

## Memo

### Decision regarding the internal review at the Faculty of Arts

#### Background

On 13 November 2013 the board approved the senior management team's plan to follow up on the academic development process. The objective was to identify and address the problems facing the university in the wake of the major reorganisations that had taken place. On 15 August 2014 the senior management team presented its proposals for following up on this problem analysis. After a consultation process, the senior management team presented its decisions on 22 October. The proposals and subsequent decisions required the faculties to review the way their departments are organised as well as other issues. Following a big meeting at the Faculty of Arts on 18 August, the faculty management team decided to invite input from all staff and students with a view to reviewing the faculty's internal organisation, and to set up a working group to consider this input and communicate its views to the faculty management team. The working group considered the input (almost 60 different contributions were received) in the review process, and on 7 October presented the faculty management team with a range of thoughts and proposals regarding potential changes in the faculty's internal organisation. The faculty management team also held a joint meeting on 28 October with the Faculty Liaison Committee and the Academic Council. Based on the work done by the working group and the discussions in the Joint Liaison Committee and Academic Council, the faculty management team drew up a range of proposals to follow up on the internal faculty review. These proposals were sent for consultation on 17 November. The parties involved in the consultation were: the Academic Council, the Faculty Liaison Committee, the Faculty Occupational Health and Safety Committee, boards of studies, local liaison and occupational health and safety committees (including the temporary local liaison committee in the Administration Centre), department and centre forums, the faculty's Arts Council, degree programme committees, research committees and the PhD Committee.

The deadline for consultation responses was 5 December. This decision is based on the 14 consultation responses received from staff and students, the meeting with the working group, and the meeting with the Faculty Liaison Committee and Academic Council. The decision has been drawn up by the faculty management team.

Johnny Laursen

Acting dean

Date: 12 December 2014

The goal of the review is to organise the faculty so it supports our core academic activities as effectively as possible, as well as ensuring the highest possible degree of staff and student satisfaction.

On the one hand, the comments received from staff and students reveal that people want the decision-making process connected with the review to be concluded as soon as possible to prevent protracted uncertainty regarding basic organisational structures. On the other hand, the comments show that the organisation should take greater account of differences in local circumstances at our departments than has been the case in the past. The comments also reveal a clear wish for staff inclusion when designing local organisational changes.

The faculty management team has sought to comply with the strong wish for greater flexibility that has been expressed. It should be underlined that the decision regarding the organisation of the faculty should naturally not prevent the organisation from being adapted to suit a variety of needs and challenges in future.

### **Faculty units**

The input and consultation responses as well as the working group's response have revealed that fundamental changes in the departmental structure at the Faculty of Arts are regarded as inexpedient at present. There is no general wish to change the existing structure (three large departments). Support for the departmental structure depends on solutions being found for the challenges facing the current departments, and on the opportunities of the departments for solving their core academic tasks – including external commitments.

Nor should it be forgotten that the faculty has two campuses – so there is a particular need to strengthen the organisational links within the Department of Education, and to ensure that the management at Aarhus Campus is closer to both subject environments and staff.

*Decision 1) The basic division of the faculty into three large departments will be maintained.*

The faculty management team's proposal regarding examining the potential for closer links between the role and organisational location of the Department of Education and the Centre for Teaching Development and Digital Media (CUDiM) has been discussed, with various opinions being expressed. CUDiM's role and organisational location have been discussed in a number of comments prior to the consultation proposal, some of which have mentioned increased collaboration with the Department of Education as one possibility. The primary view expressed by the consultation bodies at the Department of Education is that a merger is not desirable, but that closer collaboration would be welcome. Similarly, CUDiM has issued a number of critical

comments regarding closer organisational links – but CUDiM supports the idea of an open inquiry to explore opportunities for collaboration. The Academic Council has pointed out that educational-didactic development should also continue in the subject environments. DAC's board of studies has also underlined the wish to maintain the current collaboration with CUDiM with regard to degree programmes, no matter what organisational changes are made. Other comments from DAC have indicated that closer ties between the Department of Education in Aarhus and CUDiM are one option with regard to achieving a broader subject-related and departmental anchoring of the centre's educational-didactic activities.

The faculty management team has taken note of the various viewpoints expressed in the discussion. As a result, the faculty management team would like to emphasise four issues that are important in terms of proceeding with an inquiry. Firstly, the inquiry should be open. Secondly, the faculty management team (in line with the responses received from the Department of Education, CUDiM and elsewhere) is interested in exploring the potential for academic synergy based on closer links between CUDiM and the Department of Education. Thirdly, the inquiry will include the connection between the Department of Education and CUDiM's long-term development strategies and existing financial basis – including the consolidation and strengthening of CUDiM's didactic collaboration with the departmental subject environments. And finally, the faculty management team wants to maintain the ambition of strengthening collaboration with regard to upper-secondary and university pedagogics and the digital media in an educational perspective at the Faculty of Arts and between AU and external partners.

*Decision 2) An inquiry will be launched to explore the potential of closer links between CUDiM and the relevant environments at the Department of Education. This inquiry must include the staff and students who may be affected by any changes that are made – including union representatives. The inquiry will be carried out by the faculty management team in cooperation with the parties involved – in particular department and centre managements and liaison bodies at the Department of Education and CUDiM. It will start at the beginning of 2015 and end on 1 April 2015.*

The analysis connected with decision 2 will include the connection between the Department of Education and CUDiM's long-term development strategies and the existing financial basis.

Following the decisions presented in the senior management team's report of 9 March 2011, the Counselling and Support Unit became part of CUDiM. The decision in 2011 resulted in a division between the academic and administrative tasks affiliated with the SPS unit for students with special needs. The academic activities devolved

on CUDiM, while the administrative tasks were taken over by AU Studies Administration (back office).

CUDiM has pointed out that it is vital to maintain an organisational connection to subject environments if the research and education development of the Counselling and Support Unit's activities is to continue – in association with the public-sector consultancy tasks which constitute the unit's core task. For the same reason, the staff have announced that they do not want to be placed under an administrative division. At the same time, CUDiM agrees that there may be other relevant positions within the organisation. DAC's board of studies acknowledges that it wishes to continue the fruitful collaboration regarding the supplementary subject in lectiology.

The faculty management team is aware of the wish for continued subject-based anchors, but also feels that placing the centre under a faculty creates major financial challenges and will result in organisational complexity. Consequently, the faculty management team concludes that there is good reason to reconsider the location of the centre in the light of the overall academic, organisational and financial factors involved.

*Decision 3) The faculty management team will investigate the best way of ensuring that academic collaboration between the Counselling and Support Unit and the rest of CUDiM can continue. As a result, the faculty and centre wish to discuss the location of the unit with the senior management team.*

Under the decision of 9 March 2011, the Centre for Entrepreneurship and Innovation (CEI) was placed under the Faculty of Arts even though it develops and supports activities for the whole of AU. The senior management team has discussed the option of changing the organisational location of the CEI. In connection with the review process, the Faculty of Arts will submit its proposal regarding the location of the CEI to the senior management team. The faculty wishes to continue its academic cooperation with the CEI, no matter where the CEI is located.

During the review process, comments were received from the Danish Centre for Culture and Learning (DCL). The DCL's organisational location and tasks will be considered as part of the administrative process described below.

### **Academic identity, visibility and departmental sections**

The problem analysis and many of the comments that have been received reveal that the creation of large departments has led to problems regarding academic identity and visibility; and that consequently there is a great need for improvements in both of these two areas.

*Decision 4) To improve visibility and academic identity at our departments, the department heads will launch local processes with a view to suggesting meaningful*

*names for our departments and sections. This will be done under the auspices of the departments and centres. The process must be completed no later than 1 April 2015.*

The Department of Education has a slightly different need for visibility than the other departments. There is a need to raise the profile of the department as a whole as a player in the world around us – particularly vis-à-vis the education sector. A wish has been expressed for greater flexibility for the Department of Education in their collaboration with external partners. We must ensure that the departments and their managements have the opportunity to cultivate their existing collaborations and contacts with external partners. Initiatives that contain institutional commitments on behalf of the university or faculty, or which affect other departments, academic areas etc., will continue to be faculty business.

The idea of calling our departments “schools” to create greater external visibility has been discussed before. In connection with the review, it has been considered whether the visibility of the Department of Education and other academic environments could be improved by replacing the terms “departments” and “sections” by “schools” and “departments” respectively. “School” is often used in English to describe an academic unit above the level of “department”. The use of these terms could help to underline the efforts to ensure greater local freedom that are outlined below.

*Decision 5) In future the faculty will use the terms “schools” and “departments” instead of “departments” and “sections” respectively. This is subject to the approval of the senior management team. The Danish terms “institut” and “afdeling” will not be changed. In mid-2015, after the conclusion of the other processes, the faculty management team and Academic Council will discuss whether there is a need for a decision-making process regarding a Danish name for the faculty.*

The decision to retain the faculty’s large departments has generated a need to improve the internal organisation with a view to improving the support provided in core tasks within the fields of research, education and research-based consultancy. Most of the comments and consultation responses that have been received, as well as the meetings that have been held, recommend that our departments should be divided into sections in extension of the adjustment of faculty organisation that was agreed in January 2014. In other words, there is a wish to strengthen the status of the various sections of our large departments – particularly at DAC and CAS.

The departmental sections will constitute the focus of collegial cooperation in core academic areas (including education and research-based public-sector consultancy), as well as being a fulcrum for accessible management. The department heads will delegate staff responsibility for academic staff to the heads of section, who will be included in the management of the department. For instance, the heads of section will conduct staff development dialogues and discussions about opportunities for staff – including PhD students employed by AU (see below). The heads of section will be re-

sponsible for academic development (including the development of degree programmes), and for aligning the profile of the degree programmes with the relevant research base (including public-sector consultancy). One or more programme coordinators can be appointed to support some of the educational tasks of the heads of section.

*Decision 6) The introduction of sections will be maintained as decided in January 2014, although there is greater flexibility at the departments with regard to the tasks dealt with by the heads of section, and an awareness that local needs should be met.*

— The strengthening of sections at CAS and the Department of Education will be based on the established sectional structure. Minor adjustments of this structure may be necessary. A decision about the sectional structure must have been made no later than 1 April 2015. DAC will start an internal process focusing on how many sections there should be and how they should be divided. This process will be integrated with the corresponding discussions about the number of boards of studies, and must also have been completed no later than 1 April 2015.

— In extension of the wish for stronger sections, we need to consider the additional decision-making frameworks within which they operate and the additional powers that should be delegated to the heads of section.

*Decision 7) To meet the need for flexibility at section level, the department heads will investigate how to establish a better, clearer framework for the decision-making powers of heads of section. In particular, good practice should be adopted with a view to including representative bodies and subject environments from departments and centres when new positions are created. This must be done in cooperation with the current heads of section, including the relevant liaison bodies. The department heads must present a report on the results of these discussions no later than 1 April 2015.*

— The point of departure for this work is the agreed descriptions of the functions of heads of section. The descriptions of the functions of heads of section and other details are available on the departmental homepages.

### **Organisation of degree programmes – boards of studies and degree programme committees**

One significant objection to the current structure regarding the organisation of our degree programmes is that it has prevented all our subjects and academic areas from being represented directly in the board of studies. A lot of people have also pointed out that individual subjects or academic areas should be given greater freedom to develop their own degree programmes.

In some circumstances, greater representation of subjects and flexibility will be possible within the existing structure. Elsewhere it may be necessary to change the structure, so there will be differences in the way our departments organise their degree programmes in future. There is a special task facing the Department of Education involving strengthening the subject-related cohesion across the department while developing a subject environment in Aarhus.

*Decision 8) The departments will launch an internal process to identify the best way of organising their own degree programmes. This work will be done under the auspices of a working group at each department (cf. description in appendix 2). The department heads will present the results of the working group's discussions to the faculty management team no later than 1 April 2015 – including how many (and which) boards of studies the department wishes to have.*

One of the points raised has been the idea of changing the way our degree programme committees are organised, including their responsibilities and competences.

*Decision 9) The working groups mentioned in point 8 above must also establish clearer local frameworks for the work of the degree programme committees and their role in relation to boards of studies and sections – including a clearer allocation of tasks with regard to subject-related decisions to the boards of studies and degree programme committees, due regard for CUDiM's educational activities, and ensuring that staff and students are represented in the work of the degree programme committees. These working groups are welcome to suggest a new name to replace "degree programme committee" if they like. This task must have been completed no later than 1 April 2015.*

The department heads will present the result of the working group's discussions to the faculty management team – including proposals for minimum framework demands for an order of business with regard to representation, election procedures etc. The result of the department-based work will be processed by the Education Committee with a view to ensuring the cohesive organisation of degree programmes and equal terms for representation, elections etc. The work connected to decisions 8 and 9 will be done in parallel fashion.

Once the working groups have finished their work, the faculty management team will meet the Education Committee at Arts and the boards of studies in 2015 to decide whether there is a need to adjust the framework for collaboration across our departments and boards of studies – including the current activities at CUDiM.

### **Research programmes**

The opinions expressed in the consultation responses and the review regarding the importance of our research programmes vary, with some people wanting a more flexible way of organising research. Positive comments have also been received regarding

the important role of the research programmes and research committees. At the joint meetings and in the consultation responses there has been no clear picture of people's wishes with regard to the way research should be organised in future. Consequently, the faculty management team has decided to make framework decisions for the way research is organised at faculty level – leaving it up to the departments to organise their research at local level within this overall framework.

*Decision 10) Participation in research programmes will be made voluntary. The faculty management team maintains that we should continue to have an organisational framework for research collaboration. The current research programmes will continue throughout the planned period and will be evaluated in mid-2015. The evaluation will form the basis of the way research is organised in future, with the emphasis being placed on flexibility. Research will be organised based on the academic environments and will be designed to comply with the wishes of the departments.*

Once the current research programmes have been evaluated as planned in mid-2015, it will be possible to establish new research programmes. At the request of the departments and academic environments, the faculty management team may also establish cross-disciplinary research initiatives.

The departments may wish to establish other frameworks for research collaboration in addition to the research programmes. At sections which are not covered by a research programme, the responsibility for research collaboration may be transferred to a research coordinator. Each department will decide how to distribute the work between research programme directors and research coordinators (if there are any), but must ensure that the research environments are broadly represented in their research committees. After the research programmes have been evaluated in mid-2015, the faculty management team and Academic Council will consider whether there is a need for a clearer financial framework for research initiatives.

### **Organising our PhD programmes**

Some people have asked for closer links between the activities of our graduate school – in particular our PhD programmes – and our academic environments. There has also been a wish to retain the PhD degree programme in a graduate school organised under the faculty, to meet the needs of our PhD students and ensure access to cross-disciplinary PhD activities such as courses and supervision. So the faculty management team believes that the PhD degree programme should continue to be organised in a number of PhD programmes, but that these should be affiliated more closely with the departments and their academic environments. At the joint meetings and in the consultation responses there has been no clear picture of people's wishes with regard to the way the PhD programme should be organised at departmental level in future.

*Decision 11) The PhD degree programme will remain within the framework of the graduate school with a number of PhD programmes – including responsibility for enrolments, scholarships, defences, PhD plans and biannual evaluations. The PhD programmes will be adjusted in the autumn of 2015 so that whenever possible there is a better overlap between individual programmes and the departments/centres and their environments. The departments/centres and sections will jointly nominate a PhD programme director and members of the PhD programme's standing assessment committee, which is responsible for assessing applicants for PhD scholarships and enrolling PhD students.*

— The head of graduate school and PhD programme directors will continue to perform their current tasks – with the exception of staff management. In future the PhD programme directors will take part in the relevant meetings in the sections with which the programme concerned is affiliated, as well as being members of the department's research committee. The graduate school or PhD programme director can continue to decide to delegate local tasks regarding PhD courses, PhD supervision etc. to staff in the sections concerned.

— Based on many requests from the academic environments, PhD programme directors and PhD students regarding closer links between the PhD programme and our academic environments, the faculty management team believes that our PhD students should be anchored more firmly in our sections.

*Decision 12) The heads of section will have staff responsibility for the PhD students employed in their section.*

— In future the PhD programme directors should support the heads of section (for instance when holding staff development dialogues for PhD students) by informing them of the current status regarding the progress of the PhD student concerned. The PhD programme directors will arrange to discuss the level of satisfaction of PhD students who are not employed by AU (not unlike staff development dialogues), and will represent the graduate school at the department in relation to the Master's part of the 4+4 PhD programme.

CUDiM's future relationship with the graduate school will depend on CUDiM's organisational location.

### **Our culture of management and cooperation**

In connection with the discussion of organisational issues at the Faculty of Arts, it has been underlined that a good culture of management and cooperation is an important dimension. The comments that have been received do not include any wishes for the introduction of additional liaison bodies. But the need for a management culture characterised by cooperation has been underlined. Among other things, it has been

suggested that the members of various forums should help to prepare decisions in faculty and department processes. The forums in question are the Academic Council, the Faculty Liaison Committee, the Faculty Occupational Health and Safety Committee and the PhD Committee at faculty level; and departmental forums, research committees, local liaison committees and local occupational health and safety committees at department/centre level. The faculty management team is convinced that there is a need for carefully targeted efforts to develop an open decision-making culture and inclusive management practice.

*Decision 13) With a view to creating more open decision-making processes, the chairs of all the liaison bodies at faculty and department/centre level will start discussions about how these bodies can play a part in processes preparing for decisions at departments and the faculty. The chairs of these bodies will present the result of these discussions to the Academic Council, the Faculty Liaison Committee and the faculty management team no later than 1 April 2015.*

In line with the announcement by the senior management team on 22 October 2014, the individual deans, in consultation with the chair of the Academic Council, will decide how the council should be more involved in planning, holding and following up on council meetings, and how to ensure that the council gets the chance to discuss important future decisions before they are made. Similar discussions should be launched with the vice-chair of the Faculty Liaison Committee and the Faculty Working Environment Committee and the chair of the PhD Committee. The dean will present the result of these discussions to the Academic Council, the Faculty Liaison Committee and the faculty management team no later than 1 April 2015.

The faculty management team has also registered a general wish that the Dean's Office should strengthen and broaden the dialogue and intensify the contact with our academic environments and existing liaison bodies with regard to the core activities of our departments, CUDiM and the faculty. There is a particular need for the dean to be available for dialogue with the academic environments, the students and the departmental/centre liaison bodies. The Dean's Office will also make itself even more available for meetings with the academic environments and local liaison bodies at the departments and the centre when requested – including regular meetings with representatives and organisations elected by the students.

All major proposals for decisions by faculty and department/centre management bodies will be matched by discussions in the faculty and department/centre liaison bodies.

The faculty management team feels that it is important to emphasise that it fully supports the senior management team's point of view as expressed in the decision of 22 October 2014: "An important prerequisite for genuine inclusion is a higher degree of delegation of decision-making powers to local management level, thereby ensuring

sufficient local managerial freedom”. Finally, the management’s presence and visibility is all-important. This means that the large departments and other units must be organised into a suitable number of divisions/sections so as to ensure the accessibility of the management and the genuine inclusion of staff and students. All managers must be visible and accessible in the academic or administrative environments for which they are responsible. The members of the senior management team must be more visible and accessible at the faculties and in the administrative units, and through dialogue they must contribute to the exchange of ideas, arguments and views and ensure the timely inclusion of staff in decisions and processes. At the joint meetings and in the consultation responses people have underlined their wish for a new balance between stronger decentralised decision-making powers and the continuation of faculty responsibility for topics that concern the entire faculty.

*Decision 14) The faculty management team will continue its efforts to delegate decision-making powers to decentralised management and liaison level. The faculty management team will continue to determine the faculty’s overall objectives and budget, approve the departmental budgets and set the departmental performance targets. The faculty management team determines the budget for the faculty’s administration centre, and will deal with issues affecting the faculty as a whole.*

All major decisions of significance for the faculty – including financial issues and staffing plans – will be made by the faculty management team under the management of the dean following discussions in the relevant liaison bodies. The department heads and the director of CUDiM are part of the faculty management team, and must also ensure that the viewpoints and interests of their units are expressed in the faculty management team – not least viewpoints arising during discussions in the department’s/centre’s liaison bodies. Similarly, the dean is responsible for ensuring that viewpoints expressed in the Academic Council, Faculty Liaison Committee, Faculty Occupational Health and Safety Committee, PhD Committee and elsewhere are included in the faculty management team’s discussions.

Similarly, decisions at department level after discussion in the relevant liaison bodies will be made by the department/centre management team under the management of the department head/centre director. The heads of section are part of the department management team, and must also ensure that the viewpoints and interests of their section are expressed in the department management team – not least viewpoints arising during section meetings, for instance. Similarly, the department head/centre director is responsible for ensuring that viewpoints arising in department/centre forums, local liaison committees, local occupational health and safety committees etc. are included in the department/centre management team’s discussions.

The faculty management team believes that the organisation and the way we work

should provide the best possible support for initiatives based on the wishes of staff and students either locally or in the relevant liaison bodies.

Once he/she has been appointed, the new dean will decide how to organise the Dean's Office. In the light of the comments received in the consultation responses regarding the work of the Dean's Office in future, the faculty management team also feels the need to underline its support for the comments regarding improved information and dialogue in future management work that were made in the senior management team's decision of 22 October.

One particular problem relates to the organisation of liaison committees and occupational health and safety committees, because a large group of administrative staff in our front offices have been transferred to the faculty's administrative centre, and thereby to the faculty. The staff changes mean that issues of staff representation will have to be reviewed.

*Decision 15) Following the senior management team's decision to reorganise the administration, discussions will be launched in liaison committees at faculty and department level about how representatives of the Administrative Centre (Arts) can be included more effectively in discussions in the central liaison bodies of our departments. The discussions are parallel to the process at AU level.*

### **The financial basis**

Since the faculty was formed, the faculty management team has been working to create a financial basis that not only ensures the smoothest possible merger of the three former faculties but is also based on the principle of solidarity. The result is a financial model that promotes solidarity, ensures strategic focus areas including national commitments, and takes the performance-linked allocation of funding from the state budget into account. This model has been used to determine the faculty and departmental budget for 2015.

*Decision 16) The current model with the departments as the central financial units will be retained, but the faculty management team will reconsider the balance principles in the financial model once the review has been completed and the organisational changes have been finalised. This will be done in 2015 in connection with the 2016 budget process at the faculty.*

The transparency of each department's resource base must be established, including staffing ratios in relation to tasks and earnings. The basic department-based budget model is to be retained, so the heads of section will not be given budget responsibility. Instead, following the decision of the department management team they will be given a financial framework to perform their tasks. The head of section, department head and director of studies will decide on the need for (and nature of) appointments

of part-time academic staff. The sections will be involved in departmental discussions of the need for appointments in relation to resources and requirements.

### **Administration**

Following the senior management team's decision of 22 October regarding the future administrative organisation of AU, AU front office (the faculty's administrative centre) will be managed by the faculty's administration centre manager, who will refer to the dean and the university director. Parallel to the consultation process connected to the review, a process has been launched focusing on the way the faculty's administration is organised.

The faculty management team has registered the broad wish for greater accessibility and more dialogue with regard to administrative tasks, including administrative resources to support the tasks performed by the sections, boards of studies, PhD programmes and others. In connection with the process focusing on administration at the faculty, we will be investigating how the administrative support provided for our departments can be strengthened. The administration centre manager will present the provisional result of these discussions to the Academic Council, the Faculty Liaison Committee and the faculty management team no later than 1 February 2015.

The faculty management team believes that it is important to strengthen the collegial collaboration between technical/administrative and academic staff to perform administrative tasks and generate greater mutual understanding for the professionalism of all groups of staff, thereby developing a good culture of cooperation.

### **What happens next?**

Some people have pointed out that processes need to be prepared for handling any outstanding issues that these decisions leave unresolved. The department and centre managers are responsible for launching these local processes. This memo lays down the framework for these processes. They are also defined more clearly in the two appendices.

Appendix 1 contains information about the outstanding diagnoses needed at faculty, department and centre level, and about the deadlines for resolving these outstanding issues; and appendix 2 describes the mandate and deadline for the working groups mentioned in decisions 8-9.