

Minutes of Departmental Forum Meeting, 05.09.2014

Participants: Allan Würtz, Lars Relund Nielsen, Stefan Hirth, Rainer Lueg, Finn Schøler, Philipp Schröder (substitute for Valdemar Smith), Malene Thygesen, Morten Kræggpøth, Martin Duus, Joachim Mikkelsen, Karin Vinding, Anders Grosen (invited listener), Charlotte Christiansen (invited listener)

Apologies received from: Valdemar Smith, Sofie Theilade Nygaard Brodersen, Sune Lauth Gadegaard, Bibiana Paluszewska, Maren Grønås Birkeland, Mette Hyldetoft Jensen

Moderator: Lars Relund Nielsen. Notetaker: Margit Sommer

1. Approval of the agenda

Approved

2. Approval of minutes from last meeting

Approved

3. Study environment

One of the main themes in the annual work wheel of the Departmental Forum

Last week, the report on the study environment at AU was published. It contains a subdivision of the answers in study programs

Purpose of discussion:

- Status on the study environment
- Areas that can be improved relatively easily
- Areas to emphasize on a long hold effort to improve

Joachim Mikkelsen: Students want more possibility to have feedback on their performance during the semester.

Martin Duus: It you have tutorials in class, you need no more feedback.

Charlotte Christiansen: At Political Science students can sign up for a 10 minutes talk with the teacher after the end of the exams of a large compulsory course. This solution is extremely expensive.

Allan: How closely related do students feel to the academic environment at the department? Joachim: hard question to answer

Allan: Physical environment?

Martin: no problems, but students have difficulties in finding out where to go for solutions of their problems after the movement to Fuglesangs Allé. Gives much stress that they cannot find the teachers.

Joachim: high noise level (and bad acoustics) in the S-building when you need a place to concentrate on group work. Blackboard causes stress to the students who were accustomed to Campusnet. Blackboard sends too many notifications to smartphones. According to Charlotte this will be turned off.

In the report three reasons for stress are mentioned: work load, competition between students, financial problems (find time to study and have a job)

4. Discussion of the report Problem Analysis follow-up: Proposed solutions

Purpose: Based on the report "Problem Analysis follow-up: Proposed solutions" written by the senior management of the university

- Discuss if there are areas the report does not adequately address
- Decide whether to send a response from the Departmental Forum to the consultation process, and in case of yes, what the response should be.

Note, the part in the report regarding the organizational structure of the faculties and the profiling of the business study programs are subject to its own extended process, see next point on the agenda.

Schedule:

15 August to 19 September 2014: Consultation process at the university

18 September 2014: Board meeting with a general briefing of the current process

24 September and 1 October 2014: The consultation responses received to be discussed in the senior management team

5 November: Board meeting with final briefing and possible board decisions

Comments:

Karin: positive in the report that it is obvious that lecturers, students and department administrative staff need a more transparent and simple administrative structure

Rainer Lueg: proposes a grass root group composed by experienced employees who should make a suggestion of how the department should be organized. The other employees should vote whether they agree on their proposal.

Budget: Allan: the funds are allocated to the departments who can decide how they will spend the money.

Lars Relund will make a report and send it to the Departmental Forum members who are free to agree or object to his proposal.

5. Process at the ECON department

The Head of Department presented the department management's proposal to the process:

The management team has made a proposal for a process to answer two issues raised in the report “Problem Analysis follow-up: Proposed solutions” written by the senior management of the university. The two issues are:

- i) (p. 8) A review of the structure of the departments at all faculties be carried out in order to ensure that the organisation of the departments provides appropriate support for academic disciplines and for cooperation.
- ii) (p. 9) The review must therefore assess the extent to which structural changes are necessary out of consideration for the business degree programmes and whether they are profiled appropriately.

Purpose: Discuss the proposal for the process

The aim of the process is to provide a written report for the Faculty Management. The Faculty Management has to make a proposal for the Senior Management and the Board of the University. The Faculty Management uses the ECON report as input for their process.

Suggested process

A report group manages the process and writes the report.

Members: Vice chairman of the Departmental Forum, Vice chairman of the Local Cooperation Committee, the two coordinators of the study programs (Anders Grosen, Charlotte Christiansen), Heads of strategy, Head of secretariat, Head of Department.

The three stages are:

Stage 1: Selecting the important topics with focus groups interviews

- Discussion in teaching groups, NCRR, TAP group, PhD groups
- Representatives from the groups above meet with report group in focus group interviews

Outcome:

- Summaries of focus group interviews in the report
- Input for next stage

Stage 2: Survey

Construct a survey with both quantitative and qualitative questions

Conduct the survey

Outcome: The result of the survey is included in the report, including all comments

Stage 3: Hearing of report

Write preliminary report based on survey and focus group interviews

Send report in hearing

Include responses from hearing in report. In particular, the Local Cooperation Committee and the Departmental Forum should make a declaration of their view on the validity of the report

Outcome: Report to be sent to the Faculty Management

Schedule:

ECON (Phase 1): Stage 1: 2 weeks, Stage 2: 1 week, Stage 3: 2 weeks

Faculty (Phase 2): Collection of information and consultation with departments. Start in October.

AU: Review of issues i) and ii) must be complete by 31/12/2014. Dean sends review from BSS.

Discussion on the composition and size of the group who should write the department's response to the consultation document (for instance: should we have external members of the groups?).

Joachim: how will the students be involved? Allan W will talk to the students separately on this matter. The questions of the survey should be discussed in Departmental Forum

Department Forum decided that each section nominates one to two members. If two members are nominated, the departmental forum makes the selection who of the two will be represented. Furthermore there will be one representative of the department management and one of the TAP group. This group will make a survey and based on this they will write a report.

6. Information from VIP/TAP/PhD Students/Bachelor and Master students

None

7. Information from Management

None

8. Miscellaneous

None