



*For general distribution
Godkendt*

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

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

The Danish version of the Summary is always the applicable version

Date: 01-07-2024
Case No.: 2023-232-00207

Minutes of the meeting of Main Joint Consultation Committee (HSU) on 18 June 2024

Participants: Per Michael Johansen (PMJ), Anne Marie Kanstrup (AMK), Søren Lind Christiansen (SLC), Lars Hvilsted Rasmussen (LHR), Rasmus Antoft (AR), Frederik Hertel (FH), Jesper Lindgaard Christensen (JLC), Louiza Bohn Thomsen (LBT), Thomas Lykke Andersen (TLA), Klaus Kjær (KK)

Unable to attend: Thomas Bak, Lotte Brunø, Rikke Dorothea Huulgaard, Jakob Skovrup Stampe

Other participants: Linda Ibsen (LIBS), Michael Steensen Kristensen (MSK) under item 5, Pernille Sværke Boysen (PSB) under item 6, Helene Møller Larsen (HML) under item 7, Dorte Hollensen (DH) under item 8, Camilla Skjødt Jakobsen (CSJ) (reporter)

Re Item 1. Approval of the agenda

Recommendation: HSU approves the agenda

The HSU approved the agenda.

Re item 2: Information from the rectorate

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing

AMK gave a brief status of the graduate reform. On 19 June at 12.00 noon, the interim report will be published with the recommendations from the graduate committee. Meetings of the graduate committee will be held again in August and September. The final report must be finalised by October and the regulatory basis must be in place by the end of the year. From January 2025 onwards, work on new study programs and an institutional plan for the reorganisation of degree programmes is expected to be initiated, based on what is to be decided.

PMJ gave the committee the opportunity to ask questions about the rectorates written briefing.

FH asked about the Management Day, which will be held in November 2024. The theme for the Management Day will be the future administration. FH noted that the staff representatives felt that the theme of the day could seem abstract and that there was a desire for an opportunity to give input to the day from the staff and staff representatives.

SLC noted that the theme was an expression of the fact that there is currently a restructuring taking place in several areas of the administration. The aim is to involve the entire management group at AAU in this. The content of the day is still being discussed, and it is a good suggestion to take a round of input from the staff representatives in this connection.

PMJ added that the focus of the Management Day should be seen in the light of the increased digitalization in the administration and the systemic changes that are coming. More optimal ways of solving the tasks must be

looked at and better interfaces must be ensured, based on the changes that are coming. In the future, there may be demands for economic efficiency. This is already being seen in other public administrations. AAU wants to take the lead and ensure optimisation and streamlining in the organisation, in order to mitigate some of the savings we predict must come. The Management Day must help to support this, and all good forces must of course participate in this.

TLA noted that it is relevant to continue to focus on well-being and the core task in the work with the administrative area. It is relevant to cut out the things that are not necessary for the core task. TLA hopes to see a significant effect of the measures before the next Well-being Barometer, at the end of 2025.

Re item 3: Orientation from the staff representatives

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing

FH began the item with a brief orientation that The Danish Association of Masters and PhD's (DM's) chairman has gone on self-chosen leave, as a result of cooperation problems internally in DM. The staff representatives then gave a status from each main area that was represented at today's meeting.

JLC presented for the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). A staff meeting was held at SSH on June 6 2024. There was a large turnout and a more positive atmosphere than before. In addition, the staff are curious about the new requirement for working time registration. Things have calmed down as to the various management positions at the departments, where recruitment is underway, and regarding the dean position, where Rasmus Antoft will continue as dean. In addition, a number of processes are currently underway with a focus on integration between the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Humanities. There are still differences that remains, and this are still being discussed at the SSH Faculty to find a common path. RA added that there is a dialogue about how the work can be organised in the best possible way at the faculty and this will continue in the autumn.

FH added that there are concerns in relation to the graduate reform and in relation to the uncertainty of student admissions. RA added that all deans of the humanities faculties are worried about admissions. It is very much a political discussion, but also a concern that stems from the fact that the youth cohorts are declining. Although AAU attracts many students, it is a challenge. It is important that SSH continues to ensure a broad range of degree programmes and some models for handling this, just as there continuously must be a strong focus on maintaining operations and quality, as it will affect the research environments if it is not in balance.

AMK noted that it is very different where the universities are on this point. AAU has made a significant reduction in its programme portfolio in connection with the previous reform for relocation and reduction of student admissions, which means that AAU will have to restructure less.

LBT briefed for the Faculty of Medicine (SUND). At SUND, there is a lot of talk about the Well-being Barometer and the economy. The Department of Clinical Science has launched some good initiatives based on the Well-being Barometer, which has focused on the geographical organisation of staff to ensure a better gathering. At the Department of Health Science and Technology, large savings have been announced, so this is of course a topic of conversation, and it is awaited how this will be implemented. In addition, they are looking forward to the connection from the SUND building to the new hospital opening.

LHR noted that at the last meeting in the Main Joint Consultation Committee, a question was raised about whether SUND was on a slippery slope as for the external funding. In continuation of this, LHR stated that SUND is exceeding the framework for the budget for external funding this year, which is very positive.

TLA briefed for the Faculty of Engineering and Science (ENG). There is a new acting dean of ENG. The position of dean is now being advertised, as is the position of head of department at BUILD. Finances take up a lot of space at ENG. Many departments are under pressure and struggling to achieve budget targets. We are continuously working on general savings, and several leases have been terminated. This puts a lot of pressure on scientific staff, who already have a heavy workload on teaching and working on external funded projects, which leaves very little time for research and other academic tasks. The Department of the Built Environment (BUILD) is in a special situation due to previous financial challenges, but is aiming to achieve a plus and not a minus this year, but it is not without challenges.

PMJ added that a new head of department has been appointed at the Department of Mathematical Sciences. PMJ expressed that it is gratifying to hear that they are aiming for a positive result at BUILD this year. The economy must be turned around, and it has understandably been a difficult situation for BUILD, among others.

FH concluded by noting about OK24 that the staff representatives perceive OK24 as something that is financed through the PL-regulation over a period, but that the staff representatives of course agrees that liquidity problems may arise. The staff representatives finds that the management has acted very well in finding a solution to the liquidity issue, among other things through equity.

Re item 4: Briefing from the HR Department

Appendix 4.1 Agenda, HAMiU on 30.05.2024

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing

LIBS informed that Rectors Scheme og delegation have now been expanded so that level 4 managers at Shared Services in the future can be delegated the authority to hire and dismiss etc. Previously, it was only possible to delegate this competence to level 4 administrative managers at the departments, but now it is also possible in Shared Services.

The HR Department has been in the Executive Board and has been given the go-ahead to continue working on the management foundation and leadership development. LIBS finds it very positive that leadership development is becoming a priority. The HR department continues to work with the Executive Board and this will be specified in more detail later.

On 10 June, an evaluation meeting was held between staff representatives and the HR Department about last year's salary negotiations. The challenges were the same as those discussed in previous years – challenges that are being worked hard to improve. For the salary negotiations in 2024, the focus is on a better data basis and that the technical solution is improved where possible. It will still not be an optimal solution, but an improvement. However, the evaluation also stated that communication between the HR Department and the staff representatives had improved at the last salary negotiation. In addition, the difference in the salary framework for academic staff (VIP) and technical and administrative staff (TAP) was highlighted in the discussions. This takes up a lot of space and especially the question of why there is a difference.

JLC asked about a process plan or a timetable for the upcoming salary negotiation process. It was desirable that it came as early as possible, as it gives the staff representatives the opportunity to prepare and call for preliminary meetings. JLC also asked whether there was a focus on equipping new managers, for example, before the salary negotiations.

LIBS replied that it is the same process plan as last year. In addition, not much more is made of new initiatives, as a new set-up is expected from next year. The HR-partners are close to the management in these processes and talk to the management about how the good process is ensured, etc.



Re item 5: Sexism and career progression (VIVE report)

Appendix 5.1 Sexism and Career Paths at Danish universities

Appendix 5.2 Code of conduct for students at AAU

Appendix 5.3 How to talk about sexism at AAU

Recommendation: HSU discusses the proposed measures to deal with and prevent sexism.

PMJ began the item by informing that AAU, based on the VIVE report, has initiated a process in which the management and committees discuss the main conclusions of the report. The VIVE report has thus been continuously discussed in the organisation and by several committees. The report was also discussed at the head of department's meeting yesterday on June 17. PMJ noted that this report and the number we see at AAU mean that this topic is just as relevant as it has been in the past. It is first and foremost a managerial task to ensure that such incidents do not take place.

MSK reviewed the main points from the VIVE report. What the report makes clear, among other things, is that there is a risk of sexist incidents at the universities, as a result of a hierarchical culture, short employment contracts and great competition, if you want a research career.

MSK informed that in parallel with the management and committees discussing the main conclusions of the survey, a working group consisting of the Rector's Office, the HR Department and AAU PhD has identified a number of initiatives that can be initiated as a first step in the work of creating a safe and inclusive working environment. The initiatives deal with handling, communication, management, and management culture. The Main Joint Consultation Committee (HSU) was then asked to discuss the main conclusions of the report as well as the first steps to prevent and deal with sexism.

PMJ pointed out that he was very happy to participate in the meeting with PhD students, which was mentioned as an initiative. PMJ noted that he has an experience that some people may find it difficult to handle specific cases correctly. PMJ therefore finds it sensible to have a workshop for health and safety representatives (AMR), union representatives (TR) and management, so that a common level of knowledge can be achieved and so that it is ensured that there is cooperation in these types of cases. LHR agreed with this and added that it is always the managements job to stand on the side of the offended.

MSK added to the dialogue that it had been concluded that one of the things that has been missing, is communication, including that the topic is articulated in the academic environments. It has been shown that when management communicates about what culture and behavior is expected, it has a positive effect. At the same time, there has been a demand for joint response options, tools for handling and prevention. The initiatives must be seen in the light of the fact that there are conditions that can already help in the short term in the work of creating a safe and inclusive working environment, but that a cultural change takes a long time and that it is therefore necessary to also think in terms of long-term efforts.

LBT found the initiatives very good. LBT added that the process for reporting abusive behaviour is unclear, including that it is unclear who does what in the process. It would be relevant to have this described and defined better. In addition, LBT experienced a challenge with staff still considering whether it is best to report an incident or whether it is best not to. This must be reversed so that the starting point is always that it is best to report.

PMJ found it crucial and necessary that work is done with this culture, including the need to prevent incidents before it gets into a situation where it develops into a case at all.

RA added that it is also problematic that there are academic environments where one person has an inappropriate behavior and where everyone else accepts this behaviour. It is important to also focus on all those who

accept the behavior, because that is what creates a culture. RA added that it is the PhDs that are the starting point for the VIVE report, but that the report must be used as a lever to talk about AAU's workplace culture in general and for all staff members. For RA, it is very much about leadership development and cultural change.

LBT supported not limiting the efforts to the PhDs, but the importance of looking at the entire workplace. LBT added that it is important to be prepared for the conversations, so that you handle the situation and the conversations with the offended correctly and properly. LBT thought it was an eye-opener with the four main types of violations. Most people often think of the downright sexist behavior, but it turns out that the majority of the incidents that happen are about everyday sexism.

LBT referred to the code of conduct for the students and that there was a good point, which was about saying no. However, LBT found that the wording in one of the sub-paragraphs sounds as if the blame is shifted onto the offender, as it says "are you clear in your signals". PMJ can see LBT's point, although that was certainly not the intention of the formulation. **After the meeting:** *In connection with the preparation of the minutes, the HSU secretariat has been made aware that the specific wording in the code of conduct for students has been changed to "be as clear as you can in your own signals to others".*

LIBS suggested that HSU also support the process by ordering all consultation committees to take up the discussion. It is a peaceful way to start a discussion and to find out what it looks like in the individual areas.

TLA asked about how this is being spread in the organization. TLA does not see the consultation committee organization as the best or only way and has also experienced that the management is not always taken seriously when they stand up and articulate matters. It worked really well today, where MSK presented and PMJ followed up with the top management's view. This could be spread throughout the organization. TLA drew attention to the self-funded PhDs, which have even more at stake. They are not employed at the university – which is a problem, as they do not have the same protection as those who are employed. A solution should be found for this so that they are also covered by the TR and AMR.

LHR added that it was also discussed at the rector's head of department meeting how to get it down through the organisation. Meetings with the PhDs and workshops will be held at the departments. It must be discussed with the staff, and it must be communicated to the academic environments and research groups. The first step is to acknowledge that it is happening. It should not be up for discussion that it is not a culture we want. It is therefore very relevant to talk about how to ensure that it reaches the academic environments. LHR added that the best we can do is first and foremost to support the initiatives that are rolled out 100%. On the management side, there must be follow-up, and if there is a management that does not follow up, then it is LHR's opinion that then they also decline to be a manager at AAU.

AMK added that the code of conduct for students has been prepared, among other things, because of the many grey areas and a need to work with culture. A great deal of effort has been made to describe and communicate how we expect people to behave at AAU.

PMJ concluded that there was support for the initiatives.

Follow-up:

HSU's input will be taken into account in the further work and the Executive Board will discuss the initiatives in September.

Re item 6: Discussion of initiatives based on miscellaneous reports on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the new University Act



Appendix 6.1 Process plan for initiatives at AAU based on the three reports (prepared in June 2023) and the status in May 2024

Appendix 6.2 ENG consultation response regarding the DFIR report Universities for the future

Appendix 6.3 SSH consultation response regarding the DFIR report Universities for the future

Appendix 6.4 SUND consultation response regarding the DFIR report Universities for the future

Appendix 6.5 TECH consultation response regarding the DFIR report Universities for the future

Recommendation: HSU discusses the status of the process plan and the proposed initiatives at AAU on freedom of research and staff involvement.

PMJ began the item by providing information on the background to the discussion. In connection with the 20th anniversary of the new University Act of 2003, the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters (KDVS) and the Danish Council for Research and Innovation Policy (DFiR) have prepared independent reports on the state of affairs at the universities. At the same time, The Think Tank DEA has published a report on external research funding. These reports have been discussed in various contexts at AAU and have been consulted by the academic councils and department councils in the autumn of 2023.

The reports point to a number of challenges at the universities. The consultation responses were discussed by the Executive Board in January 2024, and a process has then been initiated to identify relevant initiatives to ensure freedom of research at AAU, as well as staff involvement and a democratic culture. In the process, it has been important to ensure that issues of different nature have been discussed. Proposals for initiatives were discussed in the Executive Board on 8 May 2024 with the wish to consult the Main Joint Consultation Committees (HSU) before the proposed initiatives are implemented. The initiatives are described in more detail in the case description, just as the process plan is described in more detail in the appendix 6.1.

In addition to the initiative, which concerns staff involvement, RA added that a process is initiated to investigate whether and how staff involvement in the department councils can be strengthened. RA has been chosen as coordinator for this effort. RA informed that a group will be set up with representatives from the department councils and that the HR Department will assist in the work. The group will discuss how to do this and examine how to ensure involvement elsewhere, including at other institutions, for inspiration. The work will start after the summer holidays.

PMJ then informed about the efforts regarding the concept of freedom of research, working conditions at the university, the economic structure of the sector and the influence of external parties on research. Freedom of research is an area that needs to be looked at for several reasons. There are different perceptions of what freedom of research is, and it often depends on the research that is conducted. It is important to have a discussion of this and a common understanding and interpretation of the concept and what it means at AAU.

FH referred to the briefing from the staff representative at the latest HSU meeting about the meeting of the Nordic University Teachers' Association. Here, several concepts of freedom of research have been worked on, so inspiration could be found here. FH referred to the fact that a colleague had mentioned that the consultation committee's organisation could also be relevant to look at in this exercise, and suggested whether it could be included in RA's project on staff involvement. RA and PMJ saw it as a relevant proposal.

FH indicates that these are good initiatives and that it is good that these discussions are being taken. FH then added that the University Act sets some limits for what is possible. There is no law of nature in the University Act that gives a lack of staff influence, but this is the experience in many places. This experience may be as a result of the limitations in the law.

PMJ replied that it is correct that the legislation sets some frameworks, e.g. for how the management of the universities is to be hired, and this cannot be changed unless the law is changed. FH then referred to how other Nordic countries handle the appointment of management. PMJ noted that there are many models for how this is done, and it deserves an inspection.

PMJ added that the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, which will be updated by a committee in the Ministry of Higher Education and Science in 2024, is important to focus on when discussing freedom of research.

It was also discussed whether it might be relevant to look at the report on academic freedom. FH adds that the report has been prepared in collaboration between staff organizations in the Nordic countries, and that in Denmark it is The Danish Society of Engineers (IDA), The Danish Association of Masters and PhD's (DM) and The Danish Association of Masters in Law and Economics (DJØF) that have contributed to the preparation.

LHR noted that there has been a lot of focus on the private foundations and the importance these have for the research area. For the very large grants, some of the foundations ask to join the steering committee for the projects. They want to have a lot of influence, and that is something that one should be aware of.

PMJ commented that there is not much to be done about the economic structure. This is political governed. The focus should be on the culture of cooperation. Overall, the universities are in a common destiny with the foundations. PMJ does not foresee that the universities in the near future, with a need for major societal priorities, will receive increased public funding from the political side. PMJ added that the university and the staff also have a say in which projects are sent to the foundations and whether they bid on the calls the foundations make, just as they can enter into a dialogue with the foundations about the development of projects.

PMJ concluded on the point that there is support for the initiatives to be initiated and that a more detailed timetable for this will be provided later.

Re item 7: Rules for registration of working hours at AAU

Appendix 7.1 Rules for registration of working hours at AAU

Recommendation *HSU is informed about the status of the project and comments on the Rules for registration of working hours at AAU.*

HML gave a brief status of the project. There have been discussions across the universities about common principles, but as long as there is no announcement from the Danish Agency for Employees and Competences (MEDST), there is no longer agreement on a common principle for who is exempt from registration.

SLC added that KU, DTU and CBS have decided to exempt academic staff and managers at levels 1-3 from working time registration until MEDST makes an announcement. This goes against the common principles that were initially discussed between the universities. SLC also finds that it is fundamental to put discretion under rule, which is not in accordance with the provisions of the law. Therefore, AAU maintains that everyone must still register their working hours, unless, after an individual assessment, you can be exempted as a self-organizer. LIBS added that the other universities and AAU may end up having to adjust based on a possible other assessment from MEDST.

HML informed that there is currently a lot of focus on the implementation itself. There are currently 110 registered for the introductory meetings, which will be held for staff representatives and HR staff members, etc. in the coming week. SLC then asked for Main Joint Consultation Committees (HSU) comments on the rules and the further work.

TLA was concerned about the consequences that will be as a result of the working time registration. If a academic staff member registers, for example, an average of 45 hours a week, his or her average hourly wage will be lower than someone who works an average of 37 hours a week. This means that the person's hours are worth less and it can have an impact on those who work on and register hours on projects. TLA wants the academic staff to register their actual working hours, but they can easily find themselves in a dilemma.

SLC replied that everyone must register their actual working hours in the new working time registration system. The most important thing is that the hours that are registered do not conflict with the registrations that are made elsewhere, e.g. on projects.

PMJ asked questions about the definition of working time and foresaw possible challenges in assessing what is working time and what is rest time. PMJ asked how this is being clarified.

CSJ replied that certain questions are answered in the FAQs that become available on the website. The FAQs do not provide answers to everything and there are grey areas that are not clearly defined in relation to EU's interpretation of what is working time and what is rest time. There are few judgements from the Court of Justice of The European Union in this area. This requires a dialogue at the university and with the individual about what is considered working time if there are no concrete or general answers to this from e.g. MEDST or from elsewhere. There may also be a difference in the tasks staff members are expected to solve, and thus there may be a difference in whether something should be registered as working time or not.

LIBS added that there is nothing new under the sun. There are no working time rules that have changed with the new requirement for working time registration. The registration of working hours is only about making working hours visible.

FH adds that it is correct that it is the same working time rules that must be complied with. FH also finds that it is a correct decision that AAU maintains that everyone must register working hours. FH thinks that the rules are generally reasonably clear. There is a single sentence under the delimitation, where it appears that it is only possible to measure whether the rules on maximum weekly working hours (the 48-hour rule) have been complied with, which creates some confusion as the 11-hour rule is not mentioned. If an staff member works many hours, the 11-hour rule will also automatically be exceeded.

CSJ clarified that the reason for the wording is that The Ministry of Employment has stated that there is no requirement that arrival/leaving time must be registered, but that it is only a requirement that it is the total daily working hours that are registered. If you do not register arrival and leaving times, it is not possible to measure precisely whether the 11-hour rule is observed. In addition, it is also crucial in the assessment of whether the 11-hour rule has been complied with, whether you have worked from home or not, etc. Therefore, the text is worded as it is. However, CSJ points out that this does not change the fact that the 11-hour rule still applies. The formulation is simply about whether the 11-hour rule can be measured in the system.

LBT asked about the staff members duty to ensure that the working time registration is updated once a month and how it is enforced. LIBS replied that there is no administrative follow-up on whether staff members register their working hours or not. The staff members must ensure this themselves. Otherwise, it is a common management task to ensure that staff members register their working hours.

JLC asked whether union representatives get insight into the staff members working time registration. HML replied that the union representatives do not. At present, the management does not have access to see the staff members working time registrations, but there is being working on a solution that will be implemented later, where the management gets access to see the staff members total daily working hours, but not comments, etc. This requires a systemic set-up that is not in place on 1 July, when the rules come into force. Until

then, the personnel management will only receive an email notification when the staff members working hours exceed 48 hours on average, seen over a period of four weeks.

SLC added that in connection with the implementation, it has been about AAU having a system that is compliant and that does not conflict with other systems. An opportunity may also arise later on whether it makes more sense to use a different system. The working time registration will help to identify challenges that have not previously been shed light on to the same extent, but the starting point is that it must not change the way we work today or the freedom that the individual staff member has. We need to think about working hours, in the same way as we have always done.

In conclusion, SLC pointed out that some at the university would be exempted because they are self-organizers. However, it is an individual decision and requires a justification and that the conditions are met. In addition, an announcement from MEDST is awaited and it is unclear when this will come.

FH asked that it could be considered whether it is possible to involve the union representatives in the exemption discussions. FH then asked about the budget for the project and the system and why the universities have not found a common solution.

LIBS replied that many universities use the same solution, but that some universities also already had systems that could support working time registration. In addition, some universities have chosen to use Excel sheets.

HML added that approximately DKK 600,000 has been allocated in the budget for the establishment phase and that DKK 360,000 has been set aside in the budget for annual operating expenses, where the majority of these expenses go to licenses. These are the fixed expenses. In addition, an amount is set aside for additional configurations if needed.

Follow-up:

The working group has taken note of the HSU's comments. The Executive Board must approve the rules on 24 June.

Re item 8: Amendment of rules for recruitment and employment of academic staff

Appendix 8.1 AAU Rules for the Appointment of Academic Staff

Appendix 8.2 Reasons for substantive changes

Appendix 8.3 Proposal to change the composition of assessment committees and appointment of experts

Appendix 8.4 Composition of appointment committees for positions such as head of department and academic staff

Recommendation: HSU discusses the rules for the recruitment and employment of academic staff and submits consultation responses at the meeting.

PMJ began by explaining that the changes to the rules are based on a desire for a faster and more flexible recruitment process. The time from advertising to employment must be shorter. PMJ added that there have been challenges with the recruitment process at AAU being too long, and this affects AAU's opportunities to compete for the best candidates.

DH introduced the proposals for the changes to AAU's rules for recruitment and employment of academic staff and then asked the Main Joint Consultation Committees (HSU) for their comments.



FH reviewed some comments that he had received. In relation to shortlisting, it was questioned whether the changes had been made from a management perspective. There is very little in the processes that ensures participation and transparency. FH added that it is only possible to involve the appointment committee to a very limited extent, and that it may have the risk that it can eliminate talented applicants already in connection with shortlisting. FH then mentioned whether the possibility of the department councils being able to appoint members to the appointment committee had been considered - e.g. a deputy chairperson who can participate in the appointment committee. Finally, FH mentioned a proposal that the entire appointment committee could have access to all applications.

TLA found it positive that they wanted to reduce the requirements for assessment committees to the minimum requirement in the legislation, so that it burdens as few academic staff as possible. TLA are opposed to search committees. TLA considered that some of the proposed deadlines are too short. For example, the deadlines for shortlisting. TLA does not believe the deadlines are realistic.

LIBS commented that the idea was that the HR Department should be involved much more quickly and help organize the process so that you know the process well in advance. This makes it possible for members of the assessment committee etc. to be organized in advance. LIBS added that there is currently far too much back-flow, and that is where time is lost in the process. If this is not changed, the processes will not be faster. It was then clarified that search committees are handled in an independent process and are therefore not part of the consultation response today.

JLC commented that it is important to get both search committees, assessment and hiring committees to function in practice. TLA added that the requirements for gender distribution in the committees are difficult to comply with in the small academic environments, where there may only be one of one gender who cannot handle the task alone and participate in all employments. This can result in some people joining who do not have the professional qualifications.

RA noted that it is possible to make exceptions to the rule that the chairperson is internal if, for example, it is not possible to find one within the academic environments or there is too much work pressure on individual staff member.

PMJ noted that it is generally about speeding up processes. PMJ has seen chairmen of assessment committees wait for months for the assessments instead of writing a draft themselves and sending it for comment. PMJ pointed out that one of the most important tasks at the university is to help ensure that the right staff members are recruited and hired. It gets far too little attention. PMJ found it crucial that AAU improves its competitiveness in the recruitment process.

LBT asked that it be clarified in the rules whether the deadlines are counted as days or weekdays.

Follow-up:

HSU's comments are included as consultation responses to the Executive Board.

Re item 9: Optionally

No comments