

Date and Time: 11 06 2026, 9:00 – 10:30

Place: 1520-731 (Sea View)

Subject: Research Committee Meeting

Participants: Lars Bojer Madsen, Michael Drewsen, Bjørk Hammer, Georg Bruun, Jeffrey Hangst, Steen Brøndsted Nielsen, Jan Arlt, Karsten Riisager, Rikke Frydenberg (minutes)

Apologies: Hans Kjeldsen

Absent: Philip Hofmann, Yong Chen.

Minutes

1. Briefing by Lars - Updates from NAT Research and Business Committee

- **IFD visit in the NAT Research and Business Committee**

LBM informed the committee about new opportunities within IFD, including funding for testing demonstration facilities in green and quantum areas.

AU applicants who reach the second round in the IFD Grand Solution application process have a relatively high success rate.

IFD encourages dialogue on call conditions.

Key takeaways

- RC members are encouraged to engage their networks regarding IFD opportunities.
- RC should consider how input can be provided to IFD through dialogue opportunities.

- **Interdisciplinary networks**

LBM mentioned the interdisciplinary networks, where the most recent initiative is the NAIS network (CS and MBG/BIRC). Networks require collaboration across at least three departments. The committee noted that IFA has not been strongly involved so far and discussed potential contributions.

Key takeaways

- Members should consider relevant interdisciplinary initiatives and engage where appropriate.
- Increased IFA involvement in NAIS-type initiatives is encouraged.



- **New University City infrastructure**

The Lab hub in the new University City is a form of Makers Space with shared equipment access. This is an opportunity to support new activities and collaborations.

Key takeaways

- Members should raise awareness of these facilities in their networks.
- Opportunities for collaboration and new initiatives should be explored.

- **Innovation positions**

The introduction of centrally funded innovation positions was discussed, including the scale of the initiative and its expected impact. The definition of “innovation” remains somewhat unclear. It was suggested that innovation should be considered a core task alongside research and teaching.

A search committee has been established to identify candidates relevant to IFA and input from RC was encouraged. The discussion also addressed how such positions can contribute to capacity building and be integrated into departmental activities.

Key takeaways

- Innovation should be treated as a core departmental responsibility.
- RC members are invited to provide input to the search process.
- The department should consider how innovation can be embedded in daily activities, including teaching and external collaboration.

2. The Defence Sector: Positioning and Opportunities

Purpose: Strategic reflection and input to the Department Leadership (IL)

The committee discussed the increasing focus on defence-related research and the absence of clear AU-wide guidance. While some activities are already underway within specific areas (especially SPACE), there are differing views on how broadly the department should engage.

There was agreement that the lack of central principles creates uncertainty, and that a coordinated institutional approach would be beneficial.

Key takeaways

- The current lack of AU-level guidance is unsatisfactory.
- The committee will recommend that Department Leadership raise the issue centrally, with a view to establishing principles similar to SDU's framework.

3. AI in Research: Priorities and Responsibilities

Purpose: Clarify role and priorities for the Research Committee

The committee discussed the role of AI in research, focusing on research ethics, responsible use, and the need for guidance. While there was consensus that the

department must engage with the topic, uncertainty remains regarding scope and acceptable use.

It was agreed not to initiate specific actions at this stage, but rather to build a clearer overview of existing practices and policies before deciding on next steps.

Key takeaways

- No immediate initiatives will be launched.
- Members will share relevant materials and examples with Rikke.
- The topic will be revisited at a future meeting based on the collected input.

4. Strengthening Research Areas & Pipeline Development

Purpose: Generate ideas and structure input from research areas

The committee discussed the need to strengthen recruitment strategy and clarify research priorities. It was noted that previous job postings have been relatively narrow, and that broader calls could allow for greater flexibility while still maintaining quality. At the same time, the importance of having a clear strategic direction and recruitment plan was emphasized.

The discussion also highlighted the need to better understand departmental strengths and gaps, and to involve research groups more actively in this process.

Key takeaways

- The RC recommends that future positions be advertised broadly within defined research focus areas.
- The department needs to re-establish a structured recruitment strategy.
- In the new research focus areas, the groups should map strengths, identify gaps and propose 1–2 potential positions.

5. AOB

No additional items were raised.

6. Summary of key takeaways, decisions, and next steps

The committee concluded that several topics require continued attention and follow-up. In particular, there is a need for clearer institutional guidance and stronger strategic alignment across areas.

Key takeaways

- Recommend clearer AU-level positions on defence collaboration.
- Collect and review materials on AI before defining next steps.
- Continue work on mapping and strengthening research areas and improving recruitment planning.