



For general distribution

Approved: _____

Aalborg University
Fredrik Bajers Vej 7K
9220 Aalborg

Case Officer:
Stine Vestergaard Holmstrøm
Tel: +4599403880
Email: sve@adm.aau.dk

Date: 14-01-2026
Case No.: 2024-232-00226

Minutes of the meeting of the Main Liaison Committee on 16 December 2025

Participants: Per Michael Johansen (PMJ), Anne Marie Kanstrup (AMK), Søren Lind Christiansen (SLC), Rasmus Antoft (RA), Karina Dahl Steffensen (KDS), Jesper Wengel (JW), Thomas Bak (TB), Frederik Hertel (FH), Lotte Brunø (LB), Rikke Dorothea Huulgaard (RDH), Klaus Kjær (KK), Thomas Lykke Andersen (TLA), Jakob Skovrup Stampe (JSS) and Kristoffer Aagaard Stormark (KAS).

Unable to attend Louiza Bohn Thomsen, Jesper Lindgaard Christensen og Linda Ibsen

Other participants: Steen Harrit Jakobsen (SHJ) under item 3, Dorte Hollensen (DH) under item 4 and Stine Vestergaard Holmstrøm (SVH), ref.

Item 1. Approval of the agenda

Recommendation: HSU approves the agenda.

The committee approved the agenda and welcomed Kristoffer Stormark Aagaard, who is a new member of HSU on the staff representative.

Re item 2: Information about and discussion of the analysis in the HR and Finance area

Appendix 2.1 The report from Carve Consulting, which has been sent out for consultation

Appendix 2.2 Consultation material with consultation questions

Recommendation: HSU is informed about the results of the analysis and overall feedback from the consultation, and that, on the basis of this, HSU discusses points of attention in relation to the scenarios and the further process.

SLC reviewed the timetable for the analysis. It has been a process with a focus on openness and the involvement of both managers and employees. The purpose was originally to optimize the internal processes and ensure due diligence in relation to political reforms and digital development. However, the context has changed since the start of the analysis, as AAU is now also facing a government savings requirement of approx. DKK 45 million from 2027, which increases the pressure. We are currently awaiting a report from the Boston Consulting Group (BCG), but SLC stressed that regardless of the BCG report's conclusions, action is needed. The HR and Financial Analysis, prepared by Carve, has identified six "findings" and resulted in four key scenarios. It is possible to read more about this in the consultation material on the AAU site about the analysis for the HR and finance processes.

The consultation deadline was 12 December, and SLC was therefore able to give the committee an insight into trends from the consultation responses. The consultation responses from departments and faculties show gen-

eral recognition of the analysis and support for standardising and optimising processes. However, there are differences in the perception of the right solution and level of service, and there is a demand for more dialogue and involvement. Physical proximity is considered an important part of quality, and there is a focus on attractive administrative staff positions as well as learning from other universities. The concerns include the departmental management's room for manoeuvre, differences in local needs, domain knowledge and accessibility as pre-requisites for success, as well as the quality of digital support. The culture is mentioned as a possible barrier, and there is attention to the user perspective, the risk of task slippage to VIPs and the partner role as potential bottlenecks.

From the Shared Service, there is broad support for centralisation and standardisation, with the expectation of efficiency and robustness, but concern about loss of proximity and context. It points to the need for strong change management, clear procedures, communication and involvement. Digital platforms and physical settings are highlighted as crucial. The proposed solutions include economies of scale, better system support, common procedures, unambiguous process ownership, competence development and cross-functional collaboration. There is general support for scenario 0, with some reservations for parts of scenarios 1 and 2. Combination solutions such as local contact points and ticket systems are mentioned, as well as the need for joint discussion of service levels and gradual implementation with pilot projects.

Finally, SLC informed that the steering committee will collect the consultation responses after the New Year and qualify the recommendation, which the Executive Board will consider at the end of January. The committee was then given the opportunity to provide their input.

LB emphasized the need for quick action after the decision has been made, as long waiting times can be hard for the affected employees. Especially at SSH, where the newly established departments are also waiting for clarification before they can make the final set-up. SLC commented that there will always be a trade-off between enough involvement and the quick process, but that the best solution must of course be found.

LB also highlighted that several systems do not work optimally and called for the involvement of decentralised units in the work on improvements. She emphasized that collaboration is crucial and that decentralized units can only deliver quality if they are given clear tasks and the necessary material.

In conclusion, LB expressed concern about the central HR department, where operational tasks such as hiring and allowances are not handled in a timely manner today, which creates frustration. Normally, there is no division between "us and them", but such situations can create distance, which is not appropriate at this time. SLC acknowledged the problem and stated that intense work is already being done to get the operation under control.

TLA thanked for the good review. The trends in the consultation responses well summarize what the staff representative had also discussed prior to the meeting. TLA expressed concern about the expected shift of tasks to academic staff and asked for management's expectations for the future department structure, where there are more academic staff and fewer administrative staff and thus less diversity in the units. SLC acknowledged the concern but mentioned that simple digital solutions for e.g. registering absence in apps could also help to alleviate something.

FH informed that it has been difficult to find the motivation for the process, but that today's presentation provided a better understanding. The employee side emphasized that some employees feel that the initiation of the analysis is due to a lack of effort on their part. The management side commented that it is not the employees' fault that processes have not been streamlined, it is a management responsibility that they are now taking on.

FH noted that SLC mentioned in its presentation that scenario 0 was not an option, but it is the preferred scenario in the consultation responses. FH therefore asked whether SLC had already decided what he wanted to recommend to the Executive Board. SLC responded that scenarios 0, 1 and 2 are considered necessary to

achieve the desired effect, while scenario 3 is considered too far-reaching and requires significantly more work. He emphasized that the consultation responses received are thorough and well-argued, and that the decision can only be made when a number of criteria are met. There is no desire for a model where everything is implemented at once; Instead, there must be a thorough discussion of the possibilities and prerequisites so that the process is balanced and realistic.

Kristoffer emphasized the importance of focusing on the people and ensuring that no one is lost along the way. He mentioned that if there is concern about being moved centrally, one should start from what is already working well, such as ITS, which has previously been centralised with concerns, but where there are now good satisfaction surveys. These successes should be used as inspiration and spread to create security and reduce fear.

Finally, the staff representative expressed satisfaction that we are already using the knowledge we have from previous processes. It's a really positive thing.

Re item 3: Status of the 2025 economy and discussion of the budget for 2026

Appendix 3.1 Budget 2026 – Notat

Appendix 3.2 Budget 2026 - Income statements for AAU and main academic areas (budget appendix)

Recommendation: Rector will take note of the status of the 2025 finances and discuss input for the 2026 budget with a view to the Rector being able to convey the Liaison Committee's views at the Board meeting on 17 December 2025.

SHJ presented the status of the finances for 2025. The expected profit at the start of the year was a profit of DKK 1 million, but at the second period follow-up, the profit is DKK 172 million, and the final result is expected to be even higher. This is due, among other things, to a basic grant of DKK 85 million from the Finance Act in 2024, a large take-home and DKK 60 million, which will be returned after a completed arbitration case concerning the BUILD building. In addition, there is a general restraint on operations.

SHJ subsequently presented the proposed budget for 2026. Focus points for the 2026 budget are the reform of university education, the development and implementation of a new strategy, declining educational activity, the need to allocate more resources to the grant-funded activities, increased take-home of external research grants, the turnover of free research and innovation funds and development, and the implementation of New SIS. The committee was given the opportunity to provide input to Budget 2026 in order for Rector to communicate HSU's views at the board meeting on 17 December 2025.

FH asked whether the high equity provides a basis for larger investments in the coming year. PMJ informed that in recent years, AAU has undergone a strategic shift from a heavy educational university to a heavier research and innovation university. The new strategy will also reflect this, and therefore a lot of funds must also be used to support this. FH also asked if it is possible to spend the money faster. The answer from the deans was that even though it seems like a simple exercise to spend money, it is important to consider and think strategically, therefore it will take time. In addition, many younger researchers are also starting to receive funding, and they also have a learning phase in activating the funds, which is why it will take a little longer.

FH asked if there are future risk areas. There may be a risk in the interaction between academic staff and administrative staff. Personnel costs will increase in the coming years, but the increase is in the VIP area, whereas we expect to see a decrease in TAP. Previously, the support from TAP has been included in the increase in relation to the external funding. This can cause challenges. SLC commented that this is something the universities in general have an awareness of, and they hope to get a more parallel shift of the curves so that we do not get a bigger gap.

TLA was positive about the budget, but had a concern about the burden on VIP. TLA hopes that in the future, academic staff will not be so burdened and that there will be more time for free research. It was decided to hold this discussion at a later stage, allowing plenty of time.

Finally, the committee had asked for benchmarks with other universities in the building budget. SHJ presented this to the committee.

Re item 4: Discussion of salary policy

Appendix 4.1 Draft salary policy

Appendix 4.2 Current salary policy for TAP

Recommendation: HSU discusses draft salary policy

The Staff representative wanted PPU to reconsider the policy before the HSU discusses it. PPU will therefore discuss the policy at their upcoming meeting on 30 January 2026, after which it will be sent back to HSU.

Re item 5: Information from the rectorate

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing.

PMJ and AMK reviewed the written briefing and elaborated on individual elements. The committee had no comments on the briefing.

FH noted that PMJ is stepping down as chairman of HAMiU. The staff in the HSU are very happy to have PMJ as chairman of the HSU and hope he continues in this position. This was confirmed by PMJ.

Re item 6: Employee orientation

Recommendation: HSU takes note of the briefing.

At the HSU meeting on 22 September 2025, FH mentioned that the staff representative wanted to revisit the Rules for Employees' Freedom of Expression. This wish is still valid. The request was passed on to Rector's Office after the meeting in September, and they will look into it during 2026.

The Well-being Barometer Survey for 2025 has been launched. FH informed that it has previously been difficult and expensive to get raw data delivered subsequently. This should be paid attention to in the collaboration with Ramboll in the future. Attention is already being paid to the point.

KK suggested moving the 4th quarter salary negotiations to the 2nd quarter if it could make the process better for the HR department, which is busy in the run-up to Christmas. The request is passed on to the HR department. Finally, the staff representative gave a status from their respective areas.

Re item 7: Information from the HSU secretariat

Appendix 7.1 Minutes, HAMiU 25.09.2025

Appendix 7.2 Agenda, HAMiU 24.11.2025

Recommendation: The HSU takes note of the briefing.

The HSU secretariat had no orientation points for today's meeting.



Re item 8: **AOB**

The committee had no comments on any possibly.