



Can be freely distributed

Approved: _____

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

Case Officer:
Jonas Bech Jensen
Tel.: +45 99403889 0227
Email: jbj@adm.aau.dk

Date: #10-06-2022
Case No.: 2022-232-00181

Summary of the meeting of the Main Cooperation Committee (HSU) on 10 June 2022

Participants: Per Michael Johansen (PMJ), Anne Marie Kanstrup (AMK), Henrik Pedersen (HP), Mogens Rysolt Poulsen (MRP), Rasmus Antoft (RA), Lars Hvilsted Rasmussen (LHR), Lis Carlsen (LC), Frederik Hertel (FH), Louiza Bohn Thomsen (LBT), Thomas Lykke Andersen (TLA), Lars Bo Larsen (LBL) and Palle Steen Hansen (PSH).

Unable to attend Søren Lind Christiansen, Jesper Lindgaard Christensen, Meg Duroux, Klaus Kjær and Henrik H. Søndergaard.

Other participants: Jonas Bech Jensen (JBJ) ref. and Helle Thomsen (HT) under point 1.

Point 1: Year of closures in connection with the relocation plan and ceilings on the affected programmes

/ Helle Thomsen

Appendix 1.1 Presentation, ceilings and years of relocation and reduction

Appendix 1.2 Overall overview of the dates for closure and relocation of study programmes as well as ceilings for admissions at faculty level in 2023-2030

Appendix 1.3 Faculties' process and communication plans

It is recommended that Main Joint Consultation Committee (HSU) discusses proposed closure dates, proposed ceilings for admissions in the period 2023-2030 and the planned process for faculty involvement.

PMJ initially thanked the staff side for the feedback regarding the institutional plan process. He then emphasized that the task is based on a political agreement that has been given the task of implementing, which has been both undesirable, complicated and impossible to solve without major consequences for the organization. This creates uncertainty among staff members as well as students. After today's discussions, he hopes that this uncertainty can be overcome.

PMJ informed that in connection with the process, all departments have been involved, where they have had the opportunity to provide input, which has been taken further. It is acknowledged that the plan has led to uncertainty, which is why a broad and involving plan has also been drawn up that takes this into account in the process. It takes a lot of effort to retain both staff and students, with particular attention being paid to maintaining the quality of our study programmes. The relocation plan's decisions have been made on the basis of an overall assessment, as they want to secure the supply of education in Copenhagen while at the same time not weakening the main campus Aalborg. By specialising the programmes that are unique or in high demand in Copenhagen, they are future-proofed with a streamlined identity and strategic direction for the university. This does not mean that the affected programmes are being downgraded, and RA is, among other things, in the process of finding out how the plan interacts with Campus Aalborg's SSH programmes. As PMJ reads the staff input, there are no concrete amendments to the year of closures or ceilings on admissions.



FH commented that he thinks one should try to get info from Main Joint Consultation Committee (HSU) more widely used in the organization. PMJ replied that he will take this further. FH asked if there were any further justifications in relation to the priorities that have been made in connection with the relocation plan. In addition, he believes that it can be difficult to obtain a qualified understanding of or contribute with input to the plan, due to a low degree of involvement in the decision-making process, although he thinks it is good that there will be a clarification now. RA commented that it should make sense from an operational perspective. Therefore, the programmes that are affected at the earliest in the process will be approached first. After the summer holidays, the departments will continue their staff meetings to discuss what can be offered and how to proceed.

LBL commented that there are no specific amendments, but there is clear frustration that one has not had sufficient insight into the decision-making basis behind the plan. It is felt that there is no intermediate calculation behind the decisions, which should form the basis for being able to enter into a dialogue on the concrete content of the plan. AMK replied that the decisions were based on a number of criteria that had to be pitted against each other, even when they had been contradictory. These criteria are known and are described in the appendix, so there are no hidden figures on which the decisions are based. LBL commented that one should be able to unfold the background for the specific choices further. PMJ replied that everything has been reviewed, even programmes that have not been mentioned in the plan and sector considerations with many different actors. The great level of detail would be difficult to get down to in writing, and one might even ask whether it would create additional value.

AMK asked, since a large part of the process takes place in the local environments, if there are any questions about that part of the plan. RA commented what will happen in connection with staff meetings at SSH previously has been announced, but in addition, it will be approach it by working with projections up to 2030, so that, among other things, you can plan staff composition in the longer term. LHR commented that he supports the rector and prorector's statement on the underlying criteria. It is the managerial decision that is considered most correct when all criteria are included, where it will largely be about dialogue in a situation where one has had to make the least bad decisions. MRP commented that the priority going forward will be long-term planning, which will focus on communication plans and dialogue. HP commented that dialogue meetings have been in action for some time, in which uncertainties and inquiries are continually followed up. It is, of course, positive that you are committed to your education, which you should be aware of can be expressed in the form of uncertainty and frustration.

LBL commented that he believes the gap between management and the staff representative has arisen because there are two different places in the process where staff members are still understanding and accepting the situation. He also describes how it is perceived that trust in senior management is challenged, which should be taken into account. PMJ replied that he takes this very seriously and that the involvement plan can hopefully help dispel this perception, but he will take it further. FH commented that he agrees with LBL and believes that a higher level of trust should be worked on going forward. The communication simply needs to take place in a sensible and understandable way, so that it becomes easier to understand management's decisions. Good communication has the potential to strengthen both cohesion and trust at the university.

PMJ concluded by commenting that this was a good conclusion to today's discussions. We must help each other and have the best basis for decision-making where possible. Since there were no other comments on the plan, the next phase is proceeded with, to which the staff members' input is taken into account in the process.