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Protocol for the liaison group meeting

Content

[Opening](#_Toc455995575)

[Agenda](#_Toc455995579)

[Next meeting](#_Toc455995580)

[End of sitting](#_Toc455995581)

15:00-16:15 Öjebyn with video conference

Attending

**Name Title Attending**

Carl-Johan Lagerkvist Head Yes

Mikaela Lönn Administrative manager Yes

Ruben Hoffman Safety representative Yes

Anna Mårtensson Union representative Yes

Assem Abouhatab Researcher Yes  
Johan Blomquist Analyst Video  
Mariah Hedlund Adm.assistant/protocol Yes

Absentee

Franklin Amuakwa Mensah Post doctor No  
Laura Andreea Bolos Doctoral student No  
Amelie Jönsson Student representative No

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Opening of meeting Review of agenda   1. Around the table: Every representative tell us about actual happenings or issues that they wish to bring up. New issues are directly written in an action list. 2. Follow-up on ongoing issues from the action list. 3. Working Climate 4. Information regarding our department | Presenter:  Mikaela Lönn |
| Agenda *Around the table: Every representative tell us about actual happenings or issues that they wish to bring up.*   1. Better approach regarding staff on sick leave and how to have an easier way to communicate.   *Follow-up on ongoing issues from the action list*  Action list – trainings and information The matter  1. **Training** - Training in the manager's responsibility for the work environment. Contact person at HR brought up what is within managers responsibility to improve. End date for this is set to October 3. Johan and Rob could not attend, but will have an education internal. It’s a matter of delegation. Break down the delegation order to the coordinators and make it specific. We need to make it evident what kind of task they are responsible for. If they have signed it and become insecure about it, they can revoke it. 2. **Information** - Inform about the process when it comes to sick leave and preventing sick leave. For example, how many visits at Länshälsan can I do without informing my manager? How do I contact Länshälsan? 3. **Information -** We would like to have a sign at the entrance informing about who at the department that knows how to perform HLR. Mikaela has contacted the Husråd about this. Suggestion from Anna Mårtensson is to use a certain marks that sticks out from the door of those who is HRL-trained. 4. **Information –** “Arbetsmiljöpolicy” for the department of economics. What constitutes a good working environment?  Working climate Update from the environment group. Also what needs to improve and issues. Matter in brief  1. The latest news from the environment group meeting is that the department is bad with the sorting stations in the rooms. There will be a campaign during the autumn for sorting. We as a department is not fulfilling the task of garbage and paper sorting. 2. People felt that it became very expensive during the Bicycle day. 3. “Lagefterlevnadskontroll”, a simpler version of how we fulfil the legal demands. There is a new environmental goal with different aspects, like not using flights in aspect of time etc. Better to have video conferences instead of traveling for meetings. In regards to the revision Mikaela will deal with that. 4. “Husrådet” talked about the office rooms and all over the space. It’s not only the department that has problems. Conference rooms is being re-built for office use and Ekhaga is postponed until the evaluation of the house is done. Mikaela has talked to the “room strategic” (RS) on how we can expand and the RS is going to talk to Akademiska Hus in regards on what can be done. More information will follow.   Examples of where modifications can be done   * Outside Richards room * Outside Karins and PhD’s room * The quite room, but only for short term guest room   A decision is to be made in the year end 2018/2019. In Lund the safety representative has refused to use rooms without windows to the outside, in regards to regelation. No one uses those rooms permanent and Johan Blomquist will talk to Fredrik about that to bring up on the next Liaison group meeting.   1. Some people within the department wants to keep some entrance doors unlocked because of the disturbance from noise and clangour. There is no final decision but it is taken in to consideration that it’s a problem fort the staff located close to the doors. Also loud sound level in the lunch room has been reported from evaluation of the “complaining box”. Once solution could be some kind of sound proofing in the ceiling or such. 2. There has been a decision to remove waste bins in the meeting rooms. Because there is too much food waste that goes in to those. 3. Porcelain and glasses should be returned to the kitchen once taken up stairs. We are noticeable poor at putting dishes into the dish washer. 4. Regarding bad ventilation within the department, all there is to do is to keep informing Akademiska hus (AH). But Husrådet will get in contact with AH. 5. Work environment issues – There is a broad scale on issues, from minor to major and very specific when brought up on individual level. The problem with that is how to raise the issue without “outing” the individual. Ruben Hoffman is trying to mediate and come up with a solution. We need to formulate our own working environment policy that is applicable for our department. 6. It would be positive for Assem Abouhatab to present his new role as equal opportunity representative at a “fika” or alike, to create a discussion and throw out the question on how to improve things. Assem mentions that some individuals talk about environment and some about specific matters. Some talk about gender, policy and even about “who is sitting where”. It should be clear what is followed by the equal opportunity policy and what is not. Ruben and Assems roles are in some ways overlapping. Assem needs to indicate what his role is. The security and health within work environment is supposed to fall on to Rubens role. 7. SLU is a bilingual university but it is over all poor at for example the website. Even at HR level. There is website on English but still has Swedish forms. 8. Work environment policy – what is a good work environment? All groups should discuss this. Gather information on what everyone think is a good working environment. How do we characterise a good situation? There is Value statements already, but we need to be moving forward to what kind of climate is ok. An elaboration together with Clas Malmström is a suggestion. Clas held a lecture on health, stress management and recovery on Skåvsjöholm. Afterwards he and Carl-Johan reached an agreement on an involvement with the research groups. Where he can help with different issues within every group such as how to be able to work together, accept each other, have a good work climate etc. There is no universal solution because every group has different issues. Every group has a budget to spend on the mapping of situation together whit Clas. It’s of course voluntarily for the groups to take part in this. The thought behind this is for Carl-Johan to go to group level and make a good working climate and then bring it up to department level and that will give an input on the climate. The main focus will be in the groups to see what is learnt and how to implement that on the whole department. Clas will be invited to some extent to information meetings and group meetings. The work environment policy should be the same whiles added to the group, general frame work for SLU but not the same as SLUs work environment policy. The goal is have a stimulating work climate, identifying obstacles to get where we want to go and doing so by listening to what an expert from the outside sees by looking in to the organisation and the different groups. Importance in using the elements that are relevant in regards to the policy. Inventory of the research groups by February/Mars if possible but at least have a plan made for structure on a useful policy before summer holiday 2019.  Conclusions  1. Johan Blomquist will talk to Fredrik about office spaces in regards to regulation 2. Assem Abouhatab should present his new role as equal opportunity representative at a “fika” or alike. 3. Clas Malmström is to be invited to work with research groups. 4. A structure for a useful working environment policy is due no later than next summer.  Information regarding our department Different matters within the department  *Matter*   1. Task force group “Innovative and vibrant research” did want to create a newsletter. Should they proceed as a group and start their work or should they wait for the department’s decision. Carl-Johan ask for the groups to summarise and then the head of department will bring it up on their meeting. Someone needs to be responsible for a prioritise list on who should have support etc. A dialog between groups on “who will do what” should begin. 2. End meeting from internal audit is coming up. 3. Economy – what is excluded in the “deal with the Dean”. 4. Personnel – Salary. The university has six criteria’s for salary revision. Salary structure on position is spread for postdocs and researchers. Something called “Matrix” is being implemented, meaning for example – if a person meets the criteria medium salary with filling criteria’s raising 1.7. Discriminating increase in wages to meet expectations. Coordinators is initiating salary talks and accommodate changes of salary for those who were way below their general line. All in all, harmonise the salaries for the revision so that the inconsistent structure is going to change. 5. Competence plan- Meeting with the Dean group in May provide a plan to the department. Based on that plan a set of positions that the Dean supports came up. Based on the document there was a request to the faculty board for two more lectors. There is three suggested names and up to the Dean now to decide. Regarding the Value Chain professorship, the department will keep the money as if we had have the position here. There will be a discussion on a position that match the former in future food platform and key recruitment has been initiated. It still depends on withdrawal of the balance but hopefully we have shield the most of the balance after “the deal with the Dean”. The risk with this is that we keep the money but don’t get the lectureship. A concerning question is that we have a large volume of students and in the end we need the positions. Other department don’t have the same volume so how can they fund it? 6. Staffing and environment – How can we assure that someone doesn’t end up doing something they really don’t want? Or doing too much teaching? On that Tina has now started staff planning, a new system and management of handling resources. Soon there will be a more detailed picture of how and how much people are teaching. Everything depends on how the board sees it and it is likely that an adjunct is going to have to cover up until a solution is reached. 7. There has been a meeting at SLU about doubling the students. How is the department thinking on what to act on, in regards to facilities, rooms etc. Carl-Johan is asking for inputs by the end of October to see what comes out of it. Head of Department has not been asked in the process that is now initiated. 8. A question to be raised and talked about further on is the need and want for work space for retired staff.  Conclusion  1. The task force groups need to point out someone to be responsible for a prioritise list on who should have support etc. A dialog between groups on “who will do what” should begin. 2. Carl-Johan will ask for inputs on thoughts regarding SLUs wish to double the number of students. 3. Question around work space for retired staff should be raised and talked about.  Other  1. Some new points are put into the action list.   *Noting further on the agenda* |  |
| Next meeting 2018-11-29 Meeting closed. |  |
|  |  |