a PhD hasn't fulfilled the standard. Hanne Lakkenborg Kristensen mentioned the practice when it concerns misconduct. Sabine noted that she does not think anyone would be on the assessment committee if the process had to be faster. They need a minimum of time to assess.

11	17:50-17:55	<b>Announcements</b> 1. Annual follow up on gender equality action plan (final) 2. Consultation about VIP career (final) 3. Appointment to AUFF (5 min.)	AJ
----	-------------	--	----

Anne says there are three announcements:  
The final documents regarding the annual follow up on gender equality, diversity and inclusion.  
The final consultation from Academic Council regarding VIP career and the nomination of Lotte Bach Larsen to AUFF (This was done over email). Anne says Lotte might be a good guest for a later meeting as the council is new.

<b>12</b>	17:55-18:00	<b>Any other business</b> (5 min.)	<b>AJ</b>
Eskild would like to invite the entire Council for dinner after the next meeting. Anne says it is very nice. Anne thanks the Council for their time today.			