Date	Forum	Time	Place	Meeting #
11 November 2025	Academic Council	15:00-17:30	1525-626	05-2025

Participants	Anne Jensen (ENVS), Björn Andresen (ECE), Charles Møller (MPE), Emre Karaman (QGG), Frants Havmand Jensen (ECOS), Hanne Lakkenborg Kristensen (FOOD), Karen Thodberg (ANIVET), Sabine Ravnskov (AGRO), Thomas Lykke-Møller Sørensen, Substitute for Søren Wandahl: Aliakbar Kamari (CAE) Eskild Holm Nielsen (Dean) Litte Dalsgaard (TAP, ECE), Ahmad Madary (TAP, MPE), Louise Fischer Koue (TAP, QGG) Anna Elisabeth Kristoffersen (PhD) Lærke Dueholm Jensen (student), Kira Gottlieb Køpping (student) Zakaria Hamdi (postdoc), Katherine F Dybdal-Grasberger (postdoc) Brian Vinter (vice dean), Mie Lundgaard (chief advisor)
Apologies for absence	Gertrud Lindberg Tefre (deputy head of administration, participates if invited) Søren Wandahl (CAE) (Ali participates while Søren is acting head of department) Hanne Lakkenborg
Guests	Peder Damgaard Item 6
Minutes	Ida Marie Gerdes

Item #	Time	Item and appendices	Owner
1	15:00-15:05	**Approval of agenda** *(incl. new postdoc member)* (5 min.) (Appendix)	Anne Jensen
Anne welcome to new observer elected by the postdocs instead of Zahra: Katherine F Dybdal-Grasberger and Ali Akbar from CAE, substitute for Søren Wandahl while he is interim Head of Department. She also mentioned that Ahmad Madari, from MPE, has had a new job at Aalborg University, and Anne thanked him for his engagement as he has stepped out of the Council. There were no comments to the agenda, it was approved.			
2	15:05-15:10	**Approval of minutes** (5 min.) (Appendix)	Anne Jensen
No comments – the minutes were approved			
3	15:10-15:45	**CoARA** (35 min.)	Brian Vinter
CoARA has been mentioned a couple of times in connection with the research evaluation, however not everyone is familiar with the Agreement to Reform Research Assessment. Anne has invited Brian Vinter to give a presentation about CoARA and the perspectives for the quality and impact of the research at Tech. Brian introduced CoARA (Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment), launched in 2022 by the European Commission and partners to reform research assessment. The initiative promotes qualitative, responsible, and inclusive evaluation, moving away from narrow metrics like Journal Impact Factor. Key points from the presentation:			

- Purpose and vision: Recognize diverse research outputs (data, software, societal impact), encourage Open Science, interdisciplinarity, and equity, and support systemic reform.

- Core commitments: Use of qualitative peer review, responsible use of metrics, and avoidance of inappropriate reliance on Journal Impact Factors. Signatories must submit an action plan within one year.

- Impact at TECH: TECH has not yet defined "impact" and will develop a framework aligned with CoARA that is multidimensional and qualitative.

- Examples of impact: Graduates meeting societal needs, collaborative research, open datasets, startups, and mission-oriented activities, including policy advice.

- Why it matters: Impact will become a key criterion beyond publications; researchers will increasingly be measured on impact.

The Academic Council discussed how a move from a quantitative to holistic perspective can be conducted: "No quantifiable; more holistic" does not mean absence of data, but rather that context and quality should weigh more than "simple" metrics. Brian mentioned recent trends e.g. University of Leiden has moved away from certain metrics.

A significant learning from the research evaluation is that: "We need to share more" – culture and practice for data and knowledge sharing must be strengthened.

Thomas asked about resources for implementation. ABC criteria need updating but must not become purely quantitative.

Anne noted that this requires a new way of thinking among department heads – work is underway but not yet fully implemented.

Karen asked about the role of teaching; Brian clarified that CoARA here mainly concerns research, but high impact across all pillars (research, education, society) is the goal.

According to Brian, then Impact should be defined qualitatively, multi-dimensionally and aligned with TECH's strategy.

Concrete indicators mentioned:
graduates finding jobs in Denmark that meet societal needs; joint publications, shared datasets, start-ups/innovation, mission-oriented efforts; supporting other researchers (e.g., better tools, data, methods).

Anne mentioned that we need to be clear why we want to measure impact – for whom are we doing it and why? Impact can be assessed differently by different actors and can promote some interests over others and we must be aware of this. Brian mentioned that researchers will increasingly be measured on impact.

INRAE's model was mentioned as a possible reference but must be adapted to TECH.

Karen raised the question of qualitative assessment and measurement at the same time, including how to measure the impact of someone else's work, and the challenge of international differences.

Charles stressed the need for a framework behind measurement: outputs could include number of CVRs.

Sabine suggested a course/competence boost in impact assessment; DFF cited as inspiration, but IFD might be more relevant.

Thomas questioned why Denmark has not committed nationally as neighboring countries have; Brian noted that DFF has signed up but he did not know the full explanation.

Ali mentioned that it Tech's implementation of Coara shouod consider that it can be hard for juniors to identify and make impact early in their careers.			
4	15:45-15:50	**Members for TT working group**	Anne Jensen
In October 2023 the tenure track model at Tech was revised. It was decided to evaluate the model after two years. A working group is established for the evaluation. Academic Council is requested to appoint one member to this group. The task of the Working Group is to evaluate the revised tenure track model and its implementation, collect input and practical tools from departments for shared resource/a tenure track tool box and for discussion in the Faculty Leadership. Two meetings are scheduled of 2 hrs each between January and March. Before June 2026: Recommendations will be presented to Academic Council and FSU. Potential implementation is intended before summer 2026. Academic Council is kindly asked to appoint one member to the working group by early December. Charles Møller was appointed to the working group. The Council thanks Charles for the engagement.			
5	15:50-16:05 (15 min.)	**Tech 2030**	Anne Jensen
Anne summarized that AC already has given input to the Tech 2030 ambition. The Dean would like to know how the Academic Council wishes to be involved during the upcoming strategy period. This opens a strategic dialogue about the Council's role—not only in advising during the strategy development, but also in supporting its implementation and ensuring it becomes embedded in faculty culture: - How would the Council like to be involved in the implementation of Tech 2030, now that the Tech 2030 strategy has broad support and attention is shifting towards concrete activities? - What kind of role does the Council see for itself during the strategy period – for example in relation to follow-up, identifying cross-cutting needs, or supporting alignment across departments? - How can the Council contribute to ensuring that Tech 2030 becomes embedded in everyday academic life – not just as a document, but as a shared direction for the faculty? Anne mentioned that it is important that the Council gives input to Brian and Eskild and that the Council works as ambassadors in the departments, so everyone better understands the focused topics of the Tech 2030 Ambition. Charles mentioned that the Strategy was rather vague and not very concrete – if CoARA is important, we should define in the ambition how this should look at TECH. Our academic activities are fundamental. Brian mentioned that there will be annual actions, strong communication and systematic follow-up. Karen asked how to define collaboration – who is a collaboration partner, and who is just a colleague? This would benefit from further discussions in the Council. Mission-orientation was questioned (which places specified societal problems is at the centre of all actions) and Anne asked about the balance between basic research and applied research. Brian explained how the mission oriented helps us – even down to TRL 1. Not all departments find the mission-oriented focus important in their departments.			
	16:05-16:15	**Break** (10 min.)	
6	16:15-16:45	**ØR3 and budget 26** (30 min.)	Peder Damgaard Eskild Holm Nielsen

		(Appendix)	

Peder Damgaard gave a presentation on ØR3 and budget 2026 – this was attached to the meeting material

The council discussed internal contributions and transparency. Charles requested clarity, as current practice can seem "random/poorly defined". Eskild emphasized that the amount is fixed, but uncertainties (e.g., building costs) can affect distribution; process has improved and efforts have been made to reduce complexity. Peder noted that in 2024–25 had fluctuations, especially affecting MPE.

Lærke asked about revenues related to education. The Dean indicated an expected range of approximately DKK 330–440 million, and Brian noted that these revenues are subject to a delay due to the way STÅ funding is allocated. Eskild emphasized that revenues are expected to decrease slightly, which could lead to stagnation rather than growth if student numbers do not increase. This is linked to the new **business candidate reform** and the professional bachelor track: if more students choose part-time models or if certain programmes (e.g., BCE) attract fewer students, STÅ income will be reduced, impacting overall revenue. Thomas mentioned that

Anne asked about the "tax" to the shared administration. Eskild noted that TECH now pays *less* to the university's central administration than previously (from ~37% down to ~30%, despite higher rent costs). Clarifying and explaining this in the department forums and among our colleagues is important.

VIP/TAP ratio was discussed: We have hired both more VIPa and more TAPs, but the TAP ratio has not increased accordingly. TAP resources are challenged by more tasks – many TAP are technical.

Charles suggested that financial context should be explained in department forums.

7	16:45-17:05	**Annual report regarding responsible conduct of research** (20 min.) (Appendix)	Anne Jensen Brian Vinter

Brian presented the two reports from the practice committee and the advisors for responsible conduct of research, and a short summary from the annual follow up and the discussions in the Faculty leadership and the Faculty Research committee.

He mentioned that written agreements on co-authorships is a very good idea, and recommended a wide use of these.

Anne mentioned that both the idea of status of responsible conduct of research at Tech, and the catalogue the Council made, should be revitalized when the new Code of conduct is published.

8	17:05-17:10	**Status AU Viborg** (5 min.)	Eskild Holm Nielsen

The Dean presented the current status of AU Viborg as Denmark's Green Campus and an international lighthouse for sustainable research, education and innovation. The campus is being rebuilt with a strong focus on climate-friendly solutions and will hopefully become energy self-sufficient, serving as a platform for interdisciplinary Living Labs in areas such as multi-energy systems, biosolutions, technical water, proteins, and carbon capture.

Three new degree programmes have been launched since 2024 (Veterinary Medicine, Animal Science, Plant and Food Science), with 89 new students admitted in 2025 and a total of 131 students as of November 2025.

AU Viborg thrives on mission-oriented collaboration with Viborg Municipality, GreenLab Skive, and the Danish Technological Institute, in close coordination with AU Business and Innovation.

The Council noted the strategic importance of AU Viborg in driving the green transition and discussed opportunities for further integration of research and education activities.

The Council salutes and will follow the continued institutionalization and establishment of Campus AU Viborg.

9	17:10 – 17:15	**Presentation about AR** (5 min.) (Appendix)	Anne Jensen

Thomas suggested that the material should be structured so it can be divided into internal and external use, ensuring clarity for different audiences.

Sabine proposed adding slides with placeholders (e.g., "Other") so departments or Council members can easily insert their own content when needed.

Karen noted that the presentation could also serve as a useful tool for introducing newly elected members to the Council's role and activities.

Anne concluded that she and Ida will work on the presentation and circulate.

10	17:15-17:20	**PhD degrees** since last meeting (5 min.) (Appendix)	Anne Jensen

- There were no comments – congratulations!

11	17:15-17:20	**For information (5 min.)** Meeting plan 2030 (Appendix) New substitute for Practice committee New member in AU Research ethics committee Climate Action plan 2026 (Appendix) AU DEI action plan 2030 (AU election results – will be forwarded)	Anne Jensen

Meeting plan: We have prepared a meeting schedule with preliminary topics, and you have been invited via calendar.

New Substitute for Practice committee: ECE has proposed Qi Zhong as an alternate member for the Practice Committee, and we have submitted that nomination.

Member of research ethics committee: Still awaiting a final decision on who can be nominated to the Research Ethics Committee. Two candidates have been suggested—one is only at assistant professor level (which is not recommendable due to the difficulties of the tasks), and the other is awaiting final approval from their manager before we can propose him.

AU Climate Action Plan 2026:
The *AU Climate Action Plan 2026* outlines four strategic initiatives aimed at reducing climate impact and promoting sustainability across the university. The Plan is aligned with *Strategy 2030*

and builds on previous climate efforts from 2020–2025. It has been approved by the University leadership and will be presented to the Board in December.

AU DEI Action Plan 2030:
Aarhus University is finalizing its *Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Action Plan for 2026–2030*. It includes five university-wide activities and one faculty-specific activity per faculty. TECH has proposed a mentoring programme to support inclusion and career development, especially for junior researchers and new staff. The programme is not yet formally approved. TECH will also continue with the Exit Survey for three more years, and is developing additional DEI initiatives such as a value statement, onboarding framework, workshops, and a review of academic evaluation criteria. Departments are each expected to submit annual DEI action plans.

AU election results:
Students: Lærke and Kira continues - but still two vacant seats
PhD students: Not elected yet, but four candidates

12	17:25-17:30	**Any other business** (5 min.)	Anne Jensen

AEK raised practical questions regarding who covers costs for students and PhD students participating in Council activities. The Dean clarified that departments are responsible for covering expenses related to student participation, including transport and other practical costs.