

Meeting the 20th March 2024, at 8.00-8.45 o'clock.

Extra ordinary Local Liaison Committee meeting (LSU)

Department of Biomedicine

Meeting room: 1115-151B

Participants: Thomas G. Jensen; Morten Schallburg Nielsen; Thomas Juhl Corydon; Sâmia Joca; Rikke Nielsen; Marie Louise Næstholt Dahl; Agnete Larsen; Esben Thorup Boel; Gitte Fynbo Biller; Ulla Vosegaard Als; Vivien Schack; Per Qvist

Cancellations from participants:

Bettina Winther Grumsen; Hanne Bjerregaard Møller; Bertha P. Beck Mortensen; Jani Kær;

Guest: Deputy Head of Department for Research Søren Riis Paludan

Minute taker: HR Partner, Pia Lind Lunau Kristensen

1. Forskningsevaluering/Research Evaluation - by Head of Department and Deputy Head of Department for Research

Head of Department informed that the chair of the external panel has requested further material (approx. one page from each research group) for the self-evaluation report and the background for this, prior to the panel's visit 24-25 June.

This is a change since the committee meeting of 8th March.

Head of Department informed that the research evaluation is a new activity at our Faculty. Each department must prepare a self-evaluation report based on a template inspired from KU.

Since the committee meeting 8th March, Head of Department, Deputy Head of Department for Research and secretariat manager have had a meeting with chair of the panel, Kristian Helin. At that meeting Kristian asked for more material about the research groups.

Head of Department informed on that basis his plan is to involve the research theme coordinators to help preparing the material which will be an appendix to the report.

Head of Department insured that the evaluation will not be at a group level – it is an evaluation of Biomedicine as department. And Kristian Helin has the same opinion.

Deputy Head of Department for Research added that the department hope to get advice from the panel, advice for further improving and therefore not an evaluation of individuals or even of groups.

Head of Department added that there will be a template to fill out for the research groups.

Employee side stated that the research evaluation has been a top-down process and as employee/researcher you have not so far been given the opportunity to view the report, nor knowledge of the persons in the panel – only the chair name has been mentioned. Now the management team has announced that more material needs to be prepared and from an employee/researcher's perception it will be possible to evaluate on individual basis regarding funding, research and resources. The question is whether the management team could tell the panel more precisely what they want advice or evaluation of. The employee side do not doubt the good will from the management team, but there are concerns. The employee side want to discuss with the management team, what do you want the researchers at the department to show and what do you want the panel to evaluate.

Head of Department informed that the evaluation is a new activity. Rector and the deans have communicated about the evaluation more specifically the purpose as well as Head of Department has communicated of the evaluation at house meetings. The purpose of the activity is to become even better – we always can.

Head of Department noted that he will be more specific in his communication of the evaluation process and will take this into consideration when he sends out the next newsletter.

Head of Department cannot currently answer regarding the outcome – we will learn on basis of the panel's visit in June.

The further process is to finalize the report, including the SWOT-analysis, having the visit in June and afterwards the Department can evaluate the process and the input given by the panel.

The reason why only the chair is mentioned is that is relatively new that all panel members gave accept to be member of the panel.

Deputy Head of Department for Research added that what he hears is that the employee side have a feeling that the management team says one thing about the evaluation but do another. There is no hidden agenda, what the panels needs is a lot of information to give their advice of further development and performance. From Deputy Head of Department for Research's perspective there is no reason for being afraid of the self-evaluation report – it is an evaluation of the department.

The employee side acknowledged the intention, but it does not change the fact that the process has changed rapidly and therefore requires that the management team communicate clearly of the expected outcome, the intention and so it does not create fear. The employee side argued that the process should include the questions the department wants to get answered and get advice within - it could be “are we organized the best way” “is there synergy in the way we work and use each other” etc. The department could ask the panel specific questions within topics we would like to learn more about. The employee side added that the information the management team currently plan to ask for, the management team must expect create fear at the individual level.

Head of Department informed that the process is coordinated at all departments at our faculty.

Head of Department has listened to the good suggestions and will try to include viewpoints in the further work.

The research theme coordinator added that what we want to show is that the department is diverse and contribute in many ways.

Head of Department added that when the panel visit the department it is expected that the panel should meet each research team – it would be important for the panel to meet the people behind the report and the department is nothing else than the people.

The employee side asked the management team what kind of information the panel should have. The employee side wondered why the panel need names and specific publications.

Deputy Head of Department informed that it would be helpful for the panel to have the extra information in the appendices. What the chair asks for is mostly information already in PURE / homepage – if the management team should make an extract from these sources, it would be a huge task and therefore the research themes are involved to prepare the appendices and to show this is Biomedicine, this is us, and with data provided by ourselves. It is an opportunity for the research themes themselves to point out what they want to show.

The employee side maintained that the information of names and publications could be perceived by the employees as an individual evaluation of the employees.

Deputy Head of Department for Research agreed that more specific questions to the panel can be formulated including what we want the panel to evaluate or give advice on. This is a specific wish and suggestion, which the management team can take with from this meeting. Deputy Head of Department for Research stated that from his perspective it is unrealistic to show the department without showing the people at the department.

The employee side encouraged to communicate clearly about what the department wants to get out of the self-evaluation and not at least the panel's visit. The employee side stated that all work at the department is done for the sake of the department and to fulfil the strategy – the way to fulfil can be different for the individual groups.

Head of Department stated that freedom of research is very much respected and thus the way the individual contributes to the whole picture. Each researcher decides his or her own way of conducting research.

The employee side encouraged to have another liaison committee meeting, where the report is presented as well as to follow-up with a meeting for all employees where the whole process and plan for the panel's visit is presented.

Head of Department accepted that the liaison committee can meet again, when the report is ready to be presented. Whether is possible to have a staff meeting or we need to communicate in some other way, the management team will consider.

Head of Department thanked for the meeting and the input to the report, the further process and communication.