



*Can be freely distributed
Approved*

Aalborg University
Fredrik Bajers Vej 7K
PO Box 159
9220 Aalborg

Case Officer:
Camilla Skjødt Jakobsen
Tel.: +45 4599403943
Email: csj@adm.aau.dk

Date: 13-03-2024
Case No.: 2023-232-00198

The Danish version of the Summary is always the applicable version

Summary of the meeting of the Main Joint Consultation Committee (HSU) on 27 February 2024

Participants: Per Michael Johansen (PMJ), Anne Marie Kanstrup (AMK), Søren Lind Christiansen (SLC), Thomas Bak (TB), Lars Hvilsted Rasmussen (LHR), Frederik Hertel (FH), Jesper Lindgaard Christensen (JLC), Louiza Bohn Thomsen (LBT), Thomas Lykke Andersen (TLA), Jakob Skovrup Stampe (JSS), Rikke Dorothea Huulgaard (RDH), Klaus Kjær (KK)

Unable to attend: Mogens Rysholt Poulsen, Rasmus Antoft, Lotte Brunø

Other participants: Linda Ibsen (LIBS), Rasmus Simonsen (RS), Christina Lademann Wiederholt (CLW), Camilla Skjødt Jakobsen (CSJ) (rapporteur)

Re item 1. Approval of the agenda

Recommendation: HSU approves agenda

FH asked for clarification as to whether item 6 of the agenda was an evaluation of the salary negotiation or an evaluation of the salary negotiation process. It was clarified that it was an evaluation of the salary negotiation process.

The Main Joint Consultation Committee (HSU) then approved the agenda.

Re item 2: Information from the rectorate

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing

PMJ reviewed the written briefing and subsequently gave the committee the opportunity to ask further questions.

In relation to the candidate reform, PMJ added to the written briefing that they have now come so far in the candidate committee that they have started talking about publicity. This should probably be seen in the light of external pressure resulting from the decision on confidentiality.

SLC elaborated on the written briefing on working time registration. As an employer, we are obliged to have an objective, reliable and accessible working time registration system, which must be implemented by 1 July 2024. Time registration must ensure that applicable rest time regulations and the rules on maximum weekly working hours are complied with. The goal is to have a system that meets the minimum standards implemented by July 1, 2024. As for now, both academic staff (VIP) and technical and administrative staff (TAP) must register their working hours.

SLC added that a project organisation has now been set up at AAU consisting of a steering committee chaired by SLC, a reference group (subsequently changed its name to following group) consisting of relevant participants at AAU and a working group. Project manager is Helene Møller Larsen from Study Service. The first steering group meeting will be held today, February 27th. The project goal is to find a common AAU solution for time registration. A project plan and a thorough communication plan have been drawn up, as the intention is to ensure adequate communication in connection with the process.

SLC noted that in relation to the implementation, it is relevant to be aware that there are several connections between the new requirement for time registration and the other registrations that are made and that we want to get to work together. It can be necessary to choose a temporary system solution until a solution is found that can communicate with future systems.

TLA asked whether the financial implications of the requirement for time registration at the university has been assessed, e.g. in relation to time registration on projects. PMJ does not believe that a single answer can be given to this, but that these are of course conditions to be aware of in connection with the implementation and going forward. SLC adds that the universities are currently awaiting clarification of the possibilities of exempting employees from the registration requirement and that it is important to keep in mind that there should be no changes in the way we work as for flexibility ect.

JLC asked if there are discussions with the other universities in relation to what they do. SLC confirmed this.

FH wants the union representatives to be involved in the process. PMJ suggested that the staff representative of HSU get a representative in the reference group (following group). SLC confirmed this possibility. FH sees this as a good solution.

FH noted that the staff representatives desire for a statement on the mission-driven university stemmed from a concern about how things are going. Specifically, it was the question of investment versus return, as it is a part of the basic research funds that are used. The amount is not large, but it matters. PMJ agreed that it is a relevant focus and stressed that the processes are running as they should. PMJ added that the European Science Forum had given a presentation to the Council of Ministers, where its chairman spoke about mission-bearing and why it is necessary. PMJ noted that it must support that AAU has focused on this in a timely manner.

PMJ noted that there was an addendum in relation to the statement on the status of the promotional program, where the written briefing states that there are three staff members on the promotional program (associate professor to professor). The correct number as of February 2024 is that there are five staff members on the program at The Technical Faculty og IT and Design (TECH). In addition, there are 26 staff members on the Tenure Track program (assistant professor to associate professor) overall at The Faculty og Engineering and Science (ENG) and The Technical Faculty og IT and Design (TECH).

TB noted that TECH uses the promotional program as an active instrument in relation to equality and diversity, to get educated more female professors and that half of the staff members on the programs are women.

FH commented that The Danish Association of Masters and PhDs (DM) wants to evaluate the Job Structure for Academic Staff at Universities and that there has been some discussion about the promotional program. In some institutions it is applied and in others not. There is a great variety - also at AAU. There are also other conditions in the Job Structure for Academic Staff at Universities that DM is aware of, including postdoc employment and the possibility of extending these, the conditions for staff members of external lecturers, study assistant professors, etc.

Follow-up:

A member is added to the reference group (following group) in the project on implementation of time registration requirements. FH returns to SLC as chairman of the steering committee, with the name of the HSU member who will participate.

Re item 3: Orientation from the staff representative

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing

FH began the item by informing that the staff representative will add a written briefing to the orientation from the staff representative.

FH then commented on the requirement for working time registration. Time registration has given rise to many discussions and FH's guess is that academic staff (VIP) probably won't get exempted from the requirement. In that case, FH hopes that time registration can help to make the working conditions and the working hours colleagues have in the sector visible, as there are challenges here. The staff representative would like to help with a solution and would like to participate in a discussion of this.

FH then informed about the challenges that have been at the universities in relation to compliance with the rules of the cooperation agreement (Samarbejdsaftalen). Five out of eight universities have had challenges in relation to the cooperation agreement within the past year. FH referred to two specific cases at the IT University of Copenhagen (ITU) and Copenhagen Business School (CBS), respectively. FH would like to work to prevent this from happening and to ensure that a good cooperation is established at Aalborg University (AAU).

FH then submitted a request for adjustment of the Mail Joint Consultation Committees (HSU) agreement on the composition of the Consultation Committee Organisation at Aalborg University, as there are challenges in filling the last seat for technical and administrative (TAP) staff representative in HSU. With today's wording, only certain organizations can occupy the seat. The organisations that can fill the seat under the agreement have refused. There is therefore a need to change the wording of the agreement so that a new member can be appointed. FH emphasizes that the staff representatives want to fill the vacant seat with a new TAP member, but that a broad mandate is desired if this is not possible. FH wishes to proceed with a proposal to revise the agreement and with subsequent written consultation with HSU if HSU has no objection to this.

FH then referred to some good articles on the candidate reform, focusing on the secrecy surrounding the work of the Candidate Committee.

FH has a desire for better information channels at AAU. The staff representatives want, among other things, a permanent column in AAU Update. FH also wants the staff representatives to have access to the departments' mailing lists, so that union representatives can communicate to all employees.

PMJ replied that AAU Update publishes what is sent to it. FH commented that it is correct, but that the inclusion of an article is done with the possibility that management can comment on it first.

PMJ maintains that the mailing lists are administered by the departments. However, management would like to discuss the possibility of a column in AAU Update in more detail.

LHR commented that Faculty Consultation Committee (FSU) at The Faculty of Medicine (SUND) has a fixed item on the agenda where information is provided on what has been discussed in HSU. LHR adds that the line of management must still be used to ensure communication.

Follow-up:

The management discusses the possibility of the staff representatives getting a permanent column in AAU Update and will follow up on this wish.

In collaboration with the HSU secretariat, FH prepares a proposal for adjusting HSU's agreement on the composition of the Consultation Committee Organisation at Aalborg University, to make it possible to fill the vacant TAP seat in HSU. The proposal is then sent for written consultation and approval by HSU.

Re item 4: Briefing from the HR Department

Appendix 4.1 Status of AAU's Competency Strategy 2023

Appendix 4.2 Minutes from the Main Occupational Health and Safety Committees (HAMiU) meeting 20.11.2023

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing

LIBS begins the briefing with a status from the Staff Policy Committee (PPU). Under a mandate from HSU, PPU has worked on a new personnel policy for AAU. The work has progressed, and a draft of a new personnel policy is ready to be discussed and approved at the PPU meeting on 14 March. In addition to the ongoing discussions in PPU, AAU Communication and Public Affairs has reviewed it. LIBS looks forward to the discussion in PPU. If the draft is approved by PPU, the draft will be submitted to HSU for final approval.

In continuation of this, the HR Department is in the process of looking through rules, procedures, and policies in the personnel policy area with the purpose to assess whether and if so, which ones need a review. A plan for this is also expected to be submitted to HSU after a discussion in PPU.

LIBS then reviewed the written briefing on the status of AAU's Competency Strategy for 2023, the Consultation Committee course and HSU's seminar day 2024 and noted that members of HSU are welcome to start considering topics for the upcoming HSU seminar in August. A discussion on this is expected at the next HSU meeting.

FH noted that at the joint meeting with the Main Occupational Health and Safety Committee (HAMiU) on May 3, they want an item on the agenda about stress. PMJ replied that it is the same as HAMiU wants and that this year it is HAMiU who has the lead in making a presentation for the theme and agenda for the day. Last year it was HSU.

JLC asked about the introductory meetings held for new staff members at departments and centrally, and how the participation in these meetings is. JLC notes that there have been some suggestions to the content of these meetings. PMJ replied that he always attends the central intro meetings for new staff members and that there is usually a good participation. The intro meetings are held in both Danish and English.

LIBS added that HR is revisiting the form of the central intro meetings, but there is nothing completed yet. Suggestions on the content of these meetings is always welcome, and LIBS encourages to contact the HR Department if there are concrete suggestions.

Re item 5: AAU Staff Well-being Barometer 2023

Appendix 5.1 Presentation of the AAU Staff Well-being Barometer 2023

Recommendation: It is recommended that HSU discusses the results of the AAU Staff Well-being barometer 2023 and what further initiatives, if any, the committee considers relevant to implement.

RS presented the main headlines from the Staff Well-being Barometer 2023: In the results, there are indications that we at AAU are succeeding in certain areas, especially when looking at the responses to the questions about satisfaction, meaningfulness and trusting cooperation. Here, the overall result shows that a majority of the responses are in the spread satisfied or very satisfied.

RS then noted that the picture is different when delving into the responses to the question of balancing requirements and resources. The results shows that a considerable proportion of the responses is in the middle

and it can be difficult to assess whether this group is heading in the positive or negative direction. The responses to the theme of balance between requirements and resources are relevant to note because it relates to "high workload and time pressure", which is one of five impacts which there are special provisions in the Danish Working Environment Authority's Executive Order on the psychological working environment. Following on from this, it is also relevant to delve into the responses to the questions on the balance in energy in work-life and balance in time in work-life, as high workload, and time pressure, depending on the circumstances, can pose a risk to safety and health. Subsequently an assessment of impact should therefore be carried out in relation to, among other things, nature, scope, and extent.

In relation to stress, 24% experience stress quite often or very often in connection with work. Approximately 20% of all responses at AAU level state that they have experienced stress symptoms for more than 3 months. A significant point of attention here is also that a majority of these employees (62%) have not told e.g. their manager about it.

RS noted that the Staff Well-being Barometer this year cannot be compared with previous years' well-being barometers, as there among other things have been changes in the question formulations and answer categories. The responses to the questions about abusive behaviour are the only ones that can be compared directly with previous years' well-being barometers. Here it is important to note that there is a significant increase of staff members who have experienced abusive behaviour. The increase is 36% compared to the two previous measurements.

Finally, RS benchmarked AAU's Staff Well-being Barometer against the results of NOA-L's (National Monitoring of the Working Environment among Employees) latest survey (2021) within the group "universities and research". It is not possible to compare the two measurements 100% against each other, as the results from NOA-L are distributed over five response categories, while AAU's Well-being Barometer it is possible to answer within six response categories. The answers to the questions about stress were also compared with previous measurements from the The Danish Association of Masters and PhDs (DM) from 2015 and from the National Institute of Public Health (SFI).

FH initially commented that DM probably has more recent data than from 2015 and that the sector should get some data that can be compared better across. FH would like to see greater cooperation on a national level. It is the agencies that have the data and not the universities themselves.

JLC also asked questions about ownership of data for the purpose of analysing the numbers. When JLC reads this report, it feels like déjà vu to when reading the sickness absence statistics. It is the same thing that recurs. That there is a difference between technical and administrative staff (TAP) and academic staff (VIP) and that there is a difference in the responses, depending on where the staff members are located geographically, etc. JLC asked if it is possible to get the data in a model where you take these factors into account and instead get the opportunity to dive deeper into something interesting. For example, what the stress that is experienced depends on.

PMJ replied that the well-being barometer has been changed several times to obtain the most present and relevant measurement for the working environment. Several years ago, there were more than 40 questions. It was later changed to four, then six and now the measurement has been expanded to nine questions. Methodologically, you can always attack the survey, no matter how you turn it. Creating a survey design that everyone is happy with is an impossible task. PMJ emphasized that it is the Main Occupational Health and Safety Committee (HAMiU) that has ownership of the well-being barometer and that it is therefore HAMiU that must work with any changes.

RS added that researchers at the Department of Sociology and Social Work have been involved in and have provided input to the design of the questionnaire in the current well-being barometer, just as the National

Research Centre for the Working Environment (NFA) has also been involved. It is also important to note that the results are distributed at group level and are therefore not a clinical diagnosis of individual stress.

TLA referred to a study of working conditions at the Danish universities conducted by The Danish Society of Engineers (IDA), in which the majority of the researchers at Aalborg University (AAU), that has responded, express the view that the conditions regarding opportunities to deliver research and teaching of good quality are descending. AAU scores worst of all the universities. TLA added that the amount of research commissioned at some departments is so significant that it creates an huge workload and there is no room for free research or other basic academic tasks within normal working hours. It is TLA's assessment that a typical load at the Faculty of Engineering and Science (ENG) in the "PLA group" is 80% on teaching and time bought on projects.

PMJ commented that the study referred to by TLA may also reflect general changes in the sector, as in many ways, these are the conditions that exist in the sector today.

FH had a comment from colleagues, that it seems that the 70% who are okay are highlighted in the results of this years' well-being barometers rather than the 30% who are not okay. FH asks if it is not seen as a problem that we have a workplace where 30% do not feel well. FH also referred to the differences between the individual faculties and that it might be good to hear the deans about their assessment of this.

LBT has in her dialogue with colleagues experienced that what is highlighted is a moral stress point – that it feels as if you must compromise on your professionalism and on the quality of your work, and this is what causes stress. In addition, it is also the experience that there is an increasing number of assigned tasks. LBT added that it will probably be relevant to look at how it is expected that you will complete your tasks satisfactorily. PMJ thinks that's a good point.

TB added that you can make too high requirements, but that it can also have a negative effect if you do not make any requirements at all. At The Technical Faculty of IT and Design (TECH), a lot of work is done to formulate requirements and expectations. The Consultation Committee organisation has been involved to ensure input from everyone. TB added that one can always argue whether the requirements are too high, but that the fact is that the requirements are high for academic staff (VIP) when you look at the international standards. At TECH, it is very explicitly described what is expected from the different staff categories, and then you can discuss the tasks based on that. After all, TB believes that being explicit in requirements and expectations is a positive thing.

PMJ agrees, adding that it is ultimately up to the individual to decide whether they want to be part of it or not. However, the overall requirements for research, teaching and the dissemination of knowledge should not be at an individual level. The idea of research groups was precisely that you could collectively help each other meet the requirements and that staff members throughout their work life could take advantage of the benefits this had.

FH noted that it is fine that management is explicit with its requirements, but that one should also be aware of the demands coming from other places. There are also demands from students and the outside world. PMJ agrees, adding that the university is also measured on demands from the ministry and others.

TLA asked if there has been thought about the declining response rate. TLA may fear that those who do not respond are those who are very stressed. PMJ replied that it may be a possibility, but that one can also assume that those who do not respond to the well-being barometer are some of the staff members who are the most satisfied. TLA adds that it is the experience that it is difficult to retain the staff members in their 30s and 40s and that they disappear due to too much work pressure.

JSS commented that it is important not to put a lid on something you can work with locally, even if it is not clear in the well-being barometer whether there is a problem or not. JSS adds that he experiences an apathetic mood among several staff members and that there must be a response to what is articulated in the

environments. Staff members do not feel that anything is being done about it. JSS wants to see staff members rejoin and that they want to be part of the university and are proud to be working here.

PMJ replied that it cannot be contradicted that we have a hectic work environment. SLC added that there are requirements at the university and that these requirements will be higher as we must deliver high quality. The requirements can also give rise to a need for change, and this may well put pressure on some staff members. However, it is not SLC's experience that there is an apathetic atmosphere in the departments.

LHR commented that the data should be used to look at where there is potential for improvement and that it is important to use the line of management, the Consultation Committee organisation, and the Working Environment Organisation at Aalborg University. LHR added that many find that we have a 100% solution culture, but that the fact is that in many situations 80% will be sufficient. This should also be part of the dialogue. LHR pointed out that stress is a complex thing and that it should be the potential for improvement that is being looked at and what we can do to alleviate this situation.

JLC also believes that stress can be linked to many things. JLC suggests that the points of attention that have emerged in the well-being barometer could usefully be reflected in the personnel policy, which is under revision.

LIBS noted that it should be especially important to look at the behaviour at the university. Especially when you see an increase of 36% of respondents who experience bullying, harassment, or abusive behaviour, including that these staff members do not come to their management or union representative with their experiences. We should be curious about this. LIBS do not believe that a reflection on this in the personnel policy changes anything. It needs to be taken care of in the organization. Discriminatory behaviour and stress are worrisome, and it's even more worrying that almost no one says anything about it. We need to look at what we are doing about this together. PMJ agrees with LIBS that we cannot do anything about it alone and that we need to talk about why this is the case.

LBT noted that it is the experience that staff members are resigned as year after year they feel that nothing is being done.

AMK commented that there are conditions in the well-being measurements that can conflict. For example, in situations where management does something and initiates initiatives in areas where it is in demand or necessary. This can conflict with the staff members experience that they have no influence. There may be parameters in the measurements that are affected when other parameters are adjusted, and this makes it complex.

FH agrees that it can be paradoxical. FH added that special attention should be paid to younger colleagues, who often find themselves in short term employments. However, it cannot be seen from the data whether they are the ones who are experiencing challenges, but it must be assumed that new staff members, both academic staff (VIP) and technical and administrative staff (TAP), may be more insecure than if you have been employed for many years. PMJ agrees with this.

LHR noted that the strongest tool is dialogue, including a dialogue about how we jointly handle the demands coming from outside. LHR added that it is important that staff members do not experience being part of a zero-error culture. It is necessary to talk about how we handle these demands, as we cannot reduce the external demands we meet.

TB agrees that it is important to be aware of the increase in experiences of abusive behaviour. TB added that trial actions should be initiated in projects at departments where the problem is highest and then look at whether it has a concrete effect.

LHR added that overall, there is a zero acceptance of abusive behaviour and that it is important to talk about what is going on in the environments. If it is not discussed, a common understanding will not be created, and

nothing will happen. We must use the levers we have, namely the line of management and the Consultation Committee organisation, and we must work with these things locally.

Finally, PMJ concluded that stress should be addressed as a theme at the upcoming joint meeting with the Main Occupational Health and Safety Committee (HAMiU) on May 3 - possibly with a focus area around younger colleagues and that it is expected that the discussions from the joint meeting will result in concrete test actions or general measures.

Follow-up:

RS will bring HSU's comments to the HAMiU meeting on March 5, including HSU's comments and input for the upcoming joint meeting on May 3, 2024.

Re item 6: Evaluation of salary negotiation

Appendix 6.1 Result of VIP salary negotiation 2023

Appendix 6.2 Result of TAP salary negotiation 2023

Recommendation: HSU take note of the information on the results of salary negotiations and discusses the evaluation of the salary negotiation process.

CLW began the item by putting a few words on the salary negotiation process. The process for 2023 has been as usual in many ways. It was a hope that a slightly different process could have been presented from previous years.

The system technical solution is complex, heavy, and resource-intensive, both for the HR Department, but also for the various participants who are part of the process. The challenge lies particularly in the exhibition of data. There are many returns to HR digitization and the HR partners due to errors in data, and a lot of time and resources are spent on screening data, etc. Today, data is drawn from 22 different databases.

CLW stressed that the HR Department is aware that the organization wants a more manageable, smooth and transparent process. The HR Department is in the process of securing this towards the salary negotiation in 2024 together with AAU IT Services (ITS) and the Financial Department (ØA). The objective is accurate data, that the necessary data is gathered in one place, procedural optimizations and a process and technical solution that is intuitive and fast. CLW pointed out that it is not enough to treat symptoms, but that it has been necessary to identify the challenges. ITS has helped with this data analysis.

Despite the challenges, CLW pointed out that in the salary negotiation process in 2023, there have nevertheless been indications that in some areas the process has been smoother, that the approval process has been optimized and that there has been better data support.

PMJ asked what is expected to be improved for the upcoming salary negotiation process. LIBS replied that there is currently a focus on data cleanup and data preparation. There are challenges with both poor data and poor systems. LIBS added that in 2024 there will not be a perfect solution, but the hope is that there will be valid data. When the new HR systems are implemented, the digital support of the process can also be improved.

CLW added that through the evaluations of recent years, the challenges and wishes for the process have been made known and that this knowledge has already been incorporated into the proposed solution for 2024. That is why an evaluation meeting has not been convened this year, as in previous years. Instead, the evaluation

meeting has been converted into a forward-looking meeting focusing on what is required in a future salary negotiation process.

FH requested that an evaluation meeting also be held this year. FH added that they have previously had good experiences with thematic meetings between the staff representative and the management, which has been called "the good salary negotiation". FH would also like to have the opportunity to discuss the union representatives need of information. All years, the union representatives have asked for the same data as management. FH believes that the union representatives should have the same data available as the management. FH added that the union representatives will convene a meeting with management to discuss the framework for the salary negotiations, including the financial framework. FH wants a dialogue on how to establish the process in the best possible way, as it is a very busy period.

TLA added that it will also be relevant to be able to see how large the payroll is at department level and how much of the payroll is used in the individual department in connection with the salary negotiation.

LIBS noted that the reason for not inviting to an evaluation meeting this year was that it will be the same content as the last six years. LIBS finds that time is better spent on having a dialogue about what is desired in the future processes. FH wishes to maintain the evaluation meeting.

JLC asked if there is a desire to unify the wage negotiation process in all areas at the university. CLW confirmed that this is desired. With a uniform solution, the HR Department has the best possible conditions to support the process with the resources available. JLC replicated that a uniform process across faculties is a bad idea.

JLC noted that union representatives have different needs for data. Some want more data than others. TLA added that there is a lack of data on which associate professor level you are at.

Follow-up:

The HR Department convenes an evaluation meeting.

Re item 7. Holiday year 2024/2025 and low-service days

Recommendation: HSU discusses and takes note of the briefing and decides whether the days between Christmas and New Years should continue to be low-service days, and approves other low-service days.

PMJ noted that the testing period that has been carried out over the past two years, where low-service days between Christmas and New Year have been introduced instead of company closures, has not led to what might have been feared. On the contrary, the figures show that there is a positive development in terms of how many vacation days are paid out and transferred. PMJ noted that this speaks in favour of continuing to categorize the days between Christmas and New Years as low-service days.

Everyone agrees to continue categorizing the days between Christmas and New Years as low-service days. In this context, HSU decided that this is a permanent decision until there are grounds for reconsidering the decision.

Follow-up:

The HR Department ensures that the decision is communicated to all departments. Likewise, all relevant material will be updated.

Re item 8: Evaluation of The Main Joint Consultation Committees (HSU) cooperation and working methods

Recommendation: HSU discusses the evaluation

LIBS began by referring to the case presentation, in which the written evaluation of HSU's cooperation and working method is summarised.

PMJ noted at the outset that he thinks it is positive that there is a desire for a more widespread dialogue around the table. PMJ agrees that the HSU meetings should not take place as a monologue, but that more members should participate in the dialogue. That would be very positive.

JLC asked if a decision has been made about the possibility of having a meeting in Copenhagen. LIBS replied that the agreement was that a meeting would only be held in Copenhagen if there was a relevant reason, e.g. if the meeting could appropriately be placed in continuation to other activities in Copenhagen. PMJ confirmed that this was the decision.

FH does not find it impressive with five responses and suggested that the evaluation could be made in a different form next time. FH then commented on a specific case in which he lacked that HSU had been informed. Specifically, it was a discussion HSU had in the fall of 2022 about finances and equity, after which there was a new decision from the Board in 2023 about the size of equity. FH noted that if a discussion in HSU later, in connection with a subsequent consideration by, for example, the Board, leads to changes, it would be nice if HSU was briefed.

PMJ replied that it was in relation to discussing a recovery plan, citing the desire for free equity of DKK 60 million by the end of 2025. That plan hasn't been by HSU. PMJ took note of FH's comment.

LHR noted that the Executive Committee under the auspices of The Committee for Equality and Diversity (ULD) has conducted a seminar on inclusive leadership. It is now being rolled out to heads of department and deputy heads of department and could be a good starting point for the good dialogue. LBT thinks it is a good initiative and would like to see it rolled out even further down in the organization. LHR replied that it is being rolled out as far down in the organization as it seems fit, for the sake of the organization.

Re item 9: Optionally

PMJ noted that two written briefings have been issued for today's meeting. Appendix A, on annual publication in connection with AAU's Whistleblower Scheme and Appendix B, which is a written briefing on the data breach in 2023.

FH wanted clarification as to whether the procedure for setting up appointment committees in connection with the recruitment of managers at levels 2 and 3 is carried out in the same way on all faculties. Different approaches are experienced, e.g. that the department council is involved in some faculties.

PMJ replied that the appointment committee is the chairman's auxiliary committee in connection with recruitment and that it is a common practice that the department council may be asked to provide input on who could participate in an appointment committee. However, they do not appoint the final committee. This competence lies with management. The authority to appoint in connection with the appointment of managers at level 2 lies with the rector. LIBS suggested that the HSU-secretariat could conduct a survey to uncover practices.

KK asked if AAU is still comfortable using the law firm Bech-Bruun. SLC replied that this is of course something that has been assessed and that they have looked into what engagements AAU has with Bech-Bruun. AAU

uses Bech-Bruun in connection with the whistleblower scheme. If AAU have to switch to another provider, it must be done when the contract expires and not before. In addition, there are only two specific engagements with Bech-Bruun. As for these, it is the assessment that it will be too expensive and too inappropriate to switch to another law firm.

KK asked whether AAU has set aside money for the salary increases negotiated in connection with the collective agreement in the state area (OK24). PMJ replied that AAU has calculated an increase in the salary budget of DKK 32.7 million as a result of the OK24 settlement. Great prayer day was factored into the budget. SLC added that the salary increase is higher than what is budgeted for this year, but next year it will be lower than what is budgeted. There is therefore a small challenge this year, as a salary increase at that level was not expected. PMJ stressed that there is no final decision yet, as the collective agreement settlement must be voted on first.

FH noted that DM University is not enthusiastic about the OK24 settlement in the academic staff (VIP) area, but that it expects it to be voted through.

SLC noted that a manage pay agreement in the technical and administrative staff (TAP) area could have been wished for. However, it is indicated in the settlement that the parties will begin negotiations on this with a aim to an agreement in connection with the next collective agreement negotiations in the state area (OK26).

Follow-up:

The HSU-secretariat conducts a survey through the dean's secretariats to uncover the practice at the faculties for appointment committees in connection with the appointment of Head of Departments.