

Minutes of meeting in the  
**Research Committee (Forskningsutvalget)**

Date: 17 November 2022  
 Time: 13.00 – 15.00  
 Place: AHO Board room  
 Participants: Lise Amy Hansen, Jeremie McGowan, Peter Hemmersam, Ute Groba, Ricardo Simian, Josina Vink,  
*Participants in case 64/22: Ana Betancour, Rachel Troye, Hanna Charlotta Dencik Petersson.*  
 Notice of absent: Bjørn Sandaker  
 Head of meeting: Lise Amy Hansen  
 Secretary: Reier Møll Schoder  
 Copy: Randi Stene, Ulrika Herlofsen

NR                      AGENDA

---

62/22                      **Approval of agenda**

**Resolution:**  
*Agenda 17.11.2022 approved*

**Potential partiality in cases on the agenda**

63/22                      **Approval of minutes**

**Resolution:**  
*Minutes from meeting 13.10.2022 approved*

64/22                      **PhD Calls 2023**

We received a total of 11 proposals for 5 PhD calls – which gives an approx. 45% success rate for the applicants. Each granted PhD call is an estimated 3,7 million investment from AHO into research, a total of over 18 million NOK for 2023. This is a crucial research investment for the school, which is why this process has been important to establish. The preparatory work at the institutes, is vital in ensuring research focus and nurture research ambitions across the school. Having this articulated and communicated is part of making the research at AHO matter.

We look forward to a strategic and 'faglig' discussion on the 17<sup>th</sup>. This will be a closed meeting and whilst we of course will share the outcome, the discussion will remain confidential. I trust that you will all respect this. I appreciate that the tasks we ask of you are difficult, but it is in situations like these where strategy and priorities actually play out and we would appreciate if we are able to this in a collaborative and transparent way – like we propose below.

Now, in order to enable the group to decide on how these funds are put into play at AHO and because we have an evaluation based on two metrics or kind, rather - quality & strategy – we have the following process:

**FU members**

Prior to the meeting we ask you to read all proposals

We ask you to make a shortlist of the top five proposals in regards to research quality:

*Novelty – in regards to a knowledge gap*

*Originality - in regards to a potential for future studies*

*Ambition – in regards to depth and feasibility*

*Resonance - in regards to significance and ethics*

In the meeting you will be asked to present brief arguments for your top 5 on their quality also in regards to the quality of the proposed supervision/research milieus/teams for looking after the project and the candidate.

We are all in some way partial in this process – and for FU members this means that you may not rank a proposals that you are directly involved in – we practiced this last year.

We also ask you for short, written feedback on all proposals. This you may add to during/after the meeting and then send to Lise & Reier who will compile the feedback for each proposal for the applying researcher.

In addition, I will present a short summary of applications that apply for the second time (this year this concerns 5 of the 11 applications) and how they have taken on board the feedback from last year.

### **Institute leaders**

Prior to the meeting we ask you to read all proposals.

In the meeting you will be asked to present brief arguments for your top 5 proposals from all of the applications, and we ask you to prioritize in regards to

- Strategic anchoring at their institute and the school
- Supervision capacity at their institute and the school

After this initial round we will take a break where Reier and myself will summarize the arguments so far. In the second part of the meeting we will discuss our way towards assigning the five positions.

### **Resolution:**

*We wish to thank all the applicants, and we are aware of all the work that goes into these processes.*

*We see that there is still variation in quality beyond what we wish for. The process was initially set up also with the intent to raise the competency in application writing at the school, and what is clear from this year is that this needs to be addressed outside of this application process. With such internal funding, we aim to develop to the same standards as applying for Norwegian Research Council funding, for instance. There is also a need for a research strategy to allow researchers to navigate their efforts and focus on quality and excellence.*

*We also note that there are themes that emerge across - such as pedagogy – and while we already teach and develop pedagogy, we see a need to connect to or develop expertise in positioning such research. This is part of a wider discussion on priorities for the school as a whole.*

*FU have decided to fund the following five PhD positions in 2023:*

- *The Norwegian Winter City // UL*
- *Methods for Teaching Landscape Futures // UL*
- *Tradisjonell norsk arkitektur i internasjonalt og historisk miljøhumaniorisk perspektiv // IDE*
- *Preserving the Recent Past (1975-2000) // ARK*

- *PhD in Design and Aesthetics for Service // ARK*

### **Any Other business**

Lise Amy Hansen  
Head of FU

Reier Møll Schoder  
Secretary