Akademisk råd (Akademisk Råd møde 04/24)

19-06-2024 13:00 - 15:30

03.1-s21 - Auditorie B

Mødedeltagere : Mødedeltagere
Akademisk Råd
Rektor, formand Hanne Leth Andersen

VIP institutmandater
Lektor, Mark Ørsten (IKH)
Professor, Jan Pries-Heje (IMT)
Professor, Louise Torp Dalgaard (INM)
Professor, Peter Triantafillou (ISE)

VIP tværgående/frie mandater
Lektor, Lise Lotte Hansen
Lektor, Sidsel Lond Grosen
Lektor, Kirsten Hvenegård-Lassen
Lektor, Tomas Ellegaard
Professor, Lars Fuglsang
Professor (MSO), Jesper Schmidt-Hansen

Studenterrepræsentanter
Næstformand Amir Bahloul (SR)
Sofie Amalie Bendix Munch (SR)
Gloria Mazzetta (SR)
Andreas Høecke Nielsen (SR)
Gustav Gaardbo (SR)
Alicie Nielsen (SR)

Observatører
Morten Vest Hansen (TAP)
Dorthe Johnson (TAP)
Michael Brodthagen (TAP)

Sekretær
Asbjørn Busk Jørgensen

Ekstra deltagere

Indhold

Hele mødet:
Vicedirektør for Kommunikation og Rektorsekretariat (KR) Elisabeth Hvas

Punkt 2:
Vicedirektør Trine Højbjerg Sand (US)

Punkt 3:
Regnskabschef Line Kjær Enevoldsen (ØC)

Punkt 4:
Vicedirektør René Niehues Birch og specialkonsulent Mette Schønnemann Jensen (ØC)

Punkt 5:
Teamleder Allan Grønbæk (KR)

Punkt 7:
Chefkonsulent Astrid Riese (KR)

Punkt 8:
Teamleder Rikke Anne Nielsen og specialkonsulent Asbjørn Busk Jørgensen (KR)

Punkt 1: Godkendelse af dagsorden (13.00-13.05)

Godkendelse af dagsorden

Mundtlig orientering om status på universitetsreformen

Indstilling
Det indstilles, at Akademisk Råd:

- Orienteres om status på universitetsreformen

Sagsfremstilling
Som sædvanligt vil rektor på Akademisk Råds møde give en mundtlig orientering om status på universitetsreformen og arbejdet med denne.

Den mundtlige orientering på mødet d. 19. juni vil som udgangspunkt omhandle følgende:

- Arbejdet i Kandidatudvalget
- Offentliggørelsen af Kandidatudvalgets delafrapportering
- Sektordimensionering af bacheloruddannelserne
- Strategisk satsning på videre- og efteruddannelse

Da arbejdet i Kandidatudvalget forsat er underlagt fortrolighed vil rektor orientere så vidt muligt om ovenstående temaer. Derudover arbejdes der på nuværende tidspunkt med at tilrettelægge en intern proces for inddragelse af råd og udvalg, så disse inddrages i arbejdet, så snart dette kan lade sig gøre jf. fortroligheden.

Der er blevet efterspurgt en konkret drøftelse af VEU-området i regi af reformen, men grundet fortroligheden og de forsat mange uafklarede elementer vurderes det, at en drøftelse af dette først vil være relevant tidligst til mødet i november, hvor Kandidatudvalgets endelige rapportering forventeligt er offentliggjort.

Forelæggelsen er godkendt af
Chef for Policy & Analyse Amalie Gatzwiller
Vicedirektør for Uddannelse & Studerende Trine Højbjerg Sand
Rektor Hanne Leth Andersen

Kapitalforvaltning på Roskilde Universitet

Indstilling

Det indstilles, at Akademisk Råd

- Orienteres om håndtering af kapitalforvaltning på Roskilde Universitet i relation til Israel og Gaza-konflikten.

Sagsfremstilling

Roskilde Universitet har gennem de seneste par måneder modtaget aktindsigtsanmodninger der relaterer sig til universitetets investeringer i relation til Israel og Gaza-konflikten. Aktindsigtsanmodninger er primært modtaget fra eksterne (journalister) med interesse i at afdække om Roskilde Universitet har investeringer i de pågældende områder.

RUC Regnskab har udarbejdet nedenstående besvarelser af de spørgsmål, der ofte går igen når der spørges til universitetets investeringer.

- **Aftalen med kapitalforvalteren, hvad er den?**
  Roskilde Universitets kapitalforvaltningsaftaler følger universitetets finansielle strategi, som indeholder en fastlagt investeringsramme og etiske retningslinjer. Den finansielle strategi er godkendt af universitetets bestyrelse.

- **Hvad er vores politik? Har vi noget i Israel.**
  Investeringspolitikken følger den finansielle strategi. Den fastlagte investeringsramme for Roskilde Universitets kapitalforvaltere tillader ikke investeringer i enkeltaktier. Pt. er Roskilde Universitets investeringer udelukkende placeret i danske realkreditobligationer, som er bekræftet af universitetets kapitalforvaltere pr. 22. maj 2024. Der derfor ingen aktuelle investeringer relateret til Israel.

- **En opdatering på hvem er vores kapitalforvalter og hvad er politikken.**
  Politikken for kapitalforvaltere er også beskrevet i den finansielle strategi, hvoraf det fremgår at Roskilde Universitet kan anvende et eller flere pengeinstitutter til handel med værdipapirer.
  For den del af likviditeten, som er anbragt i værdipapirer, foretages forvaltning gennem eksterne kapitalforvaltere, som er Danske Bank og Jyske bank. Kapitalforvaltere kan investere efter den investeringsramme, som er fastlagt i kapitalforvaltningsaftalen med Roskilde Universitet. Roskilde Universitet har bestyrelsesgodkendte retningslinjer for investeringsrammen, hvor de finansielle risici og etiske standarder fastlægges, og universitetet har fokus på en lav risikoprofil og efterlevelse af høje etiske standarder.

- **Hvordan forvaltes det – en orientering om det.**
  Investeringernes samlede værdi udgør pr. ultimo april 123 mio.kr.

Indstillingen er godkendt af

Vicedirektør René Niehues Birch og universitetsdirektør Henrik Zobbe

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET

Økonomi og Campus juni 2024

Indstilling til nedlæggelse af ØU

Indstilling

Det indstilles, at Akademisk Råd

- Godkender nedlæggelse af Økonomisk Udvalg som selvstændig enhed og at det faglige indhold fremadrettet håndteres i AR.

Sagsfremstilling

Indstillingen skal ses i sammenhæng med en overordnet proces med at optimere og reducere tidsforbrug på mødeaktivitet i de samlede ledelsesmæssige og kollegiale processer. RUC's ledelse mener, at der er et potentiale uden at det går ud over relevant involvering i beslutningsprocesserne.

Økonomisk Udvalg under Akademisk Råd består ud over rektor af universitetsdirektør, 2 VIP-repræsentanter, 2 studenterrepræsentanter samt 1 TAP-observatør. De understøttes typisk af medarbejdere fra Budget og Analyse fra Økonomi og Campus.

Det er rektoratets oplevelse, at der forekommer en dobbelt behandling, idet både Økonomisk Udvalg og Akademisk Råd involverer sig ligeværdigt i behandlingen af de økonomiske oplæg.

På baggrund af dette indstiller vi at Økonomisk Udvalg nedlægges.

Høring

ØU har kommenteret på indstillingen, hvor de viser forståelse for behovet for en skarpere governance-struktur, men alligevel ikke kan støtte forslaget om at nedlægge udvalget. ØU mener, at udvalget giver bedre mulighed for direkte dialog mellem de ansattes repræsentanter og ledelsen samt administrationen, som udarbejder budgettet rent teknisk. ØU bemærker også, at udvalget giver mulighed for at komme mere i dybden med forskellige aspekter af budgettet, så de bedre kan give inputs til ledelsen og i regi af AR.

Indstillingen er godkendt af

Vicedirektør René Niehues Birch og rektor Hanne Leth Andersen.

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET | **Cover**
KR-ES | 16-05-2024

Indstilling om nedlæggelse af Udvalg for Eksterne Samarbejder

Indstilling
Det indstilles, at Akademisk Råd:
- Godkender nedlæggelse af Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder

Baggrund
UL tiltrådte i september 2016 indstilling om at etablere Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder på baggrunden af et ønske om at justere og yderligere udbygge indsatsen for at fremme et hensigtsmæssigt og værdiskabende samarbejde mellem RUC og omverdenen. I 2018 blev udvalget yderligere formaliseret og fik et kommissorium, som præciserer, 'at udvalget har til opgave at være forbindelsesled mellem uddannelses- og forskningsmiljøerne og RUC som helhed om eksterne samarbejder. Udvalget skal kanalisere viden og rådgive om samarbejde mellem RUC og omverdenen med henblik på at fremme eksternt samarbejde og understøtte iværksætteri, lige som udvalget skal skabe debat om emner relateret til eksterne samarbejder. Udvalget skal diskutere sager relateret til eksterne samarbejder af overordnet og strategisk betydning for universitetets drift og udvikling og foreslå strategiske indsatser' (se bilag 1). Kommunikation og Rektorsekretariat (KR) har betjent udvalget.

Sagsfremstilling
Udvalget har ikke afholdt møder siden 2019 da større sager vedr. eksterne samarbejder de seneste år er blevet drøftet i relevante ledelsesfora og AR (fx IRIS-rapporten og uddannelsespartnerskaber med regionale aktører. Der er desuden etableret faste retningslinjer for samarbejdet mellem institutsekretariaterne og RUC Eksterne samarbejder som administrativt understøtter arbejdet med regionale aktører såsom virksomheder, offentlige aktører og interesseorganisationer. Ligeledes rådgiver enheden om forskningsbaseret innovation og studenteriværksætteri. Det foreslås, at det også fremadrettet vil være disse fora, der behandler og drøfter sådanne større strategiske sager om eksterne samarbejder.

Forelæggelsen er godkendt af
Vicedirektør Elisabeth Hvas og rektor Hanne Leth Andersen.

Bilag

1. Kommissorium for Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET

Rektoratet

3. maj 2018

Kommissorium for Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder

§ 1. Udvalgets opgaver

RUC's Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder har til opgave at være forbindelsesled mellem uddannelses- og forskningsmiljøerne og RUC som helhed om eksterne samarbejder. Udvalget skal kanalisere viden og rådgive om samarbejde mellem RUC og omverdenen med henblik på at fremme eksternt samarbejde og understøtte iværksætteri, lige som udvalget skal skabe debat om emner relateret til eksterne samarbejder. Udvalget skal diskutere sager relateret til eksterne samarbejder af overordnet og strategisk betydning for universitetets drift og udvikling og foreslå strategiske indsatser. Eksempler er:

- RUC's organisering og forankring af eksterne samarbejder
- RUC's prioriteringer inden for eksterne samarbejder i forhold til universitetets overordnede strategi og i forhold til instituttернes strategier
- Politik inden for eksterne samarbejder

§ 2. Udvalgets rolle

Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder er et rådgivende udvalg i forhold til rektorat, universitetsledelse og Akademisk Råd. Samtidig kan udvalget selv proaktivt tage relevante emner op for at skabe debat om spørgsmål relateret til eksterne samarbejde og igangsætte indsatser af særlig strategisk betydning.

§ 3. Udvalgets sammensætning

Udvalget består af 10 medlemmer og har følgende sammensætning:

- Prorektor
- 1 VIP-repræsentanter pr. institut udpeget af institutleder
- 1 VIP udpeget af AR
- 1 studentermedlem udpeget af AR
- 2 TAP fra KR udpeget af Kommunikations- og sekretariatschef
- 1 TAP fra US udpeget af Uddannelseschefen

Prorektor er formand for udvalget og udvalget sekretariatsbetjenes af Kommunikation og Rektorsekretariat.

§ 4. Udpegning og periode

Udvalg for eksterne samarbejder er et rådgivende udvalg. Udvalgets medlemmer udpeges af instituttерne, chefer og AR, jf. § 3, for en periode af 2 år.

§ 5. Forretningsgang

Udvalget mødes 6 gange om året, hvoraf mindst ét møde er et heldagsseminar.
Ved starten af perioden udarbejder udvalget en handlingsplan, som suppleres med planer for de enkelte år.

Udvalget vedtager i øvrigt selv sin forretningsorden.

Prorektor 3. maj 2018

Punkt 6: Pause (14.10-14.25)

Pause

Status på forenkling og styrkelse af governancestrukturen på RUC

Indstilling
Det indstilles, at Akademisk Råd:

- Drøfter og vurderer udvalgsstrukturens funktionalitet på RUC i lyset af de justeringer, der er foretaget og beskrevet i statusnotatet (bilag 1), jf. også vedlagte oversigt over organisering af RUC (bilag 2).
- Drøfter om kollegialitetsbegrebet er nyttigt for at tydeliggøre arbejdet i de forskellige typer af udvalg, herunder særligt i relation til rollen som medlem af Akademisk Råd.

Baggrund
I juni 2022 besluttede Administrativt Ledelsesforum (ALF) at igangsætte en proces, der dels imødekom et aktuelt fokus på prioritering af RUC's ressourcer og dels imødekom et ønske fra bestyrelsen om en forenkling af governancestrukturen på universitetet. Sagen byggede desuden på en række drøftelser og beslutninger om initiativer vedr. styrkelse af medbestemmelse og medinddragelse. ALF udarbejdede konkrete forslag til tiltag, der skal bidrage til at indfri disse ambitioner.

Overordnet er målet, at universitetets governancestruktur skal være værdiskabende og rumme en passende balance mellem effektive ledelsesfora og mulighed for medbestemmelse og medinddragelse.

Tiltagene, udarbejdet af ALF, har haft to formål. Det ene er forenkling af governance, herunder reduktion af antallet af mødefora og optimering af det samlede tidsforbrug i mødefora, fokus på mødefrekvens, færre medlemmer i de enkelte mødefora, kortere møder og fokus på måden, hvorpå organisationen arbejder, jf. også det allerede igangsatte arbejde, om styrkelse heraf med bl.a. fokus på proces, mødeledelse og sagsfremstillinger. RUC har de seneste år arbejdet med styrket kvalitetssikring af sager i universitetets ledelsesfora, herunder haft fokus på udarbejdelse af covers til sagerne med tydeliggørelse af såvel indstillinger som beslutninger i referater.

Det andet formål er at styrke medbestemmelse og medinddragelse af medarbejdere og studerende. Dette styrkes, hvis det står klarere, hvad beslutningsrummet for det enkelte udvalg i den enkelte sag er, herunder tidligere inddragelse i strategiske sager og klarhed om de enkelte udvalgs mandat, rolle, kompetencer og ansvar. Eksempelvis spørgsmålet om hvordan udvalgene har en rådgivende og medbestemmende rolle, og hvordan indstillingerne bliver tydelige ift. om der skal rådgives, orienteres eller træffes beslutning. Så et væsentligt fokus i governancedrøftelsen er tydelighed om, hvad skal drøftes, med hvilket formål og i hvilke fora. Dette skal også bidrage til at undgå dobbeltbehandling af sager.

Igangsættelsen af processen i ALF skal også ses i lyset af, at der i de senere år er sket en udvikling, hvor de lokale fora på institutterne, så som institutråd, uddannelsesudvalg og forskningsudvalg, spiller en større rolle og udfylder en vigtig del af behovet for medinddragelse. Samtidig er tværgående strategiske drøftelser på ledelsesniveau blevet styrket med etableringen af Dekanforum og Uddannelsesstrategisk

Ledelsesforum (ULF). Men der er ikke sket en justering af governancestrukturen i takt hermed. Det har medført, at mange sager drøftes i flere fora uden en tilstrækkelig tydelig sondring mellem formålene med drøftelserne. Dette er både ressourcekrævende og skaber uklarhed over, hvor beslutninger træffes.

Sagsfremstilling

Arbejdet med forenkling og styrkelse af governancestrukturen på RUC har været sat i bero fra foråret 2023 til foråret 2024 på grund af den økonomiske situation og prioriteringen af den økonomiske genopretningsplan. Der er arbejdet videre med forslag til forenkling via nedenstående udvalg. I vedlagte notat (bilag 1) er redegjort for status for hvert af dem:

- Forskningsudvalget (FOU): Kommissorium revideres
- Udvalget for Eksterne Samarbejder (UES): Forslag om nedlæggelse på dette AR-møde
- Uddannelsesudvalget (UDDU): Kommissorium revideres
- Økonomiudvalget (ØU): Forslag om nedlæggelse på dette AR-møde
- Personaleuddannelsesudvalget/PUU: Kommissorium revideres

Kollegialitet

På universitetet sameksisterer mindst tre forskellige styreformer, som interagerer med hinanden, og som det kan være nyttigt at skabe bevidsthed om, når man ønsker bedre rammer for medindflydelse og medbestemmelse. De tre styreformer er den kollegiale, den ledelsesmæssige og den administrative. Justeringen af governancestrukturen, med henblik på at forenkle strukturen og styrke medbestemmelse og medinddragelse, har betydning for interaktionen mellem de tre styreformer. Akademisk Råd spiller en central rolle i denne struktur som det centrale kollegiale organ. Kollegialitetsbegrebet går ud på, at forskere og undervisere gennem samarbejde og dialog i det kollegiale organ har indflydelse på de beslutninger, ledelsen skal træffe. Kollegialitet fremmer en demokratisk og deltagende tilgang til universitetsstyring. Det kollegiale styre lever i formelle fora som fx studienævn, hvor medlemmerne træffer faglige beslutninger, og Akademisk Råd, hvor medlemmerne formelt set rådgiver ledelsen, og som beslutningsprocesser baseret helt eller delvist på peer review og faglige skøn. Forskningsgrupper og -centre er også eksempler på kollegialt ledede enheder. Der ønskes en drøftelse i Akademisk Råd om den kollegiale styreforms rolle og udformning på RUC, herunder særligt Akademisk Råds rolle og opgave.

Videre proces

Efter drøftelse i Akademisk Råd forelægges status for Universitetsledelsen og Hovedsamarbejdsudvalget, og til sidst orienteres bestyrelsen på møde i september. Universitetsledelsen vil, som led i sin drøftelse, overveje, om der er behov for at se på en harmonisering af governancestrukturen på tværs af institutterne.

Økonomiske og administrative konsekvenser, herunder finansieringskilde

Ingen direkte økonomiske konsekvenser, men en ambition om, at en forenkling vil bidrage til et mindsket ressourceforbrug i råd og udvalg. Forenkling og tydeliggørelse af governancestrukturen vil forhåbentlig medføre en styrkelse af rummet for medbestemmelse og medinddragelse – og et styrket Akademisk Råd indholdsmæssigt ved at forenkle den samlede udvalgsstruktur og lægge et mere reelt rådgivende ansvar i Akademisk Råd som organisationens øverste kollegiale organ. Dette skal understøttes af tydeligere beslutningsrum, tydeliggørelse af de enkelte foras roller og kommissorier og tydeligere indstillinger i sagsfremstillinger. Desuden er der, i forlængelse af den første behandling af sagen ultimo 2022, indført nye tiltag bl.a. tilrettelæggelsen af drøftelser i Akademisk Råd, hvor der nu er strategiske drøftelser, uafhængigt af kadencen for sager i bestyrelsen, og fokus på, at rådet skal inddrages langt tidligere i processerne.

Kommunikation
I 2021 gennemgik RUC Administration kommissorierne for universitetets mødefora. Opgaver, ansvar og sammenhæng mellem universitetets mange råd, udvalg og mødefora blev præciseret. Dette arbejde vil blive opdateret med status for ovennævnte fem udvalg og lagt på intra.

Forelæggelsen er godkendt af
Vicedirektør Elisabeth Hvas og rektor Hanne Leth Andersen

Bilag
1. Notat: Status på proces vedr. Forskningsudvalget, Udvalget for Eksterne Samarbejder, Uddannelsesudvalget, Økonomiudvalget og Personaleuddannelsesudvalget
2. Oversigt over organiseringen af RUC’s institutter, RUC Administration og de fælles råd og udvalg, hvor organisationen mødes på tværs
3. Baggrundsartikel: “Collegiality in modern universities – the composition of governance ideals and practices” (Kerstin Sahlin og Ulla Eriksson-Zetterquist)

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET
Rektorsekretariatet/riese

Notat
3. juni 2024

Status på proces vedr. Forskningsudvalget, Udvalget for Eksterne Samarbejder, Uddannelsesudvalget, Økonomiudvalget og Personaleuddannelsesudvalget

Forskningsudvalg (kollegialt udvalg)

Forskningsudvalget har drøftet dets fremtid med baggrund i et behov for tydeliggørelse af udvalgets kobling til, på den ene side institutternes forskningsudvalg og institutråd, og på den anden side ledelsesorganer såsom Dekanforum og Universitetsledelsen. Derudover er der behov for en præcisering af udvalgets rådgivende funktion ift. både rektorat, universitetsledelse og Akademisk Råd (AR). Endelig har udvalget drøftet udpegnings- og repræsentationsprincipper.

Drøftelserne har vist, at der i medlemskredsen er bred opbakning til, at Forskningsudvalget skal videreføres som et kollegialt organ, der rådgiver AR og ledelse på forskningsområdet, og at medlemmerne samtidig fungerer som forbindelsesled mellem centrale og lokale debatter. Drøftelserne har også vist, at der er behov for at justere kommissoriet mhp. at præcisere, hvordan koblingen mellem Forskningsudvalget og lokale organer sikres. Dette fordrer dog også en mere ensartet organisering af de relevante lokale organer, f.eks. hvad angår udpegning og rolle, da en tværgående kobling i et fælles forskningsudvalg ellers er vanskelig. Der er endelig behov for en forventningsafstemning ift. indhold og rammer for Forskningsudvalgets rådgivning af AR og ledelse.

Universitetsledelsen vil i første omgang drøfte mulighederne for harmonisering af forskningsrelaterede organer på institutterne, og hvad dette fordrer ift. justeringer af et fælles Forskningsudvalg. I forlængelse heraf vil der også være behov for en præcisering af udpegningsprincipper for forskningsudvalget og medlemmernes forpligtelse til at fungere som forbindelsesled mellem institut og RUC's forskningsudvalg.

Udvalg for Eksterne Samarbejder (en slags permanent styregruppe)

Udvalg for Eksterne Samarbejder blev etableret i 2016 på baggrund af et ønske om at justere og yderligere udbygge indsatsen for at fremme et hensigtsmæssigt og værdiskabende samarbejde mellem RUC og omverdenen. Udvalget har haft til opgave at være forbindelsesled mellem uddannelses- og forskningsmiljøerne og RUC som helhed om eksterne samarbejder.

Udvalget har ikke afholdt møder siden 2019, da større sager vedr. eksterne samarbejder de seneste år er blevet drøftet i relevante ledelsesfora og AR (fx IRIS-rapporten og uddannelsespartnerskaber med regionale aktører. Der er desuden etableret faste retningslinjer for samarbejdet mellem institutsekretariaterne og RUC Eksterne samarbejder som administrativt understøtter arbejdet med regionale aktører såsom virksomheder, offentlige aktører og interesseorganisationer. Ligeledes rådgiver enheden om forskningsbaseret innovation og studenteriværksætteri. Det foreslås, at det også fremadrettet vil være disse fora, der behandler og drøfter sådanne større strategiske sager om eksterne samarbejder.

Uddannelsesudvalg/UDDU (kollegialt udvalg og underudvalg til AR)

I første omgang blev det forslået, at Uddannelsesudvalget blev udfaset og nedlagt. Dette skyldes bl.a., at der i arbejdet med et nyt kommissorium for UDDU blev identificeret en række uhensigtsmæssigheder ved UDDU's format og rolle ind i governancestrukturen. En proces er nu i gang hvor UDDU revideres og en arbejdsgruppe er nedsat i regi af Uddannelse & Studerende. I efteråret 2023 besluttede AR at bevare UDDU og nedsatte en arbejdsgruppe, der havde til formål at komme med et oplæg til formålet med UDDU samt den fremtidige brug af udvalget. Arbejdsgruppens oplæg blev drøftet på det efterfølgende AR-møde, hvor det blev drøftet, at der skal arbejdes videre med at beskrive UDDU som udvalg og revidere udvalgets forretningsorden. På den baggrund igangsatte UDDU i januar 2024 en proces for en ny model for UDDU, der blev præsenteret i marts for UDDU og efterfølgende for AR. Arbejdet med at revidere forretningsorden er for nuværende forsat i gang og forventes afsluttet ved udgangen af 2024.

Økonomiudvalg/ØU (kollegialt udvalg og underudvalg til AR)
Rektoratet indstiller på indeværende møde, at AR nedlægger Økonomiudvalget som selvstændig enhed, og at det faglige indhold fremadrettet håndteres i AR. RUC's ledelse vurderer, at der er potentiale for at bidrage til at leve op til formålene med den overordnede proces for forenkling og styrkelse af RUC's governancestruktur, uden at det går ud over relevant inddragelse i beslutningsprocesserne. Økonomiudvalget under AR består ud over rektor af universitetsdirektør, 2 VIP-repræsentanter, 2 studenterrepræsentanter samt 1 TAP-observatør. Møderne understøttes af medarbejdere fra Budget og Analyse fra Økonomi og Campus. Det er rektoratets oplevelse, at der forekommer en dobbeltbehandling, idet både Økonomiudvalget og AR involverer sig ligeværdigt i behandlingen af oplæg vedr. universitetets økonomi.

Personaleuddannelsesudvalg/PUU (samarbejdsudvalg under HSU)
Der er en proces i gang i regi af HSU. Det forventes, at kommissoriet ændres, herunder mødeantallet. Personaleuddannelsesudvalget (PUU) har siden efteråret 2023 arbejdet med at decentralisere den generelle kompetenceudvikling for VIP og TAP til institutter og RUC Administration/afdelinger. HSU har på sit møde i marts 2024 besluttet den fremtidige struktur for kompetenceudvikling på RUC. Begrundelserne for at decentralisere kompetenceudviklingen er bl.a. at imødekomme ønsket om en styrkelse og forenkling af governancestrukturen, understøtte en mere strategisk og systematisk tilgang til kompetenceudvikling samt forankre beslutningerne om kompetenceudvikling i det nærmeste ledelsesregi, så ansvar, prioriteringer og beslutninger følges ad. Det betyder, at PUU's formål og sammensætning ændres pr. 1. august 2024, og at den individuelle kompetenceudvikling af RUC's medarbejdere fremadrettet lægges i de enkelte enheder, hvor den individuelle tildeling af midler aftales mellem leder og medarbejder. Der fastholdes en mindre andel af midler i HR til tværgående strategiske indsatser på universitetet.
PUU fastholdes som et underudvalg til HSU, da der i henhold til samarbejdsaftalen skal etableres et kompetenceudviklings-/efteruddannelsesudvalg under samarbejdsudvalget, hvis en af de lokale parter fremsætter ønske herom, og vil fremover have til opgave at rammesætte kompetenceudvikling på det strategiske niveau. Dette skal ske bl.a. ved udarbejdelse af en kompetenceudviklingspolitik for TAP og for ledelsen (der er allerede udarbejdet en for VIP), og ved at følge udviklingen gennem afrapportering fra lokaludvalgene og på denne baggrund indstille forslag om tværgående kompetenceudviklingstiltag og aktiviteter. Mødeaktiviteten for det nye udvalg vil være max to møder om året i modsætning til de 5-6 møder, der hidtil har været afholdt i PUU.

Som noget nyt vil der fremover årligt blive lavet en drøftelse og evaluering af kompetenceudviklingsbehov i lokaludvalgene, dvs. inden for den eksisterende udvalgs- og mødestruktur, for at sikre en drøftelse af kompetenceudviklingsbehov på det niveau i organisationen, hvor midlerne anvendes, og hvor der er kendskab til de lokale udviklingsbehov. Denne drøftelse vil skulle afrapporteres til PUU og dermed til HSU. Der vil blive udarbejdet nærmere beskrivelser herom og en skabelon til dette formål.

Rød = kollegiale udvalg
Grøn = samarbejdsudvalg
Hvid = ledelsesudvalg
Lilla = uden for kategori
= medlemmer findes via valg.

RUC

Bestyrelse

Institut for Samfundsvidenskab og Erhverv*

Dekan
Prodekan
Sekretariatsleder
Sektionsledere
Studieledere
Forskningsgruppeledere
Centerledere
Ph.d.-skoleleder

Ledelses-gruppe
Ph.d.-udvalg
Institut-råd (IR)
Lokal-samarbejds-udvalg (LSU)
Studie-nævn
Uddannelses-udvalg (UDDU)
Forskning s-udvalg (FOU)

Institut for Kommunikation og Humanistisk Videnskab*

Dekan
Prodekan
Sekretariatsleder
Sektionsledere
Studieledere
Forskningsgruppeledere
Centerledere
Ph.d.-skoleleder

Ledelses-gruppe
Ph.d.-udvalg
Institut-råd (IR)
Lokal-samarbejds-udvalg (LSU)
Studie-nævn
Uddannelses-udvalg (UDDU)
Forskning s-udvalg (FOU)

Institut for Mennesker og Teknologi*

Dekan
Prodekan
Sekretariatsleder
Sektionsledere
Studieledere
Forskningsgruppeledere
Centerledere
Ph.d.-skoleleder

Ledelses-gruppe
Ph.d.-udvalg
Institut-råd (IR)
Lokal-samarbejds-udvalg (LSU)
Lokal-arbejdsmiljø-udvalg (LAU)
Studie-nævn
Uddannelses-udvalg (UDDU)
Forskning s-udvalg (FOU)

Institut for Naturvidenskab og Miljø*

Dekan
Prodekan
Sekretariatsleder
Sektionsledere
Studieledere
Forskningsgruppeledere
Centerledere
Ph.d.-skoleleder

Ledelses-gruppe
Ph.d.-udvalg
Institut-råd (IR)
Lokal-samarbejds-udvalg (LSU)
Lokal-arbejdsmiljø-udvalg (LAU)
Studie-nævn
Uddannelses-udvalg (UDDU)
Forskning s-udvalg (FOU)

Akademisk Råd

Uddannel-sesudvalg (UDDU)**
Økonomisk Udvalg (ØU)**
Forsknings-udvalg (FOU)**

Hovedsamarbejds-udvalg (HSU)
Hovedarbejds-miljø-udvalg (HAU)
Personale-uddannelses-udvalg (PUU)**
Forskningsetisk Udvalg (FEU)
Ligestillings- og mangfoldigheds udvalg (LMU)
Udvalg for Eksterne Samarbejder (UES)**

Rektorat
Universitetsledelsen (UL)
Forskningsstrategisk Ledelsesforum (FLF)
Uddannelses-strategisk Ledelsesforum (ULF)
Administrativt Ledelsesforum (ALF)
Roskilde Doctoral School (RDS)
Pædagogisk Udviklingsforum (PUF)

Universitets-direktør
Vicedirek-tørkredsen (VD-kreds)
Administra-tionens Lokaludvalg (ADM LU)

RUC Digital
Vicedirektør
Teamledere
Ledelses-gruppe

RUC HR
Vicedirektør
Teamledere
Ledelses-gruppe

RUC Kommunikation og Rektorsekretariat
Vicedirektør
Teamledere
Ledelses-gruppe

RUC Økonomi og Campus
Vicedirektør
Teamledere
Ledelses-gruppe

RUC Uddannelse og Studerende
Vicedirektør
Teamledere
Ledelses-gruppe

Roskilde Universitetsbibliotek (RUb)

*Fremstillingen af institutternes opbygning er ikke nødvendigvis fyldestgørende. Dette tilpasses i en senere udgave
**Udvalg er i proces jf. den igangværende sag om

Collegiality in modern universities – the composition of governance ideals and practices

Article *in* Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy · November 2016

DOI: 10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

2 authors:

Kerstin Sahlin
Uppsala University

Ulla Eriksson-Zetterquist
University of Gothenburg

NordSTEP
Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy

co-action PUBLISHING

WORK AND LIFE IN ACADEMIA

Collegiality in modern universities – the composition of governance ideals and practices

Kerstin Sahlin[1] and Ulla Eriksson-Zetterquist[2]*

[1]Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden; [2]Gothenburg Research Institute, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

The questions of how universities are governed and how they should be governed have recently gained attention throughout Europe. The history of universities shows a diffused pattern of repeated reform efforts. However, this situation has more or less exploded since the turn of the century, bringing in new modes of organising. In short we can observe a diffusion of more managerial forms of organising, leading to a situation where different governance ideals co-act. In this paper we analyse the interplay of several governance ideals as they play out in practice. We begin and end the essay by noting that collegiality is a modern, efficient and practical form of governance, but it never works entirely on its own; rather it interacts with other modes of governance. After an introduction of diverse modes of governance, analysed as ideal type models, we exemplify how those diverse modes mix in practices of governance and organising. A more theoretical argument that runs through the paper is a critique of the dominance of ideal types of discussions on university governance and in organisation theory more generally, to the extent that those ideal types tend to be reified.

Keywords: *collegiality*; *university governance*; *reforms*; *bureaucracy*; *management*

*Correspondence to: Ulla Eriksson-Zetterquist, Gothenburg Research Institute, Box 603, 40530 Gothenburg, Sweden, Email: uez@gri.gu.se

How are universities governed and how should they be governed? Recently those questions have gained quite some attention throughout Europe. Observations of the long history of universities show a diffused pattern of repeated reform efforts, largely inspired by what has been seen as the most efficient ways of organising at the time and following from the shifting roles of universities in society over the years. When it comes to the reform trend often called *New Public Management*, after Hood's (1991,1995) early observations of the reforming of public sector organising and governance in the orgnisation for economic co-operation and development (OECD) countries in the 1980s and 1990s, universities appear to have been somewhat of a latecomer, but a very active one. It is true that universities have long been subject to rationalising reforms, not least in connection with the extreme expansion and transformation from elite education to mass education of the 1960s and 1970s. Since the turn of the century the introduction of new modes of organising, allocating resources and measuring and assessing results has more or less exploded.

With these transformations, universities – and public bodies more generally – have come to be shaped more and more like organised actors with clear inspiration from corporate models of organising (cf. Brunsson & Sahlin-Andersson, 2000; Jemielniak & Greenwood, 2013; Meyer & Bromley, 2013; Ramirez, 2010). Universities have developed elaborate organisational structures, including new and strengthened management positions, expanded communication departments, and innovation and technology transfer units. New modes of result-based allocations of resources have been introduced in university systems as well as in individual universities. In short we can observe a diffusion of more managerial forms of organising. However, many of the more traditional traits of university governance remain. Traditionally, universities have – in part – been structured as arenas for professions with elected leaders, with a strong emphasis on academic freedom and academic duty as the means to produce output and control quality in research and education and with decision-making resting on principles of collegiality and meritocracy.

Most Swedish higher education institutions are constituted as public agencies with regulated legal frameworks for how to govern, control and organise them. This legal framework has been subject to a number of reforms over the years. In sum, collegial structures dominated by faculty (in earlier times primarily professors) have opened up for stronger influence by students and representatives of society at large. The most recent such reforms have

Citation: NordSTEP 2016, **2**: 33640 - http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

spurred a lively debate on the role of collegiality in contemporary higher education. In 2011, the so-called autonomy reform meant that the internal organisation of higher education institutions was deregulated. Before 2011 the law prescribed that all higher education institutions should have at least one faculty board – consisting of faculty and student representatives – with responsibility for the quality and content of education and research. Instead of prescribing the existence of specific forms of internal organisation, after 2011 the law just stated in general terms that issues of scientific nature should be handled by scientifically competent faculty. With the legal reform the prescription of the election of academic leaders was also deregulated.

Reforms along similar lines, at government level and in individual universities, continue. Following on the deregulation in 2011, a wave of reorganisation of Swedish higher education institutions followed, where collegial organisational structures were replaced by more management-like forms of governance and control (see Sundberg, 2013, 2014). Appointment procedures for academic leaders have also been subject to fundamental change, again more clearly influenced by management and bureaucracy ideals than by collegiality (Engwall, 2011; Sahlin & Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2016).

The new forms of governance have challenged more traditional forms, especially collegial modes of governance and of controlling quality. While many reforms have met surprisingly mild resistance, they have given rise to quite intense debates on issues of governance and the organising of universities. In Sweden, this debate has largely come to circle around the importance or limitations of collegiality. A few recent publications have clarified historical developments of collegiality (e.g. Björck, 2013, 2015), collegial practices (e.g. Sundqvist, 2010) and how recent deregulation has come to undermine the use of collegial forms of governance further (Ahlbäck Öberg, 2014; Ahlbäck Öberg et al., 2016). In general though, discussions on collegiality tend to be surprisingly imprecise. What is collegiality? Why is it or why should it be an important part of university governance? And where in and around universities do collegial models apply? Despite lively debates on collegiality, these questions are largely left unanswered.

In this paper, we define and discuss what collegiality is, how it works in practice and how it could work in practice. We identify when and where collegiality appears to work and what the prerequisites for this mode of governance are. We describe some important reforms of Swedish universities that have had an impact on collegial forms of governance and organising. We begin and end the essay by noting that collegiality is a modern, efficient and practical form of governance, but it never works entirely on their own. Collegial forms of governance interact with other modes of governance. How this interaction occurs needs to be analysed, discussed and structured.

Our discussion grew out of our observations and experiences (as researchers on organisation and governance but also as academic leaders and as practising researchers and professors in Sweden – a university system in transformation) of recent reforms and the debate on these reforms. We saw how collegial forms of governance, over time and with repeated organisational reforms, have come to be more or less abolished or perverted to the extent that they have partly become ineffective. We are at the same time critical of the often-simplified discussion, featuring in the promotion as well as in the critique of current reforms, where one ideal type of governance tends to be contrasted with another, largely without clarifying these alternative models and leaving unsaid how various modes of governance can interplay and mix.

This paper contributes to the analysis of the interplay of several governance ideals as they play out in practice. The interplay can take the form of checks and balances, or models may overlap or compete. One mode of governance may supplement, challenge, transform, pervert or undermine other modes. Hence to understand and explain the development and impact of diverse modes of governing universities, we should discuss them in relation to each other and their interplay with each other.

A more theoretical argument that runs through our paper is a critique of the dominance of ideal types of discussions on university governance, and in organisation theory more generally, to the extent that those ideal types tend to be reified. Such ways of structuring the analysis and debate on university governance and organising tend to miss many of the dynamics of current governance practice.

Collegiality in theory and practice

What is *collegiality*? Many references are made to collegiality in the current debates on university governance, but more seldom is it clearly defined. Why this is the case is briefly discussed below, but first we would like to describe the main elements of collegiality.

Most discussed in recent debates, and in reaction to the recent reregulation of the Swedish university system, is a formal structure for collegial decision-making. The former faculty boards, consisting of academic staff and with representatives of the students, had the main responsibility for decisions on content and quality in teaching and research. This included, for example, decisions on curricula, quality assurance of research, research training and education, allocation of resources within the faculty, plans for which faculty positions to announce and how, appointments of lecturers and assistant professors and so on. Some decisions, such as the appointment of professors, were taken by the rector but after reviews chaired by the faculty board.

The faculty boards have undergone a series of reforms over the years. One important such reform was when students gained representation on the board. With the

Citation: NordSTEP 2016, **2**: 33640 - http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

change in the law in 2011, presented as an autonomy reform and deregulation, universities were no longer obliged to have such boards. Instead, the law now prescribes that decisions of the kind exemplified above have to be taken by people with scientific merit and with influence from the students. A follow-up study of that reform showed that almost all universities and university colleges in Sweden have abolished the faculty boards or have transformed them from being decision-making bodies into having an advisory role (Sundberg, 2013). The same study showed that smaller and newer universities have made more thorough organisational reforms, whilst the oldest universities (Uppsala and Lund) have largely kept a system with faculty boards as decision-making bodies. This is the aspect of collegiality recently most discussed: the existence of a formal decision-making structure that gives decision-making power to bodies where academic staff are in the majority. In its most clear form, persons with scientific competence, elected by their peers, form such decision-making bodies.

Unlike university systems in many other countries, Swedish universities do not have academic decision-making bodies on a university level, such as senates. The historical structure with a *konsistorium* (consisting of a body of full professors) as the highest decision-making body of the university, has been reshaped through a number of reforms into corporate-like boards with an external chair and a large share of external members.

A second aspect of the formal structure making up a collegial decision-making system concerns the role of academic leaders and how they are appointed. The collegiate organising principle ideally includes a management structure with elected leaders. Leaders who have the support and therefore confidence of their colleagues are elected by them (elected as *primus inter pares*). Academic leadership is in this view ideally formed as a non-permanent, and often not full-time, position. This position is viewed as doing a term of service to the research community. The principle of *primus inter pares* puts strong emphasise on the scientific merits of those leaders. Common arguments for such a principle is that legitimacy and confidence in the leader is essential for them to be able to lead the scientific development of the university. A second argument has to do with competence and with the need for leadership that has close contacts with and builds on scientific operations of the university. This in turn has to do with the fact that collegial decision making is to be knowledge based and in essence involves processes of forming, scrutinising and arguing for the evidence base of decisions to be taken.

Currently, according to Swedish law, university rectors are appointed by the government, but after nomination from the university board. Previously these nominations were done after elections by faculty (and starting in the early 1980s also students and staff). This has been deregulated too. The board is still required to consult with students, academic staff and personnel, but the form for such consulting procedures is decided by the board. Only a few universities have kept some form of election procedure and most universities nowadays use external consultants for recruiting and checking candidates. Still, according to the law rectors have to fulfil some academic criteria – they have to be qualified for university lectureship. With these developments, the practice of recruiting rectors and the qualification of rectors have changed. As shown by Engwall (2014), the majority of rectors are nowadays externally recruited and on average those rectors have lower academic qualifications, but several of the recently recruited rectors in Sweden have long experience in academic leadership positions on several levels and often from several universities or university colleges. These changes suggest that academic leadership has become a career track and is no longer primarily seen as a temporary service for the academic community.

A third aspect of the collegial formal structure is the use of peer review for positions, promotion, research funding and publication. In universities, external experts are used for the reviewing and ranking of applicants to professorship and lectureship positions. This practice renders the promoted applicant support and indication of quality from external, less partial academic reviewers. However, this aspect of collegiality has also been partly compromised through a series of reforms and changes of praxis. Changed practice has followed on deregulation of the legal requirements for how to arrange peer review. One such change is that several universities now ask external reviewers only to select those who are qualified for a position, but the ranking of top candidates is done internally. The main argument for such a revised procedure is that new positions should be filled with persons whose profiles fit the strategy of the university, department and research environment. The revised procedure is an expression of the strengthened emphasis on internal organisation and strategy.

Thus far, we have described structural aspects of the collegial system and we have described how this structure has been transformed, together with the deregulation of legal support for the collegial system. However, as is true for organisational models and governance more generally, collegiality will not work just because the university organisational chart is drawn in a certain way. Collegiality is as much a culture of how work should be pursued as it is a structure for planning, decision-making and follow-up procedures. Collegiality, in other words, should primarily be defined as a work process (see also Bennett, 1998).

When defining collegiality in cultural terms, we need to bring into the picture why collegiality is seen as important. The main rationale for a collegial system is that it is seen as the main form for producing high quality research and teaching. The formal arrangement described above all rests on the assumption that decisions and developments should be based on scientific knowledge, arguments and procedures. The basic principle for how to manage, govern and develop universities resembles the academic seminar. Leaders and decision makers pursue rational and scientifically based arguments, and their arguments can be questioned and tested through scientific discourse. Just as in a seminar and in the production of research results, discussions, criticism and the scrutinising of arguments and conclusions are core features of collegial forms of governance. Leaders, moreover, are there to chair this ongoing scientific discussion. This also means that leaders and decision makers are to represent science and the scholarly community as a whole, not a single group of scholars or employees. A further basic assumption is that the research community, and the scientific argument, is wiser than just the individual leaders. The system is built so as not to give power to individual leaders, but to form a system where individual leaders and their measures are to be subject to questioning and testing, much like the work of individual scholars and individual research results. This does not mean that academic leaders in a collegial tradition are expected to be weak. Quite the contrary – leaders are expected to take measures based on scientific argumentation and on scientific qualifications. Additionally, through the election process, academic leaders act with the support of their colleagues and thereby on behalf of the community. It is truly a meritocratic system and it is built to be independent of individual interests, all as a basis for pursuing academic freedom – knowledge should always come before interests.

However, as shown by Maasen and Olsen (2007), among others, the meritocratic collegial system is easily confused with a system of internal representative democracy. With the stepwise reforms described above, the two systems of collegiality and representative democracy are mixed in decision-making bodies. Representatives of administrative personnel and students tend to be elected and viewed as representatives of specific groups, whilst academics, according to collegiate ideals, are elected as *primus inter pares*, representing science and the scientific profession rather than scientists and their colleagues and co-workers.

Before summarising the current state of collegiality in the Swedish university system we should also note some fundamental prerequisites for a collegiate system to function. When writing about university expansion and the associated transition from elite universities to mass universities, Halsey (1992, 2004) emphasised that collegiality assumes a collegium. Collegiality presupposes, of course, that there are colleagues who can listen and talk to each other. Hence, trust, knowledge and a continuous dialogue based on and upholding a common set of norms for what is good science, good knowledge and the main objectives for universities are basic prerequisites for a collegial system to function.

Collegiality as a governance form, in other words, takes shape with continuous development for establishing what good scientific practice is and how this practice shapes research, education and collaboration. Bennett (1998) emphasised the professional community, professional togetherness, as a basis for collegiality. This community cannot be formed once and then be assumed as a basis, but must be carried and upheld through active collegial activities, such as peer review and seminars. Moreover, the professional arguments – not private interests – are assumed to shape those discourses. Collegiality, in other words, is a working process based on the scientific argument. In this way, the collegium takes responsibility for the development and the quality of research and education (Bennett, 1998).

Challenges to collegiality in Swedish universities

We have pointed to a number of reforms of the formal organisation of universities that have weakened the legal support for collegiality. Moreover, universities are mainly organised legally as public agencies and hence are subject to governance and governance reforms of public agencies more generally. However, while formal structure plays an important role in the possibility to uphold collegiality, we have argued that collegiality should first and foremost be seen as a working process, as an aspect of university culture. As such it needs to be actively supported and maintained. This is not unique to collegial organisational forms but is true for all kinds of organisational structures. Moreover, in line with this, much effort is put into supporting management, decision-making and governance. However, support in the form of leadership training, policy papers, strategic conferences and governmental instruction largely emphasises management and bureaucratic principles, whilst the impression is given that collegiality – if not completely disregarded or criticised – is taken for granted and with no need for such maintenance support.

One striking example of a challenge to collegiality concerns leadership training. This kind of training has expanded dramatically throughout the Swedish university landscape. Our observations of such leadership training courses suggests that they spend very little time and effort on discussing, maintaining and supporting collegiality but are much more focused on bureaucratic and management ideals (more on these below). This can be explained by a number of related developments. We have already mentioned that much reform of the universities comes with reform and governance of public agencies in general. Universities in this context are seen as 'a kind of public agency' without specific features. Another explanation is found in the increased use of consultants, people who are

Citation: NordSTEP 2016, **2**: 33640 - http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

experts on organising and governance but tend not to have extensive experience from universities, research and teaching. Another explanation is found in the lack of clear definitions and discussions on what collegiality is and what it is for, as we have commented upon above. And as indicated in the introduction to this paper, we also find that collegiality is often described just as bottom-up influence, as ways of anchoring decisions through negotiations with various groups of collaborators. In contrast to such a view we emphasise that collegiality forms a specific, ideal type of governance, with specific aims and objectives. Moreover, in academic leadership training courses, critique of collegial forms of decision making, organising and leadership are commonly found. For example, peer review processes have been criticised for being inefficient, biased and too subjective. A similar critique has been expressed regarding faculty boards and so on. Academic leadership, as formed in line with collegial principles, has been criticised for being weak and conservative. We read this critique as a critique of collegial practices. However, the critique often spills over onto the collegial principle as such. Again, this observation makes us ask for a more lively discussion on both the principles and practices of collegiality. If it is the case that collegial processes do not function as intended or if they are found to be problematic, the conclusion may not be that collegiality – in principle – is problematic. Some of the problems attached to collegial models of leading and organising may in fact be a sign of too little, rather than too much, collegiality (see Sahlin, 2012).

It is striking that very few official documents include definitions and discussions on collegiality, whilst many books written by former deans, rectors and so on include quite extensive discussions on what collegiality is, how it works in practice and why it is important (see e.g. Cole, 2010; Kennedy, 1997; Rosovsky, 1990; Russel, 1991; Sundqvist, 2010). This observation suggests that collegiality is treated as though it is clear what it is, as an institutionalised form of governance, whilst management is seen as a model that needs much support in terms of training, definitions, strategy documents and so on. In contrast, we maintain that no form of governance works exactly according to the ideals, and all forms of governance need to be subject to translations, maintenance activities and to scrutiny and reflection.

The section above on collegiality and on developments of university governance in Sweden points to yet another challenge to collegiality. The role and task of universities have changed considerably over the years, with mass education reaching higher education, the expansion of the university system, new tasks for universities and more socially embedded universities. While collegiality is central to the task of developing and scrutinising knowledge – in research and teaching – many tasks in current 'multi-universities' go beyond these tasks (cf. Kerr, 1963; Krücken & Meier, 2006). Hence, the discussion on collegiality points to the importance of developed reflections on what universities are for (see e.g. Collini, 2012). Moreover, it relates to questions concerning the nature of universities as organisations, as well as the nature of the task and roles of universities. Are universities unique bodies that require specific forms of governance, or can they be productive entities like any kind of public agency or corporation? We do not further develop this discussion on the role of universities in society in this paper but only point to the urgency of developing this discussion systematically, together with the discussion on university governance, which is the focus of this paper.

Ideal type comparisons: possibilities and limitations

Much of the current debate on governance of universities, the need for reforms or the critique thereof is framed in terms of ideal types. One ideal model of governance is contrasted to another. The old is put in opposition to the new. We often hear (the challenged or largely abolished) collegiality being discussed in opposition to what is sometimes described as more modern forms of (new public management or corporate-inspired) management. University leaders and reformers talk about 'line management' in contrast to 'bottom up'. The latter is an example of how collegiality is understood by the advocators of line management principles. As we will elaborate more in detail, the principle of collegiality cannot be summarised as merely a bottom-up management system.

An ideal type-based analysis, or debate, tends to emphasise differences between the types. Ideal type analysis of governance can highlight developments over time and is also used as a basis for comparisons. At the same time, such an analysis has clear limitations. Such an analysis can to a lesser extent clarify overlapping and common features of governing – across the ideals. Moreover, ideal type analyses tend sometimes to give the impression that governance forms coherent packages or models. In practice, governance hardly forms such coherent yet distinct models. Even Weber, who taught us the virtues of ideal type analysis, also urged us to go beyond such ideal type reasoning in our understanding of the organisation of society. Before going beyond the governance ideals, we now turn to those ideals that appear to form much of the basis of current reforms and developments of governance and organising of the modern university system: bureaucracy and management.

Bureaucracy

Universities are often described as bureaucracies. The bureaucratisation of universities stems from the fact that they are public agencies and thus operate under the law of the state. Universities were also bureaucratised with their growth. They nowadays form large organisations that, in order to be coordinated and controlled, need a certain amount of bureaucracy. The need for bureaucratisation is most often related to the need for rule following, relative to rules set by the law and to internal rules. The need for bureaucracy in universities and the criticism thereof follow well-known paths.

Possibly the best-known ideal for organising operations is Weber's (1922/1983) ideal concerning bureaucracy. The basis of this is that people are to be separated from personal interests and official capacities and that universal rather than particular relations form the foundation of operations to be taken. According to the bureaucratic principle, roles and work are in focus and those positions are filled with persons who fulfil their regulated tasks. When Weber described bureaucracy as an ideal, a series of principles were drawn up as 'a functional division of work, hierarchical issuing of orders, hard-driven specialisation within the respective field of responsibility and the employment of a professional workforce with education and experience in the area of competence' (cited in Styhre, 2009, p. 16). Besides the fact that bureaucracy starts out from hierarchical organising, it is also based on the use of rules and work descriptions and, as a third component, on co-workers identifying with these ways of organising (Bendix, 1956; cited in Styhre, 2009, p. 18).

Criticism of bureaucracy appeared soon after Weber was translated into English. Byrkjeflot and Teig (2013) discussed the criticism and defence of bureaucracy. Merton (1957), commented on by Byrkjeflot and Teig (2013), was of the opinion that bureaucracy is non-human, faceless and an obstacle to people's innovative power and creativity. Another criticism of central importance for the development according to Byrkjeflot & Teig (2013) was delivered by Mises in 1944, who found that bureaucracy, as a governance form, is unnatural and a waste of resources. Critiques of bureaucracy have depicted it as dysfunctional and as a governance form that opposes reforms and modernisation (Byrkjeflot & Du Gay, 2012), hindering economic growth and counteracting the freedom of the individual. Defenders of bureaucracy have objected to this, commenting that Weber was talking about bureaucracy as an ideal. This means, for instance, that bureaucracy is not to be seen as a recipe for organisational efficiency. Even though Weber emphasised that bureaucracy concerns an ideal for government employees, it is broader and contains a public ethos and a personality type. The personality type that becomes faceless in popular descriptions can more clearly be understood via Weber's notion of *sina ira et study*. The person who is a bureaucrat of the ideal type works without anger or preference, without devotion or enthusiasm. Rather, duties are to be performed dispassionately and in accordance with the rules that have been set. The bureaucrat is an independent decision maker whose own opinions are not allowed to impact upon the work being done (Byrkjeflot & Du Gay, 2012). Even though bureaucracy seems anachronistic, or at least mechanistic, and lacking the ability to change, it is still, however, an organisational form capable of responding to changes in its surroundings (see, e.g. Byrkjeflot & Du Gay, 2012; Styhre, 2009), something which, for instance, is enabled by the fact that it is simpler to change and adapt roles than people, to the new demands for technical, social or economic change being made of organisations (Kallinikos, 2004). The summary between the criticism and the defenders may be that bureaucracy as an ideal has been in fashion on and off over the past 100 years (Byrkjeflot, 2000). At regular intervals, it is assumed that bureaucracy is on its way out to make way for other organisational forms, such as project-based organising or virtual organising (Styhre, 2009), but despite this it seems to return in new forms.

Management

The introduction of management models in public organisations, including universities, was largely argued for in reaction to what was seen as too much bureaucracy. In conjunction with New Public Management being developed as a general basis of reform just over 25 years ago, the notion arose that the public sector would be more efficient and better governed if it copied corporate forms of efficiency and quality (Hood, 1991). The introduction of management into the public sector did not follow a grand programme or strategy. Rather, it was largely introduced as individual management techniques, but where one technique followed on another. With this, the entire structure and identity of organisations over time came to be understood more and more as managed corporate-like organisations. In this respect, universities followed the general trend of public sector reorganising and too came to be viewed through the frame of corporate organising (e.g. Engwall, 2011; Ramirez, 2010). However, this incremental change also means that it is not easy to present management as an ideal type.

Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson (2000) made an attempt to describe this ideal by pointing to three characteristics. The first one is that management assumes hierarchy. The leaders are to lead and those are the ones who are assumed to initiate strategy, development initiatives and performance criteria. Management puts great emphasis on leaders and leadership. This is also emphasised in the catchphrase often used – at least initially – for many of the New Public Management–inspired reforms: 'let managers manage' (see Sahlin-Andersson, 2001 for an overview). The second characteristic of management is that the organisation is perceived to be an actor with a unique entity (also see Meyer & Bromley, 2013). The boundaries of the organisation are important and performance of the organisation as a whole is in focus; the organisation is naturally seen as operating on a market in competition with other organisations. The third characteristic is that organisations are assumed to be intentional in the sense that they work towards specific goals and purposes.

Citation: NordSTEP 2016, **2**: 33640 - http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

Policies are to be translated into action, and results are measured and assessed in relation to those policies.

A quick look at universities through the lens of those three ideal types shows a growth in bureaucracy and later in management, largely at the expense of collegial structures (for illustrations see Björck, 2013, 2015). We can observe an expansion of managers, increased focus on strategic planning with profiling, formulated mission statements and developed performance measures, not least on the organisation level. However, in order to learn more about the actual interplay of ideas and ideals, we need to go beyond ideal types and see how the interplay plays out in practice. We give two examples below that have been subject to quite a lot of debate: first, the election and role of leaders and, second, the way in which organisations deal with critique and conflict.

Interplay of ideals

Leaders

The various governance forms have different ways of choosing their leaders. In the governance form of collegiality, leaders are chosen on their scientific merits and on the person's knowledge of the operation's knowledge content and development. The reason for this is that the leader must be able to lead and coordinate knowledge-developing and knowledge-reviewing processes specifically. Leaders thus base their authority on their professional merit and in the trust shown by their colleagues. Crucially important to the leader being able to lead, and to be entrusted with leading, is that he or she have good knowledge of the operation. The recruitment of leaders is thus often done internally.

Bureaucracy in the administrative form is also based on merit, but the basis here is that people work their way upwards through the hierarchy, showing their skill as regards following rules and routines in order to govern. A leader has to follow the rules set by the principal body, and there are also clear rules regarding competence assessment. The management form also has a very pronounced belief in the individual leader. When this person is to be appointed, it will be important to have interest profiles – Does the person have the 'right' management qualities? – and to have demand profiles. With such recruitment and within the management ideal, the leader is given a mandate to act in accordance with his or her own judgement, according to the overarching goals set by the principal body.

Collegiality and bureaucracy have in common the fact that personal feelings should be controlled so that they do not come to dominate or even influence decisions. As collegiality is based on knowledge and, above all, the possibility of being able to argue and critically review different parts of the shared knowledge, personal interests become less significant.

It is often said that academic leaders 'pay service to the academic community'. Hence, leaders primarily receive their mandate from their colleagues and because of this also have an obligation to listen to them. Ideally, though, this does not mean that the leader serves the interests of their peers. The collegial system is based on the idea that decisions and development are based on knowledge – not interest. What it does entail though, is that leaders maintain their legitimacy by listening to their peers as scientific experts and that leaders have to explain why certain measures are taken and what consequences they foresee from such measures. According to this ideal, leadership is executed in close collaboration with those who are being led. This also means that the leader remains a colleague of the peers and is assumed to take on the leadership role for a limited period of time, afterwards returning to his or her previous position as a part of the group. This basic idea about leadership is also the reason why many academic leadership positions are only part-time and rotating.

The equivalent does not apply to a manager in a bureaucratic or management-oriented governance system. In both these models, being a leader becomes a career and it is assumed that in order to lead the leader needs to create some distance from those who are to be led, in order to give room also for leading measures that may not be seen as being in the direct interest of those being led. This also means that it is difficult for a leader to go back to being a colleague after having done a term of leadership. A normal procedure is rather for the leader leaves the unit upon resignation, and a leadership career often includes movements between units and between organisations.

The various governance forms entail consequences for the operations they are used in. In a study of management in academic institutions, hospitals and the manufacturing industry in the United Kingdom, the practices that concerned work processes, supervision, goals and reward structures were compared (McCormack, Propper, & Smith, 2014). The researchers found a difference between managing university environments and manufacturing industries and hospitals, but they also found that there was a difference between different university environments. Older universities were using elements of collegial governance with rotating leadership to a greater degree. Newer universities, by contrast, were to a greater degree using leadership structures in which being appointed as a head of department was often seen as an initial step towards a career in the university's management structure. In addition, studies of Swedish universities have shown similar differences between older and newer universities (Sundberg, 2013, 2014).

In the study on academic institutions, hospitals and the manufacturing industry, the configuration of the leadership showed itself to be of significance as regards how it was practised (McCormack et al., 2014). In the case of temporary and rotating leadership, heads of department strove to put as little time as possible into administrative managerial duties in order to act as effectively as possible. Instead, their focus was on what they deemed capable of strengthening the institution as an academic institution. In cases where the position of head of department constituted an initial step towards a continued career in the university's management structure, the heads of department instead more clearly strove towards complying with the policies originating from university management.

When the ideal form of management is allowed to characterise the academic environment, specific subject-related competence is thus given less importance. If we choose such an approach, then the leader can also be taken from different types of operations, as it will be experience as a leader rather than scientific competence that is seen as key. This view of management radically differs from the collegial, where the leader's competence in the field of operations is seen as entirely crucial. Leadership in the collegial mode is about assessing and developing knowledge, simultaneous with the operation being greatly expected to be self-organising and governed, not so much by the organisation's own goals and strategies, but by quality and knowledge standards developed within the profession. Here, the key task of the collegial leader is instead to lead the knowledge-developing and knowledge-testing dialogue.

Collegial leadership is sometimes characterised as weak. Our reading of the literature does not lead to that conclusion. Instead, because collegial leaders work with a mandate from their peers, they have a strong basis for their leadership. However, they have to listen, argue and explain. When taking measures that go against some of their peers, this undertaking demands a great deal of integrity and requires that they be able to argue and explain why the measures are needed. In this sense leaders share authority with their peers.

The discussion on weak leadership, we argue, tends to mix difficulties connected with collegial leadership with the difficulties of local leaders more generally to pursue changes. This leads to the conclusion that it is as important for a collegially governed organisation to seek to form systems and levels of organisation so that locally taken decisions and leadership measures can be contextualised and partly checked by bodies including larger parts of the organisations. In practice this means, for example, that there need to be clear connections between collegial bodies at the departmental, faculty and university levels.

Managing conflicts and criticism

In a classic text in the social sciences, economist Hirschman (1970) developed the concepts of *exit*, *voice* and *loyalty* for his analysis of how various systems deal with criticisms, conflicts, decline, failures and non-functional courses of events. Hirschman's departure point was that all systems need to be based on loyalty in order to work. Here, both individuals and groups are presupposed, as a rule, to act loyally with the system. In order to enable this goal, organisations use a range of tools to keep their members loyal. Exit and voice are two ways of acting that are used in the event of failures, conflicts and decline. These two principles can also be used to convey criticism regarding external relations with a certain body in a system, for example customer relations (Hirschman, 1970). These two means can also be used by individuals or groups within a system as means to express their critique. *Exit* means that the criticising or failing individual or group leaves the scene. This can be done through the initiative of the one exiting or the exit can be forced by the leaders of principles of the system. Voice is another form of critiquing or correcting – when people or groups raise their voice to protest against a development, to achieve change or stop certain procedures or when leaders or principles raise their voices in order to seek to change the actions and procedures of certain individuals or groups. Hirschman provided different examples from a range of different organisations showing a series of examples of how exit and voice can be used both by and against those leaving, by those who are critical and by those who are criticised. The examples also show different combinations of exit and voice. Hirschman's terms can also shed light on fundamental differences between collegiality, management and bureaucracy.

Loyalty is the basis of the collegial governance form, whereby individuals are loyal to the operation and to the academic community. At the same time, in this governance form, there is great scope for voice. Voice becomes something of collegiality's zest for life. Arguments and knowledge are under constant criticism and review while being developed within the university or the academic community at large. Of course, exit may also exist in the collegial system, but it is rather seen as an exception.

Whilst voice is an essential part of a collegial system, it is not seen as desirable in bureaucracy and management. There, the organisation members are instead prerequired to comply with set rules, strategies and goals, but when serious conflict or deviance from norms and rules occur exit tends to be preferred to voice. It is not uncommon, for example, that leaders leave or are forced to leave organisations as consequences of conflicting views, for example with higher management levels, the executive board or owners.

It is still relatively uncommon for rectors or academic personnel to be forced out of their posts at universities. And even if the legal protection for full professors to be in principle irremovable from their positions has been weakened, there are still quite firm rules that protect academic staff from being easily removed from their jobs. However, in other parts of university operations, we see a rather clear move away from viewing voice as an essential part of the daily operations to instead emphasising

Citation: NordSTEP 2016, **2**: 33640 - http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

loyalty coupled with exit. One example of this is found in the communication strategies of Swedish universities. These emphasise the importance of loyalty and minimise critical voices, in any case those openly challenging their own managements (cf. Björck, 2015; Fredriksson & Pallas, 2013).

As Björck (2015) has pointed out, voice includes a further alternative in practice, that is, that the co-workers choose not to say anything and instead keep quiet. While skilful researchers can choose another organisation, or university, those with their main competence in teaching are more tied to their employers – although a market for excellent researchers is at hand, there tends to be less of a market for excellent teachers. Another 'inner exile' lies in negligence, when academic staff resign dejectedly or adopt a dissociated cynicism in situations:

> where they experience trust in their professional judgement and integrity as being replaced with distrust and the chronic monitoring of their operation, with an accompanying drift of focus and resources away from primary assignments. In relation to the employer, it becomes easier to react with the same by-the-book attitude that you yourself feel you are being treated with. It seems to be more difficult to justify time-consuming commitment to shared matters – despite the fact that the institutional framework causes ramifications for your own project – and easier to limit the care taken with your own career. In a passive-aggressive state, it comes easy to be negligent vis-à-vis some tasks. (Björck, 2015, p. 18) (Our translation.)

As a consequence of this, academic staff can choose to go into 'inner exile', wrote Björck (2015).

Collegial organising and decision making are time-consuming and demand engagement from academic staff. The continuous debate and reviewing are an essential part of the collegial model. Moreover, as we described above, an important prerequisite for collegiality to work is that norms are shared for what is valid knowledge and scientific claims. In that sense the collegial model builds on a common base and a trust in this common base among peers. If groups find less motivation to engage in time-consuming collegial processes of scrutiny and decision making or if they even choose to remain silent and go into inner exile, collegiality will be undermined, not only or primarily because of the introduction of alternative modes of governance, but because of a lack of engagement and trust among those whose engagement is needed for collegiality to work.

Concluding remarks

Despite much talk about collegiality, we have noted a lack of principle discussions on what collegiality is, how it can be upheld and why it should play an important part in university governance. As we have noted, collegial forms of governance demand activities and procedures directed at upholding a collegial culture (the existence of a collegium, common scientific standards, ongoing seminars, trust in science and so forth). Further, collegiality is a form of governance that relies on scientific norms and is aimed at basing developments on and for scientific development. This argument leads us to conclude that a developed discussion on how collegiality can be upheld and restored also needs to be based on more open arguments and practices as to why universities need collegiality. This latter discussion needs to be linked to a discussion on what the roles are for universities in society – what universities are for.

Collegiality does not work on its own and, as is the case with all modes of governance, collegiality cannot remain unchanged as new prerequisites for management come into play, various modes of governance mix and new and revised roles of universities evolve. One line of thought that has run through the paper is that collegiality has been undermined, not only through the introduction of more bureaucracy and more management, but also because the practice and knowledge about collegiality is not upheld and it becomes less and less clear what collegiality is, what it is for and how it needs to be maintained and supported.

At the same time, management is also characterised by ambiguity. Management models spread partly because they are shaped in generic and generalised ways open to translation (cf. Sahlin-Andersson & Engwall, 2002). Moreover, with the introduction of new public management, political control is pursued with a mix of bureaucratic and management principles. At the same time as management models have come to dominate much of governance in and of universities, they remain surprisingly imprecise. For example, it remains quite unclear how to define what good academic leadership is from a management perspective. This conclusion suggests that a clarifying discussion regarding what management principles are, what they are good for and what the limitations are of such principles is as much needed as the discussion of collegiality. As a basis for both these discussions, we cannot rely only on ideal type reasoning. Contemporary governance forms of universities mix to the extent that distinct ideal types may not capture important dynamics of this governance. We need comparative empirical data on reforms, practices and impact.

References

Ahlbäck Öberg, S. (2014). Kollegialitet och linjestyre – oförenliga roller eller nödvändig dualism? In M. B. Blom & L. Magnusson (red.), *Samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten vid Uppsala universitet 50 år, 1964–2014* (p. 123–134). Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

Ahlbäck Öberg, S., Bennich-Björkman, L., Björklund, S., Engwall, L., Foss Hansen, H., Gustavsson, S., et al. (2016). *Det hotade universitetet*. Stockholm: Dialogos.

Bendix, R. (1956). *Work and authority in industry*. New York: Wiley.

Bennett, J.B. (1998). *Collegial professionalism: The academy, individualism and the common good*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.

Björck, H. (2013). *Om kollegialitet.* SULF:s skriftserie, XLI. Stockholm: Sveriges universitetslärarförbund.

Björck, H. (2015). Makt och myndighet i högskolans samtidshistoria. Reaktioner på nedmonteringen av kollegialiteten. In N. Andersson & M. Greiff, (red.), *Från Göteborg till Malmö via Königsberg. En resa i idéhistoria, idrott, kultur och utbildning. Till Lennart Olausson en festskrift* (pp. 85–108). Skrifter för Historiska perspektiv. #15.

Brunsson, N., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2000). Constructing organizations: The example of the public sector reform. *Organization Studies*, *21*(4), 721–746.

Byrkjeflot, H. (2000). Fortolkningen av Webers byrakratiske idealtype organisasjonsteorien. *Nordiske organisasjonsstudier*, *2*(2), 5–28.

Byrkjeflot, H., & Du Gay, P. (2012). Bureaucracy: An idea whose time has come (again)? In T. Diefenbach & R. Todnem By (Eds.), *Reinventing hierarchy and bureaucracy: From the bureau to network organizations* (pp. 85–109). Bingley: Emerald.

Byrkjeflot, H., & Teig, I.L. (2013, March 14–15). *Revisiting the bureaucratic phenomenon: Social-anthropological and organizational perspectives.* Paper presented at the 9th New Institutionalism Workshop, Warszawa.

Cole, J.R. (2010). *The great American university: Its rise to preeminence, its indispensable national role, why it must be protected.* New York: Public Affairs.

Collini, S. (2012). *What are universities for?* London: Penguin Books.

Engwall, L. (2011). Aktiebolag och universitet. I P. Björk m.fl (red.), *Det goda universitetet: Festskrift till Anders Hallberg* (pp. 267–280). Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

Engwall, L. (2014). The recruitment of university top leaders: Politics, communities and markets in interaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *30*(3), 332–343.

Fredriksson, M., & Pallas, J. (2013). *Med synlighet som ledstjärna: En analys av vilka principer som styr kommunikationsarbetet i nationella förvaltningsmyndigheter.* Division of Media and Communication Science Research. Report 2013:1. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

Halsey, A.H. (1992). *Decline of donnish dominion: The British academic professions in the twentieth century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halsey, A.H. (2004). *A History of Sociology in Britain: Science, Literature, and Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970). *Exit, voice and loyalty.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, *69*(1), 3–19.

Hood, C. (1995). The 'new public management' in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *2*(3), 93–109.

Jemielniak, D., & Greenwood, D.J. (2013). Wake up or perish: Neo-liberalism, the social sciences, and salvaging the public university. *Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies*, 11(1), 1–11. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10:1177/1532708613516430

Kallinikos, J. (2004). The social foundations of the bureaucratic order. *Organization*, 11(1), 13–36.

Kennedy, D. (1997). *Academic duty.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (1963). *The uses of the university.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Krücken, G., & Meier, F. (2006). Turning the university into an organizational actor. In G.S. Drori, J.W. Meyer, & H. Hwang (Eds.), *Globalization and organization: World society and organizational change* (pp. 241–257). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maasen, P., & Olsen, J.P. (Eds.) (2007). *University dynamics and European integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.

McCormack, J., Propper, C., & Smith, S. (2014). Herding cats? Management and university performance. *The Economic Journal*, *124*, F534–F564.

Merton, R.K. (1957). Priorities in the scientific discovery: A chapter in the sociology of science. *American Sociological Review*, *22*(6), 635–659.

Meyer, J.W., & Bromley, P. (2013). The worldwide expansion of 'organization'. *Sociological Theory*, *31*(4), 366–389.

Ramirez, F. (2010). Accounting for excellence: Transforming universities into organizational actors. In V.D. Rust, L. Portnoi, & S.S. Bagely (Eds.), *Higher education, policy, and the global competition phenomenon* (pp. 54–75). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rosovsky, H. (1990). *The university: An owner's manual*. New York: Norton.

Russel, C. (1991). *Academic freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Sahlin, K. (2012). The interplay of organizing models in higher education: What room is there for collegiality in universities characterized by bounded autonomy? In B. Stensaker, J. Välimaa, & C. Sarrico (Eds.), *Managing reform in universities: The dynamics of culture, identity and organisational change* (pp. 198–221). London: Routledge.

Sahlin, K., & Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2016). *Kollegialitet. En modern styrform*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2001). *National, International and Transnational Constructions of New Public Management.* Score Rapportserie 2000:4. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.

Sahlin-Andersson, K., & Engwall, L. (2002). *The expansion of management knowledge: Carriers, flows, and sources*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Styhre, A. (2009). *Byråkrati: Teoretiker, kritiker, försvarare*. Malmö: Liber.

Sundberg, E. (2013). *Autonomireformen: Vad hände med det kollegiala styret?* (C-uppsats). Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

Sundberg, E. (2014). *Autonomireformen: En kompletterande undersökning*. Samverkansgruppen för en god forskningsmiljö (GFM), Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Uppsala universitet.

Sundqvist, B. (2010). *Svenska universitet – lärdomsborgar eller politiska instrument?* Hedemora: Gidlunds.

Weber, M. (1922/1983). *Ekonomi och samhälle: Förståelsesociologins grunder*. Övers. Agne Lundquist. Lund: Argos.

Citation: NordSTEP 2016, **2**: 33640 - http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v2.33640

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET
Forskningssekretariatet/abusk

Cover
04.06.2024

Drøftelse af læring fra og opfølgning på forskningsevaluering på Institut for Mennesker og Teknologi 2022

Indstilling

Det indstilles, at Akademisk Råd:

- Orienteres om og kommer med bemærkninger til resultatet af forskningsevalueringen på IMT. AR bedes anlægge et tværgående perspektiv på evalueringen.
- Kommer med eventuelle bemærkninger til instituttets plan for opfølgning.
- Drøfter om den samlede evaluering giver anledning til overvejelser af mere strategisk karakter for universitetet.

Sagsfremstilling

Institut for Mennesker og Teknologi havde den 2.-4. november 2022 besøg af et internationalt evalueringspanel, som skulle evaluere instituttets forskningsmiljøer. Panelet gennemførte i løbet af tre dage møder med udvalgte ansatte på IMT samt enkelte medlemmer af RUC Forskningsservice og ledelsen. Møderne blev styret af panelets forperson Christopher Mathieu fra Lund Universitet, hvilket skabte en god struktur og stringens samt en klar rollefordeling mellem panelet og RUC-personel på møderne.

Panelet udtrykte en stor tilfredshed med panelbesøget i sin helhed og særligt en stor begejstring for de ansattes engagement og forskningsglæde. Overordnet set fandt panelet, at forskning er sekundært til uddannelse på IMT, at instituttet er meget heterogent, og at visse udfordringer i højere grad handler om manglende kommunikation og anerkendelse end egentlige operationelle årsager. Panelet bidrog desuden med en række anbefalinger, herunder at uddannelsesaktiviteterne bør indhegnes for at give mere tid til forskning, at forskningsmæssige hensyn bør veje tungere i rekrutteringer, og at kommunikation internt og eksternt bør forbedres.

Forskningssekretariatet har udarbejdet et resumé af evalueringsrapportens overordnede resultater og anbefalinger (bilag 1). Den samlede evalueringsrapport er vedlagt (bilag 3). I dialog med prorektor har IMT forholdt sig til evalueringsrapportens anbefalinger og har lavet en plan for opfølgning på baggrund heraf (bilag 2).

Videre proces

Dato	Råd/ ledelsesforum	Indhold af høring i råd/ledelsesforum	Ansvarlig enhed/ sagsbehandler
27. juni	Universitets-ledelsen	Drøftelse af læring fra og opfølgning på forskningsevaluering på IMT 2022	Forsknings-sekretariatet
2. halvår 2024	Bestyrelsen	RUC’s bestyrelse orienteres årligt om aktuelle evalueringsrapporter og planer for opfølgning	Forsknings-sekretariatet
2. halvår 2024	Forsknings-udvalget	FoU drøfter ”lessons learned” fra de 4 gennemførte evalueringer.	Forsknings-sekretariatet

Økonomiske og administrative konsekvenser, herunder finansieringskilde
I evalueringskonceptet er ikke indlejret budgetmæssige konsekvenser som følge af evalueringsresultater.

Forelæggelsen er godkendt af
Vicedirektør Elisabeth Hvas og prorektor Peter Kjær

Bilag

1. Resumé af evalueringsrapport fra forskningsevaluering på IMT 2022
2. IMT Research Evaluation Follow-up
3. Research quality evaluation of the Department of People and Technology, University of Roskilde, Fall/Winter 2022-23_final report

Resumé af evalueringsrapport fra forskningsevaluering på IMT 2022: Overordnede resultater og anbefalinger

Dette resumé omfatter evalueringspanelets overordnede resultater og anbefalinger. Der henvises til panelets evalueringsrapport for uddybende evaluering af forskningsprofil, forskningsexcellence, samfundsmæssig impact, forskning og uddannelse, forskningskapacitet samt evalueringer af de 6 evalueringsgrupper.

Overordnede resultater

1. Forskning er sekundært til uddannelse

Panelet finder, at forskning er sekundært til uddannelse på instituttet. Det ses, at uddannelsesmæssige hensyn er bestemmende for organisering (bl.a. af forskningsgrupperne) og beslutninger om rekruttering. Hertil kommer, at underordningen af forskning påvirker den tilgængelige forskningstid for VIP på alle niveauer. Underordningen af forskning har strukturelle, kulturelle og økonomiske årsager, og hænger blandt andet sammen med vægten af uddannelsesindtægten i RUC's samlede økonomi.
Ifølge panelet bør forskning og uddannelse forsones. Enten ved at integrere forskning og uddannelse med et øget fokus på forsknings-output. Eller ved at betragte forskning og uddannelse som forskellige aktiviteter med egne ressourcer, der overlapper i forskningsbaseret uddannelse.

2. Instituttets store heterogenitet er et aktiv og en udfordring

Panelet finder, at instituttet er meget heterogent. Fagområderne og disciplinerne er forskellige. Blandt forskningsgrupperne findes der både veletablerede og nye grupper. Noget af instituttets forskning er grundforskning, imens andet er anvendelsesorienteret. Nogle forskningsmiljøer er konventionelle i deres tilgang, imens andre er anti-mainstream. Alle forskningsmiljøerne demonstrerer, at de kan opnå instituttets mål vedr. excellence og impact, omend nogle miljøer gør dette mere konsistent end andre.

Instituttet har ambitiøse planer om at udnytte instituttets disciplinære heterogenitet til at samarbejde om store samfundsmæssige udfordringer. Panelet konstaterer, at forudsætningerne for tværdisciplinære samarbejder er gode, og at sådanne samarbejder sandsynligvis er nødvendige for realisere instituttets potentiale. Dog viser erfaringen, at det også medfører en række operationelle udfordringer, som skal adresseres og assisteres.

3. Nogle udfordringer handler i højere grad om manglende kommunikation og anerkendelse end om operationelle årsager

Panelet finder, at der er udfordringer med frustration og manglende selvtillid. Ofte skyldes dette ikke egentlige problemer på et operationelt niveau. I stedet skyldes det manglende kommunikation, formidling, offentlig omtale og anerkendelse af instituttets aktiviteter. Dette er gældende fra et individ-niveau op til centralt RUC-niveau.
RUC bør argumentere nationalt og internationalt for en samfundsengageret, udfordringsdrevet og kollaborativ tilgang til forskning og intervention, efterhånden som denne tilgang, der bygger på traditionelle RUC kerneprincipper, også vinder frem i den bredere videnskabelige og politiske verden. Det kan forhåbentligt lede til mere funding samt bedre selvtillid blandt personalet.

Anbefalinger

1. **Forholdet mellem uddannelse og forskning bør forsones**

Uddannelsesaktiviteter (undervisning, forberedelse, administration, uddannelsesreform) beslaglægger i dag tid og mentalt energi fra forskningen. Derfor bør uddannelsesaktiviteter øremærkes, eller også bør personalet kompenseres for de reelle timer brugt på uddannelse. Alternativt bør forskning gives bedre muligheder for "pushback" mod uddannelsesaktiviteterne.

2. **Nogle rekrutteringer på alle niveauer bør være motiveret af forskningsmæssige hensyn (og ikke uddannelsesmæssige behov)**

3. **Kommunikation internt og eksternt bør forbedres og mere proaktiv.**

Kommunikationsmedarbejdere bør kontakte forskere med henblik på at finde indhold – og ikke omvendt. Forskere bør være mere aktive på sociale medier.

4. **Tag udgangspunkt i det der er meningsfuldt og motiverende for forskerne. Brug dette til at udvikle forskere og miljøer i nye, ønskede retninger.**

5. **Tilskynd forskere til at bringe det, der allerede er opnået, op på et højere niveau**

Et højere niveau kan f.eks. være at publicere i en højere rangeret eller international kanal, at udvikle policies, at udbrede viden fra co-creating processer eller at bruge resultater i projekt ansøgninger. Der synes at være meget uudnyttet potentiale.

6. **Undersøg systematisk hvordan heterogene forskere og forskningsgrupper faktisk samarbejder om store samfundsmæssige udfordringer**

7. **Overvej hvordan "social data science" kan udbredes som en tilgang på tværs af instituttet**

De centrale personer og grupper, der besidder kompetencerne i dag, er allerede underbemandet. Skal disse grupper i fremtiden være operationelle partnere med de øvrige grupper, eller skal de i højere grad være interne konsulenter, der underviser det øvrige personale?

8. **Den komplekse, multifacetterede forskning, som instituttet kan forfølge, kræver en organisation, som er problem-baseret i modsætning til domæne-baseret**

9. **Der bør være en opmærksomhed på, hvordan forhold som excellence vs. impact og lokal/national vs. international balanceres og prioriteres.**

IMT RESEARCH EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP

Background

This action plan is based on a report from the international research evaluation of the Department of People and Technology (IMT), fall/winter 2022-23, performed by an expert panel consisting of:

- Christopher Mathieu (Lund University)
- Gloria Bordogna (National Research Counsil of Italy)
- Andrea Kleeberg-Niepage (European University Flensburg)
- Pernille Tanggaard Andersen (University of Southern Denmark)
- Professor Per Anderssson (Linköping University)
- Mats Eklund (Linköping University).

The report has been widely discussed in the IMT research committee at two meetings in the spring of 2023. The committee decided to focus on five overall themes, presented in further detail below. and has in collaboration shaped the action plan with timelines for implementation at the departmental level. In addition to the five themes, the plan will also highlight other points of attention, which require a stronger focus in the future.

The five overarching themes of actions are as follows:

- Impact
- Internationalisation and network
- Interdisciplinarity
- Recruitment and career development
- Balance between research and education

Department of People and Technology

The Department of People and Technology is the largest and topically most diverse of the four departments at Roskilde University. It covers subject areas such as health care and health professionals, geography and urbanism, working life, organizations and social innovation, social psychology, data science and informatics, food and energy systems, and learning and pedagogics. The diversity of the subject areas is reflected in the wide variety of research methods, theories, funding sources, and publication strategies of the different researcher groups. Questions pertaining to stakeholder engagement and research impact also vary in terms of audiences and collaborators. The Department is oriented toward basic research and theory development as well as highly applied and action-oriented research and in some instances consultancy work.

The Department's ambition is to perform research at the highest level within our fields of expertise, yielding outcomes that promote the positive development of society. We liaise with international research partners to ensure international scientific impact, while also contributing to communities of practice both locally and globally. We strive to be an inspiring and healthy working space for all employees, to support personal and group development and achievements, while nurturing connectivity and communal responsibilities within and between the department units.

NOTE:

The action plan precedes the implementation of section management at Roskilde University in the fall of 2024. Responsible parties vis-à-vis action points will be revisited during the implementation of section management.

Colour code used in this document:

University level
Department level
Researcher group level

1. Impact

The evaluation points to the need for a greater audience and a larger impact of the research of the department. IMT's research addresses a wide range of timely and important societal challenges, and hence the potential impact of our research is large. The evaluation panel points to potentials in more holistic and integrative work (see section on interdisciplinarity), the potential of wider and deeper communication of our research, and the potential in widening the audience and generalizing the results – e.g. moving from "the Danish case" to more widely applicable analyses. Much of the research at the department is characterized by a critical or "marginal" perspective, but this should not limit the importance nor audience of our work. It is important to stress that a more international, wide or even mainstream dimension of the research of the department, should be in addition and not replace the existing national, critical and practice-oriented dimensions.

Actions	Criteria/indicator	Time plan	Key actors
Develop methods and indicators to monitor impact based on the 2030 University Strategy: Interconnected.	Methods and indicators developed	N/A	Rectorate & Communication
Identify specific IMT impact criteria	Impact criteria discussed in FOU	Aug-Dec	Dean, FOU
Develop goals for impact in the forthcoming department strategy	Develop time plan for impact in department strategy	Aug-Dec 2024	Dean, FOU
Deliver impact-oriented pre- and post-award support	Impact capacity strengthened in pre- and post-award team	Aug-Dec 2024	Dean, FOU, Award Team
Take stock of international research collaborations	On the agenda of researcher group meetings	Jan-May 2024	Researcher groups
Identify and strengthen research collaborations with societal stakeholders.	On the agenda of researcher group meetings	Jan-May 2024	Researcher groups

2. Internationalization and network

The evaluation report points to the value of increased internationalization in several ways. This includes direct academic research collaboration, international (co)-publishing, outstays, incoming scholars, playing a more active role in networks and scientific communities, and hosting international conferences. The Department has a strong national anchoring in much of its research, but this just accentuates the need for a deliberate internationalization agenda for the individual, in the research groups and at the department level.

Actions	Criteria/indicator	Time plan	Key actors
Develop a framework for the implementation of a "Visiting Scholar Scheme"	Framework developed	N/A	Pro-Rector
Strengthen onboarding programs for visiting scholars	Programs developed and implemented	N/A	Pro-Rector
Develop a deficit guarantee for IMT to host international conferences	Principles for priorities to be developed	Q3, 2024	Dean, FOU
Enable VIP staff to accumulate research time to enable outstays	Specify rules for doing so	Q4, 2024	Dean, Pro-dean, LSU, FOU
Plan research seminars in continuation of PhD defenses	PhD committee members deliver seminars	Continuous	PhD School, Research groups
Ensure that PhDs go on environmental change	PhDs go on environmental change	Continuous	PhD school, PhD Supervisors
Share international networks and contacts	On the agenda of researcher group meetings	Annually	Research groups
Develop plan for visiting and hosting	On the agenda of researcher group meetings	Annually	Research groups

3. Interdisciplinarity

In spite of the interdisciplinary reach of the department as a whole, much of the research is organized in research groups which are quite homogenous both in terms of disciplinary span, methods and topics. The department has a large potential in widening the scope of its research and addressing complex societal challenges through a multidisciplinary and holistic analysis. The evaluation panel goes as far as to propose a radical reorganization along key societal questions in order to support and foster a challenge-driven and impact-oriented research platform.

Actions	Criteria/indicator	Time plan	Key actors
Allocate seed money for interdisciplinary projects across departments	Interdisciplinary pilot projects funded	N/A	Pre-Rector
Advocate for interdisciplinary calls to be made by funding bodies	Funding bodies advertise interdisciplinary calls	Continuous	Rector, Pro-Rector, Deans
Create an environment for the discussion interdisciplinary and challenge driven calls	Interdisciplinarity discussed in staff meetings and seminars	Continuous	Dean, FOU
Apply for strategic investments to be made in data-stewards to better enable social data science	Applications that include data stewards submitted	2025	PLIS and Digital Transformation Research Groups
Organize interdisciplinary seminars with a view to project applications	Seminars held	Annually	Research Groups

4. Recruitment and career development

Academic career pathways are challenging and highly competitive. The teaching load at the department is considerable, leading to trade-offs between teaching and research. The economy and recruitment logic of the department is heavily biased towards teaching loads, and hence strategic hiring for research agendas is a challenge. Younger researchers balance their orientation towards individual mentors, but also need a diverse suite of role models and academic inspirators. There is need for transparency and honesty when it comes to new positions and co-funding options within the department.

Actions	Criteria/indicator	Time plan	Key actors
Develop a common framework for competence development	Common framework enacted	N/A	HR
Develop a new budget model based on the RUC strategy – Interconnected 2023	New budget model in place	N/A	University Director
Make resource allocation vis-à-vis recruitment more transparent	Establishment of a Recruitment Committee	Q3, 2024	Dean
Ensure systematic dialogue about recruitment	Establishment of a Recruitment Committee	Q3, 2024	Dean
Make plans for delegating personnel management to the respective environments	Establishment of Section Based Management	Jan-Aug 2024	Dean, LUA, LSU, FOU, IR
Develop a scheme for career development for early career scholars	Career seminars organized and career sparring at an individual level made available	Continuous	Dean, HR and PhD School

5. Research and education

The evaluation report designates the balance between education and research as one of three overall findings: "Research is largely secondary to education at the department (…) Educational priorities set the agenda for organizational structures, even the organization of research groups and environments. Educational priorities are the basis for the personnel recruitment and hiring decisions", the report states. It is a common experience that research time is strongly challenged by educational, planning and meeting activities.
A recommendation is therefore to rethink the relation between research and education, and two models are suggested: One is a greater integration between the two activities while at the same time pulling this towards research-output goals. Another is to acknowledge these activities as taking place in separate spheres and with dedicated resources and skill sets. Fencing in education time is thus a means to create more coherent time for research, however, hiring as a research motivated action is also mentioned in the report.

Actions	Criteria/indicator	Time plan	Key actors
Develop model for the monitoring of the economies of educational programs	Model developed and used in decision-making	N/A	US
Develop model for long-term planning and allocation of teaching obligations	Model developed and implemented	Q2, 2025	Pro-Dean, IMT-secr. (U), Heads of Studies
Make teaching norms transparent across programs (and departments, if possible)	Accessible overview of teaching norms generated	Q2, 2025	Pro-Dean, IMT-secr. (U), Heads of Studies
Reduce allocation of resources reserved for exams	Inventory of possible reductions produced	Q1, 2025	Pro-Dean, IMT-secr. (U)
Identify avenues to more coherent research time	Task force on "Coherent Research Time" established	Q4, 2024	Dean, Pro-Dean and FOU
Hold biannual meetings in researcher groups to discuss teaching obligations	Biannual meetings held	Biannually	Research Groups, Heads of Studies

Research quality evaluation of the Department of People and Technology, University of Roskilde

Fall/Winter 2022-23

The evaluation has been performed by:

- Christopher Mathieu, Department of Sociology, Lund University, Sweden (Chair)
- Gloria Bordogna, National Research Council of Italy – Institute of Electromagnetic Sensing of the Environment (CNR – IREA) - Milano, Italy
- Professor Andrea Kleeberg-Niepage, Department of Psychology, European University Flensburg, Germany
- Pernille Tanggaard Andersen, Professor & Deputy Head of Department, Department of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark
- Professor Per Andersson, Department of behavioural sciences and learning, Linköping University, Sweden
- Professor Mats Eklund, Department of Management and Engineering, Linköping University, Sweden

Table of contents

Introduction

Background for the research quality evaluation

During Fall/Winter 2022-23 the Department of People and Technology, Roskilde University conducted an evaluation of research quality based on internationally recognised academic standards. The evaluation covers the Department's six research environments:

- Data Science and IT;
- Social Psychology;
- Society, Space and Technology;
- Working life, Organizations and Social Innovation;
- Learning and Education; and,
- Health and Society.

The assessment was commissioned by the Pro-rector of research.

The evaluation of the Department's research has three main purposes:

- To contribute to development and learning through reflection on strengths, weaknesses, and potentials, based on an ambition to promote pioneering, interdisciplinary research.
- To generate systematic insights into the quality of research based on international expertise and internationally recognised standards.
- To establish a common and recognised tool for quality development based on a systematic evaluation of the Department's research profile, strategy, and performance.

The panel is aware that this is an evaluation at the Departmental level that can serve as an impetus for the Department's further development. Thus, the panel has focused primarily on matters within the Department's purview, while also, where deemed important, commented on wider opportunities and constraints.

The panel supports its recommendations with reference to bibliometric analyses, self-presentation reports, strategy documents, data sheets and knowledge obtained during the site panel.

Presentation of the assessment panel

Reader Christopher Mathieu, Department of Sociology, Lund University (Chair)

Christopher Mathieu is Reader (Docent) in Organisational and Labour Sociology at the Department of Sociology, Lund University. He is affiliated as research fellow to the Birgit Rausing Centre for Medical Humanities; CIRCLE, the Centre for Innovation Research at Lund University; and the Institute for Employment Research (IER) at Warwick University. He currently works on two Horizon 2020 projects – *Beyond 4.0* on the impact of the new technologies on the future of jobs, business models and welfare in Europe; and *Diheco* on digital platforms in healthcare. From 2015-2018 he coordinated the H2020 project *QuInnE: Quality of jobs and Innovation generated Employment outcomes*. He is also the current chairperson of the European Sociological Association's (ESA) Research Network on the Sociology of the Arts. Recent publications include *The Oxford Handbook of Job Quality* (OUP, 2022) and *Accomplishing Cultural Policy* (Routledge, 2022).

Dr Gloria Bordogna, National Research Council of Italy – Institute of Electromagnetic Sensing of the Environment (CNR – IREA) - Milano, Italy

Gloria Bordogna is a director of research at CNR IREA. Her research topics concern uncertainty and imprecision modelling in information retrieval systems, databases and geographic information systems. She participated in European projects and coordinated national projects on the themes of textual contents' representation, flexible querying, social networks mining, and knowledge & data-driven fusion of multidimensional multisource data. From 2003 to 2010 she was adjunct professor of Information Retrieval and Geographic Information Systems at Bergamo University. Since 2008 she has organized the special track on "Information Access and Retrieval" at the "ACM SAC". Among her activities she is a member of the editorial board of journals among which "MDPI ISPRS Int. Journal of Geo-information" and "MDPI Geomatics"; serves as a reviewer of journals and European and national research agencies (ESF - European Science Foundation, FCT - Portugal, ANR - France; FWO-Belgium, ERCEA - "ERC Starting Grants" program); participates in the program committee of several international conferences, such as ACM SIGIR, ACM CIKM, ECIR, FUZZIEEE, IPMU, IEEE/WIC/ACM WI/IAT, FQAS. As main recognition of her research activity in 2017 she was elected fellow of the International Fuzzy System Association and since 2021 she is ranked in the Stanford University list of the top 2% most widely cited scientists.

Professor Andrea Kleeberg-Niepage, Department of Psychology, European University Flensburg (EUF), Germany

Andrea Kleeberg-Niepage heads the Psychology Department at the Interdisciplinary Institute for Environmental, Social and Human Sciences at the EUF. Her field of research is developmental and educational psychology with connections to critical and social psychology. Her research interests include historical, cross-cultural and methodological approaches.

Current research projects deal with the use of digital media by children and adolescents, the conditions for success of inclusive schools from the perspective of the subjects, children's and adolescents' ideas about the future in different countries, the replication of historical studies (e.g. on children's drawings) and on changes in young adults' dating practices and ideas about love in the online age, on which she publishes internationally and nationally (e.g. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2136772; https://doi.org/10.3224/diskurs.v17i4.04; https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732322110197 ; https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-021-00195-1).

She contributed to The SAGE Encyclopedia of Children and Childhood Studies in 2020, serves as an ad hoc reviewer for various journals (e.g., QHR, HUAR, Theory & Psychology) and research communities (e.g., DFF), and is co-founder of the Psychological Institute for Subjectivity and Practice Research, which provides i.a. psychological training and supervision for teachers.

Pernille Tanggaard Andersen, Professor & Deputy head of department, Department of Public Health, University of Southern DK

Professor Pernille Tanggaard Andersen scientific research areas are health, well-being and patient progress, inequality in health, local areas and health promotion interventions. She has published articles in several leading international journals including Plos One, BMC Health Services Research, Social Science & Medicine and the European Journal of Public Health. H-index: 11. In addition, she assesses funding applications for Danish, Norwegian and Dutch foundations and the EU and is a peer reviewer for more than 20 journals within Public Health Sciences. Tanggaard Andersen has given more than 50 keynote or guest lectures at conferences and symposia in several European countries. Professor Tanggaard Andersen is a member of several national and international steering groups; assessment committee and editorial committee and international committees. She has received research funding from various sources, several national and EU foundations, municipalities and agencies.

Professor Per Andersson, Department of behavioural sciences and learning, Linköping University, Sweden

Per Andersson is a professor of education at the Division of education and adult learning, Department of behavioural science and learning, Linköping University. The research area covers adult education as well as vocational education, and he is responsible for the vocational education research of the division. Sweden. His research interests focus on recognition of prior learning, professional development among teachers in vocational and adult education, and marketisation of adult education. Presently he is running a research project on marketisation of Swedish adult education, funded by the Swedish Research Council. Andersson is also the editor of the Nordic Journal of Vocational Education and Training.

Professor Mats Eklund, Department of Management and Engineering, Linköping University, Sweden

Mats Eklund is professor in environmental technology and management, Linköping university, Sweden. He holds a PhD from the multidiciplinary research school of Water & Environmental Studies at Linköping University and is a professor at the technical faculty there since 2007. He leads research in the group “Industrial and Urban symbiosis” and is the founder and director of the transdisciplinary Biogas Solutions Research Center, a triple-helix center of excellence. He is also the founder of the Industrial Ecology research program emanating from strategic collaboration between *Tekniska Verken* and Linköping university. He has supervised more than 50 Master theses, twelve PhD-candidates to their degree and authored more than fifty scientific papers on analysis, development and dissemination of sustainable solutions. Other roles he has includes member of the board of the recycling/garden company Econova, and strategic advisor and evaluator of research projects for the family Kamprad foundation and the biomass research program of the Swedish energy agency.

The site visit

The panel conducted a site visit to the Department of People and Technology on 2-4 November, 2022.

Submission of the report

This report was submitted on 3 February, 2023.

Summary

The Department of People and Technology (DPT) is large and very heterogeneous, almost a mini-university with the social and behavioural sciences, humanities, natural / physical sciences, health science, computer and information sciences, and technical sciences all represented. Orientations and means of operation and organisation also vary. Therefore, in the discussions below many of the observations and recommendations apply to some research environments, groups and their activities, but not all. Even those that apply generally do not apply universally. This should be borne in mind while reading this report. Specificities of each environment are reported in the sub-reports (appendices A-F). In some places we have also chosen in the assessment to make contrasts and discuss priorities. This does not necessarily imply a mutual exclusion or matter of one or the other or trade-offs. Often several objectives can be obtained, sometimes simultaneously, sometimes sequentially, sometimes requiring divisions of labour. But resources, such as staff, time, effort, attention, and financing are always required, and when devoted to one ends the same resources cannot be devoted to another at the same time.

We have also been asked to train our analysis at the research environment (RE) level, rather than research groups (RG) or teams or individuals. We recognise that in some cases REs comprise of RGs of different sizes, with different histories, traditions, track records and means of operating.

Three overall findings

1. Research is largely secondary to education at the department. We understand that this has an economic base, that RUC is largely financed through block grants for its educational activities rather than income streams for its research activities. Educational priorities set the agenda for organisational structures, even the organisation of *research* groups and environments. Educational priorities are the basis for personnel recruitment and hiring decisions. The extensive work in restructuring and developing educational programmes is largely uncompensated and directly eats into research time. A (legitimate) concern with research-based teaching impacts policies on how much pure research time academic personnel can have. In addition to the economic basis, there also appear to be structural and cultural reasons behind the superordination of education to research, with profound and well-known impact on the amount and timing of research time available to academic staff at all levels. Research, in our opinion, is not even *relatively autonomous* from education. Research and education need to be reconciled, as it appears doubtful that this can be radically transformed. Two basic choices appear possible. One is greater integration of research and education, but then pulling this more towards research-output goals – scientific and societal impact-oriented publications and projects of high scientific value. The other is acknowledging these as largely separate activities requiring their own dedicated resources and skill sets and treating them as different spheres that overlap in research-based education. In the future, it should also be considered how the research dimension can be upgraded and given more substance and become a supported and supporting unit in its own right.

2. The great heterogeneity within the department is unequivocally an asset, as well as a challenge. This heterogeneity not only has to do with disciplinary backgrounds and fields of study. There are some highly successful durable groups that are well-established (decades old) and well-known even

internationally, and newer groups addressing novel topics. Some research is oriented towards basic science while other is highly contextual and oriented towards specific applications. Sometimes basic science and case studies are combined seamlessly. Some research environments follow conventional patterns whereas others are distinctly anti-mainstream in their approach. Despite these differences, all research environments display that they can achieve the stated departmental performance goals regarding excellence (publication rankings, funding sources) and impact, though some do so more consistently than others. The latter appears indicative of different commitments to different aspects of the departmentally acknowledged research agenda/strategy.

There are two dimensions to the heterogeneity issue that we will return to. One has to do with the *primus inter pares* aspect of the excellence-impact construction, skewed towards excellence measurements. Different expressions and reasons for this are given and discussed further in this text. The second has to do with the potential synergies of collaborations based especially on disciplinary (including methodological) heterogeneities, and what this means for organising, structuring collaboration and personnel decisions. There are ambitious plans and visions of how DPT's diversity can be harnessed especially for engaging with large complex societal challenges. DPT has many of the necessary components for doing so, but there is also evidence from more limited attempts at collaboration between vastly different disciplines and research units that operational challenges in collaboration need to be explicitly addressed and overcome. Status, availability, unfamiliarity, differing disciplinary procedures and demands that can only be resolved by adopting one form (such as when conforming to publication standards in disciplinary journals), and radically different ontological, epistemological and methodological points of departure are all operational factors and all matters that have surfaced and need to be continuously addressed. This type of grand collaboration is possible, desirable and probably necessary for DPT to meet its full potential, but it needs to be assisted, otherwise retreating to the familiar and comfortable is an overriding risk.

3. Some problems or issues are matters of recognition and communication of things that operatively function and perform well. In other words, the underlying production works fine, but the lack of further communication and dissemination, and the recognition that often follows from satisfactory communication and publicity, leads to frustration at best and self-doubt and possibly abandoning positive activities at worst. Communication, credit and recognition are issues that run from the individual up to the central RUC level. This matter is also linked to the nominal equality of excellence and impact, but their de facto hierarchisation. The assessment panel does not believe that all problems are symbolic, communicative, and purely social recognition-based in nature. It is important to understand what, and at what level, things become problematic. However, especially as the appropriateness and worth of some core principles and approaches traditionally practiced at RUC are gaining traction in the wider research and policy worlds, it is important for RUC and DPT to argue forcefully nationally and internationally, and in academic, policy, and wider public forums for a societally-engaged, problem and challenge oriented, impactful collaborative research and intervention actions. This hopefully will result in greater acceptance and funding of such endeavours, as well as shoring up confidence among staff that what they have been long oriented towards is right and valuable.

(A bit more than) Three overall recommendations

1. Reconciliation of the education–research relationship. Though there are clear synergies and beneficial aspects of the relationship between education and research, there is also a predatory relationship regarding time and mental energy between educational activities – teaching and preparation, education administration, and educational programme reform and transformation – and research activities. Educational activities either need to be ring fenced, compensated for more accurately (i.e. one gets the hours for the time activities actually take), or increase the ability for research to pushback against education (though there are obvious risks with the latter, especially if it is left to individuals to deal with increased demands for research production). The predatory relationship applies to all academic staff and requires a general solution. An issue that pertains to a more limited group regarding the education–research relationship is allowing those who can attract research funding to a group and produce high quality research and cover their salary to engage 100% in research to do so. There are other means of securing research-based education than mandating that 20% of researchers' time be devoted to education. The 20% to be devoted to teaching is likely in reality to preoccupy more time than on paper, as time devoted to teaching has proven hard to ringfence. These educational activities will shift to others and may lead to an opportunity for permanent hiring or temporary positions. But as there is a component of research time in all academic staff contracts there is little risk of polarising staff into pure teaching and pure research pools.
2. At least some hiring – at all levels and not just the professorial level – should be research motivated, not primarily based on educational needs. This would also make having an explicit and committed research direction and strategy at the research group, environment, or centre level important.
3. Improve communication – both internal and external. Increased communication should be proactive, with communication officers contacting researchers for content to publicise rather than waiting to be approached by researchers. Efforts should be made to valorise what is significant but currently under-recognised. Researchers should themselves be more directly active on social media.
4. Build upon what is meaningful and motivates researchers. Augment inherent motivation with opportunities to exercise the skills and interests of the staff and provide supplemental training and development. This should be done at individual and group levels to advance in desirable directions rather than solely continuing on established paths. The major question is: At what level or what type of organisational entity can encourage and facilitate upward developmental spirals rather than primarily reproduction? This entails both close and detailed knowledge of the research group/environment (or whatever form of larger societal problem-oriented units might replace them) and the ability and legitimacy to spur and challenge the unit in an external but solidaric manner.
5. Encourage and facilitate researchers to take what is already accomplished to a higher level – a higher ranked publication channel, an international outlet, developing advice or routines from the organisational strategy level to a policy level, from the co-creator group to other similar groups or potential audiences, or turning results and findings into the basis for project applications. There seems to be a lot of untapped potential for upgrading the research results already obtained and developing this potential further. This should not be confused with mere recycling or repackaging.
6. Systematically investigate how work and cooperation actually takes place between heterogeneous researchers and research groups, especially in larger constellations confronting complex societal challenges. DPT uniquely has qualified researchers from a variety of perspectives to do this.

7. The identification of "social data science" as one approach that can run across the department is promising and can possibly meet a policy-driven demand for knowledge that is useful in a variety of political discourses. But what are the real implications of pursuing the "social data science" ambition? Key individuals and groups appear already overloaded and understaffed. Is it reasonable to expect research groups that can expand based on their own agendas to become operative partners across the vast majority of other research groups? Or are the approaches, knowledge and skills of these key groups to be taught and spread to other research groups so their role will be an education, training and coaching/internal consultant role? Is there the time, capability, arenas and acceptance for even this?
8. DPT is uniquely endowed to pursue research entailing long, complex, multifaceted chains, but this requires large, problem-based as opposed to domain or topic-based organisation. Just as data and digital technologies are ubiquitous, so is learning, work and organisation, innovation, space and place, social psychology, health and well-being. There are important questions to be addressed within these domains, but these are also core and necessary components (as are domains largely outside of this department such as aesthetics, legal frameworks, financing and resource allocation) to the complex problems the department can, with its broad competencies, go a long way to addressing.
9. Though there is a formal acknowledgement that both excellence and impact are of value and should be pursued it is evident to all that an informal but clear hierarchy between the two exist. A similar situation exists between the local/national and international. Again, it is not a matter of one or the other, but begs the question what im/balances can exist, what is invested in and what is authentically affirmed, and plays a role in decisive allocations such as jobs and financing? A corollary question is at what level – individual, research group, research environment, the department, or duration are imbalances towards one or the other OK, or need to be remediated?

Research profile, strategy, and organisation

The Department's contribution to achieving RUC's 2030 strategy.

RUC's 2030 strategy elaborates the following five research ambitions:

1. We conduct cutting-edge research at the highest international level, and our aim is to develop a distinct interdisciplinary profile based on the social sciences and humanities combined with key contributions from natural, technical and health science.
2. Our research is excellent, challenge-driven, and contributes to sustainable development in close interaction with the surrounding community: locally, nationally, and internationally.
3. The societal impact of our research always builds on fundamental principles of freedom of research, research integrity and open science.
4. We aim to be an international hub for critical interdisciplinary research.
5. Our aim is to offer coherent time for research, well-functioning research organisation and robust administrative research support.

Below we will summarily touch on each in turn. As some of the issues raised below return in other sections, we will expand on them there rather than taking extensive discussions here. At the same time, we recognise that DPT is one of four departments charged with attaining these goals on behalf of RUC as a whole. The department's role here is taken seriously for goal-attainment, especially as DPT is large, heterogeneous and has unique assets in this regard.

Regarding ambition 1 there is evidence that cutting-edge research at a high international level is being conducted in all REs. In some environments, most notably Data science and IT, technical science is the main driver, rather than a key contributor. That this flips the script should not be seen as a problem, but rather expanding the strategic focus.

Regarding ambition 2, there are some environments that work at the broad societal challenge level, others primarily at a much more narrow, focused level. Both basic research and applied research are relevant to a wide variety of significant societal challenges from living and working in culturally diverse settings to energy-efficiency in a number of sectors. In several REs there is also a very deep and widespread commitment to collaborative, co-creative research that is strongest at the local, then dissipates as one moves towards the international level.

Regarding ambition 3, freedom of research is pervasive, jealously guarded and institutionalised. The commitment to open science in the form of OA publishing and research dissemination is also largely realised, though greater efforts in dissemination could be made centrally and at the individual and group level (via social media). Research integrity is not clearly defined and thereby difficult to assess. Hopefully ethics, which is explicitly absent in the strategy, is included under research integrity. The ethical dimensions of research were taken up in several discussions during the site visit, both in terms of motivation and the research process.

Regarding ambition 4, much of the research conducted at the department is self-avowedly or identifiable as critical, progressive, non-mainstream and interdisciplinary (see the sub-reports of the REs). Some of this, notably that undertaken within Social Psychology, is noted internationally for its critical approach (see appendix B).

Ambition 5 is a mixed bag. “Coherent time for research,” to which one might add sufficient or “translating what is on paper (i.e. 40% of one’s work time) into reality” has by most accounts not been achieved and how this is to be achieved is still an open, recurrent question. What and who is (jointly) responsible for a “well-functioning research organisation” is also an open question. Regarding robust administrative research support there appears to be much satisfaction and appreciation, and positive results from research support, as well as some deep disappointment. “Robust” may entail either prioritisation of whom to serve and whom not to, or expansion of the service, but the latter likely at the cost of fewer actual researchers employed. These are important questions regarding future research support, as well as the division of labour between the university and departmental levels.

Assessment of the Department’s research profile, strategy and organisation

The department does not have a single, discernible research profile and a common strategy. This may be why, in some circles, “social data science” is talked about as a covering theme or red thread. However, it would be difficult to capture the breadth of the department in a single thematic profile. The activities of the department are very much in line with the name and strategy of the department. Technologies figure prominently in most of the research environments, though some are more material-technology heavy, and others focus more on people – social and behavioural processes, with which various social and material technologies are at play. Data, digital and communication technologies are the core technologies, though other mechanical, material, self and social (including governance) technologies also are prominent in specific research environments, often also in conjunction with data, digital and communication technologies.

Regarding strategy, as mentioned above, clarity about which goals – broadly excellence and impact – are expected from whom, when and in what amounts is necessary. This does not necessarily need to be in document form and universal for all; it can be conveyed as part of a continuous dialogue, but must be done openly, explicitly and with everyone implicated. Questions about at what levels specialisation (especially in "excellence" or "impact") is OK or balance is expected need to be answered. The strategic objectives of the university and department are broad, and if there are specific expectations on constellations at different levels, these need to be expressed. This is also part of the broader theme of internal communication in this report.

Regarding organisation of research in terms of organisational units, there seems to be a trend towards aggregation (larger units – consolidating RGs in REs) to promote critical mass and broader collaboration. Two points are important here. First, the REs seem to be organised along the line of and to serve educational programmes rather than organised on research premises. Second, the REs are based on logics of similarity. This is productive for disciplinary or delimited fields of study or topical research and individually and collectively refining core competencies. But it does not promote the broad collaboration (nor begin to work through the challenges of collaborating across methodological and theory of science differences) necessary for addressing mission or societal challenge-oriented research. The top-down approach supporting effective organization of research in relation to complex societal needs also needs to resonate with the bottom-up formation of primary networks of researchers. Are the REs going to be home bases from which individuals and groups are drawn for major inter-RE collaborative projects, and working out the collaborative issues during each project? Or, are more durable, grand and complex collaborative constellations envisioned?

Hiring practice (gender balance; Danish and foreign researchers; internal and external hires; age and generational issues).

According to the department's self-evaluation it has been quite successful recently in recruiting and hiring attractive candidates. The gender balance of some research groups is skewed in manners reflecting broader ratios in the fields these REs largely comprise of. While there are notable exceptions, the international researchers are largely northern European, from neighbouring countries. Though some REs have had too few senior research leaders (professors) over the period examined and some are hit by generational issues and retirement, there seems to be an awareness of and actions taken or planned to redress these issues. There seems to be an exception to this in the case of the Learning and education RE where there was a genuine concern for the future regarding adult and vocational education due to retirement without a clear replacement strategy.

One way of promoting internationalisation of research, especially from beyond the EU, is hiring mid-career academics from strong research environments outside the EU through targeted advertising and recruitment.

A second issue especially for those on temporary contracts (PhD students and post-docs, and apparently some assistant professors) is transparency regarding hiring practices. There are two dimensions to this. The first has to do with how and by whom decisions are made about when and in which areas permanent positions are made available. The second has to do with the criteria upon which candidates are evaluated.

Finally, it appears clear that educational needs lay behind decisions to hire, rather than research considerations.

Recommendations – suggestions

Constructing durable organisational units along the lines of societal challenges that bring together the competencies found in the six research environments is worth considering at least as a pilot. This would allow familiarity and focused, multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary and pan-paradigmatic dialogues to take place and grow. This would allow the department to study collaborative dynamics at this scale first hand, using the competencies that already exist within the department. The other, conventional, alternative is to allow the researchers to stay in home bases close to the empirical, theoretical and methodological perspectives they currently possess while bringing them together in larger challenge-addressing units when relevant and let them work out their collaborative issues on their own. Regardless of which alternative is chosen, the efforts of organisational change should not be underestimated and needs plenty of time to be properly fruitful. These organisational developments need to be accompanied by activities generating easily accessible communication strengthening the identity and profile of RUC for the benefit of student recruitment, research funding and increased interest for collaboration from societal actors.

Allow research to be organised in a more autonomous manner from education so there would be educational-programme based units for educational purposes and research-based units for research. This would increase the proliferation of administrative units at the department, but it would also allow for the logics of research to be unfettered and probably lead to more cross-fertilisation between RGs and REs.

Greater efforts should be made to attract staff from strong research environments beyond northern Europe. This would have manifest benefits on internationalisation, as well as hopefully bringing in novel theoretical and methodological approaches as well networks and societal understandings. However, there is still an opportunity to develop and strengthen a “Nordic profile” of the research that could be of global relevance and interest. In that case, it should be further strengthened and communicated.

Increase transparency regarding hiring and communication about this with internal temporary staff-members. This can be done under the broader umbrella of career development symposia.

Make some recruitment decisions based on research needs, not just teaching needs.

Research excellence

Research quality

The research environments all display strong performance in the primary metric parameters for assessing research quality – publications and externally funded research. Some research environments consistently perform highly on these metrics, others do so sporadically. This indicates that ability to reach these levels are found in all research environments. The regularity of high performance may have to do with a number of things ranging from motivational, to capacity, to opportunity matters. On the motivational side, members of research environments have varied commitments (and experiences of meaningfulness) toward these parameters while others may also prioritise other goals such as local-level impact. Competing commitments vie for time and other resources leading to periodic trade-offs. Also on the motivational side, experience or non-experience of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and disincentives attached to attaining different goals likely play a role in motivating individual and group behaviour. However, it also appears that certain goals and commitments are more routinised than others in some research groups. This likely has to do with disciplinary traditions, exposure to values and practices early in one’s career, as well as current group dynamics and embedded traditions in the RGs. On the capacity side, some research environments may possess multiple members and teams that are oriented towards the standard excellence criteria meaning that the cyclicality of publication and funding among component members does not show up as evident at the RE level in contrast to REs where a limited number of members or constellations deliver on these parameters. Regarding opportunity, there can also be domain issues, with certain fields of study or disciplinary perspectives having less access to research funding, which in turn can limit producing research findings of interest to high-level publications. Critical, non-mainstream, qualitative, highly contextual or narrow-focused, and basic fundamental research may also have more difficulty in securing funding or/and access to high-level publication outlets than more conventional research.

These factors lead to the observation by many that high-quality research is not always picked up by the parametric measurements, which are more disposed towards some fields and approaches than others. However, as the REs are fairly expansive, all REs have proven capable of high performance, at least occasionally, on the excellence metrics. The more granular the perspective the more diversity can be found within the research environments regarding which constellations deliver on the excellence metrics versus other parameters, such as societal impact.

International visibility

All research environments have distinct and significant visibility and presence at the Scandinavian or Nordic level. This likely has to do with two things. The first is the similarity in objects of study, as Nordic societies resemble each other to a certain extent making similarities and differences of mutual interest. The second is proximity, language and established exchange and funding opportunities.

Moving beyond the Nordic region, some REs have a strong presence at the European level in terms of publication and research collaboration, the latter especially in terms of participation in the EU's framework programmes. The existence of strong bilateral ties between research groups or individual researchers at RUC and universities outside of Scandinavia and especially overseas is hard to discern, but there appears to be some durable connections to institutions in India and Australia.

Publishing in languages other than English or Scandinavian languages appears to be a matter of an individual researcher's personal background and ability to write in these languages. Some REs publish in other European or Asian languages as seen in the total publication overviews for each RE, and translations into other languages are mentioned in RE self-reports. Translations are a good proxy indicator of research that is of value at the practitioner, policy or educational level in countries where English is not a working language.

Research groups or profile areas that have been engaged in collaborative research or have been early movers in specific fields have well-established international reputations that in some cases are into a second generation of international leadership in specific domains.

Academic impact

Academic impact also varies from RE to RE, especially if measured in terms of citations and high-ranking outlets. Some of this variation likely has to do with the positions of different disciplines and research fields in the academic world as discussed above.

One parameter of academic impact that should be more widely recognised and detected in several REs is creating academic research infrastructure. Resuscitating or initiating bi-annual conferences, networks or associations or a key journal in a field can have great impact on an academic community as well as branding implications for RUC even if being resource (time) demanding.

Hosting large research centres or research programmes in the focal areas of DPT at RUC involving several universities could also be a worthwhile investment.

Recommendations and developmental potential

Creating larger units, i.e., consolidating research groups within research environments, may help critical mass deficiencies if collaboration across the new units can be facilitated. A starting point to facilitate collaborations is to identify complementary skills and practices and synergies between basic and applied research to address real problems in the REs in order to make common proposals. This can lead to more robust research and findings attractive to higher-ranking publication outlets. Attention should be paid during such consolidation processes to maintaining the existence of primary networks.

From a short-term perspective, hire research leaders with distinguished track-records or promising research trajectories. From a long-term perspective, invest in research skills and methodology training for existing, especially younger staff that add genuinely new competencies to research environments.

Some of the research published in BFI level 1 publications is likely capable of being upgraded for publication in level 2 outlets. Processes of reviewing and upgrading completed research should be encouraged (motivationally) and facilitated through more technical academic writing services and assistance in navigating more extensive and time-consuming review processes.

Greater recognition and support for especially international academic infrastructure activities should be given.

Internationalisation

Internationalisation is largely an area for improvement, especially if one looks beyond the Nordic region. RUC is part of two international university alliances, but we see no evidence of these playing a role in international research activities, except for publication benchmarking.

Much of the international contact and collaboration appears to be *individual/personal* rather than institutional. This is quite common, but also creates vulnerabilities. The REs that recurrently participate in EU framework projects work intensively at a European level. Again, collaboration beyond Europe appears to be based on individuals.

Recommendations

Centres, sabbaticals, exchanges, use of Erasmus+, Marie Curie and other EU exchange programmes; further engagement in COST networks, cotutelle arrangements, and of course Horizon Europe are natural channels to secure internationalisation. The ERUA and CEA alliances are small networks but might be the basis for greater internationalisation. These alliances were not mentioned during the site visit or prominent in the documentation provided, which raises the question of their actuality as vehicles for the internationalisation of research.

Create better access for researchers outside of Denmark to up-to-date information about opportunities for visiting scholar and collaboration opportunities on the departmental, RE, or RG *website(s)*.

Better communication of profile areas within the Department, including the connection to Nordic societies, aimed at scholars beyond Denmark may spark more external interest for international collaboration with DPT.

Interdisciplinarity

Most of the REs are highly interdisciplinary in terms of mix of personnel with PhDs in different fields. Some individuals have an interdisciplinary PhD, and some have studied a variety of subjects from Bachelor to Master to PhD levels. The Department contains a broad array of personnel with PhDs in the social sciences, behavioural sciences, humanities, natural/physical/environmental sciences, technical/engineering sciences and possibly medicine. The REs thus operate along the lines of interdisciplinarity as only in a few cases does one discipline perspective predominate. However, most REs appear to comprise of disciplines that lay close to each other and have similar ontological, epistemological and methodological points of departure. So, while formal interdisciplinarity exists within the REs, we seldom find radical or inter-paradigmatic mixes and methodological heterogeneity. This is what we mean above by the REs being organised along a logic of similarity.

Something that we find quite positive that is tangentially related to interdisciplinarity is the work of several REs across the researcher-practitioner or scholar-citizen boundaries. This derives from commitments to participatory, co-creative and action research approaches. While this type of interaction is usually categorised under impact and societal engagement it should also be acknowledged as a form of interdisciplinarity.

While interdisciplinarity is primarily seen as positive, it was also mentioned during the site panel interviews that it is difficult to write articles in collaboration between for example data science and social or behavioural sciences as different traditions and publication standards exist. In one panel interview it was stated: “it is a bit hard to publish articles together, because there are different traditions in different fields, and it can be complicated to agree on which environment/field the article should be published within.” It was mentioned that as a consequence of this experience meetings and cooperation takes place, but formal outputs can be difficult to produce. Radical interdisciplinarity poses challenges. Therefore, more experience in this is needed to work out ways forward, especially if this type of collaboration is seen as a central aspiration of the department.

Recommendations

Recognise and promote researcher–practitioner collaboration as a form of interdisciplinarity, exploring its strengths and challenges. Strengthening the practitioner position in analysis of needs and co-production of new knowledge could make it appropriate to leave the interdisciplinarity terminology and moving towards transdisciplinarity (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1462901116307493).

Promote, experiment with, and analyse the processes and hindrances of interdisciplinary collaboration across ontological, epistemological, and methodological perspectives or paradigms. This is both of academic and practical value, especially at the department. It is better that the problems and challenges are discovered and dealt with in a controlled setting than leading projects in the future to founder over such matters.

Societal impact

Societal impact

The societal impact of the REs is rich, varied and delivered in a number of different ways. Some societal impact is delivered directly through participatory research including active interventions with practitioners in the organisations they work through. Other impact is obtained by influencing policy makers, civil servants and administrators through consultations and seminars based on research findings. Other impact is assumed accomplished through the mechanisms of mass communication with broader publics, or through direct interventions in the physical environment.

While formally affirmed as important and nominally on par with research excellence, we repeatedly heard calls for greater recognition and understanding of societal impact and for it to be more readily measured (along the device of “what gets measured counts”). At the same time, it was also questioned if it really can be measured, or whether proxy indicators are sufficient. There is also the matter of *when* societal impact takes place and can be detected. One example is the impact of teaching materials and textbooks. They get read by people who enter practice and through their actions have direct effects on the world. This was contrasted with the fact that some international articles neither get read nor reach people/practice. Though textbooks have an impact, it was directly stated that “writing textbooks does not make you a career.” Another issue raised related to impact is that not everything is used as researchers intend – impact is difficult to control when research gets released to the public, managers, policy makers.

Despite these issues, we find wide and passionate engagement for impact, and direct calls for greater recognition and valuing of societal impact activities. As one person at a panel interview stated, there is great intrinsic value and appreciation from external actors, but internal affirmation is often missing: “You experience recognition from outside, not internally at RUC or by [university management/leadership].”

Communication

Communication was a frequently discussed issue, both in terms of internal and external communication. In direct relation to societal impact, better and more unequivocal internal communication regarding RUC’s and the department’s views on societal impact were called for.

Regarding external communication and societal impact, dissemination of research findings and publicity about impact efforts were called for. Keeping websites updated on these matters, with proactive and coaching communications officers was frequently mentioned. In addition to more central, institutional efforts, individual members of REs could be more proactive and directly active on social media in publicising their research findings, collaboration and interests. Successful communication is vital for recruiting students and partners for collaboration as well as for external funding.

Resonance with the Department’s strategy

The efforts and achievements regarding societal impact are impressive.

Impacting national and EU policy are areas for improvement, though some constellations have had success at these levels both on the back of long-term research and reputation building as well as single, intensive, comprehensive projects on specific topics.

There is a perceived hierarchy between “excellence” often in this context seen as international publications in high-ranking channels and impact. This tension is communicated, and discussed internally, but not explicitly. This (perceived) hierarchy within the department’s strategy, as stated above needs to be explicitly addressed. Many of those highly engaged and successful in societal impact activities feel under-recognised and rewarded.

Recommendations for strengthening societal impact

Be clear and transparent about the definition and understanding of societal impact. Accept its diversity/hetergeneity and include that in the processes of recognition.

Be clear and transparent about the value and rewarding of societal impact and different forms of societal impact if this is gradated. There seems to be the perception that policy impact is valued higher than organisational or direct citizen impact, that international impact is more valued than national or local, that impact efforts in Danish are less valued than in English. Lifting up and discussing impact publicly or having workshops on impact would both allow issues to be clarified and give it recognition and perhaps raise its status.

Encourage better branding – support multi-channel communication efforts, issue press-releases, and keep public media outlets like websites updated in Danish and English. The communication activities should all resonate with the overall identity of RUC as a societally relevant university with special expertise in making research useful for practitioners.

Encourage those whose societal impact is via direct engagement with partner organisations to go beyond reporting just to partners and those commissioning research to also seek out other similar organisations and associations for dissemination and impact activities. Reply systematically to the question, who else would find this research useful or interesting?

Research and education

Link between research and education and student involvement

The link between education and research was continuously discussed during the site visit as being both highly beneficial as well as antagonistic to research. Engagement with students and their involvement in research was viewed very favourably. At the meeting on research and education there was a consensus that the connection between research and education must become more formalised and systematised but that it is moving in a positive direction with the new changes in the educational programmes.

Below we discuss the advantageous and disadvantageous dimensions of the relationship between education and research.

Beneficial

The beneficial dimensions are: inspiration and topical synergies between education and research; that through teaching activities, new insights and solutions can be developed, explored and criticised in a group setting; that students can in some case be given or share research design, data generation and analysis and writing tasks, which in some case can save the researcher time and result in high-quality output; that students can be given hands-on experience in high-level research; and the opportunity to communicate research findings directly to students through research-based education. Students are renowned for reading a lot of new articles and keeping their teachers up-to-date in the field through them, and trying out new ideas and methods.

Antagonistic

The primary negative or antagonistic aspect of the relationship between education and research stems from the fact that time, effort, and mental energies expended on teaching and education detracts from time, effort and mental energies that can be devoted to research. The primary problems identified is that educational activities are underfinanced/budgeted in the sense that the compensation for the hours put in is lower than the actual hours expended; and that educational activities are "greedy" in that they are more taxing in time and effort than they appear on paper, which can also be expressed in terms of invisible work that intrudes and must be undertaken, but is not transparent as part of the initial package. Coupled with the extensive group work (problem-oriented project learning, PPL) undertaken in study programmes at RUC, which is student-facing and interactive, it can be difficult to set boundaries and barriers to enquiries and demands. Expressed succinctly, ringfencing hours and effort devoted to education is very difficult and usually falls on the individual employee. Likewise, educational activities are claimed to take more time than the hours compensated for, especially for junior and inexperienced staff, creating a foreseeable or "planned" deficit that negatively impacts research time. Another factor pointed out recurrently is that reforming and development of educational programmes is not budgeted or compensated for. The extra time and effort spent on educational activities either comes out of time devoted to research or results in uncompensated overtime, with the health and social strains this creates. Universally we heard things like "on paper we have 40% research time, but that is not the case in reality," or "on paper the share of research time looks generous, but it gets eaten up by teaching and education administration."

How this works is summarized by one associate professor: "You probably overprioritize teaching a bit because students are there, you meet them and interact with them – it is not easy not to prioritize them. You are not able to use 40% of your time on research."

Another commented on the impact of curriculum development work "We just finished up the new Master's programmes – this work was not financed, so we had to create these new programmes in our research time /spare time. There was a lot of administration that had to be done."

Departmental policy regarding balance between education and research

There is a clear awareness of these problems, as for example "coherent research time" is one of the objectives in the 2030 strategy. What is done at the departmental and educational programme/director of studies level is unclear, but clearly not sufficiently effective. We did not hear things like, "it's still a problem but it's getting better" in this regard, which we heard on some other matters. This may have to do with the fact that this review was carried out in close proximity to a major reorganisation of the education programmes.

Suggestions

A suggestion that was identified during the meetings from a research professor was to preserve young researchers' time devoted to research by assigning them teaching duties relative to the same topics of their research for long periods of time so as to optimise time needed for lesson preparation and encouraging them to adopt PPL.

Another idea was to be able to rotate certain administrative and also teaching responsibilities more, as at the moment "Everybody is engaged in everything." For example, some researchers could take on more administrative and/or teaching tasks in one semester to allow others more research time, and in the following semester they would switch again. In the case of applications or publications that arise in this way, however, everyone could then be involved.

Make sure that good examples of successful integration of research and education where student projects generated material for scientific publications is spread and publicised within RUC.

Research capacity

Personnel issues: recruitment, retention and career progression

Time horizons, i.e., whether the department wants to increase internationalisation, research leadership or high-ranking publications in the short-, medium- or long-term dictate whether one chooses adding developed versus developing human capital (recruiting senior researchers versus recruiting younger researchers and investing in development and diversification). Aside from this basic issue coupled to departmental and RUC strategy, many of the issues brought up relate to temporary staff's concerns about what it takes to transition from non-permanent to permanent positions.

As noted above, transparency about how decisions about new positions are made, including number of positions, how they are periodized and allocated thematically, and who decides, was asked for on the one hand, and how candidates are evaluated on the other.

Retention does not appear to be a problem despite the issues mentioned above, including the encroachment of education into research time. There are positive and not so positive causes of voluntary personnel turnover not being an issue. RUC is experienced as a unique educational environment which still pursues distinct and cherished values, which the staff we met stand staunchly behind. So, commitment, so long as these highly meaningful values and activities are retained, is high. This means that the normative climate at RUC is extremely significant. A negative reason why some in temporary positions see their future tied to RUC is that they feel they are not given enough research time to compete with persons coming out of other environments where research is better supported. It must also be said that those on temporary contracts share the same normative commitment as their senior colleagues.

PhD students' relationship to research environments

PhD students' relationship to REs vary. At the site visit meeting with PhD students, the majority found it easy to be part of more than one RE, a statement that obtained for post-docs and assistant professors as well, and for them also across departments. Some PhD students reported their RE as offering great social and academic support, while others found them less supportive or relevant. In the recent reorganisation of REs, one PhD student found the new RE less favourable than the previous one, and one PhD student stated: "You have lunch in the research group, but otherwise you are quite left to yourself." On the matter of changing REs and supervisors, the consensus was that it is possible to switch research groups – more in some programmes than others, and while it is also possible to switch supervisor, it is quite rare.

The REs play varying roles in the lives of the PhD students, but they are only one of several significant relationships. As one PhD student stated, "There are at least five different roles in connection to a PhD student, which are performed by between two to five individuals."

The relationship between PhD students and REs is also something of interest and commented on by senior researchers. From a project leader and supervisor perspective it was stated:

> Another challenge in relation to the younger researchers is that the PhD school is disconnected from the research groups – and often you are not allowed to supervise a PhD student even though you were the one who got the funding. This means that the PhD projects sometimes are completely disconnected from the main project that got the funding. The PhD school is defining the focus on all the projects even though they are externally funded. The PhD school should be connected to the research groups.

This order seems to constitute an important inconsistency in the system. Project leaders in externally funded projects cannot be sure that a PhD-candidate will choose to work in a planned project which seems like an impossible situation, especially considering the growing expectations of external research funding. This issue may formally lay within the parameters of national education policies, but a viable solution needs to be found at the local level for externally funded research including PhD positions to be an attractive option for those seeking external funding.

Research governance

Following on from the section directly above on the relationship between PhD students and REs, the governance structure for PhD research is quite complex. It is found by some to not always be responsive and accommodating of the demands of project work, with national ordinances also playing a role. This complex relationship appears to be an important and ongoing issue related to how doctoral education is structured, how research groups and environments should operate, and how those externally funded projects with PhD positions embedded can operate. Here research governance and doctoral education governance interact in a complicated manner, with the world and priorities looking different from different positions.

If we define the purpose of research governance as facilitating research, allocating resources and making decisions on the one hand, and providing guidance regarding wider qualitative, quantitative and domain goals and aims and justifications of these on the other, we would differentiate between structures of governance and practice of governance.

Much discussion and reform activity is oriented towards the structure of governance. How big should the units be (to attain critical mass)? In what senses should they be coherent (thematically, similar disciplinary backgrounds or complementarily diverse)? And which units should be delegated which competencies in central activities such as prioritisation, decision making and resource allocation? As discussed above there are advantages and disadvantages of having core, established research units based on similarity or radical diversity. It is possible to have both, but it would increase complexity, with academic staff having membership and participating in two (or more) research units. This should also be seen in light of the limited actual time available to research activities. The trend towards decentralisation of prioritising, decision-making and resource allocation at the research unit level is positive and will require procedural transparency at this level.

This brings us to the issue of the practice of research governance. The basic issue is what facilitates creating the conditions under which people potentially with very different backgrounds can productively collaborate, as structural reforms produce little unless collaboration takes place. Above we have talked about the need for more experience, and analysis of the experience of large heterogeneous research collaboration. Learning from this experience and analysis is what will lead to the learning necessary for effective research governance practice at DPT. This will likely lead to an understanding of the “people skills” necessary for appropriate research governance practice.

Finally, transparency is an issue that is continuously brought up. This may have to do with procedures and competencies not being settled, or that they are insufficiently communicated.

Research support services

In general, there is a fair amount of satisfaction with research services, and the recent success of the department in securing certain types of funding is likely indicative of competence. Younger and foreign researchers report good support, the latter indicate that research services encountered at RUC/DPT are favourable in comparison to other universities.

If a division of labour between the departmental and university level should be increased, it seems beneficial to shift pre-grant assistance with EU and major public and private national funds to the university level, while having post-grant and smaller, often more niched or tailored, funding agencies at the departmental level. This means that the variation, volume and complexity will be higher at the departmental level than the university level, though the sums will be higher at the university level. This should be seen as a worthwhile investment, though prioritisation at the departmental level may be required. Small projects are important for continuity and trust with collaborative partners, they affirm connection to local and regional community and businesses and public sector, and not the least they build a knowledge base for possible, future, larger projects. They are also important for the moral or normative climate at the department and a negative polarisation is likely if only larger projects would obtain support services. Support services could possibly expand towards developing and maintaining long-term relations with strategically important private and public partners.

Where research services have been found to fail is when jurisdictions cross and response time in making decisions and producing contracts is too slow.

External funding

At the departmental level, the trend is positive regarding research funding with prestigious and multi-year EU, Danish state and private funding increasing dramatically in 2020. Another encouraging sign is that DPT's external funding increased two years in a row and greatly while other departments at RUC see stagnation or decline. This is indicative of a strong capacity of the department to secure significant external funding even under generally less favourable conditions. This increase in external funding is significant in itself and should have positive implications for internationalisation and publication output quality as well. Whether this is sustainable or not may have to do with some environments or constellations having maximised their research capacity without further personnel.

This raises the question of allowing a wider division of labour between educational and research activities raised earlier. At one of the panel sessions it was stated that, "We should be better at having a more flexible organization, so you do what you are good at. XX is, for example, good at funding, and others in the research group are better at teaching. We must be better at complementing each other instead of thinking that everyone has to do the same things." This would be one means of slightly increasing the research capacity of the department without new permanent hiring, though if external funding continues to rise or plateaus at a high level, hiring will be necessary to cover the increased volume of academic production in these environments.

Declines in municipal and regional funding is worrying and likely problematic for some research environments and will likely impact the funding of PhD positions. Such funding, while often comparatively modest in *kroner*, plays important roles in maintaining continuity in relationships to key actors in the welfare sector, business and local communities, as well as facilitating access to workplaces and training environments. Thus, this type of funding is directly significant both in terms of research, societal impact and community relations.

While external funding is unequivocally advantageous, some issues were raised regarding how it impacts research agendas and the views on the value of internal research funding.

There is a worry expressed by some that external funding calls are setting our research priorities, so staff feel compelled to apply for the funding that is available, rather than developing the projects they and less wealthy and powerful constituents find important. Though some open calls exist at the EU and national levels, an increasing amount of research funding is steered to greater or lesser extent. This issue is framed as a matter of who is setting the research agenda – researchers, or those with control over funding agencies – and is taken to be a research freedom issue. There is also a perception among some that there is a diminishing appreciation of the possibilities and significance of internal research funding. The assertion is that meaningful and significant research can be accomplished with internal research time and funding, especially when researchers pool their time in a common project or add it to more modest grants. However, there is the impression that the quality and significance of the research produced is judged not on its content merits, but by its funding source. As one person interviewed stated, "The trend is that only externally funded research is legitimate, and that is not ok." It is also asserted that internal funding allows a greater degree of academic freedom, and therefore is operatively and symbolically significant.

Though things are going well for DPT in terms of external funding, they probably could be better. Due to RUC's and DPT's unique approach and assets, university management should be more active in dialogue and lobbying private and public national funding agencies, especially now that research policy internationally and at the EU level is more in accordance with RUC's approaches. Long-term relations with strategic partners, possibly confirmed by formal arrangements, would be a valuable asset for those efforts.

Final remarks

We would like to conclude with a word of caution, which may be obvious but merits keeping in mind, and a word of encouraging praise.

Combining and making larger units does not automatically lead to greater or more collaboration in new and heterogeneous combinations. If this is what is intended, what truly promotes this needs to be understood locally. Are key persons and units available? What creates and sustains interest and commitment? Do these new, complex and heterogenous units have clear and common goals and aspirations? How can heterogeneity be forged into integrated complementarity? Fortunately DPT has the requisite intellectual resources to analyse and provide solutions for these issues in-house.

The problems underlying the initiative of evaluating the departments of RUC involve, for instance, student recruitment, external research funding and the entire RUC identity in a changing world. The panel acknowledges RUCs unique heritage and encourages it to make use of its distinct abilities in addressing critical societal challenges through high-quality research-based inclusive solutions. The panel also encourages you to build on these strengths that are increasingly needed and recognised globally, and make your characteristic strengths better known to the world.

Appendix A – Research quality evaluation of "Data science and IT"

Summary – Data science and IT

OVERALL FINDINGS

1. "Data science and IT" is the 3rd biggest research environment (RE) of the department of People and Technologies. It is the most internationalized RE. As far as external fund raising capacity, the RE is the first one of the department, with projects for the majority funded by the Danish state, privates and regions, and two funded by EU. In terms of the share of types of activities of researchers, the RE stands out for the greatest membership in scientific committees, boards and councils and for the organization and participation to scientific conferences; la majority of the publications are in conference proceedings and international journals indexed by Scopus and with impact factor: all these facts indicate a **high quality of the research with consolidated involvement of the members in both basic and applied research at national and international level.**

2. The **RE comprehends two groups**: PLIS (Programming Logic and Intelligent Systems) and SDI (Sustainable Digitization). These two groups have an unbalanced membership in favor of the PLIS which has almost double the membership of the SDI, which suffers for a low critical mass. These two groups carry out problem oriented research combining empiricism and theory: while they share collaborative practices and participatory design for IT solutions in interdisciplinary applications they are **characterized by complementary interdisciplinary research expertise that can mutually boost each other's research potential:**
   - **PLIS has an original basic research profile** on Logic and Logic programming, AI and decision support methods, data science on big data, databases and spatial data structures, analysis of programming languages, logic and knowledge modelling, IT security and IoT interaction design **inspired and applied in several application contexts**. It appears structured into main subgroups having distinct research fields expertise and resulting papers, with seemingly only a few collaborations among each other's subgroups as far as the writing of publications.
   - **SDI is more focused on applications in real settings** of Information Systems, Computer Supported Cooperative Work, and Design Science Research methods, which are applied in several contexts, notably to support green and sustainable digital solutions in enterprises and organizations, thus achieving a high fund-raising capacity.
   - Both groups collaborate with the Centre for Big Data, initiated by PLIS, the Maritime and marine research centre and the Fablab which has been indicated as promising channels to open collaborations with other departments of RUC and groups.

3. **The RE suffers for some critical issues.**
   - One is mainly related with the **too high quota of time dedicated to education**. In fact, the environment stands out for the greatest quota of examination (10%) which is around 3% - 4% for the other RE. During the site visit meeting the quota of time required to teach was stated to be largely underestimated not considering the time needed to prepare lessons. This has been indicated to determine a strong impact to limit the time dedicated to carry out research.

- Furthermore, it was stated that since **the definition of PhD programs is disconnected from groups this creates problems in the case of externally funded PhDs positions**, with unclear or conflicting objectives.
- Last but not least, it has been indicated that while **there is an emphasis to engage in applied research that can bring high societal impact, the societal impact is not measured** and not recognized at RUC, resulting in invisible work, and, besides that, **there is a fear that this trend can lead to external fund-driven research instead of application-driven research**.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Given the size of the RE and the composition of the staff present (the number of associate professors is the 2nd lowest among all the other REs in the department; the number of Postdocs is the 3rd lowest among all other REs of the department), the relevance and potential of the research fields, the quality of the research and its high fund raising capacity, taking into account the criticality of the high examination and teaching workload, as outlined above, **the increase in the number of RE members could alleviate the high impact of teaching time on group members and therefore free time to devote to research activity** to increase its potential.
2. **Both basic and applied research should be pursued** as neglecting basic research in favour of applied research can lead to a loss of competitiveness; in doing so one runs the risk of not being up-to-date with novel methods and technologies, and of being unable to define original solutions to emerging complex societal problems. **A way to corroborate basic research and applied research is to encourage a more strict collaboration between the two groups PLIS and SDI to mutually boost potential of their complementary skills**:
   - given that some members of the two groups are already shared, that they already have a few fruitful collaborations as stated in the on-site visit meetings, and, that SDI has a low critical mass, the fusion of the two groups could be considered as a way to strengthen further their mutual collaborations. Besides increasing the overall critical mass, which has been stated during the on-site visit meetings as strictly related to the quality of the research, data science can be a glue for the two groups. For example, theoretical logic programming carried out in the PLIS group can be fruitfully applied to provide theoretical foundation for the assessment of sustainable energy consumption of software, carried out by following empiric participatory studies. This can open a fruitful and original way to green ICT design to achieve European green deal, that is a current up-to-date topic of research and a priority of Horizon Europe. Besides that, a closer collaboration between the subgroups of the PLIS group should be encouraged and pursued to overcoming the weakness of some subgroups, pointed out during the on-site visit, relative to lack of people to collaborate with; this could lead to original and promising research. For example, the basic research on spatial index structures and spatial query languages, can be hybridised with expertise on flexible querying and could be fruitfully support sustainable routing in the marine shipping, allowing to scale the dimension of the applications. This basic research field has also potential synergies with the themes of the "Society Space and Technology" RE.

3. **Data science methods are nowadays an up-to-date research field that needs to be continuously cultivated and expanded** at the RE to attract International funds:
   - the theoretical logic programming expertise present in PLIS can be used in a participatory framework to define original explainable machine learning approaches which can become a distinctive original

traits of the data science research at the department. Nowadays a frontier of data science basic research is explainable AI, which could be faced by theoretical logic approaches, with applications in potentially many fields in which explicability is mandatory according to the EU commission as expressed in the documents on the EU way to AI, those fields that imply potential risks for the security and safety of people such as the health, legal and environmental domain. In this respect the collaborations with stakeholders, such as the Roskilde university hospital and the Wien medical university, with groups of other departments, like “Social science and business”, “Humanities and Culture” with which there are already links since long time, with other REs of the department like “Health and Society” and via the interdepartmental Centre for big data, could certainly provide significant study cases to put in practice the theoretical findings by developing working prototypes which can then be the basis for the participation to larger projects at the international level.

- Consider updating the panorama of PhD program and master courses related to data science methods in AI and machine learning techniques which evolve very quickly, and their application in different domains such as health, environment, social science by calling on the PPL approach within the context of the Center of Big Data. As stated in the on-site visit meetings, this practice is already applied and demonstrated to be a successful way to involve students in projects as well as to bring benefits to research, and definitely to aid growing a new generation of technicians and researchers with strong skills required in a modern society. Besides, in defining the PhD programs, the PhD school should be connected to the groups to take into account the needs of their projects that fund external PhD positions as pointed out during the on-site visit meetings.
- Last but not least, European funded projects should be pursued further, given that the profile and quality of the research carried out at the RE is highly relevant and in line with the EU research and innovation priorities. In facts, as stated in the on-site visit meetings, the great interest and expectations of the society for big data and data science often are relative to solve quite simple problems, which do not need interesting research angles in the field. Conversely, Horizon Europe funding programmes, that tackles climate change to achieve the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals and boosts the EU’s competitiveness and growth, are more challenging. Specifically, the ethical dimension of new technologies, notably those related to explainable Artificial Intelligence and their potential societal impact to support both a sustainable recovery and acceleration of digital transitions to the European Green Deal, ultimately leading to a climate-neutral and green Europe is relevant to the RE.

Research excellence – "Data science and IT"

RESEARCH QUALITY

As testified by the bibliometric indicators in documents C4 and Da3 the RE mainly reports its research results in selected peer-review research publications (with an average of 75,8% of the total number of publications during the period 2017-2021 (source document C4). Furthermore, the RE is the one with greatest percentage (66%) of peer-reviewed research publications indexed in Scopus, which means high quality articles.

The majority are international publications, mostly articles in conference proceedings, second articles in journals, and third chapters in books; during the period there has been an increase of open access publications (from 36% to 75%, source Document C4) which is good for improving the academic impact and must be maintained and possibly further increased.

During the period there is a decrease of the absolute number of publications (the total number of publications decreased in 2021 with respect to 2020 (-8) but is above 2019 (+7)).

Nevertheless, if we consider the BFI publications normalized with respect to the full time equivalent FTE (that increased with time since 2016) the previous findings based on absolute number of publications are reversed: **all levels BFI publications normalized by FTE increased since 2016.**

This also confirms the evidence that the time spent for examination and teaching has a negative impact on the absolute number of publications.

The publications in the overall list (excel file Da2) are 297 since 2017, which on average means about 2,6 publications a year for each member of the environment.

Potential of the RE with respect to the Research Quality

The data on the production of scientific research, while outlining a high quality of research results, can be further improved, as indicated in the following sections, by strengthening collaborations within the members of the RE, leveraging on the synergies of interdisciplinary skills already present , inviting the PPL program to productively involve students in the research projects of the RE and exploiting the international networks of collaborations to carry out joint projects, thus favouring the exchange of skills and ideas.

INTERNATIONAL VISIBILITY

The RE is the most internationalized environment in the department with 20.8 percent not EU members and 1.7 percent EU members (not Danish) (of the RE's total FTE) (report C3).

The environment has a consolidated involvement in both basic and applied research at the national and the international levels.

Collaborations are mainly with foreign universities (43) and with national universities (36), and second with private companies.

Among the top-10 collaboration partners 40% are foreigner universities (one in US, one in Spain, and two in Australia). Other international collaborations mentioned in the self-evaluation report are with Netherlands, China, India, and Canada.

Noticeable that collaborations with EU countries are less than those with not EU countries, probably this reflects the fact that there are not many EU funded projects.

The weaker aspects with respect to the other environments are mainly relative to the following:

- Membership in review committees (1%)
- Membership in research networks (6%)
- Hosting of academic visitors and editorial activities (0%)
- Consultancy is the 2nd lowest (1%)

However, these figures appear to ignore the many international personal networks of individual members of the RE.

Potential with respect to the international visibility

To continue improving the international visibility impact, membership in research networks and hosting of visitors should be pursued, as it already happened for membership in research networks that increased by 11% in 2021. Furthermore, as discussed below, also applying for EU funding can help establish new collaborations with members of other EU countries.

ACADEMIC IMPACT

The RE, as reported in document C4, stands out for the greatest membership in scientific committees, boards and councils (28%) and for the organization and participation to scientific conferences (14% 2nd highest), which indicate a consolidated involvement in both basic and applied research; finally, it appears in boards of companies or other organization (10%) thus promoting both academic and societal impacts.

By analysing the self-reported Research results (document Da3) it appears that there has been an increase of academic impact mainly for editor of series or collections, peer review of manuscripts, membership in review committee, membership in research networks, while there has been a decrease in participation to workshops, seminar, courses, probably due to the pandemic effect.

Nevertheless, on average, in the last quarter of 2021, these activities increased reaching the end of 2018.

The RE comprehends two groups that share a few collaborations between them as stated by one of the groups' leader and remarked by other members during the on-site visit meetings.

PLIS – Programming Logic and Intelligent Systems

The PLIS group is characterized by an interdisciplinary research profile carrying out basic research inspired by applications at the crossroad of a number of fields such as logics, applied mathematics, operation research, computer science, information science and information engineering. The main research themes comprehend analysis of programming languages and program properties, logical modelling and knowledge representation and reasoning, Artificial Intelligence methods, decision making models and Decision support systems, big data and data science, complex IT systems, databases and flexible querying, spatial data structures, interaction design and IoT, participatory design.

These varied basic research competences have brought to a number of articles in peer-reviewed publications, mainly international journals and international conference proceedings as reported in the list Da2, and as it also appears from the seven selected articles: they are dated from 2017 to 2020, two of which published in proceedings of international conferences, well reputed in the sectors of robotics and databases, and the other five articles published in international journals with Impact Factor ranging from a minimum of 1.039 to a maximum of 6.363 (2021)). These results, which have received a number of citations, demonstrate the high quality of the research at both the academic and international levels.

The PLIS group appears to include three main subgroups, as evidenced by the authorships of the publications:

- one subgroup applies operation research in the marine sector for sustainable shipping,
- another subgroup is expert on theoretical logic programming with many applications among which flexible query answering systems, health care diagnosis, and participatory-approach to pattern recognition and image classification in health;
- and the last subgroups focused on spatial data structures and spatial querying and implicit or explicit georeferenced information with potential applications in many fields.

These competences are put in practice in a number of different application contexts, often in collaboration with groups and experts of other disciplines.

The group presented nine externally funded projects with a total amount of more than one Million and a half euro demonstrating a very good capacity to attract funds mainly at the national level.

- Four projects are more on basic research inspired by applications relative to symbolic AI approaches applied for pattern recognition in images, Machine Learning applied for Natural Language Processing, logic formalization of cognitive psychology, and constraint handling rules programming language.

  Potential
  These research topics are distinctive of the group's research and deserve to be cultivated and further explored as they can help shape the group's original approach to AI explainable methods and data science. The European way to AI stresses the need to increase user acceptance of novel technologies, based on explainable, trustworthy and human-centric AI. Thus, symbolic and (Natural) Logic approaches combined with participatory design, machine learning and deep learning can be a promising direction to explore for future theoretical research and for making project proposals at the European level.

- Four projects are related to sustainable energy consumption and green transition. This is a relevant application objective both at the national level especially for the marine sector in Denmark, and at the European level, as far as "Toward Zero-Power ICT" and sustainable energy consumption themes, which are of central interest for the European green deal.

  Potential
  These lines of research and relative applications deserve to be maintained and further expanded since they can potentially attract further funds from Horizon Europe, as far as the policy priorities clean energy and sustainable mobility, to make Europe climate-neutral and with a sustainable economy through the transformation of its mobility, energy, construction and production systems.

- Finally, there is a research project on spatio-temporal big data management for Location Based Services in indoor environments. Also this field of research on spatial data structures and spatial querying has got an international recognition and is very promising.

  Potential
  This research line is potentially synergic with the methods of flexible querying of databases defined within the group, and is also relevant for applications in the marine shipping routing context, carried out by other members of the same group. Besides, synergies with the environment on "Society, Space and Technologies" could be explored.

DSI - Sustainable Digitization

The size of the SDI group in terms of membership is just over half the size of the PLIS group.

The group is characterized by an empirically-driven and collaboratively-driven interdisciplinary approach to applied research, which means that it pursues renewing of project management to solve real world problems, by introducing new digital and sustainable digitization processes used to improve collaborative and communicative practices, and by evaluating the effects of IT usage by participatory design methods.

The competences, which are relative to theoretical, practical, technical, and social issues concerning Information Systems (IS) , Design science research (DSR), and computer supported cooperative works (CSCW), are rooted into multidisciplinary application contexts, and are recognized nationally and internationally, as testified by the presence of single members of the group in the advisory board and editorial board of international journals, and in program committees of international conferences, the many links with the Danish universities and industries, and international networks, and the number of citations of the selected articles, notably 252 citations since 2016 for the selected paper on Design Science Research.

The five selected articles, dated from 2015 to 2022 (one still to appear), and published in three different international peer-reviewed journals (CSWV) (IF 2.8 (2021)) European Journal of Information Systems (IF 9.011 (2021)) and Communications of the Association for Information Systems (SJR Impact Factor 0.41 (2021)), report studies on different interdisciplinary application contexts.

The group presented four Projects for a total amount of funds of more than one and a half Million euro demonstrating an excellent fund-raising capacity considering the small number of members of the group. The applications are relative to very relevant and up-to-date critical issues of smart working, sustainable energy use and smart cities empowerment, and digital health care, all themes in line with Horizon Europe calls.

- The largest project of the group is intelligrid about getting "households to use green electricity" and is funded by EU Interreg with one Million euro.

  Potential
  This research objective is very relevant and the research can benefit by exploiting expertise of the PLIS group on theoretical logic programming by combining it with the participatory and collaborative approach. This can open an original approach to face green ICT that can be the basis for future European projects.

- Furthermore, one project is funded by DIREC (Digital Research Center) on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW) systems that support hybrid work.

  Potential
  Since the group has a wide expertise on CSCW this field deserves to be maintained and further investigated by expanding the multidisciplinary application contexts.

- One small project is about the topic of "Scandinavian smart cities" and is funded by DKKI; the topics of this project takes advantage of competences on IT enabling citizens to co-create georeferenced information.

  Potential
  These topics have synergies with the themes of the group "MOSPUS" of the "Society, space and technology" environment, and also with the PLIS subgroup working on spatial databases. Their collaboration by exploiting complementarities and experiences could be a basis for joint proposals on the theme for larger projects.

- The last project is funded by Steno diabetes centre and is entitled "Supporting SMS-based intervention for diabetes 2 patients" and is about digital health care, which is a theme falling within the studies of the group on the inclusion of technology in the medical and welfare domains.

  Potential
  To foster the potential of this theme the synergies with the environment "Health and Society" could be investigated considering the openness to collaborate with other groups expressed by members of this latter environment during the on-site meeting.

Potential of the RE with respect to the academic impact

A suggestion for the research management is to promote more opportunities to facilitate exchange of both ideas and expertise between the two groups and within the PLIS group, and to try to make joint project proposals by exploiting the mutual synergies of the members, so as to scale from the national to the international level the ability to attract funds, which is perfectly feasible, considering the visibility of the group within the international research community, as testified by the numerous connections of single group's members with international research networks, and the citations of the published articles.

During the on-side visit meetings, many members of the environment stated that there are already a few collaborations among the members of the two groups and within each group, and the improvement of the collaborations with other groups of both the same department and other departments was indicated as feasible especially by means of the participation to centres, the Centre for Big Data, and the Centre for Maritime and Marine Research.

Thus, given these favourable premises, the fusion of the two groups could be considered since it appears both feasible and appropriate to achieve a bigger critical mass.

Societal impact – "Data Science and IT"

Societal impact of the RE is high, built on tradition from action research, which per definition means "*that one gets out and make changes in society*" and on getting people to participate in joint performances, as stated by a member of the environment during the on-site visit meetings.

The RE has the greatest membership with respect to the other environments in participation to committees, council, boards (28%) and in boards of companies or other organization (10%) activities that promote societal impact. Members of the two groups also participated to dissemination activities and in many significant national and international societal impact debates and events on the subjects of their projects. Moreover, the objective of the SDI group to solve real world problems is functional to create high societal impact. As a result, a number of PhD students are co-funded by external partners.

Three significant and relevant societal impact cases, also having a high academic impact, have been presented in report Da5.

CASE 1: "***Participatory design and pilot implementation of a CNN-diagnosis for clinical practice"***

It is about the design of a pilot deep learning - CNN tool and its evaluation in a real setting to interpret images for health diagnosis of renal and bladder cancer in collaboration with Wien medical university and Zealand university hospital in Roskilde. The line has already brought to a number of international publications (seven are listed) and is funded with three projects.

Potential

The potential societal impact of this work is about the qualitative shift in treatment of cancers in Denmark, by reducing the number of unnecessary surgeries .

Further the developed methods and technologies can be useful for health diagnosis through images of other illnesses, and in recognitions of target objects in other contexts.

The research objective of the project is in the direction to extend the back-box Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) by exploiting collaborative design practices involving physicians to provide explanations of the recognition criteria of the CNN, thus achieving an explainable AI approach.

Besides the big potential to develop an original research on explainable AI, another potential societal impact of this extension of the CNN approach by a participatory design practice is the creation of a benchmark dataset of annotated images about specific tumours which can become a reference set to make diagnosis in Denmark hospitals, thus also reinforcing the societal impact of participatory design practice which is a core research area at RUC. Currently they already collected about 1000 images.

CASE 2. "***Decision support for energy efficiency in maritime operations"***

This case is relative to developing new algorithms for planning and optimization of maritime port operations related with vessels management, such as vessels discharging, loading, lower time waiting at the ports, to reduce CO2 emissions. Nine publications have been reported on these studies and three grants. The research has also been published in non-academic contexts such as the business section of Danish news.

The societal impact of this case has already been manifested by the tendency of companies in the maritime area to increase their investments in implementing tools to improve energy efficiency and CO2 emission reduction by adopting results of the projects. This is a very relevant societal impact results impact considering the importance of the marine sector industry for Denmark and the policy of net-zero emissions by 2050 for climate change containment.

Potential

This line of research could be further expanded by considering the optimization of other port operations in which the real time management of spatio-temporal information is needed, by combining the expertise in the field with the result of the research present in the group and relative to spatial databases and spatial querying.

CASE 3. “***Energy efficiency of computing systems”***

This case tackles the problem of green ICT, i.e., energy efficiency of computing systems which is very relevant at social level at both local and global scales, considering that the global IT sector energy demand ranks among that of the main countries and that electricity usage by IT is expected to increase a lot with the mass digital transformation of organizations and the expansion of Industry 4.0.

The line has long term cases since 2012. A participation to an EU cost action and involvement in international projects. It brought to a number of publications and to six grants with relevant funds.

The objective of this case is to develop methods and tools to prioritize energy efficiency as a design goal of ICT systems and to make citizen aware of the problem.

To raise awareness, the members of the team have participated to several debates with Danish IT industries, local governmental institutions, with developers of ICT systems and with national and international business companies in the sector.

To reach future ICT developers they also developed new courses at RUC and promoted the subject also with external teacher associations.

Potential

The line can further expand its studies by targeting EU funds. There is currently a lack of commonly accepted definitions and methods to evaluate the energy efficiency and overall sustainability of cloud and edge computing technologies. By tackling this problem from a theoretical logic programming approach to the design of sustainable ICT solutions, this line of research holds great promise for achieving both great academic and societal impact.

Critical issues of the RE with respect to the societal impact

During the on-site visit meetings, it has been stated that public data are often used as starting point for analysis, but the great interest of society for big data and data science not necessarily brings to interesting external funded projects, sometimes they pose only simple problems whose solutions do not need research.

Moreover, it has been stated that the focus of the environment research, as also of all the departments, is going to be more on applied research than on basic research, in order to attract external funding by promoting societal impact. Centres have been created to raise awareness externally on the research at RUC.

Nevertheless, this trend needs to be monitored since disregarding basic research can lead to a loss of competitiveness. One can run the risk to be not up-to-date with novel methods and technologies, and to be incapable to define original solutions to emerging complex societal problems.

Besides that, this can also lead to external fund-driven research instead of application-driven research as stated during the on-side visit meeting.

Finally, many times it has been remarked that while societal impact is very important for the department, its recognition and measurement is difficult which results in invisible activity. It has been stated that books for teaching do often have a big societal impact, and many books have great utility in society but lack international recognition because are written in Danish.

Nevertheless, as stated during the on-site visit, a book written in Danish may have a greater societal impact than a book written in English. Researchers for these results receive recognition from outside university not within RUC because there is a strong evaluation culture that do not measure societal impact.

Potential of the RE with respect to the societal impact

Nowadays social media cannot be disregarded by universities and research project managers. Taking care of project websites, publishing posts, images, presentations, videos of seminars in social media, making webinars, are powerful means to reach a wide audience and to boost the societal impact of the research activities and results both locally and internationally.

Finally, methods and metrics for assessing societal impact at distinct levels, personal, groups, RE, etc., should be explored: for example in the case of books by considering the number of book's copies sold, and the number of courses and number of years in which the book has been adopted at universities; in the case of projects by tracking the timeline, popularity and sentiment of social media posts that deal with projects results, or by considering the media that reported news on the project.

Research and education – DATA SCIENCE AND IT

The environment presented two student collaborations cases which well exemplify both the links between education and research involving members of the environment and the PPL approach results.

CASE 1. Collaboration with Roskilde festival and Musicon and GRASP Festival of Knowledge

In the context of these events which address sustainable solutions for urgent up-to-date issues exploring the potential of art, music, activism and culture, students developed proposals by focusing on experimental practices and participatory design which are distinctive characteristics of the research of the RE.

Several hackathons took place where students met stakeholders to obtain feedback from them on the concept prototype. Unfortunately, due to the pandemics both the 2020 and the 2021 editions of Roskilde festival and Musicon did not take place, and at the time of writing the Da4 report the last edition was still to come.

The four selected publications, which reports on results in the pre-pandemic period, 2011-2018, exemplify the kinds of proposals made. The themes are exploring design research practices in constructive research and in interaction design. An interesting one, built on the concept of creating excuses to interact by exploiting touch, proposes interfaces and interactive art installations for fostering complex social curiosity. The experience outlined generative properties for interaction designers.

Potential

This research is highly interdisciplinary involving design research, interface interaction design, and psychology, and potentially could be a bridge to collaborate with other groups such as “Social psychology”.

CASE 2. FABLab

During the on-site visit to the department we had the opportunity to see the FABLab laboratories and to talk with researchers and technicians involved in its activities. It represents a valuable means for RUC to establish collaborations with students, researchers, start-ups and private citizens with original ideas by offering them rapid prototyping services. It is also a means to realize the PPL program.

Two examples of traditional activities are described in report Da4.

The first one is related with the research activity also reported as societal impact CASE 3. “*Energy efficiency of computing systems”* and related with the research objective of sustainable energy consumption, thus providing a complete view of the research and learning cycle from different perspectives.

Specifically, three students worked at their Master thesis by evaluating the energy composition of distinct Word Press plugins obtaining interesting results by developing in Fablab an original measuring setup which has been already adopted in other domains. One paper and one poster paper have been published in 2022 on this activity that has been presented at an international forum and at a webinar with 40 participants from companies of software developers, contributing to the societal impact of the research.

The second example is about measuring usage of new roads and paths in naturalistic places and in collaboration with local communities in Naturpark Amosen, citizens, entrepreneurships and tourist companies, thus promoting societal impact too. Besides developing new trails, the collected crowd data also provided useful information for tourist management.

The Fablab was involved by assisting students in developing three different electronic tools for people counting which have been evaluated by comparison with traffic data from a mobile company to assess their accuracy. This activity has brought to eight national and international publications since 2019 demonstrating its ongoing contribution to the academic impact of research. This example could be further expanded by involving the PLIS group members working on spatial databases and the groups of the “Society Space and Technologies”.

These examples are paradigmatic of how well education can be integrated with research, yielding both high social and educational impact and contributing to academic impact too.

Critical issues of the RE with respect to Research and education

Having a look at the education courses on basics topics of Computer science in 2021 they slightly increased by 1 (Student Man Year), while those on informatics decreased. Conversely, there was an increase of courses on applications of informatics and computer science, and on interdisciplinary studies on health promotion and health strategies, on spatial design and society and on Nordic urban planning.

To boost the potential academic and social impact of data science, to keep up with the new quick evolutions of such technologies continuous updating of the courses on both computer science and data science methods are needed, which requires to maintain and possibly to increase their offer.

This goal is in conflict with the already too high commitment to education of the RE members.

Notice that the environment has the highest quota of examination (10%) with respect to the other environments, these latter amounting up to 3%-4%, and this quota has increased by +23.3% in 2021.

During the on-site visit meeting when we asked which were the weaknesses of the groups of the environment the first problem that members of the two groups pointed out was that “it is difficult to find time for research”.

They added “We use a lot of our time on applying for funding, and teaching. We use 50% of our time on teaching and the education – it is a lot compared to other universities.”

These figures outline that there is a conflict and a straggle for time needed for course preparation, teaching, examination and the time needed to organize, manage and carry out research.

Furthermore, its was stated that “Especially the young researchers use a lot of time on teaching. You get about 2.5 hours of preparation for each hour of teaching and new researchers use 10 hours to prepare a teaching session.”

Moreover, it was also pointed out that even if younger researchers already teach a little less that the rest of the staff, because it's taken into account that they have to spend the time taking teaching education, other measures could be applied to try protecting research time of the young researchers.

Another problem that also came out in the on-side visit meeting with young researchers is that “the PhD school is disconnected from the research groups, and often you are not allowed to supervise a PhD student even though you where the one who got the funding. This means that the PhD projects sometimes are completely disconnected from the main project that got the funding. The PhD school is defining the focus on all the projects even though they are externally funded.”

This was also recognized as a problem by the PhD students we met, who daily experience conflicts between what they have to do according to the doctoral school program directives, and what they are required to do by the project manager who provided external funding for their PhD.

Potential of the RE with respect to Research and education

A possible solution discussed during the meeting to balance the time spent in teaching and in doing research was to invest some time to widen the external funded projects in order to benefit of the pay-off time from teaching. Nevertheless, this would require an initial effort of time to prepare the proposals.

Another possibility that was indicated as feasible is to exploit further the PPL approach, in order to involve more productively students into the research projects, by assigning them useful tasks, for example execution of experiments, testing, development of piece of software, etc.

A recommendation of one group leader made during the on-side visit meeting was also to preserve young researchers’ time devoted to research by assigning them teaching duties relative to the same topics of their research for long periods of time so as to optimize time needed for lesson preparation and encouraging them to exploit PPL further.

It appears that the RE has a big potential to expand its research lines further and to improve its visibility at European level, but it needs to hire novel research members: new PhDs and new staff for the RE will boost the time needed for research.

Finally, as far as the transparency issue in dealing with PhDs, it was observed that if the PhD school will be more closely connected with the groups of the RE in the future, then a new critical situation will occur that requires a redesign of the administrative tasks at the RE, since, according to a member of the RE, “this will determine much more administration in the research group”.

APPENDIX

Notes on Bibliometric indicators from several sources: document C4, Document Da3 and the excel file Da2 with list of publications.

According to the figures in document Da3 the peer reviewed publications had the greatest decrease in 2021 (-14) with respect to 2020, while they had increased by 3 if compared to those published in 2019: it seems that there is a regular tendency to increase every other year; 2020 was the year with greatest number of publications probably due to lock-down effect that allow people to concentrate on writing.

Publications with BFI highly increased in 2020 (+12) as well as level 2 publications (+3). The results are not reported for 2021.

Publication types privilege Conference articles which are more or less stable (+1),

There are missing journal articles in 2021 (-15) which had a slow but almost stable increase in previous years (from +8 to +15).

These figures outline the need to understand why Journals were not targeted in 2021, which, however, seems inconsistent with the self-reported results of the groups of the environment where 2 journal articles are reported.

The publications in the overall list (excel file Da2) are **297 since 2017**. Considering that the environment comprehends 18.8 members, the average number of publications of each member in each year is more than 2.6 publications.

The publication categories are as follows:

- 98 articles in Journals among which 85 articles in peer-reviewed journals as follows:
  - 2017 15
  - 2018 18
  - 2019 19
  - 2020 18
  - 2021 2
  - 2022 13
- 86 articles in Proceedings of conferences among which 85 articles in peer-reviewed proc. in English language as follows:
  - 2017 11
  - 2018 12
  - 2019 20
  - 2020 23
  - 2021 18
  - 2022 1
- 9 conference peer reviewed articles (which is unclear if they are articles in proceedings of conferences)
- 28 papers among which 22 peer reviewed and 2 with DOI.
- 19 peer reviewed book chapters
- 12 Anthologies, i.e., editors of proceedings, special issues, workshops, projects

- 8 reports among which 2 peer reviewed
- 6 conference abstracts
- 5 report chapters in Danish language
- 4 editorials (preface of conferences)
- 3 conference abstract in proc.
- 3 working papers
- 3 reprints
- 2 books (one peer-reviewed)
- 2 encyclopaedia chapters (2017 and 2022)
- 2 posters
- 2 net publications
- 2 memorandum
- 1 review in 2021
- 1 literature review in 2018
- 1 PhD thesis
- 1 compendium
- 1 debate

These numbers are not in accordance with the bibliometric data of the RE in document Da3 that report 0 articles in journals in 2021.

Appendix B – Research quality evaluation of Social Psychology

Summary – Social Psychology

Findings

The research quality of the Social Psychology Research Environment (RE) makes a valuable contribution to the RUC's self-image as a reform university by challenging the usual ways of producing knowledge in social psychology, being interdisciplinary, committed to teaching and striving for its social impact in terms of changing people's lives for the better.

- By developing innovative theoretical and methodological questions, approaches, concepts and related studies, the RE strives for change in the scientific field and in society.
- The work of the RE is highly regarded in critical psychology, social psychology, and childhood studies at the international and national levels. Locally, its pursuit of significant impact on the lives of research subjects is highly valued.
- The members of the RE are intensely dedicated to teaching with the aim of training students at the highest possible level, while treating them as aspiring co-researchers whose ideas can make a valuable contribution to their own research agenda.

Recommendations

- Improving and expanding the strategic use of existing national and international collaborations could help to increase the number of publications and explore promising funding opportunities (via foreign partners or with them on the EU level).
- A more strategic rotation of tasks, duties and responsibilities (in terms of joint publications, teaching formats, administrative work) between the members of the RE, using the respective strengths of each member, could help to increase the number of publications and funding applications.
- Since the RE often deals with "big questions" such as inequality, social justice or migration, a more intensive exchange with other RE within the department that also deal with these topics could help with the sharing of work (e.g., with publications) or the expansion of academic networks (e.g., with funding applications).

Research excellence – Social Psychology

Research quality, international visibility, and academic impact

Strengths:

- The Social Psychology RE at RUC focuses peoples' everyday experiences in their respective socio-cultural context taking into account their actual living conditions as well as political discourses and practises. In doing so, the RE is connected to historical and current approaches of critical psychology, in which the person is not researched as an isolated individual, but is understood as a social subject whose experience and behaviour cannot be understood without taking into account his or her concrete living conditions. Main areas of the RE - critical psychology, tech psychology, psychology and learning, childhood studies – are united by a first-person perspective which is unique in the field of (social) psychology. Furthermore, the concept of *Everyday Life* as the decisive framework not only inspires the REs' own research programme, but opens up opportunities for scientific cooperation beyond the REs' field of research and beyond their scientific discipline as well. The application and development of specific and often qualitative research methods and designs are linked to this programme, as experimental settings, for example, which are common in academic social psychology, are not suitable for answering the research questions here.

- During the last five years several members of the RE succeeded in launching internationally recognised publications (cf. google scholar, research gate) as well as well-regarded publications in the Danish contexts. The majority of publications was published in English or other non-Danish languages, which facilitates international recognition, while publications in Danish support the connections not only to national research associations but also, and perhaps even more importantly, to the local research partners and communities. Publications are published as peer-reviewed articles in respected journals, or as books, book chapters and edited volumes in prestigious international publishing houses. In the joint authorships of a considerable number of publications, the various levels of cooperation (department, university, national, international) become obvious. Moreover, numerous single authorships show the individual excellence of the RE members.
- Given the fact, that a critical psychological stance often needs a publication strategy beyond typical high impact mainstream journals the REs' average citation impact score as well as the share of publications that have been awarded BFI points seems appreciable, especially since a considerable number of publications consist of book chapters and books that are less considered here.
- During the five-year period RE-members received funding for PhD projects and compound research projects by several external sources. These funds have recently risen again after a period of decline, apparently due to a newly implemented more systematic collaboration strategy. In addition to larger grants, there are also some smaller ones. Although small, they seem to be equally important, as they allow researchers to continue their work on a particular topic over several years, contributing to long-lasting and reliable research collaboration with relevant societal stakeholders. Last but not least, several non-funded projects are conducted leading to excellent results and publications.

Potentials:

- The number of publications has somewhat declined since the year 2020 (maybe partly an effect of pandemic related issues?) – strategic planning of publications in groups of authors with changing leads might help to increase the output again. Furthermore, an open access strategy which is supported on the department level (e.g., by supporting one Gold OA per year per first author) or university level (develop respective contracts with relevant publishers) can increase visibility and avoid delay.
- The amount of third-party funding had declined before a recent increase. This increase might be due to the rather newly implemented strategy of more systematic collaborations in order to apply for national and international grants. This strategy could be intensified via the diverse international networks of the RE members looking for strategic partnerships with researchers in whose country's applications are promising. At departmental level, a culture of appreciating even small funds - that can support longitudinal research and therefore form a solid basis for publications as well as societal impact - could increase the motivation for further applications.
- Systemic involvement of young researchers (PhD students) in the development of new research ideas and corresponding funding applications could achieve two things at once: 1.) current approaches and innovative methods from ongoing PhD projects can be used for further research development. 2.) young researchers can contribute to a possible continuation of their research career after their PhD.

Internationalization

Strengths:

- Several members of the Social Psychology RE have been intensively publishing internationally and gained an impressive recognition in the field. As editors or editorial board members for various international journals or as leading figures in international scientific organisations RE members are highly visible in a global community of critical and theoretical psychology, social and tech-psychology as well as in the interdisciplinary field of childhood studies.

Potentials:

- Systematic joint publications or grant applications with international partners could strengthen the integration into international research networks and international visibility.
- The already existing international focus of activities could also be more strongly supported by the Department (e.g., by recognizing engagement in international contexts like organising conferences or acting as journal editors as part of the group's research excellence).

Interdisciplinary

Strengths:

- Being part of an international critical psychology network and movement and taking the concept of *Everyday Life* as a theoretical framework already implies a research attitude that is not only centred on the own discipline but is open to interdisciplinary exchange and collaboration. For instance, the REs' focus on human-tech-interactions or on people's collaboration include several connections to disciplines beyond psychology like education, technology/IT or health sciences. Currently, such exchange takes place on international and Nordic/national level but also within RUC (across and within the department). The same applies for the integration of some group members in the per se interdisciplinary field of childhood studies. Traditionally strong in the Nordic countries, childhood studies are meanwhile a global endeavour with the explicit objective of understanding and researching childhood globally as a contextualised experience.

Potential:

- As the REs' work often tackles fundamental and overarching social and societal questions (e.g., issues of inequality, migration, climate crisis or health related topics) – as other REs in the department do as well – the collaboration within the department might be improved. Nevertheless, such local collaborations cannot just be a goal on its own, given the fact that national and international collaborations are usually the main factors for visibility of research and also for forming funding networks. However, if such local cooperation serves to mutually expand national and international networks, for example, or leads to high-quality publications, conferences or joint funding applications, it would be beneficial for all involved. Thus, the definition of realistic goals as well as (joint) current research topics, questions, and methods is crucial to decide whether such in-departmental collaborations are beneficial.

Societal impact – Social Psychology

Communication

Strengths

- RE members engage in communication activities that reach beyond the actual academic context itself. By participating in stakeholder meetings or public policy events, holding public lectures/keynotes, advising policy-makers and legislators as well as by being present in various media formats (e.g., newspapers, tv news, radio broadcasts) the group has already achieved a notable visibility and social influence.

Potentials

- The broader communication of the group in the 21th century might be improved by maintaining a joint website or social media or network presence that reports on current research, introduces the members of the group, and in general presents its activities to a broader, non-academic audience. As such activities are somewhat time consuming, at least the reported bureaucracy related to such presence on the side of the university should be reduced.

Societal impact

Strengths

- The first-person perspective that forms the basis for the research orientation of the RE necessarily involves a turn towards those who are researched by taking up their problems and questions as a starting point for the own research. Thus, research results have to be disseminated to the research subjects to offer opportunities for understanding their own practises and potentials for changing and improving one's everyday life. The above-mentioned activities outside the actual academic context already make an important contribution to the societal impact of the RE.
- Also, significant here is the considerate number of Danish publications as these represent a low-threshold access for interested parties from various social fields and the research subjects as well.
- Furthermore, using (albeit smaller) local grants contribute to longstanding and sustainable collaborations with societal stakeholders; reliability is a key quality feature here.

Potentials

- To improve societal impact even more, the suggestions related to using social media or network opportunities to distribute results, gain attention and new interested parties shall be emphasized here again.

Research and education – Social Psychology

Strengths

- The group's devotion to the problem-oriented-learning (PPL) approach offers numerous opportunities to link teaching/education of students to research activities. Here, current research questions and projects form the basis for a learning experience that leads not only to abstract knowledge and skills, but to a first-hand experience of how scientific research can shape and change the social world. In addition, collaboration with students in seminars or via supervising students theses sometimes leads to joint research projects and corresponding publications.

Potentials

- The groups' involvement in the PPL clearly holds the opportunity to link research and teaching even more closely and to turn the heavy workload in teaching (at least partially) into an advantage for research. Research-oriented teaching formats could be used even more systematically to collect and evaluate empirical data (and thereby also to open up new empirical fields through the students), to develop adequate methods and field approaches or also to test theoretical approaches and develop new research questions. In turn, students can be actively recruited from such teaching formats to further work on partial aspects within the framework of their respective assignments or theses and thus help to advance the ongoing research projects of the group.

Balance between research and education

Strengths

- Most members of the research groups have to combine a heavy teaching load with their respective research activities. Nevertheless, by using PPL formats and involving students in research activities, teaching partly contributes to the improvement of research projects.

Potentials

- In addition to the possibilities described above for even closer integration of research and teaching, it may be possible to distribute or rotate workloads when planning teaching. Block formats for courses can create much-needed free space for research activities, and courses with a very high level of supervision could be rotated between group members on a semester-by-semester basis.
- At the departmental level, thought must be given to how tasks in academic self-administration can be better distributed in order to limit the additional workload over time, since this usually comes at the expense of research time.

Appendix C – Research quality evaluation of Society, Space and Technology (SST)

Summary

Overall findings

- On a general level, the SST performs well considering conventional criteria and indicators for research quality evaluation. In the material we have used, including the interview and the visit we made, there is evidence for a good production of scientific publications, successful external research funding, achieving synergies with education and societal impact through research approaches involving external stakeholders.
- The group contains research that links major sustainability challenges, for instance climate strategy, sustainability in farming and mobility with solutions involving local stakeholders and phenomenon, that are especially interesting and valuable. Making this link between some of humanities' big challenges and what needs to happen on the ground is a challenging but important contribution displayed by SST.
- The research profile of the group appears diverse and even fragmented. This do not necessarily influence the quality of the performed research but probably the ability to take on challenging research tasks that require strong research environments. The fragmentation of research also makes the external communication about the societal role of the research group more difficult.

Overall recommendations

- The group should consider how they can further develop their identity and framing in relation to some of the major societal challenges in order to, internally and externally, clarify their role in society. Such an effort could possibly also lead to improved quality and relevance of the research through closer connection to external actors.
- Changing the profile of a research group is not an easy quick-fix. However, the age structure of the SST staff implies that there will be a dynamic period ahead. Here is a chance, to not strengthen the centrifugal forces that would increase the fragmentation of the research, but instead strengthen the areas that are between the existing strong areas.
- Metrik operates laboratory facilities in three different knowledge areas. This is assumed to require a lot of resources, in order to be relevant and up to date. The research group may consider partnerships or other collaboration forms where labs in other parts of RUC or at other universities could be used instead.
- There were indications that there had been "internal battles and challenges" within SST. A stronger external focus through a process of developing a new overall strategy addressing crucial, societal challenges would probably be helpful in creating an even stronger orientation to results, rather than relations.

Research excellence – SST

The research quality in all regards is good. Researchers publish peer-review articles in relevant, high-quality journals as well as in monographs. They contribute to high-quality knowledge building in areas like mobility, human geography and urban studies. There are examples where researchers have become acknowledged by relevant prizes and fellowships. International networking and seminar culture feeds the academic environment. The group have a strong external funding record, both regarding EU and national sources, indicating both quality and relevance of their research.

Surprisingly, the Metrik group operates labs in three different areas; pyrolysis, anaerobic digestion and “open food” as well as being involved in the “Fablab”. This seems resource-demanding and may also restrict research to specific knowledge areas. Being up to date in several practical areas like this seems challenging. It may be worth considering if more of this work could be done in collaboration with other academic actors inside or outside RUC.

The research profile of the groups is not very clearly articulated. This observation, together with the publication list, indicate that the research agendas emanate from individual initiatives and is opportunity-driven rather than strategic and related to identified crucial societal challenges. There was a mention of “internal battles” as well as “centrifugal forces” by the staff during the evaluation process. Addressing some external societal and scientific challenges in a strategy process could perhaps divert some of the energy from internal battles to external results.

SST should consider their overall strategy including their name, framing and research profile. SST could probably be more competitive and societally relevant if they selected and focussed on a few major societal challenges and their corresponding sustainable solutions. Research including development and dissemination/implementation of such solutions requires interdisciplinarity that could be covered within SST to a large extent. It could be complemented with existing national and international partnerships and form larger research programs or centres, that would strengthen the institutionalisation of the research and its support.

Societal impact – SST

Externally funded projects involving academic and non-academic partners is related to the expected societal impact and SST reports that they collaborated with more than 150 different organizations during the last five years. In several projects, a diversity of actors including municipalities, companies and civil society organizations, have participated in co-production of knowledge. This has influenced processes regarding planning and implementation of more sustainable solutions in practice. The group thereby contributes to joint learning and networking in societies where they are involved. This was also demonstrated in several societal impact cases involving stakeholder co-production of new knowledge. On top of that, they publish scientific papers and reports related to their EU- and national projects. Despite these efforts, the group expressed frustration over the poor, wider external communication of their research and lack of support from departmental and university level in this regard.

The SST group strongly stressed the need for more external communication about their research. They were also disappointed about the support from higher levels of RUC. Their high ambitions should be met by communication support from departmental and university levels. However, they could also continue to do more external communication themselves on social media, since it is more powerful when researchers themselves sends the message.

Research and education – SST

There is possibly a conflict between successful performance regarding research and education and the staff report that education is a big share of the workload. The staff also reports on the difficulty of having time to focus on research without being “disturbed” by educational activities. They also mentioned that the administrative burden related to teaching has grown while administration related to research has improved and that more appropriate help here is available. There is a rather well functioning collective responsibility for education and less focus on individual performance of the educating staff.

Furthermore, the educational programs necessarily influence the scope of the research. However, some examples from SST indicate that they have been able to explore the positive synergies between research and education and report that knowledge from student projects have contributed to scientific publications. This is encouraging and in contrast with the sometimes-used words like “obligation” and “burden” used to describe the staff’s involvement in education.

To continue to coordinate the development of; (i) curricula of the programs, (ii) the research strategy and (iii) the stakeholder involvement is worth all attention and represents an important approach of “getting it together”, simultaneously working with the three main challenges of academia. This is the way forward – that the group do research, educate, and interact with society on the same topics, whether they are, for instance, sustainable food production systems, climate strategies or planning of viable cities. Such an approach can simultaneously improve performance in all three dimensions of the academic mission.

Appendix D – Research quality evaluation of Learning and Education

Sub-report for the Learning and Education research environment,
with the newly constituted research group Learning, Education and Pedagogy (LEAP)

Summary

Overall findings

- Learning, Education and Pedagogy has a broad lifelong learning approach including a diverse range of learning processes and learning environments. This approach should be important to critically understand present challenges in learning and education that go beyond e.g., single institutions, and not the least beyond the institutions of today's society that are primarily educational.
- The group as a whole does research with high quality, visibility, and impact, but there is currently more focus on some of all the relevant lifelong learning contexts.
- The group has a clear connection to the university education on a general level, with the focus on problem-oriented project learning both in the group and in the university as a whole. However, presently (some of) the connections to the specific programmes are somewhat unclear and not yet fully established after a reframing process concerning educational programmes.

Overall recommendations

- Keep the broad focus of the group, which should include the different parts and aspects of lifelong learning that have been presented as signifying the group.
- Increase the efforts of recruitment to keep the broad focus. The evaluation has highlighted the importance of improving the age and gender balance of the staff. Entry-level and junior positions are crucial for renewal. However, there is also a need for renewal of senior staff in areas where key persons have retired, as the senior staff is central to (quoted from the group report) "develop deeper potentials in basic research expertise and impact."
- Strengthen the position of research in the work of the staff, in a way that avoids an overload of teaching obligations but also improve the connections and synergies between research and education. The problem-oriented project learning approach has a good potential when it comes to the latter area.

Research excellence

Learning, Education and Pedagogy (LEAP) is a newly established research group, based on a number of already existing, smaller, research groups (now rather sub-groups). The present group is representing a broad lifelong learning approach. Our understanding is that this approach is important to critically understand present challenges in learning and education, which go beyond single institutions, and not the least beyond the institutions of today's society that are primarily defined as educational institutions. We see the value in this broad approach and, based both on its value and the strengths briefly described below, we recommend the environment/group to keep developing this approach.

Our assessment is that the group as a whole does research with high quality, visibility, and impact. Particularly, the impact is visible on a national level, but in some areas also on an international level. However, the broad lifelong learning approach including the diverse range of learning processes and learning environments presented as signifying the group is not fully reflected in the work that is presented more in detail. The latter is not strange, given the limited space for presentation and the broad range of research, but still worth noticing. Here, the different sub-groups have a potential to learn from each other and develop a broader visibility and impact, not the least on an international level, including all the parts of the group.

The publications from the group are extensive and cover a broad research field, which goes beyond what is reflected in the cases that are presented as examples of the work of the group. There are also different types of publications, international as well as national, and research- as well as more practice-oriented, which should contribute to broad dissemination of results.

CeDif (Center for Daginstitutionsforskning, in English The Danish Center for Research in Early Childhood Education and Care) is a national centre (in cooperation with Aarhus University, DPU) with focus on early childhood education and care, which – based on the presentation of the research – seems to be particularly prominent at the moment, with extensive external funding and a certain number of staff connected to the centre.

However, there is a need to increase the efforts of recruitment to keep the broad focus of the environment/group. The evaluation has highlighted the importance of improving the age and gender balance of the staff. Entry-level and junior positions are crucial for renewal, but there is also a need for renewal of senior staff in areas where key persons have retired. The senior staff is important to (as quoted from the group report) "develop deeper potentials in basic research expertise and impact."

Societal impact

The group presents a high engagement outside academia, which is relevant for the research that is presented. There are relevant and plenty of partnerships that promote societal impact. However, here too the focus seems to be narrower compared to the broad lifelong approach that is promoted initially, which means that there is a potential to develop societal engagement and impact.

Still, there is social involvement across the whole spectrum of fields that are presented in the profile of the group. The societal impact also interacts with expectations from the practice fields. However, some expectations could be difficult to meet, with the present lack of competence in some areas such as vocational education and adult education (including the 'traditional' lifelong learning field which goes beyond school for young people).

Research and education

The specific connections between research groups and programmes are difficult to grasp. This might be a sign of the ambition of developing multi-disciplinarity, in research as well as education, which might take time to establish in a coherent way. There are new educational programmes, and the connections between research groups and teaching in the new programmes seem not to have been fully "established" yet.

Education takes much time for the staff, and actually more time than is formally assigned to this task. Nevertheless, there are potentials for synergy identified, not the least based on the problem-oriented project learning approach at the university which is an approach that to a large extent is parallel to developing knowledge in research. And in addition to this, the project learning approach is also in focus in one of the sub-groups of LEAP. To develop both research and education, we still see a need to strengthen the position of research in the work of the staff, in a way that avoids an overload of teaching obligations but also improve the connections and synergies between research and education. Here, the problem-oriented project learning approach has a good potential as a key to development.

Appendix E – Research quality evaluation of Health & Society

Summary – Three overall findings and recommendations for Health & Society

Method note. This report is based on:

- the "Self-evaluation report" submitted by the Health and Society (H&S) research environment (RE),
- support documentation provided to the evaluation committee, and,
- a one-hour group interview between the evaluation committee and four members of the H&S research environment group: Karen Christensen, Sine Lehn, Nicole Thualagant and Nete Schwennesen (all female senior researchers at professor/associate professorial levels).

Three overall findings:

1. The merging of two previous research groups – one with a medical orientation towards health and one a social scientific approach to health – has tremendous potential as well as challenges. The merger, like our impression of most of the research units at DPT, is the product of an educational programme logic rather than a research logic. This means that research aims were not the driving force of this organisational manifestation. This means that it will have to evolve and find its way and strategy as a research unit. The "evolutionary process" can be organic or helped and focussed through explicit, deliberate and deliberative coordination. Assistance should be extended to assure that the medical and social science approaches are combined to provide more holistic and comprehensive approaches and explanations, rather than leading separate existences within the RE. This is elaborated in recommendation 1 below.

2. An "empty" Centre on welfare and health exists. The "empty centre" can be understood both in terms of an uninvested in and thereby inoperative organizational entity, or metaphorically that there is a midpoint or potential meeting-point at the heart or centre of this RE that is not developed enough to pull people to what could become a focal point within the RE and unite the Research Group (RG) with other researchers and research environments at RUC and internationally.

3. The RE performs satisfactorily even under recent conditions with less research leadership from the professorial level. The RE has displayed not just potential but substantial accomplishments especially in terms of publication output in 2019 (n= 38). A question worth addressing is what lies behind this exceptional result, and what can motivate and sustain this, if this type of performance is chosen?

Three overall recommendations:

1. The ambitions that the RE has expressed in more reflexive, comprehensive and holistic approaches to research about health is ambitious and laudable. However, to accomplish this agenda requires more comprehensive funding and may require more contact with or lobbying of national (public and private) research funding agencies to understand and invest in the value of bi- or poly-paradigmatic and mixed-method research in the health field. The ambitions of the RE are more in

line with EU/EC Horizon Europe (HE) approaches and the RG would become an ideal partner for HE consortia. Leading an application as Coordinator would be one way of profiling the capacities of the RG internationally. But coordinating an application requires tremendous academic and research services effort from the central administrative level at RUC.

The RE clearly has a strong social science research base. The medical background is not prominent, and a question worth asking is if the medical disciplinary background is something that has been found among researchers associated with the merged research groups who have retired or moved on, and thereby no longer significantly represented, and if so, what does this mean for the ambitions of the RE? A second question is what dimensions or domains of the very broad medical field are represented within the RE? Again, the RE appears strong on care and nursing, somewhat on medical technologies, but little in terms of treatment and diagnosis and specialist medicine (with the possible exception of gerontology). It is recommended that an inventorying of the areas of competence and interest that exist within the RE takes place to identify where internal competencies exist and where external (RUC, national, international) resources are needed to accomplish the extended, comprehensive and holistic ambitions the RE envisions.

2. Construct a purpose the Centre on Welfare and Health through a university-wide process, making it common property across departments and open for departmental and central university seed investment. The RG appears to have sufficient external collaborative relations with health education and practitioner environments in the region to attract small project and PhD student external funding for some activities of a visible, well-functioning centre. A well-functioning Centre entails a clear mandate, sufficient resources and administrative procedures and support that make collaboration with external partners swift and easy and not mired by drawn-out bureaucratic indecisiveness. The mandate of the centre would spell out a unique role involving, but distinct from that of the REs and research groups taking part. The Centre appears to be the best opportunity for casting a wider net, but if it is to be a deep, project-based research milieu, this would require a different approach than the one discussed at the group interview, which spoke of the Centre more as a clearing-house for research already undertaken.

3. Personnel. The RE appears to be impacted by retirements that have led to research leaders with distinct and distinguished competencies leaving the RE. This is both a direct loss of competence, but also of profiled areas, that also open opportunities for new directions and associations. Until recently the RE currently has had only one professor (MSO on 80%, 2020 figure). Recent recruitment of two professors with important profile competencies – aging, technologies, and mental health appear to supplement senior research leadership in the RE, but the effects of this recruitment have yet to be seen in full. Attention should be paid to career progression and career planning so that the individual and collaborative competencies that have led to demonstrable successes can be fostered and not harmed by personnel leaving due to blocked career paths and research opportunities. There is currently a good generational mix and collaborative atmosphere, but pressures increase as people move upward in the academic pyramid. Transparency and opportunity are central to this process.

4. Communication support should also be prioritised, for publicising current research, and making people at all levels: from DPT to RUC to national to international, aware of the accomplishments of

and collaborative opportunities with the H&S RE. When an operative Centre on welfare and health exists, the same pertains to the Centre.

Research excellence

Research quality

Based on the publication data, which demonstrates volume of production and the status of the outlets the RE publishes in (levels 1, 2, and 3), the most telling quantitative measurement – BFI points/FTE – varies greatly over the period 2017-2020, with a low of 0.42 in 2017 to an exceptionally high point of 2.22 in 2019, falling back to 0.97 in 2020. The top in 2019 is clearly linked to publishing in level 2-3 publications (6 that year, as compared to 0 in 2017, 2 in 2018 and 2 in 2020), while fluctuations in FTEs within the RG appear to be a lesser factor. This means that the RE, and likely several members of it, are clearly capable of publishing in high-status outlets. What is worth investigating, if publishing in these outlets is prioritised, is why these outlets are sometimes chosen and sometimes not? Is it a matter of reaching an intended audience, having experience in writing for and going through review processes in such journals, having the empirical data and or theoretical/conceptual material to publish in these types of outlets? As 2019 was not just an exceptional year in terms of volume of production, it is indicative of the (realised) potential to perform at a high bibliometric and impact level.

Another factor contributing to, as well as acknowledging, research excellence is that members of the RE sit on journal editorial boards. This provides insight into the publication process which is an asset to the RE and RUC. Editorial engagement is primarily at the level of Danish and Nordic journals. A natural next step would be broader international journals and scholarly societies.

International visibility

Based on publication collaboration, the RE collaborates primarily with Danish actors (7 of top 10; with two Norwegian and one Finnish university rounding out the top 10). This is indicative of a very strong national, and to a lesser extent Nordic focus, which can also be seen as a low international presence. One reason for this might be the nature of the health research discussed in the self-report, being focused on governance and institutional dimensions that are closely tied to particular (welfare-state based) contexts. But the other areas of interest including global changes, aging, gender and intersectionality, pandemics, (digital) technologies, equity, non-human elements in health and personal health strategies are more trans-contextual. So there appears to be greater opportunities to increase international visibility if greater international collaboration can be established. Here the role of the empty/dormant Centre appears important as an arena for these purposes.

In the self-evaluation report contact with universities abroad are listed, but the natures of these collaborative contacts are not elaborated. However, the backgrounds of several members of the RE and the contacts listed and research stays abroad indicate that vital research contacts exist. Utilising these contacts to especially productive, high-level research environments abroad more fully would improve both the quality and exposure of the research conducted within the RE. Staff exchanges, joint seminars and workshops and research project applications are conventional means of deepening collaboration and opening it to more individuals at both ends.

Despite the "national" orientation discussed above, one comment made during the site panel interview implies that the RG doesn't appear to be nationally/regionally well-known. "The University of Copenhagen and University of Southern Denmark also have research fields in relation to health, but they do not know about the environment at RUC" was one statement made during the group interview, to which none of the others present at the group interview objected. There is apparently some collaboration with staff/research units at the University of Copenhagen, but there seems to be a feeling that the RE's accomplishments and collaborative potential are insufficiently recognised even at the national level. In the future, it is necessary to optimise national cooperation both with the University of Copenhagen, SDU and other universities and enter into research collaboration. This may be a communication issue, or it may be a matter of access to and activity within national networks, conferences and associations. Both are instrumental to improving and displaying research excellence.

In terms of national and international visibility, the role of the website – having it continuously updated and tailored to different groups such as policy-makers, practitioners, international academics, and national academics – was underscored. This communication activity needs to be proactive and up-to-date, giving a clear and accurate impression of the activities of the RE, in order to increase and sustain international visibility.

The RE's research funding base is also regional (sub-national, healthcare region) and national, though it also receives part of a major Norwegian grant. This link between funding and research objects (national healthcare systems) also restricts international visibility, unless more general empirical or conceptual/theoretical dimensions can be drawn from local or national studies and published in more globally-read outlets.

Academic impact

Based on the discussions above, the academic impact is reasonably strong at the national and Nordic level, but appears to be weaker at the more extended international level. Again, there are topics that are deemed important in the wider international health field that the RE seeks to address, but has not yet established a durable presence in these circles.

Subsection recommendations

What will it take to realise the statement: "Our researchers have the potential to attain higher international impact through publications and research." (self-report, p.2)? For a group that has functioned for most of the period under analysis with fewer professors than in other REs, they are doing well, but have greater potential. There seem to be a number of factors related perhaps less to research excellence and robustness than to how it is measured in terms of bibliometrics and international reach.

The self-professed methods profile of the RE is one factor. The primary methodology is co-creative, qualitative action, small-n research, and often mono-contextual. This type of research can be rigorous and highly valuable to the groups and contexts it focuses on, but that it is less amenable to many international journals. To penetrate such outlets, one has to find the right angle, which requires an investment in investigating framing for different outlets and academic communities. Without direct positions on editorial boards this requires contact and trial and error work that takes time. If bibliometrics are prioritised, this type of investment in understanding at the group level how the type of research that the RE is committed to (see below) can be made more internationally relevant and attractive is important.

The RE has a strong commitment to local collaborators and Danish outlets and national stakeholders. Rather than combatting this in preference for more internationally viable studies, these impulses should be actively reconciled. It is apparent that local/national commitments are what is going to guide the unit. Simultaneously the matter of striving actively to see if broader relevance can be achieved has to remain a foremost objective. This situation or "dilemma" appears in other REs as well, so it might be a good idea to take this up at the departmental or university level – for a strategy discussion regarding support for national/local approaches and how these can be either complemented by more purely international endeavours or making the local/national more relevant to international audiences.

Internationalisation

The RE is highly international in its composition, or at least the members we met at the interview. But as discussed above, the RE is very locally, nationally and Nordic oriented as a unit, and the international background of its members appears to be underutilised from a collective perspective (i.e., remain personal contacts).

Likewise, there appears to be established links with India. As is often the case, much of the international network appears to be based on personal networks. Whether these are institutionalised, i.e., held and maintained by several persons or de-personalised and held by the research group or environment in general is a different matter. It is important to know what the social and research basis for these connections are. Are they project collaboration, publication collaboration, or exchanges? Do they involve multiple individuals at both universities or research/educational institutions collaborating and interacting or a select few? What efforts and support are offered to institutionalise these contacts?

Interdisciplinarity

The RE is highly heterogeneous in terms of academic disciplines. There is however a heavy social science tilt in the academic background profile, with less medical and natural science. As some of the ambitions discussed above, i.e., broad holistic trans-paradigmatic research, imply an integration of social science approaches to health with medicine, natural sciences and humanities, it appears that social scientific interdisciplinarity can well be accomplished, and appears necessary, within the RE, but that moving across major paradigmatic lines will require collaboration across departments or with external partners. This would be nice to have in the form of regularised network contacts, but essential for the projects that the RE seems to envision at the national and even international levels.

Subsection recommendations

One step towards greater internationalisation would be to approach international contacts as collective resources despite often being personal in origin. Here it would be vital to openly discuss what these contacts have to offer the RE in general, and how exiting contacts of value can be made more open to members for the RE or wider RUC community. It would also be of value to strategically identifying environments abroad that there currently do not exist relations with that would be valuable to the RE and establish contacts.

How a wider international appeal is constructed will in part depend upon which of two basic strategies the RE and possibly the Centre on welfare and health decide – a broad, inclusive and potentially vague profile or narrow, specialist, and exclusive expertise. So, some of the internationalisation decisions can be made within the RE itself, while others depend upon the RE's role in and decisions of broader organisational entities, most notably the Centre.

Obviously, relation development and management require time, and an experience of mutual benefit is essential. This requires financial resources for academic infrastructure, logistics, and personnel time.

Practically, the Centre and website are already identified within the RG as central – to which we concur. Other strategies such as arranging conferences and workshops could also be pursued to lift visibility and initiate collaboration.

Societal impact

Communication with wider society outside academia

The nature of the research primarily carried out within the RE – co-creative, qualitative action research implies an existing, established communication and interaction with actors outside academia. Most research is empirical, problem-driven and collaborative with external, practitioner partners. As mentioned above, there is a strong commitment to this within the RE: "We must stick to that identity" is an indicative statement. And it is in line with current political trends, the kind of research that is expected now. Moving beyond mere communication to collaboration, especially with practitioner environments and sub-university vocational educational institutions, requires that departmental and university administrative support has to be able to move at same speed as other actors to enter into agreements and contracts.

Policy

Policy impact appears to be at the regional, rather than national or international (EU; WHO) levels. Rather than policy per se, there is likely a greater impact through direct collaboration and action research activities at the organisational *strategy* and i*mplementation* levels. While the reach of this kind of influence or impact may not be as broad as policy impact, it may indeed be more transformative of the (working) lives of citizens and organisations than policy impact. So having this kind of impact intention and accomplishment should be regarded as of equivalent value as higher-level policy influence.

Drawing on extensive previous research within the RE, and funding by an extensive Norwegian research grant, societal impact Case 2 focuses directly on municipal care policy and practice in Denmark and Norway. This impact is increased by having the research results presented at seminars with municipal actors. The research has also resulted in academic and practitioner-oriented publications and been reported on in mainstream mass media, as well as forging academic-practitioner-policy maker networks.

Organised civil society *(unions, employers organisations, NGOs and civil society organisations/associations)*

As discussed directly above, there are collaborative partnerships across practitioner and training environments in the healthcare field rooted in the action research participatory approach practiced in the RE. Furthermore, extensive contact with NGOs and state authorities established and collaborated with is found in societal impact Case 1. Societal impact Case 3 is primarily oriented towards clinical professional (nursing) education to improve professional skills in specific areas, and thus can be seen as a direct contribution to a professional association that has direct impact on patients/citizens.

Public / members of society *(open forums, traditional and social media)*

Some public speaking engagements, but no strong impression of a national or international media presence is found.

Societal impact Case 1 on ethnicised parenting and the Danish welfare state uses an action research approach that surely has an impact on the 35 couples directly involved, as well as hopefully creating and awareness among politicians and civil servants about the prejudicial foundations of parenting interventions and interaction with state authorities and services. This direct impact on authorities was reinforced through workshops carried out with social service officials.

Impact of communication / outreach beyond academia

As noted above, the nature of collaborative research co-creates direct impact on the collaborating entities. The existence of co-funding of PhD students with actors in healthcare sector is a direct channel of mutual impact and evidence of relevance. Likewise, members of the RE also sit on boards and steering groups in healthcare and clinical education organisations, exerting direct, and likely research-based influence on the activities of these organisations. There appears to be a trade-off, though probably not a necessary one, between depth of impact through close collaboration with specific actors and breadth of impact. Increasing this breadth of impact is something the RE could work on.

Another notable and significant accomplishment is proactive and collaborative engagement with marginalised groups – something RE members can and specialise in doing. This niche role and opportunity is laudably taken seriously within the research group, and apparently primarily undertaken with internally funded research time.

Subsection recommendations

Recommendations in this domain are linked with higher-level strategic choices as well. At the moment the type of research – deep, qualitative, on-site, local, Danish-language based collaborative research brings direct impact immediately to a restricted number of organisations/environments and members of the collaboration partners, and improves the service and understanding of the citizens and groups interacted with. This can be seen as direct impact on strategy and implementation, and to a lesser degree on policy, with the exception of policy at the municipal level.

Based on the assumptions that differences between Danish regions are comparatively little, there is a potential to disseminate this wider within the Danish (and possibly Nordic) context, as well as draw out policy implications. A routine of trying to write policy briefs or organisation level strategy briefs could be tried. A recurrent question should also be: *What wider implications does the research findings that we have produced have?*, and trying to get findings to relevant audiences.

A frequent comment during the site visit regarded creation of a website that might make the research of the RE more accessible to journalists and civil society organisations. This might lead to more direct and indirect speaking and communication engagements for member of the RE in mass media forums and events.

Research and education

Research and education; student involvement in research

The student collaboration case allowed students to evaluate how a health policy programme works with regard to a vulnerable group, thus affording students insight into an area that normally would be difficult for students to access without sponsorship from senior researchers due to ethics and patient integrity issues. From the case summary it appears that student engagement added value to the project through novel insights into shortcomings of implementation, so there appears to be mutual benefits to the students – access to a highly restricted domain in healthcare; novel insights provided by students that can improve implementation; and a wider academic or practitioner-oriented publication. This case is a good example of researcher-student collaboration to reach educational, research and societal impact goals.

Societal impact Case 3 involves action research allowing nursing students at Rigshospitalet to engage in research design, implementation, analysis, writing and scholarly presentation/communication. So here the RUC educational tradition reaches into medical training at Rigshospitalet.

Organization of the researchers' work

Balance between research and education

The MA programme unites the RG/RE and appears to dominate the day-to-day activities of the RE. The temporal (time devoted to research versus educational activities) and mental (what members of the RE think about) balance between research and education appears highly skewed towards education rather than research. This is a primary theme in the main report, and is it most instructive to reference the passages there, as this RE is not unique in many respects, with the possible exception of being more concentrated on a single MA programme than other REs. This concentration may have implications.

Subsection recommendations

Research and education at RUC, and not just within the RE have a love-hate relationship. Education, as mentioned above is the predominant organising logic at RUC, with the REs being creations of educational rather than research priorities and logics. This creates synergies, which can be seen in the student cases, but may also impact the research interests, agendas and priorities of the members of the REs as educational topics are what they deal with most regularly. So, this may influence the thematic orientation of some of the research undertaken. Of course, educational programmes may also be influenced and adjusted to independently discerned research interests and priorities.

As especially this RE is tightly bound to an educational programme, it seems important for research reasons for members of the RE to be actively involved in networks and activities beyond the RE, be they at RUC, national and especially international levels to be open for these wider impulses and issues.

Appendix F – Research quality evaluation of Working life, Organizations and Social Innovation

Summary

Method note. This report is based on:

- the "Self-evaluation sub-report" (appendix D.E) submitted by the Working Life, Organisation and Social Innovation (WLOSI) research environment (RE),
- support documentation provided to the evaluation committee, and,
- a one-hour group interview between the evaluation committee and four members of the research environment with the following members of the RE:
  - Jonas Egmose,
  - Linda Lundgaard Andersen,
  - Sidsel Lond Grosen,
  - Agnete Meldgaard Hansen
  - Annette Kamp.

Three overall findings

1. A number of the topics and approaches embraced by the RE, such as (workplace) democratisation; psychosocial work environment; social innovation, sustainability and entrepreneurship; solidarity; and knowledge co-production are topics of interest to major funding agencies. These are also frequently linked to issues such as societal inclusion and coherence, economic growth, and health. As there are societal trends pulling in opposite directions (erosion of democracy and participation, deteriorating psychosocial work environments, top-down imposition of innovation, societal fragmentation, expert or consultant-led knowledge production, etc.), policy-makers see this as problematic and potential solutions worth investigating. This presents opportunities for members of the RE to pursue externally funded research on topics meaningful and of interest to them, but the framing and collaboration partners have to be judiciously selected. Regarding collaboration, collaborating beyond the RUC or national environment is practiced by some groups within the RE to a greater extent than others, while potential topical opportunities are open to all within the RE.

   Establishing or even taking initiative to collaboration at the national and EU level may in some cases require leveraging or creating networks and contacts. Selecting a topic/issue for concerted activities and letting the ambitions of the groups in the RE be known to potential collaboration partners should be facilitated. This can run from fairly passive actions like listing focus areas and (potential) projects on a website to more active (and expensive) actions such as inviting in potential collaborators to symposia at Roskilde; study-visits abroad; creating strategic alliances with research environments with common interests at other universities; or holding panels at international conferences. [Apologies for smuggling recommendations into the "Findings" section]

2. This RE, both in working life as well as social innovation, has been successful and significant in developing Nordic and European/global academic *research infrastructure* in terms of journals, associations, networks and conferences and meetings. This should be recognised and rewarded to a greater extent and worked into the research assessment matrix/framework. This infrastructure

could however be used more optimally in the RE's own *output-oriented activities* (project applications, collaborative research and publications) in addition to facilitating the output of others. It should be recognised also that resources and effort devoted to infrastructure development and maintenance are resources not available for output-oriented activities, though there can be reciprocal relationships between infrastructure and output that can be utilised.

3. The groups within the RE are highly oriented towards making direct, local impact for improving conditions in research partner organisations. This is deemed very meaningful by members of the RE, is a strong motivational factor, and should be preserved. Local impact can be accomplished along with other goals.

Three overall recommendations

Baked into some of the findings/observations discussed above are recommendations. Some of the recommendations below build upon the observations above to a greater or lesser extent, while others are less directly related points above.

1. Systematically attempt to work-up research conducted on the local/national level and currently published exclusively in Danish into wider, English language publications. Especially the interest in the RE in concept and theory development (as stated and evidenced in appendix D.E sub-report and the publication list) can be drawn upon here. Theory and conceptual development/refinement are intrinsically of broader significance and should meet a wider audience. The same "widening" approach can be taken to interventions – interventions may be seen as highly contextual, but efforts should be made to see what more generic lessons there are for application elsewhere.

2. The orientation towards practice and practitioners should continue to be used prospectively to *find and elaborate nascent and emerging issues, processes and topics* in working life, organisation and social innovation, sustainability and entrepreneurialism for further elaboration. This strategy has proven highly successful in the past for groups within this RE, establishing a strong international reputation on specific topics.

3. Members of this RE should be open towards joining the work of other REs and larger projects and not just carrying out research and projects under the RE's own ambit. This would be of mutual benefit as the theoretical, conceptual and empirical approaches and domain knowledge within this RE are relevant across a very wide range of applications. Like many other REs, this RE could well survive in the comfort of working within itself and from its own theoretical, methodological and topical base. But it would also be a tremendous, and necessary, asset in broader collaborations. *Care work* is a topic that could unite at least three, probably more REs at DPT, where the WLOSE RE has key and unique competence to offer. The work and book on *precarity* shows that the RE can enrol a large number of local researchers work on a topic horizontally. This should also be possible vertically – *i.e.,* collaborating with other REs and disciplines to address large-scale, complex, multidimensional problems.

Research excellence

Research quality

The RE as a whole has displayed that it can perform well on the two primary parameters for research excellence, publications and external funding. The RE has obtained prestigious grants from EU and national funding agencies. The RE also obtains a significant number of grants from smaller agencies and organisations, indicating that it is a trusted partner for intimate collaboration.

The topics of interest within the RE, as mentioned above, open for both applied and basic research, sometimes inherently combined. The RE also possesses expertise in a number of "hot" research fields: precarity, digitalization and care professions, social innovation, and participatory, learning approach to improving psychosocial work environment. This indicates that the RE has both accomplished and has further potential to produce significant research in collaborative projects.

A similar story can be told about publications. During the exceptional year of 2019, the number of level 2-3 publications rose from the previous high of 7 to 12, indicating that the publications came from groups and individuals across the RE and clearly displays a capacity to produce this type of work. Peer-reviewed publication output rose steadily upward during 2017-2019, peaking with 12 then fall back to 5 (Appendix D.3e). However, slightly more BFI points were obtained in 2020 than 2019, which shows a "quantity for quality" compensation mechanism. This may go against the "fewer but higher-ranking" ambitions expressed in the DPT self-report and publication strategy, but shows productivity, and possibly a cyclicality. There may also be a potential for further BFI 2-3 publications if BFI 1 publications are or can become a basis for developing further publications for BRI 2-3 channels instead of being a terminus. Likely, a portion of what is published in Danish, especially that which is concept- and theory-developing should also be made available to wider international audiences.

Finally, Centres appear to play an important role above or in complement to the REs, and the role of this structural form in supporting and further developing research excellence outputs is worth analysing.

International visibility

The Social Innovation group within the RE has high and long-standing Nordic and European visibility in projects, networks and publications, including European Framework Programme project participation; a COST action; Nordic workshop and network building. The Working Life groups is a central player at the Nordic level, especially in research infrastructure development named above. In these fields the RUC is well-known and associated with these topics internationally.

However, publication collaboration is highly national (7 of top 10), then followed by Norway (2 of top 10) and India (1 of top 10).

Book production shows collaboration and coherent focus, but most of the books are in Danish. Could these reach a wider audience? Probably, as the topics transcend the Danish context, but the empirical material is likely local and contextual in origin. Again, the question is how to make the local/Danish of wider interest and relevance. Concept and theory development are the easiest routes, or combining the data and observations from several chapters in a book into a comparative-case article would be another.

Academic impact

The RE, especially particular groups within it, unquestionably has had national and international academic impact. In some fields it is more consistent and sustained than in other. This can be seen in terms of key publications, projects and network development and consolidation; leadership and positions on boards of associations (e.g. EMES) and journals, presidency of organisations, arranging conferences in Roskilde, and holding keynote lectures at academic and wider conferences. The academic impact is thus achieved in several different ways, from setting agendas in specific fields of research by holding key positions or keynote lectures to providing and exercising influence through the creation of academic infrastructure, to the more traditional academic impact mechanisms of influential publications and large projects. Again, all these dimensions are represented within the RE, though there are some groups that have built a more stable platform for certain types of academic impact than others.

Subsection recommendations

One obvious recommendation would be more concerted effort or concentration, drawing the multiple competencies that are found within the group into more durable and sustainable collaboration around topics of mutual interest and concern. This appears to happen on occasion with notable results. Finding the happy medium between larger collective research and publication projects and more niched, specialised and individualised projects, especially when research time is already at a premium, is a question to solve. However, there is much to be gained by operating on a larger or broader basis, if a sufficient level of commitment and engagement can be secured.

In this RE, like several others, non-research activities such as education and administration appear to, if not have priority over research, have an urgency that means that they come first and take the time that is needed for these activities to be carried out satisfactorily. This results in less time actually afforded to research than should (i.e. allocated on paper) and needs to be (the amount, coherence and timing of time) to accomplish high level research. This is even more important as one of the primary suggestions is not just creating time for the base research and reporting to stakeholders and interested parties (which largely currently gets done) but also taking this material one more turn to make the findings and analysis available to the research community beyond the Nordic region. If such time cannot be secured administratively, the RE needs to create things that cannot be squeezed; projects and activities that have an urgency and push back on the other activities that routinely encroach on research time and cognitive effort.

There seems to be a tension not just in this RE but across RUC and academia in general between freedom, steering, and consolidation. While freedom may be thought of at the individual level, opportunities are increasingly available primarily at the group or collective level, requiring a commitment to a group project form versus looser association. On the one hand this tension needs to be directly discussed – why are certain sizes or constellations of collaboration more frequently chosen over others? Is there an optimal size or construction and what makes this so? Could we experiment with larger or broader collaboration? Is there as positive dynamic between working on one's own or in pairs and working in larger constellations? Are there complementary actors or units we could make further advances with? Expansion and experimentation could be supported by local resources or breaking down barriers if such are found to be hindrances. It is also important to see to it that those who want to pool their resources get a multiplier factor or particularly solicited support.

It is also important to recognise, appreciate, and utilise infrastructural activities – be it building research infrastructure for the RG, RE, Department, University, national or international networks.

We would encourage a formal living *research plan*, with goals and timelines, either at the Research Environment, or the Research Group level, which ever is deemed most appropriate. Naturally this research plan must be collectively produced, reflect group interests and ambitions, but also be concrete enough to pursue, follow up, and give researchers a clear idea of what they should be growing towards at an individual and collective level. Part of this plan should not just be new and on-the-horizon projects, but also take up how we can maximise the academic and societal impact of research already conducted. A good question is always, “what is the next step for this?” the reply to which sometimes is that it has reached its terminus and we should move on, but there might be alternative possibilities that require more thought or presentation to a new audience to find new opportunities.

Either at the individual or group level engage in substantive, durable partnerships with other REs in larger-scale research multi-dimensional projects where the particular skills and domain knowledge possessed within this RE can be utilised in addressing large, complex societal challenges.

Internationalisation

There is a relatively high number of publications with foreign universities – 17 of 27 when collaborating with university-based publication partners (Appendix D.3e). This shows international collaboration networks, that also should increase the international visibility of the RE’s researchers and research.

Regarding the nationality profile of the RE’s membership, judging by the persons we met at the site visit interview and the names on the publications (and publication languages), the composition is quite Danish. While there are many forms and roads to internationalisation, international recruitment is something that could open new avenues for the RE.

On a similar note, there is a tendency for the RE to have played on “the Danish case” in comparative contexts a fair amount. While this is natural and beneficial in comparative research, and an opportunity to open a dialogue across systems and countries, efforts should be made to move beyond this so as not to be pigeonholed in this role.

Subsection recommendations

Bring the world to Roskilde through organising conferences, symposia, guest research positions, or inviting foreign researchers into collaborative projects or giving them roles in local projects. Bringing people to Roskilde, individually or in groups would expose them to the total environment of the RE, DPT, RUC and beyond, paving the way for future collaborations.

Strategic, international recruitment would also build outward networks and channels. This entails fewer opportunities for internal candidates, but PhD positions and post-docs would not tie up permanent positions. On the other hand, recruiting mid- and senior-level researchers on a permanent basis could be oriented towards supplying alternative perspectives and skills as well as international networks and research output channels at higher levels.

Interdisciplinarity

There is interdisciplinarity at individual (persons who have studied different subject during their education or studied interdisciplinary subjects) and group levels, but this tend to be highly clustered around similar disciplines or sub-disciplines. So, while there is interdisciplinarity, there is not broad heterogeneity.

Avowedly (from the site visit panel discussion and the self-presentation), the RE is academically fairly homogeneous, with a primary base in the social sciences, and to a certain degree in the humanities. While there is topical collaboration for example in the fields of health and monitoring technologies the collaborations are in the realm of social scientific approaches rather than medicine, health science or engineering. It was also stated that collaboration both within and outside of the RE takes place largely within a common epistemological and methodological framework. So, while several social sciences and to an extent humanities disciplines are represented, there does not appear to be a great amount of radical interdisciplinarity or poly-paradigmatic research.

Subsection recommendations

A limited opportunity for more radical interdisciplinarity lies within DPT in the fields of the natural, computer and engineering sciences that might make sense in some respects or projects. However, the epistemologically and paradigmatically different sciences or disciplines that would be the most complementary collaboration partners lay outside of DPT and possibly Roskilde – such as Medicine, Law, and Economics. There would be challenges entailed in collaborations across these disciplines with very different points of departure, but such collaborations would facilitate exploration of issues beyond social, behavioural and humanities perspectives. A second challenge, but well worth undertaking, is convincing researchers in Engineering, Medicine, Economics and Law that their analyses are limited without the social, behavioural and humanities perspectives and methodologies that members of the WLOSI RE can provide. It is probably more viable for this RE to collaborate outward for greater interdisciplinarity than to try to bring greater radical interdisciplinarity into the core of the RE through recruitment or training/competence development.

Societal impact

Communication with wider society outside academia

Policy

At the national and EU level, societal impact case 2 seeks to impact legal frameworks and policies towards social enterprises in Denmark and Europe. Societal impact case 3 has influenced policy debates and changes in legislation on unemployment benefits for self-employed and freelancers; and collective agreements on temporary academic staff at Danish universities, which can be considered a regulatory impact. Presentations on the topic were made directly to policy makers in three Danish parliamentary political parties.

The RE works both actively at the level of municipalities and Regions. Societal impact case 1 is about psychosocial work environment improvement in the Regional (county) sector, encompassing 29 workplaces (establishments) at 70 sites and a total of 2000 employees. The case operates from the perspectives of public sector employers and unions. It is longitudinal work, having received four grants (totalling 8,5 m DKK) covering the period 2016-2025. Its direct impact regarding capacity building among employers and employees to deal with stress, turnover and high workload operates more at the interventions and strategy level. Furthermore, the project empowers employees to collect and analyse own data.

Organised civil society (unions, employers organisations, NGOs and civil society organisations/associations)

Funding for collaborative projects is regularly secured from unions, employers and NGOs. This means that these organisations trust, have faith in and listen attentively to the findings and processual advice from members of the WLOSI RE. These relationships probably also open avenues of communication to other organisations in these networks. The stream of small grants keeps continuity and continuous practice-near research and reduces the vulnerabilities of relying on larger funding agencies. The commitments voiced by the RE for participatory and democratization of work and organisations can be directly carried out through these collaborative activities.

Also, in the vein of direct impact on civil society, societal impact case 2 creates ecosystems for social enterprises in Denmark and Europe. Societal impact case 3 focuses on precarious work, and especially its impact on workers. Research findings are disseminated to unions, social partners and social movements. Only a relatively minor grant in monetary terms has resulted in this impact. The benefits directly to the union funding the study, DM, has helped them in their traditional and a-typical members.

Public / members of society (open forums, traditional and social media)

While there is both broad and specific audience dissemination chronicled in case 1 and a number of public presentations undertaken in case three, there does not appear to be a great amount of direct or media-based contact with the general public. Some communication through newspapers was mentioned. Little mention was made of social media use for disseminating findings and information of research by the RE.

Subsection recommendations

The RE is quite accomplished and proud of its societal engagement and impact. This primarily takes the form of direct impact through collaborative interventions. Some policy influence is exerted in the traditional sense as well on key research topics undertaken within the RE. The societal impact is clearly of mutual interest and appreciation.

Societal impact, direct relations with collaboration partners and stakeholders and action research/intervention studies are clearly highly motivating and effective. Therefore, these activities should be appreciated and supported, even oi they do not generate great financial resources or data or empirical foundations for high-level international publications. *The moral importance of these activities both for the staff as well as collaboration partners outside of RUC should not be underestimated or jeopardised*. This does not mean that efforts in these areas cannot be improved. In part this has to do with broader communication of the societal impact accomplishments within DPT, RUC, regionally and nationally. This could be undertaken by proactive communication officers. There is also the opportunity to take matters into the researchers' own hands and more actively use social media for broader reach in publicising research and accomplishments. Another thing that could be done is more actively targeting other potential users or adopters of the tools, methods, models and interventions produced in co-creation and collaborative activities undertaken. Just as with many of the BFI 1 publications, there is surely much of value produced in the practical research undertakings that could be useful for other actors.

Research and education

Research and education; student involvement in research

Students have been involved in externally funded research, also in conjunction with interest organisations, unions and case organisations. Students have also been engaged in creating an open-source serious game (social innovation) for HR consultants facilitating intervention and knowledge growth on future of work dilemmas. Extensive co-creation and co-design has taken place between students and practitioners. The process has been iterative in the game/technology intervention and change management process, including student feedback on games. This example shows the degree to which students can be integrated into not just traditional data generation and analysis activities in research, but in research and development activities with very practical and concrete outcomes.

Organization of the researchers' work

The organisation of research work in the RE appears to be highly associated with traditions found within the respective research groups that the RE comprises. Small grants and the internal research time (a significant amount of which is lost to education and administration) play an important role in research activities and motivation within the RE, and there is evidence that these can be pooled for maximal effect when projects of high meaningfulness are created. This is indicative of a high degree of self-directed and self-initiated research. Again, there are advantages and disadvantages associated with this, depending on what parameters one looks at the outputs and learning processes from. There are likely changes based on retirements, group size, and changes in the wider research landscape that are felt within the research groups, which brings vulnerabilities as well as possibilities for organising research in different manners and shifting output goals.

Balance between research and education

Teaching was generally reported as a stimulating and favourable activity, with mutual benefits on research. This holds especially if one can teach in subject areas close to one's research interests. However, as across DPT, the teaching burden is also high in this RE, and generally teaching and administration takes more time than is formally compensated for. A quote from the panel interview with members of this RE echoed sentiments heard from other REs at DPT: "There is a framework for teaching, but not for research. Research requires consistent time, but this is not always possible. Research also creates exciting input for teaching and vice versa." In general, one can say that there is a general imbalance between research and education to the disadvantage of research, and that this is difficult to control on the individual and group level.

Subsection recommendations

The relationship between research and education in the WLOSI RE is quite similar to that of other REs at DPT. This indicates that there are structural factors behind the benefits and disadvantages in this relationship. A basic question to pose is: "What doesn't get done that should get done?" and then analyse the causes of this. Some answers likely will have to do with the education-research relationship, some may have to do with how research work is organised. Here there are likely lessons to be learnt from other REs, as well as unique contextual factors and situations particular to this RE. This means that similar analyses should be undertaken across DPT and then compared. From this evidence base common and RE-specific measures can be devised and implemented. During such a process it would be possible to ask "What would it take to do important things radically differently, and what needs to radically reoriented?" versus what can be accomplished in an incremental but coherent and effective manner?

Regarding structural factors and the overall organisation of research work, there appears to be good working relationships and a good gender balance within the RE. There also appears to be a need to go generationally in opposite directions at the same time – both getting younger, and a need more senior research leadership to provide experience and weight with regard to research applications and contacts. This indicates a potential need for greater guidance and structure and more clout in relation to external actors, such as funding agencies.

As discussed above, the potential benefits of working in larger and more diversified constellations should be explored. Though there is always a risk of landing in a position of subservience unless the value of the skills, knowledge, approaches and track record of the RE can be persuasively argued for in relation to disciplines and entities that may have greater mainstream status, convincing arguments can be made not just towards likeminded individuals and groups at RUC, but increasingly internationally where such perspectives and approaches are gaining traction. The basic message here is get the most out of the established and sophisticated core competencies, rather than changing course radically, though learning new approaches is always enriching.

Meddelelser og orienteringer

A: Skriftlige behandlinger siden AR møde 03/2024 (skriftlig)

B: Tildeling af ph.d.-grader siden AR møde 03/2024 (skriftlig)

A. Skriftlige behandlinger i Akademisk Råd siden møde 03/2024

Skriftlig behandling 2/2024: Indstilling om udpegning af studenterrepræsentant til CEA

Akademisk Råd udpegede Lucija Gruber Zlatec som ny studenterrepræsentant for Critical Edge Alliance (CEA), idet sekretariatet modtog positive tilkendegivelser fra 13 medlemmer.

B. Akademisk Råds tildeling af ph.d.-grader i perioden fra og med d. 12. marts 2024 til og med den 6. juni 2024

Akademisk Råd har ved skriftlige høringer tildelt nedenstående ph.d.-grader:

NAVN PÅ KANDIDAT	PH.D.-SKOLE	HOVED-OMRÅDE
Anne-Sophie Bogetoft Mortensen	Kommunikation og Humanistisk Videnskab	HUM
Tiffany M. Ramos	Naturvidenskab og Miljø	NAT
Anders Frische	Naturvidenskab og Miljø	NAT
Anne Julie Arnfred	Kommunikation og Humanistisk Videnskab	HUM
Josephine Bjergbæk Olsson-Svendsen	Naturvidenskab og Miljø	NAT
Morten Skov Madsen	Samfundsvidenskab og Erhverv	SAM
Jakob Sejrup Villadsen	Mennesker og Teknologi	HUM
Nina Halberg	Mennesker og Teknologi	HUM
Jonas T. Stage	Mennesker og Teknologi	HUM
Kontantinos Missios	Naturvidenskab og Miljø	NAT
Peter Horne Zartsdahl	Samfundsvidenskab og Erhverv	SAM
Anna Cornelia Ploug	Kommunikation og Humanistisk Videnskab	HUM

Punkt 10: Eventuelt (15.15-15.30)

Eventuelt