

WELCOME to workshop No 4

LTV subject area review

5th of May 2023

Why are we having this workshop No 4?

- Last and final workshop
- Summing up and synthesis
- Reflections and comments
- Basis part of a decision and development plan by the faculty board
- Part of the decision process; decision made by the faculty board



Agenda for today

13.00 - Introduction (Christina)

13.10 - Recap (Christina)

13.25 - What have we heard? (Christina & Karl)

13.40 - What do we think about what we have heard? (Christina & Karl)

13.50 - Break

14.00 - Group discussions in break-out rooms

14.40 - Break

14.50 - Comments from the deans on the group work (Christina & Karl)

15.00 - Wrapping-up (Christina)

15.10 – End of meeting



Recap -



WHY are we doing a subject area review?

- The review of the subject areas at the faculty, was decided by the faculty board December 2021.
- But taking us a step back
- We knew that
- Quite obvious that
- Our guesses was



Recap – WHAT have we done so far?

- Started with workshop No 1, April 19th 2022,
- Continued with workshop No 2, August 18th 2022,
- Had workshop No 3, February 27th 2023,
- Did the current situation analyses on subject area and department level during the winter 2022-2023.



Workshop No 1

The purpose was to:

- Initiate the review and revisiting the reasoning behind the decision,
- Holistic approach and creative discussions on strategically beneficial future forms of the subject areas, both definition and distribution,

And we:

- Shared and discussed in groups perceived challenges and tried to identify important future questions.



Workshop No 2

The purpose was to:

- Look for inspiration and learn from others

Inspirators:

- Professor Ove Nilsson from the Department of Forest Genetics and Plant Physiology, Faculty of Forest Sciences (S), SLU,
- Professor Helena Hansson from the Department of Economics, Agricultural and Food Economics, Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences (NJ), SLU,
- Professor Thomas Arnebrandt, physical chemistry and pro vice-chancellor at Malmö University (MAU),
- Discussed in groups - more of at LTV and hard to replicate. And why.



In the current situation analyses

The purpose was to:

- Provide a basis for the continued review and more profound process.
The analysis was divided into two steps (1 and 2)

The subject area leaders and head of departments were assigned to do:

1. An analysis focusing on present focus, Q&I2018, opportunities and competence needs
2. An analysis focusing on development needs, synergies and overlaps, new development (meaning what not to continue), the way forward



Workshop No 3

The purpose:

- Turn important issues and stones,
- Find common grounds and understanding, or not.....,
- Have a better insight and understanding,
- To “move”, “position” and “develop” together.

And:

- Presentations of the department management analyses,
- Fish Bowly,
- Menti.



What have we heard?

Workshop 1:

- You agreed on “*What lead us here*” meaning the reasoning for the decision of the subject area review and what “*is seen in the horizon*”.
- Work interdisciplinary solve the complexities of future problems,
- Break the silos, going beyond our familiar subjects, integrated subject areas,
- Identify our faculty-DNA
- Identify synergies/overlap
- Perspective on all our three/four missions
- Insights from our history, faculty and SLU strategy, and KON2018
- Consider the context that each subject area belongs to outside
- Identify ways for communication
- Flexibility, stability, quality, relevance, attractiveness, long term approach
- Reflective approach, looking inside-out and outside-in, communicate, create understanding
- Our individual approach, important for how we proceed and succeed



What do we see on the 10 year horizon?

Societal changes, societal perceptions and how society can adapt to limited resources

Integrated subject areas

Human/environment relationships (how people affect the environment instead of just the other way around,

Biosynthesis

Basic and applied science

New ways of collaborating

Holistic system studies

Climate change and climate justice

Ecology and biodiversity

Multifunctional landscapes and spaces

Practice of knowledge production

New models of teaching and learning

Effective solutions, fair wages, population growth, land use

Water management

SDG's

Circularity

Self sufficiency – produce food (what, how and how much can we grow, how do we store and process food, how do we optimize use of resources and land use allocation)

Economics and politics

Digitalization, automation, big data, bioinformatics

Tools for future ways of working

Genome editing

Landscape economics (engineering, architecture and sustainable resources)

Health-human-organism

Urban and rural sustainable food – planning, diversity, conservation, farm to fork

System transition towards applied sustainability

Collaboration is needed to meet these challenges, both within and with academia surrounding society

What have we heard?

Workshop 2:

- More loose frame work e.g. a matrix organization
- Shared common resources, infrastructure and equipment to increase synergy among groups at the Faculty,
- Establish integrated dynamic teams with shared goals and resources,
- The purpose and the role of the subject areas,
- Support from the management



Finishing words after Workshop 2



What have we heard?

Workshop 3 (including the current situation analyses):

We heard



How it looks today (6 depts & 26 SA)

Institutionen för människa och samhälle

- Företagsledning
- Miljöpsykologi

Institutionen för biosystem och teknologi

- Hållbar växtodling (**Odlingssystemsekologi**)
- Odling hortikultur (**Hortikulturell produktionsfysiologi**)
- Mikrobiell hortikultur (**Hortikulturell mikrobiologi**)
- Teknologi och digitalisering för animalie- och växtproduktion
- Djurmiljö och byggnadsfunktion
- Tillämpad statistik

Institutionen för landskapsarkitektur, planering och förvaltning

- Landskapsplanering
- Vegetationsbyggnad
- Förvaltning och management (**Landskapets governance och förvaltning**)
- Landskapsdesign (**Design av urbana landskap**)

Institutionen för stad och land

- Designteori
- Landskapsutformning (**Professionens praktik**)
- Fysisk planering
- Landskapsarkitektur med inriktning mot förvaltning (**Landskapsförvaltning**)

Institutionen för växtförädling

- Växtförädling hortikultur
- Växtens produktkvalitet hortikultur
- Växtförädling agrikultur
- Växtbioteknik
- Växtens produktkvalitet agrikultur

Institutionen för växtskyddsbiologi

- Integrerat växtskydd
- Kemisk ekologi hortikultur
- Kemisk ekologi agrikultur
- Sjukdomsvektorer
- Resistensbiologi



Suggestions from head of departments (6 depts & 21 SA)

Institutionen för människa och samhälle

- Företagsledning
- Miljöpsykologi
- *Status quo*

Institutionen för biosystem och teknologi

- Agricultural systems
- Horticultural systems
- Animal systems
- *From six to three subject areas*

Institutionen för landskapsarkitektur, planering och förvaltning

- Landskapsplanering
- Vegetationsbyggnad
- Förvaltning och management (*Landskapets governance och förvaltning*)
- Landskapsdesign (*Design av urbana landskap*)
- *Status quo*

Institutionen för stad och land

- Designteori
- Landskapsutformning (*Professionens praktik*)
- Fysisk planering
- Landskapsarkitektur med inriktning mot förvaltning (*Landskapsförvaltning*)
- *Status quo*

Institutionen för växtförädling

- Växtförädling hortikultur och agrikultur
- Växtens produktkvalitet hortikultur och agrikultur
- Växtbioteknik
- *from 5 to three subject areas*

Institutionen för växtskyddsbiologi

- Integrerat växtskydd
- Kemisk ekologi agrikultur och hortikultur
- Sjukdomsvektorer
- Resistensbiologi
- Ev ytterligare ny ämnesgrupp
- *Merger of two and creating a new*

Menti - "what's the most interesting thing you have heard today?"

Bottom-up research

Many agree that there are needs for financial support and stability for subject areas. Also a need for giving the same prerequisites between faculties

Previous workshops discussed change in a positive way, but today was focused on status quo and not on change

Subject support – how do we think strategically on different levels (equal prerequisites)?

Do SLU need to have faculties?

Continuity and change at the same time

Make it easier to work at different departments

Perhaps something else needs to be changed in order to achieve what we are looking for (quality, better funding etc)

Maintain Department organisation with minor changes

Suggestions on a clearer definition of subject areas and questioning on strategic level of funding decisions

Collaboration easier if you know what everybody does?

Many of us think that there is no reason for change

One extremely small department at the faculty; would be a subject group in many other universities

We need to get to know each other better

Use more of state funding to support long-term strategic investments

We are conservative for a reason

Diversity of thoughts

Stability

We are quite good over all







There is a common acknowledgement that research topics need to be filled from the bottom-up, but that the faculty, departments and subject groups use strategic funding for steering purposes

What do we think about what we have heard?

- A lot of energy, creativity and basis for a proactive and needed process (workshop 1 and 2) 😊
- A lot of collaboration and wish for more within and across (workshop 1 and 2) 😊
- A lot of creative ideas and suggestions for future research topics (workshop 1 and 2) 😊
- Breaking down walls and create new dynamic groups with a sharing attitude (workshop 1 and 2) 😊



What do we think about what we have heard?

- However,something happend, got lost and dissapeared (the current situation analysis and workshop 3) 
- More focus on structure than on content (the current situation analysis and workshop 3) 
- Subject areas role – important/not important = duality 
- But, two departments = quite large changes, one department = smaller changes and three departments = status quo (the current situation analysis and workshop 3)  
- Our hopes was more new and creative thinking, less conservation and guarding and better understanding of the role of the subject areas (the current situation analysis and workshop 3) 

Break

- Be back and ready by...



Group discussions in break-out rooms

- What are your thoughts on what the Deans have heard and their thoughts?
- Give suggestions for how we could take further steps in development of the subject areas based the HoDs suggestions?

20 min + 10 min break

Padlet - [please write ongoing while you discuss](#) (padlet link will be provided in the chat)



Break

- Be back and ready by...



Wrapping-up

- Deans comments on the padlet
- What is the next step?
- What will happen now in the decision process with the Faculty board.

