

# Subject area review

TOMASOSTERMAN MAY 04, 2023 01:12PM UTC

## Room 1

---

We wonder what will be decided on and what can be decided on in August?

The administrative organisation should be adjust depend on what we want to do research on and with whom.

### Subject development discussions

We are missing discussions on how subjects could develop and what that would mean for future collaborations and how we organize ourselves.

### Suggestion

Create meeting arenas for diskussion/project planning. For example take docent lectures further for this purpose.

Faculty-financed measure (prjects, investments) could open for new cooperation across researchers from different department.

An organisatorial change should be couple to a prior discussion of subject area development.

### Reflection

We agree that the process turn out to be more about how we organize us, not how we want to develop the subject areas.

## Room 2

---

Vilka hinder finns i dagsläget för samarbeten över ämnesområdesgränser?

Om våra nuvarande ämnesområden är breda och flexibla har vi möjlighet att inom ramarna för nuvarande organisation möta framtidens utmaningar, viktigt att inte ha för små enheter, sträva efter en kontinuerlig dynamik.

Vad är definitionen av ett ämnesområde? Ska det ha en styrande funktion? Ska det verkligen vara en professor kopplad till varje ämnesområde?

Viktigt att undanröja gränser mellan kompetensområden, men inte skapa nya organisatoriska hinder.

De innehållsmässiga frågorna har kommit i skymundan.

Att se ämnesområdena i huvudsak organisatoriskt riskerar att missa viktiga funktioner.

Innehållet i ämnet behöver definieras

## Room 3

---

### On next steps

To increase funding for subject areas to strengthen, improve and to compete internationally

### On the deans' thoughts

We think that subject areas should still be organized within departments (not expanding across dept. borders), but this does not in any way hinder collaborations between subject areas, incl. and across departments

### On next steps

a very positive thing with this process is that we who have been part of the workshops have gained more insights about subject areas and how colleagues reason about them. Important to find way to continuously have arenas for dialogue across subject areas - also including other colleagues than the subject area leaders and HoDs

### on the deans' thoughts

Will it be possible to recruit new professors in subjects that are not synonymous to a subject area? With fewer subject areas, is there a risk of reducing the number of professors? Or can a large subject area have more than one professor?

There is a risk if persons who are highly competent cannot qualify as professors, i.e. good resources would go, braindrain

## On next steps

Important to make room and time for internal discussions at the departments, before any change is decided. Important to view the HoDs' suggestions as suggestions, and that colleagues who have not been part of these workshops are involved in the process to formulate the final suggestions for decision

## on the deans' thoughts

It seems logic and useful to aim for slightly fewer and larger subject areas (in some cases), but important that subject areas do not expand too widely - important to be able communicate the identity and focus of each subject area

The purpose of the workshops seemed to be more on structure rather than content, maybe we misunderstood what was expected.

## on the deans's thoughts

It was a bit new to hear that the deans had expected more creative ideas e.g. about subject areas expanding across dept. borders

## On the deans thoughts

Subject areas also need to be defined in an international context, in order to be internationally competitive, (as well as with national universities) therefore it is important they are , to a great extent, developed and defined "from inside" so they can keep their focus and gain in international recognition

## Room 4

---

### Way ahead

The Faculty needs to provide arenas (organise and fund!) to get to know each other and thereby increase

- o collaboration within the faculty
- o improved possibility to contribute to societal development needs
- o possibilities to give birth to new ideas...

### Way ahead

Give the Departments another possibility to hand in a final suggestion for potential changes. This will provide the Faculty Board with a better basis for decision. Such suggestion could contain thoughts on subject fund allocation and potential changes there.

## Coordination with (comparison to) other faculties

This part in the decision has been missing throughout the process. How does this impact the process? What are we missing? This could potentially also help bringing back focus to the content of the entire review.

## Subject area analyses

The reporting and reflections from the subject area analyses were sparse. What is happening with these? Much work for the subject area leaders.

## Incongruence deans expectations vs outcomes

Interesting. Maybe this could have been highlighted earlier in the process?

## Collaboration at Faculty level

The LTV strategies have stated goals of increased interdisciplinary and collaboration. No arenas has been provided by the faculty for this.

## Room 5

---

### The recruitment of professors gives an important possibility to change.

### Subject areas needs to be basic for scientific development. Themes could be based or related on societal challenges. important to have a long term perspective

### The department structure make it harder to collaborate

### Definition of subject areas need to be clarified in relation to research groups, subject of higher positions etc. Unclear how the faculty define the responsibility distribution between SA-leaders, research group leaders etc. Not the same definitions at the departments

**There is still a need to clarify the aims of the change.**

**possibilities by solutions between the departments**

**There is other tools to create development than changing the subject groups. Location etc**

**The analyses seems to be correct**

**The low interest to change in not surprising. There is a need of incentives to change.**

## **Room 6**

---

ämnesområde, ämnesansvarig, ämnesgrupp - dessa sitter idag "ihop". När vi drar i en (ämnesområdet) utan att aktivt förhålla oss till de båda andra så blir det svårt att prata förändring. Samtidigt så är logiken som skapar dem byggd på olika parametrar (disciplin, vetenskaplig skicklighet, organisation). Det blir komplext.

Ett (snabbare) sätt att få till samarbete är de institutionsövergripande olika "projekten" som efterfrågar tvärvetenskap etc. Dokumenterar och analyserar vi de som är

sjösatta? Här finns kanske frö till ny förståelse av ämnesområdets sammansättning.

Om man är besviken över svaret kanske frågorna skulle ställts på annat sätt?

Fakultetens DNA - vad är det och behövs det i relation till ämnesområde? Samhällsrelevans är möjligen ett DNA... men har vi gemensamma metoder, teorier, etiskt förhållningssätt etc? En ws som möjliggör för oss att diskutera och förstå detta på en ämnesnivå (inte institutionsnivå) hade varit spännande.

Disciplin och ämnesområde - förändras i olika hastigheter och har möjligen olika beståndsdelar.

Hur viktigt är det att vi har en jämförbar områdesindelning med andra universitet? Samtidigt måste vi uppfattas som unika inom ett ämnesområde, tror vi.

Är det en projektorganisation som man pratar om - eller ska ämnet stötta bästa möjliga forskning?

Rollen som ämnesansvarig olika på olika institutioner. Man kanske kunde ha klargjort detta i början av processen för det påverkar hur man resonerar.

Inte så konstigt att några vill ha status que och några förändra. Beror på var man är i sitt förändringsarbete.

\*\*\*\*\*