



May be freely distributed
Final

Department of Chemistry and
Bioscience, AAU
Fredrik Bajers Vej 7H
9220 Aalborg Ø

Case Officer:
Louise Bak Søndergaard
Telephone: 9940 3187
Email: Lbak@bio.aau.dk

Date: 12-09-2022
Case No.: Meeting no. 3

Minutes from:

Research Committee Meeting

FRB7H 2.405 and Teams – 24 August, 2022 [Click here to enter a date.](#)

Participants: Torsten Nygård Kristensen (chair), Kim Lambertsen Larsen, Morten Lykkegaard Christensen, Marco Maschietti, Anders Olsen, Per Halkjær Nielsen, Vittorio Boffa, Jens Laurids Sørensen, Majken Pagter, Jeppe Lund Nielsen, Mette Lübeck, Michael Toft Overgaard, Jens Muff, and Kåre Lehmann.

Unable to attend: Morten Mattrup Smedskjær

Other participants: Kristian Bering (item 2), Louise Bak Søndergaard (minute-taker)

13.30-13.35 Item 1. Approval of the agenda

Approved with minor adjustments.

13.35-13.50 Item 2. Peer-review of research applications and pitch of research ideas

By Kristian Bering

Presentation of current practice and potential new steps.

Peer-review:

Berring gives a short introduction and tells that the process of internal peer-review started approximately three years ago. At the moment it is difficult to find reviewers (why a small group ends up reviewing often), even though reviewing gives the opportunity to get informed regarding upcoming projects.

It is discussed that only few researchers are using the opportunity at the moment, but it's the assumption that researchers have informal discussions with colleagues. Furthermore, it is discussed whether internal peer-review should be mandatory. Arguments against a mandatory peer-review are for example that (1) some research areas do it internally, (2) there are often partners, and (3) it might become very time consuming. On the other side it is pointed out that (1) applications supposedly get better by going through a review process and that applications' success rate might increase. It is also noted that peer-review is a great opportunity –



especially for younger researchers – and that it is important to make sure that research applications are not send in without any kind of prior peer-review.

Decision:

There will be a focus on DFF applications this fall: all applications must go through peer-review prior to sending it in.

The meeting's participants will take questions for discussion back to the research areas.

- 1) Should peer-review be mandatory? (could it be done within the research group or should it be a 'department issue'?)
- 2) How do we make sure that applications are not send in without any kind of peer-review? For example major applications such as DFF)
- 3) How do we get more researchers get involved in reviewing?

Pitch of research ideas:

It is suggested to have fixed pitch days each year, as pitch days can provide researchers (as for example post docs and single writers) with useful feedback and advice from experienced colleagues. However, ideas in a very early stage should be discussed in the research area prior to at a pitch meeting. It is suggested that each research area should send a reviewer for each meeting.

Instead of pitch meetings it is suggested to have workshops on a specific funding call, however it is pointed out that this been tried earlier without success.

Decision:

The committee decides that each research area should send a representative to, who participate in a 'panel' at the pitch sessions (it doesn't have to be the same representative each time). There will be 4 pitch sessions a year.

13.50-14.05 Item 3. Research applications – developments in numbers and success rates

By Michael T. Overgaard

The item is postponed to a later meeting in the committee.

However, Kristian Bering and a student employee are currently working on updating our application data, so we can make better statistics.

14.05-14.25 Item 4. Pep talk' re. applications to DFF and NOVO fall 2022

By Per Halkjær Nielsen and Torsten N. Kristensen

Among other points, Kristensen brought the committee's attention to the importance of highlighting the specific role of a collaborator who writes a letter of support in DFF applications, and to ask colleagues – who have had



successful DFF applications – for help. Regarding NOVO applications, Halkjær's pointed out that (1) post docs can apply for senior post doc grants, (2) the importance of having at least one very good article, and (3) that CV, progress, desired aims are especially important for applications for the emergent investigator grant and the ascending investigator grant. Furthermore, he encouraged to apply for environmental and industrial grants (and to use one's network for these applications, as one doesn't have to be PI), and to take part in an application for a challenge in agriculture. Halkjær also brought the committee's attention to the application system: it takes time to fill it in, so don't do it the days before. Read the instructions, fill in everything, and make a PDF to check the application.

After Halkjær's and Kristensen's presentations the following points were brought up: 1) The importance of getting help with applications language wise. 2) If one's application is rejected, it can be a good idea to try to get feedback for example by calling the funding agency.

14.25-14.35 Item 5. Tenure VIP positions and NNF RECRUIT

By Michael T. Overgaard

Lehmann and Muff gave a short status.

14.35-14.50 Item 6. Institute strategic money

By Michael T. Overgaard and Torsten N. Kristensen

Presentation of the process for the rest of 2022 and rounds in spring 2023.

Prior to the summer holiday the committee granted money for many good projects. The plan is to have another round of applications for 2023 during this fall, and the recipients of such a call were discussed by the committee.

<p>Decision: The call for application will be send to assistant professors, associate professors, and professors).</p>

14.50-15.00 Item 7. Missions

By Michael T. Overgaard

A short update on AAU-missions.

The department are to send in suggestions to the faculty 7 September 2022.

AOB

Kristensen gave a short update form a faculty meeting. It was noted that it is still possible to apply for faculty funds (Bubble projects etc.) regarding the faculty strategy.