



Udkast

## Agenda Business School Council

Tuesday **9. februar 2021**

MS Teams

**Members:** Christian Nielsen (formand), Jacob Rubæk Holm (VIP), Jesper Sort (VIP), Jonas Eduardsen (VIP), Mikael Randrup Byrialsen (VIP), Michael Simonsen (TAP), Anne Fisker (TAP), Nikoline Sofie Noohra Roos (stud Ø), Mathias Stuhlman Badstue Jørgensen (stud EØ)

**Cancellations:** Jacob Rubæk Holm (VIP)

**Observers:** Niels Lennon, Finn Olesen, Svetla Marinova, Christian Østergaard, Lasse Bork, Michael Dahl, Poul Houman Andersen, Lorenzo Massa Niels Dechow

### Agenda

<b>1. Approval of Agenda - 5 min</b>
<i>Appendix 1:</i>
<i>Appendix 2:</i>
<i>Explanation:</i>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>2. Approval of minutes - 5 min</b>
<i>Appendix 1: Minutes from last meeting</i>
<i>Appendix 2:</i>
<i>Explanation:</i>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>3. Follow up on last meeting</b>
<i>Appendix 1:</i>
<i>Appendix 2:</i>



Explanation:
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>4. Impact / Business School Journal - employee contributions</b>
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
<p><i>Explanation: Establishing a Business School Journal is a great way of getting impact and communicate our research in a lot of different formats in both peer-reviewed articles and other less formal formats as videos, podcasts, blogs working papers etc. How do we ensure employee contributions to the journal in a steady flow and how should it be run? Should head of research groups and labs become editors for a section in the peer reviewed part of the journal and ensure that research from the group is published? Should each group have a focus month? Should it just flow without assigned responsibilities? How do we get reviewers for such a broad scope of topics?</i></p> <p><i>How should the less formal part be run? We have the facilities but is that enough for researcher to take the initiatives to produce materials and share their research this way?</i></p>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>5. Research group leader vs lab leader responsibilities</b>
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
<p><i>Explanation: We need to discuss what the differences and similarities are between leading research groups and research labs.</i></p>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>6. Educational Coordinator</b>
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
<p><i>Explanation: We would like to give the research groups a more visible responsibility to ensure that the educations will develop. Head of BS will present a collaborations model. It will be discussed how this can be anchored in the research groups. Det faglige skal forankres i FG og det administrative skal centraliseres.</i></p>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>7. Meetings with head of research groups</b>
Appendix 1:



Appendix 2:
<i>Explanation: Christian and Ina has decided that we should try to have meetings with head of research groups twice a year.</i>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>8. Evaluation of meeting leader process</b>
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
<i>Explanation: How does it work that Christian Nielsen is not as much head of the meetings as previously? How has it been to lead the meetings? Does it work to have pre-meetings about the agenda? What should continue and what should change?</i>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>9. Communication from the meeting</b>
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
<i>Explanation:</i>
Notes:
Follow up:
<b>10. AOB</b>
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
<i>Explanation: New rules of procedure for collegiate councils</i>
Notes:
Follow up: