

Board meeting 25th of April 2018

Annexure #5



Content

Agenda for Board Meeting Wednesday the 25 th of april.....	3
Appendix 1: Orientation from the chairmanship.....	4
Appendix 2: Orientation from the executive committee.....	5
Appendix 3: Orientation from the campaign group.....	6
Appendix 4: Minutes from earlier board meetings.....	7
Appendix 5:	23
A) Debate on how we do minutes	
B) Appendix to the student councils order of conduct relating to minutes	
Appendix 6: Revised UNIPOL action plan.....	25
Appendix 7: The study-environment prize.....	32

Agenda for Board Meeting Wednesday the 25th of april

<u>Formalities</u>	<u>16:00 – 16:10</u>
--------------------	----------------------

- Election of conductors
- Election of minute taker
- Approval of minutes from the last board meeting
- Approval of the agenda

<u>Orientations (O)</u>	<u>16:10 – 16:15</u>
-------------------------	----------------------

<u>Presentation and debate about how we do minutes (DE)</u>	<u>16:15 – 16:45</u>
---	----------------------

By Marcus & Johan

<u>Approval of UNIPOL action plan (DE)</u>	<u>16:45 – 17:00</u>
--	----------------------

By Conductors

<u>The Study Environment prize (DE/D)</u>	<u>17:00 – 17:20</u>
---	----------------------

By Conductors

<u>Break & Coffee</u>	<u>17:20 – 17:35</u>
---------------------------	----------------------

<u>Debate on employee positions (O/D)</u>	<u>17:35 – 18:35</u>
---	----------------------

By The Chairmanship

<u>Break & Coffee</u>	<u>18:35 – 18:50</u>
---------------------------	----------------------

<u>Upcoming Work Tasks</u>	<u>18:50 – 19:00</u>
----------------------------	----------------------

By Signe

<u>Presentation of the RUS-chairmanship and their work (O/D)</u>	<u>19:00 – 19:20</u>
--	----------------------

By Roar & Daniel

<u>Any other Business</u>	<u>19:20 – 19:30</u>
---------------------------	----------------------

By Conductors

<u>Dinner & possibility for a beer</u>	<u>19:30 - ??</u>
--	-------------------

Appendix 1

Orientation from the Chairmanship

By Johan Hedegaard Jørgensen

Russeminar

Johan and Louise have been to Rus-seminar with the tutors over the weekend of the 12-15th of April. The tutors got to know each other better, matched expectations, divided roles of responsibility and as always partied together. All of this went well. However, from our point of view, the weekend was slightly unstructured and some of the program had to be moved or abandoned due to poor planning and rainy weather. Still, it is our impression that we managed to represent the Student Council in a positive manner and that many of the tutors now “have a face on” Johan and Louise, which is great.

Lastly, we would like to inform you that one person will no longer be a tutor due to poor behaviour at the seminar, but the decision was mutual. We might also receive a complaint on a person in the tutoring. If this happens we will of course handle it confidentially.

Trade Union negotiations

We’ve been negotiating with the unions Djøf and DJ (The Danish Union of Journalists), and will before the board meeting have negotiated with IDA (engineers / natural science) and KS (communication-type jobs). The negotiations have mostly been positive and we stand to gain slightly more funding than previous years. The negotiations are expected to be finalized somewhat later than usual due to the unions being focussed on the collective bargaining that’s going on (OK18).

Meeting with the rectorate

The whole chairmanship had a meeting with the rectorate monday afternoon the 15th, which went relatively well. We talked about tutoring, student ombud (again) and how the effects of a potential lockout will be communicated to the students, and how potentially saved money will be spent. Lastly we required into the situation regarding Academic Books which have had some trouble operating, as we orientated about at the last board meeting. If you are interested to hear more about this, ask Louise. Peter Lauritzen did not attend the meeting. He didn’t attend the last meeting either, so that’s beginning to be frustrating.

Blog post in Politiken

Johan has written a blog-post about the Study Boards to Politiken, which they will bring one of the coming days. It might already have been in the paper the 25th. Stay tuned.

A.O.B

Signe has returned from Africa – Which is really great.

Appendix 2

Orientation from the Executive Committee

By Rasmus Duus Daugaard

Trip to Aalborg

Mathilde and Rasmus were in Aalborg from the 12th to the 13th of April. They were participating in the reception of Studentersamfundet (The Student Council at Aalborg University). It was a very fun experience, where we learned a lot about how Studentersamfundet works, and how they run their tutoring period.

Visit to Sweden (Office meeting)

The board asked us to call an office meeting, where we can discuss how the big office could become more welcoming to the rest of the board. The meeting will be on Monday the 23rd of April at 10AM. Pia, Mathilde and Rasmus have been in Ikea to get ideas for the office. Among other things we looked at new smaller height adjustable tables for the office.

General assembly of the NICE Council

Peter has helped the NICE Council with their general assembly and reopening, which took place the 9th of April. The NICE Council now has seven board members.

Kitchen status

The Student House has told us that it is possible to use the kitchen for events, if people from organizations that the Student House knows, ask nicely and clean up after themselves. However, the Student House is gonna give permission on a case to case basis.

The general data protection regulation presentation

On Wednesday the 18th of April, we hosted a presentation in the Student House by Toke from DSF about the new general data protection regulation. Mathilde and Rasmus are working on implementing the regulation in the Student Council.

Appendix 3

Orientation from the campaign working group

By Mathilde Elisa Vendelholt

We have had our first meeting in the campaign working group, where we began brainstorming what sort of campaign we wanted to make and how to go about it.

We have decided to make a campaign very similar to the summer festival of 2017. It's going to be a one day event where different speakers will give presentations and hopefully we'll end up with a comedian to close it off just before the beginning of the summer party by RBC and RUCbar 11th of may.

The theme of these shenanigans will be: A world in decay?

There will be between 2 and 4 presentations about this subject. Right now we are talking about artificial intelligence, war in Syria, climate change and a few other subjects, and we are reaching out to different speakers both locally and RUC and more nationally known. We are striving to have themes that reflect all four of the subject areas.

If you want to be involved with planning reach out to us. The more the merrier

Appendix 4

Minutes from earlier board meetings

Minutes from the board meeting of the Student Council

Date: 5th of April 2018

Members of the board present:

Johan Hedegaard Jørgensen (FM), Louise Mattesen Provstgaard (FM), Phillip Crilles Bacher (UB), Marcus Turunen (UB), Pia Maagaard Hansen (AR + FU), Micky Winther Ronnenberg (AR), Anne-Sophie Schröder (AR), Mathilde Elisa Vendelholt (FU), Yavuz Inekci, Julie Lund Jensen, Rasmus Duus Daugaard (FU), Morten Jensen (alternate), 12 people

FM: Formandsskab / the Chairmanship

FU: Forretningsudvalg / Executive Committee

AR: Akademisk Råd / Academic Council

UB: Universitetsbestyrelsen / The University Board

Absent with abolition:

Signe Tolstrup Mathiasen (FM), Sofie Holmbjerg, Signe Bøtzau Paulsen, Lea Holritzer Pehrson, Katrine Damberg (AR), Annika Roe, Sisse Marie Sjøgren Nielsen, Peter Dusan Nicic Sørensen (FU), Erik Slot Malmqvist (alternate), Nicolai Otto (alternate), Mennan Şerefoglu (alternate)

Absent without abolition:

Erik Lørup (AR), Amanda Costa Bizarro (AR)

Observers:

Point 1: Formalities

B/

Election of conductor:

Louise and Mathilde was elected

Election of minute taker:

Johan was elected

Approval of the agenda:

The agenda is edited, and point 5 is removed.

Approval of last BM minutes:

It is noted that on point 6. in the orientation from UB it is not clear what was meant. Phillip and Marcus clarify that what they said was that they suggested a theme for the University-board seminar. For which they suggested more inclusion and university-democracy especially in relation to the

It is noted that Anne-Sophie is not part of the election group but the campaign group.

Due to the point made in A.O.B. the minutes is rejected.

Point 2: Orientations

B/

Our organizational worker:

Heidi have been ill lately, hence the appendices have come out slightly disordered. The Chairmanship is in dialogue with Heidi.

RUC-Sport:

RUC-Sport have chosen that they want to manage their economy themselves. Since they are an organization in their own right, it is their choice to make. They will of course still cooperate with the Student Council.

A board member raises concerns that organisations that used to be close to our organisation moves away from the Student Council. And that it could be a good idea to try to ensure that RUC Sport stays close to the Student Council.

UNIPOL working plan:

The UNIPOL working plan is not yet done, and will be presented at the next meeting.

Academic Council:

The Academic Council worked with RUC's annual economic report yesterday. Micky elaborates on this, that RUC has saved a lot of money on pay to employees as well as received money for specific research projects. The University Board has decided not to cut some money on education other than what they're forced to cut by the ministry.

RUIB's Board:

The board of the housing committee in Roskilde Municipality where we have a seat, and Phillip who are currently sitting there would like to withdraw so that someone else can take the spot. If interested in housing conditions ask Phillip or Johan for more info.

HUMRådet:

Anne-Sophie makes a short verbal orientation about HUMRådet since they did not formally send one in. They are currently discussing how to organise their economy.

Election group:

PR-Comittee:

RBC:

They will host the summer party along with RUCBar the 11th of May. They could very much use bartenders, and Micky will be the barchef. He will write out soon and ask you to give a hand. RBC will host their own bar as they have done at the other semester parties.

Point 3: How to use the chairmanship and EC

B/Johan

If you are in doubt, check drive. Otherwise you can ask the Executive Committee.

Mails is the channel of contact. Not Facebook, Twitter etc.

Mails and stuff with mails is Heidis turf. For now this is problematic. When more info about the issue is available, it will be handled.

If something is in a hurry, you can always call.

If you want someone (EC or a chairman) to call back, send a text with the content of the conversation.

Rasmus will make a guide for this, that will be put in the minutes.

Point 4: Presentation of Roskilde Festival coordinators

B/ Nadja Hyldgaard, Kevin Krogh, Oliver Boel

The Roskilde Festival coordinators present themselves and inform the board what they do. The main responsible is Nadja Hyldgaard who is “foreningsansvarlig” (organizational responsible) for the Student Council.

They are working a lot to recruit volunteers for the festival, since we had a lot of struggle with recruiting last year. The earlier and more we spread the word the more people will attend.

The Student Council runs the area called caravan camping, where people have camper vans, bikes etc. It is a cool area.

Responsibilities:

Oliver: Communication

Nadja: Main responsible

Kevin: Practicalities and volunteers

The coordinators ask that we spread the word, and especially have other RUC students to join the effort. They target the active people at RUC. They really want to make it nice this year by having a base camp and taking good care of the volunteers. They are talking with some of the chef-teams from RUC who might want to help with cooking and making stuff nice. They are working in using new forms of reaching volunteers so that we can fill our quota. They want to make it a social community where people volunteer year after year.

They can be contacted at: Festival@studenterraadet.dk

Micky says that they want to do something about the summer party where they can spread the word.

Point 5: Presentation of RUS-Chairmanship (Moved to next board meeting)

B/

Point 6 : Presentation of SUL

B/ Rasmus Markussen (from SUL)

Rasmus is the chairperson of SUL, (Studeransattes landsforbund) which is the trade union for student-instructors, student-counsellors etc.

They negotiate for student-employees with the state and they can make collective bargaining on their area (although rather small).

They work to ensure that student-employed at the universities have proper conditions etc. They work to have students being part of the union.

SUL have their general assembly this Saturday where people are more than welcome to show up. People can run for the board (and there is a fair chance of being elected)

SUL would like to cooperate closer with the student movement, and with the Student Council. And ensure a better degree of organisation for student employees.
SUL asks whether we want a representative in their board. - It is asked what the work-intensity would be for that person. It is roughly one meeting pr. month with potential working groups

They have a Facebook-page, and can be found at SUL.nu
their email is: Post@SUL.nu

Point 7: Creation of new committee posts in the budget

B/ Louise

We have created new committee posts, and we discuss where the money are supposed to come from.

It is proposed that Academic Event committee receives 4,000kr
It is asked whether 4,000kr is enough - but it is replied that more money can be fundraised

It is noted in relation to the Academic event committee that they can enjoy the benefit that the board last year booked a potential lecturer from some bureau - ask Marcus for more detail.

It is proposed that 5,000 kr. is added to the PR committee from the “Communication post”

It is proposed that 500 kr. is added to the organisational committee from insurance

It is questioned how we can fundraise money. - Rasmus and Peter is working on it

All proposals passed.

Break

Point 8: Treatment of RBC's working plan

B/ Conductors

Pointed out, that it should be a coherent text. Also remove explanations for the points. Also remove the section under the budget.

Pointed out that we should have a “nice to do”. The reason being, that it is a list of stuff to do, when the “need to do” is done. Remove the “nice to do” list.

Explain the “money for skiingtrip” better.

Make sure to update the budget later, so that it is official about the budgets.

Move the “We want social events....” up as the first thing.

Approved by the board with the above changes

Point 9: Introduction to DSF's political conference

B/ Johan

Signe has shared an event on our Facebook-group.
The event is from the 20th to the 22nd of April at DTU.
We have X amount of votes that is determined by the number of students at the university.
At the political conference DSF decides, what the organisation as a whole should mean about stuff nationally.
We need to send at least 3 persons, since that is our amount of votes.
The theme is Grammys, and we have Elvis. The best delegation gets the "uglepris".
There is a lot of nice social stuff.
The deadline for registration is tomorrow. Therefore you should say if you wanna participate today. If you are in doubt, please say so, so that we can make sure that you can still participate.

Point 10: The political paper Quality educations:

B/

30-34 Man burde være mere explicit i, hvor stor ratio man vurderer er i orden.
92-95 Man burde have mere end ☐ ekstern censur.

47-49 Retskrav er nice og pisse vigtigt.
59-62 Herre vigtigt med timetalsnormer.
Feedback er pisse godt. Det er starten af "facilitering af god uddannelse" generelt også.
96-98 Det er pisse godt.
E-læring: Han er lidt iffy, men vigtigt at der står, at det ikke må blive en spareøvelse.
Nice at der er noget om studienævn.

Akkreditering: Man burde fremhæve, at akkrediteringen ikke er ret gennemsigtig. Det bliver et styringsredskab og ikke et kvalitetsredskab.
Det er vigtigt, at DSF formulerer det mere eksplicit, da det er svært at gennemskue.

Generelt godt papir. Kommer godt rundt om det hele.
Især i starten er det pisse godt, at uddannelsen skal være samfundsrelevant uden at være arbejdsmarkedsrelevant.
Det om retskrav er nice.
Starten af e-læring måtte der gerne være en definition af dette.
95: Flere eksaminer underlagt ekstern censur.

Enig med alt andet. Det der er blevet sagt i rummet er en god linje at lægge.
God pointe med akkreditering.

130: Det er letkøbt at skrive, at e-læring ikke må være en spareøvelse. Der må godt tænkes mere over, hvordan det ikke er en spareøvelse.

E-læring ikke specielt sagligt formuleret. Lidt for meget talesprog.
Enig i tidligere kommentarer.
27: Lidt vage formuleringer "tilstrækkeligt antal forskere". Måske mere explicit forklaret.
Også 100.
Uklart omkring instruktører.
45: Naturlig forlængelse er vagt.

Papirerne er ofte løse og "fluffy", da det er et overordnet holdningspapir.
Nu er det vigtigt, at vi finder ud af, hvad vi mener.
Ekstern censur: Principielt kunne det godt være højere, men RUC's censorkorpsammensætning er ikke specielt hensigtsmæssig for vores uddannelsesform.
Vigtigt at vi holder fast ved, at erhvervslivet ikke må definere vores uddannelser.
Feedback: Definere det begreb noget mere, så det er mere klart. Summativ/formativ. Kvalitativ/kvantitativ.

Det med instruktører er ganske flot formuleret.
Enig i, at feedback skal være defineret. Enten ved, hvad det ikke må være, eller hvad det kan være.
Fedt at det står flere steder, at det skal fastlægges lokalt. Er det nødvendigt at skrive det flere steder? Phillip erkender, at det giver mening, da det hænger sammen med det sidste om studienævn.

Vigtigt at vi sætter os i skoene på studerende på eksempelvis arkitektskolen, da de ofte vil være uenige med nogle af de specifikationer, som vi godt kunne tænke os.
Det er forskelligt fra uni til uni, hvad en spareøvelse er. Derfor er det svært at specificere, og DTU vil måske være uenige.
Kan konkretiseres ved at sige, at man ikke må få mindre fysisk kontakt med undervisere.

Men DSF kunne tage muligheden for at definere det.

Mener at konkretiseringsniveauet er ganske fint. Det kunne måske godt blive mere konkret, men slet ikke mindre, da det vil gøre det

Man har allerede understreget, at man gerne vil have flere konfrontationstimer.
Konfrontationstimer virker defineret som undervisning.

E-læring: Bruge mere spaltepads på at snakke om, hvornår e-læring er nice. På den måde definerer man også, hvad der ikke burde være e-læring. Altså vende det afsnit på hovedet, så det ikke er ting vi ikke vil have, men ting vi gerne vil.
Konkretisering: Ofte diskussionsemne.
Det kunne være godt at indskrive noget mere om vejledning eller lign.

75: Godt at der er en holdning til opkvalificering af undervisere.

Censur:

et bestyrelsesmedlem mener, at ekstern censur er vigtigt, da det sikrer, at vi også bliver vurderet af omverdenen. Specielt med projekter er det vigtigt, da der ikke på samme måde som med kurser foreligger en klar definition af kompetenceniveauet efter projektet.
Altså er ekstern censur vigtigt for den opfattede kvalitet af vores uddannelse.

Virker enig. Man kunne skrive noget om, at eksterne censorer faktisk har faglig forståelse for projektet, da det tit er problemet med ekstern censur på RUC.
Vigtigt at det ikke går ud over vurderingskvaliteten.

Vi skal ikke sige nej til mere ekstern censur, fordi den bliver brugt dårligt.
Vi burde skrive, at vi gerne vil have mere ekstern censur og samtidig skrive noget om, at censorkorpset er bedre designet.

Vi burde kræve: Nok ekstern censur som også er ordentlig.

Kvaliteten af ekstern censur er vigtigere end mængden.

Her giver vi mandat for, hvad der skal arbejdes for. Derfor skal pointerne stå lige skarpt.

Mere ekstern censur vil samtidig give en bedre censur, da der vil komme en større faglig udveksling.

Opsummering:

Konkretiseringsniveauet: bedre definitioner, eks: e-læring, konfrontationstimer og vejledning.

Vigtigt at samfundsrelevans ikke er arbejdsmarkedsrelevans. Formuleringen nu er god. Feedbackafsnittet er godt, men mangler en definition.

E-læring: Bedre uddybelse. Lidt nemt købt med "ikke spareøvelse". Måske vende det om, så man

Udvidet retskrav er nice.

Timetalsnormer er nice.

Ordentlig Stud/VIP-ratio er nice.

Det om studienævn er nice.

Akkrediteringsprocesserne burde være mere eksplicit. Vigtigt at tilføje en pointe om, at den process som ligger nu sikrer styring mere end kvalitet.

Censur: Mere ekstern censur er nice. Der skal dog indskrives noget med, at censorkorpset skal sørge for, at censorer matcher fagligheden til det de skal vurdere.

Overordnet: pisse godt.

Point 10: Election of delegation and delegation leader for PK:

B/ Conductors

The delegation leader is responsible for meeting with the other delegations, so that we start closer to us.

They also have meetings during PK to talk about the different proposals for amendments "ændringsforslag".

Also does "lobbying" during PK.

Keeps an overview over the entire PK.

Signe T. would like to be the delegation leader.

Signe is elected as the delegation leader.

People who wants to be in the delegation:

Morten

Phillip

Pia

Anne-Sophie

Louise

Mathilde

Marcus

Johan

Annika (in absentia)

Point 11: Update on what we know about OK18:

B/ Johan

During a possible lockout all buildings will be locked, so that you can only get in with a student card.

There will be a demonstration the 10th of April, which we will support.

SNAS will “occupy” the headquarters of the Social Democrats of Denmark the 6th of April.

We will not support this even though you can of course go yourself as an individual person.

SU will continue. If you have an application, it will drag out, since there is nobody to handle them.

The conciliator (forligsmanden) can only postpone strike and lockout if she deems, that there is a possibility of reaching an agreement during the time.

Point 12: The Study Environment Prize:

B/ Peter

This point is postponed since Peter is not here.

Point 13: Upcoming work tasks

B/ Johan

- We get a visit from the Zimbabwean student organisation, ZINASU, the 19th of April.

This is because Frederikke Veirum is doing capacity-building work there with the international committee of DSF.

If you want to participate, contact Frederikke or Johan.

-Toke from DSF will come and give a seminar about personal data the 18th of April at 13.30. This is important knowledge for everyone handling this, and therefore it is nice to invite everyone from fagråd and the like.

- Marcus would like to invite everyone to help define, what the Organisational committee should have on the agenda next meeting.

- Next wednesday there is a meeting about the arrangement of the office. Pia will call for this meeting.

- Katrine would like to receive stories about students, that have been treated badly by RUC, which she can use to push for a Studentombud.

- There is a meeting in the campaigngroup the 17th of April. Wanna join?

- RBC would like help for the summer party. It is important, that the board support this. Please join, when we call out for it.

Point X: A.O.B:

The kitchen in the Student House will close on Saturday. This is due to the fact, that it is always dirty. We will give the chairmanship a mandate to be angry about this. The chairmanship will enter into a dialogue with the Student House.

If you have some sort of cooling-device (like a fridge), the EC would like to have it for storing lunch.

We should have a discussion about names in minutes. Johan and Marcus will make a presentation for the next board meeting that will be the foundation for a discussion about minutes in general. As a consequence of this, we will reject the minutes from the last BM.

Minutes from the board meeting of the Student Council

Date: 13th of March 2018

Members of the board present:

Johan Hedegaard Jørgensen (FM), Signe Tolstrup Mathiasen (FM), Phillip Crilles Bacher (UB), Marcus Turunen (UB), Pia Maagaard Hansen (AR), Erik Lørup (AR), Micky Winther Ronnenberg (AR), Anne-Sophie Schröder (AR), Amanda Costa Bizarro (AR), Katrine Damberg (AR), Mathilde Elisa Vendelholt, Signe Bøtzau Paulsen, Annika Roe, Yavuz Inekci, Rasmus Duus Daugaard, Lea Holritzer Pehrson, Sisse Marie Sjøgren Nielsen, Peter Dusan Nicic Sørensen, Morten Jensen (alternate), Erik Slot Malmqvist (alternate), Nicolai Otto (alternate), Mennan Şerefoğlu (alternate)
22 people

FM: Formandsskab / the Chairmanship

FU: Forretningsudvalg / Executive Committee

AR: Akademisk Råd / Academic Council

UB: Universitetsbestyrelsen / The University Board

Absent with abolition:

Louise Mattesen Provstgaard (FM), Julie Lund Jensen,

Absent without abolition:

Sofie Holmbjerg

Observers:

Point 1: Formalities

Election of conductors: Rasmus and Mennan

Election of minute taker: Pia

Approval of the agenda: Approved

Approval of last BM minutes:

Approved with the correction for point 3 that instead of moving 5000 kr. to a new "STUNE Political" post, 5000 kr. from "Event puljen" will be earmarked for political events in STUNE.

Point 2: Orientations (O)

1. Chairmanship

Written: *in the appendix.*

Oral: *comments below.*

- Johan adds that he will be out of the office next week on a study trip.

2. EC

Written: *in the appendix.*

Oral: *comments below.*

- Signe T. adds that we have talked about the OK18 and the influences it will have for us as students in case of a strike or a lockout. We have made an info meeting on Friday the 23th of March.
- Signe T. adds that we are protesting against the recommendation from the "Committee on Improved University Educations" to remove the decision-making competence of the study boards.
- Johan adds to this that we were at the "action" together with DSF yesterday, and that there will be a lot of focus on this the next couple of days and we will be campaigning against it. Also Micky was in the news yesterday.

3. UNIPOL

Written: *in the appendix.*

4. LPU

Written: *in the appendix.*

5. HUM-RÅD

Written: *in the appendix.*

6. UB

Oral: *comments below.*

- By Phillip
-

Point 3: Evaluation of the Board Seminar (D)

B/ Signe Tolstrup

- Oral orientation on the results.

Comments:

- Katrine had a presentation by lector at INM on the history of RUC and the Student Council, which she suggest to consider using for future board seminars at RUC.
 - Next time make it more clear what we want to work with on the seminar.
 - We should try to focus on less things and have more time for them - especially the work in the committees.
-

Point 4: Approval of committee 'action plans' (DE)

B/ Conductors

1. PR committee:

/Not any changes since the board meeting

Comments:

- Consider how many students actually visit our website.
- Name change: There are comments on renaming the board meetings.
- There is a comment, that part of the board is against changing the name to "SR meeting with the board".
- It will in any case has to be brought up on a board meeting and decided there.

Proposed: *that we pass the action plan with a note that it has to be written as coherent text and that the name change will be taken up again later in the board.*

- ***Approved with the proposed note.***

2. CIP

/Not any changes since the board meeting

Comments:

- Phillip had a suggestion
- National Political work should be worked with in LPU, the formulation might be misunderstood.
- Keeping the part about national political work as it is.

Proposed: Changing the to a (Change fell)

- ***Approved without the proposal.***

3. LPU

/Not any changes since the board meeting

Comments:

- The national political committee should also do national political work - eg. mobilizing students for large event.
- Point 3 shows how the committee will work with the national political work.
- It could be more concrete - making local activism and campaigning.
- It should be LPU's responsibility to mobilize and campaign for national political courses.
- To motivate and activate students in DSF work.
- Influence DSF as much as we can in order to be able to stand behind them.

Proposal: ***Approved with the proposal.***

1. **Mathilde proposes** rewriting the action plan so national political activities are more visible and coherent throughout the text.
 - a. facilitating the local work in regards to national political activities.
 - ***Proposal is passed***

4. Organisational committee

- ***No comments***
- ***Approved.***

5. Academic event committee

- ***No comments***
- ***Approved.***

6. STUNE

- ***No comments***
 - *Change STUNE to stud. rep. network*
 - *Changes we to they.*
 - *Change.... to make the candidates aware of...*
- ***Approved.***

7. RUS

- ***No comments***
- ***Approved.***

8. **RBC**
- **Comments:**
 - *There needs to be one more party.*
 - *Taking a look on the months of the parties*
 - *Party in November*
 - *RBC takes the comments into consideration.*
 - **Proposal:**
 - **Johan proposes** putting in a point under goals saying:
 - *Doing social events for RUC-students*
 - ***Proposal is approved***
 - **Rasmus proposes** that the overall action plan should be approved on the next board meeting.
 - *RBC take the comments into consideration.*
 - ***Proposal is approved***
9. **UNIPOL**
- **Comments:**
 - *Making it more specified on what we mean about our paroles.*
 - *More coherent*
 - *Write in the actual paroles.*
 - *Make it less internal.*
 - *Put in the calendar. (RUC meeting calendar)*
 - *Explain “akkreditering” and student ombud*
 - **Proposal:**
 - **Katrine proposes** that the overall action plan should be approved on the next board meeting.
 - *UNIPOL takes the comments into consideration.*
 - ***Proposal is approved***
 - **Phillip proposes** that we approve it now and orientate with a rewriting action plan on the next board meeting.
 - *UNIPOL take the comments into consideration.*
 - ***Proposal fell***

OBS: Changes to the agenda: to take 5 min from point 6 “Roskilde Festival”, 5 min from point 7 “Election of University Election-group” and 5 min from point 8 “Discussion & Revision of Volunteer Strategy”.

Point 5: Discussion and setting down of a campaign group (DE/D)

B/Mathilde and Johan

Mathilde explains the point. At the board seminar there were a lot of talk about the campaign and to sum up and act on these inputs, there is a proposal to set down a working group for the visibility campaign. Key points from the board seminar: visibility, positivity campaign about what we already did in SR, make it visible for other students how SR is organised and structured.

Open discussion about what a visibility campaign could be about.

Sisse is asking how the goal of this campaign differ from the PR-group's work on visibility. Agreement that the campaign includes different groups of SR, especially.

- Coffee pop up: telling story about what SR already did
- Simplify the work of SR in three categories: social, political and academic
- summer party after the hand in of projects.
- Summer party is nice, but it is different from a visibility campaign for SR.
- UNIPOL should be included. A christmas calendar is a good idea, but it would be nice to supplement it with putting focus of the work of SR to make people remember it for the elections.
- It would be strange to put down a working group to do almost the same as the PR-committee group.
- To make a working group could include people in the work around visibility, who don't have the time to join a committee.
- A working group about visibility could supplement the PR-committee.
- Important to make a clear distinction between the theme for internal and external use. 'Visibility' could be an internal focus.
- An external theme could be the 50 years anniversary for the student uprising, which could include student politics during the years and SR-work. At the same time this theme could include different committees in the working group.
- Proposal: the PR-committee could facilitate the work of the working group. The focus of the working group should only be the campaign.
- Campaign: student democracy /democracy at universities
- Proposal: set up a working group between PR-committee and LPU.
- The PR-committee is not necessarily about making campaigns.
- Time frame proposal: relatively short campaign. Spice it up with social event. Rather few and nice events during the campaign than keeping it too long of a campaign.
- Slogan proposal: 50 years of student influence. Student democracy.
- It is not about taking away responsibility from the PR-committee, but rather as the board and other people would like to join and carry out activities.
- The stune network would probably like to do some similar stuff.
- A small group will meet up and include more during the process.
- UNIPOL also put down a working group about the study boards and is trying to include the stud.rep network.
Proposal: two parallel tracks: the working group with PR-committee and another group of UNIPOL and Stud.rep.
- Proposal: PR could be the facilitator for the meetings. The meetings should be open to everyone from the board who would like to join.
- Important to not only look back, but also look forward to how the wind is blowing about student influence. Invite political spokesmen from different parties to debate student influence 50 years from the student uprising.

Campaign theme: Student democracy (approved)

Putting down a working group (approved)

PR-committee should be the facilitator (failed)

Members of the working group: Signe Tolstrup, Marcus, Johan, Mathilde, Philip.

Point 6: Roskilde Festival (O/D)

B/Signe

Orientation by Signe T: The last years the SR have made a volunteer effort at Roskilde Festival. We get most of our unbound money from here. We have already hired three coordinators, who is handling all the planning. Signe would like the board to consider being a volunteer at the festival, which should be very chill (when there is enough volunteers). You'll have to work 4 shifts of 8 hours in the caravan area. It is older people, who are very relaxed and "clean" who live there. You'll walk around with a buddy and look for fires and illegally parked cars or sit in one of the gates. It is important that we get the money – sign up for being a volunteer yourself and ask your friends to join you.

Point 7: Election of University Election-group

B/Johan and Rasmus

Orientation: We set down a working group to formulate the overall strategy. Before summer the board will have to elect the election candidates.

Members of the election group: Philip, Micky, Pia, Amanda, Signe T., Rasmus, Johan, Mathilde, Katrine, Anne-Sophie.

Note: the subject councils often send people to this working group as well – so please make them aware.

Point 8: Discussion & Revision of Volunteer strategy (DE/D)

B/Conductors

Comments:

- Johan: *In general it would be nice to consider Annas recommendations from her point on the board seminar. Rethink the paper so that it fits this years situation.*
- Signe: *We should think about why we need volunteers and what we need them for. What makes sense for the organisation and what makes sense for the volunteers. What is the working environment for the volunteers.*
- Katrine: *The paper can be difficult to use in practice, but works well as a theoretical paper, that can be used to understand volunteers. Another aspect is how to include students at RUC.*
- Annika: *One side of a two sided medal, this is an internal view - we need one that can be given to volunteers as a tool. A workflow could be a good idea. What happens after recruiting?*
- Mennan: *Volunteer environment at the student council - We have to remember that we "are on", when we meet someone new, because this could be their first meeting with the student council. Be aware that you are representing the student council.*

- Katrine: *There is a difference between a volunteer and “core actives”. When do we meet the actives and how do we include them more in our organisation. This discussion should be continued somewhere else.*
- Johan: *It is very election oriented and it has an internal perspective. Keep it in mind and work with/ debate it.*
- Signe: *Adapt it to how we work with it in the student council - less general and more focus on what SR does. We should not pass it yet but continue the work and adapting of it. The board should think about if we should still have volunteer positions?*
- Anne-Sophie: *What is the definition of a volunteer? Is it RBC, election, RF? We should invite our volunteers more to internal parts such as committees and do it directly.*
- Javuz: *People doesn't know that they can do projects for us - let students do funded projects that are on their initiative but cored from SR.*
- Mathilde: *A public volunteer strategy with what work you can do in SR, as an external tool. And then keep this as an internal paper.*
- Signe B.: *There are information on the website on how to be a volunteer and what work you can do. Should we update that and what can we do with that?*
- Johan: *Tutoring - Who are volunteers and who isn't? Tutors, chairmanship*
- Katrine: *Activities bank, Public for volunteers. - Making the inner circle bigger. Invite friends + bring new friends. It is our responsibility to invite people and give people responsibility to make them stay.*
- Micky: *Everyone that does someone for SR, especially RBC, are our volunteers. We need to know what end goal this has - we need more direction to discuss these.*
- Katrine: *We should have a group to look at the paper and incorporate the comments by rewriting it and then take it up on another board meeting.*
- Anne-Sophie: *It would be nice to have questions for all the points.*
- Annika: *Be aware of the invisible rules.*
- Katrine: *We should talk about the offices and how we make them more open for the board and volunteers.*
- Pia: *We have talked about it in the EC - and very much feel like there needs to be something done to the office space.*
- Johan: *We will take the office space up on a board meeting.*
- Signe B.: *Make a list of the things with names in the office and show it to the new people.*
- Phillip: *Make the working environment a part of volunteers environment.*
- that the paper includes all of the different kinds of volunteers such as RBC, tutoring, STUNE and more.
- **Mennan proposes:** to postpone the voting for the paper now and instead make a working group.
 - **Approved.**
- **Mennan proposes to create a working group which:**
 - *Makes detailed/ concrete guides*
 - *Maps what kind of volunteers we do have*
 - *Look at the Activity bank*
 - *Discuss an external paper*
 - *Look at invisible rules.*
- **Approved**

People in the working group: Katrine, Annika and Phillip (and Signe).

Part of the discussion:

- **Katrine proposes:** (Moved to AOB)
 1. New strategy for volunteer
 2. *Make a group to work on the offices space. **
 - *Post-it on what will make a good offices environment.*
 3. *Keep working environment on the agenda in June. **
 - **Phillip proposes:** (Moved to AOB)
 - *to make the working environment a part of volunteers environment.**
-

Point 9: Upcoming Work Tasks

B/Signe Tolstrup

- Spread the word and invite your friends to the Facebook-event for the OK18 info-meeting.
-

Point 10: A.O.B

- **Work Environment in the big office:**
 - Suggestion to have a meeting with different representatives, anyone who wants to be a part of the meeting.
 - Open discussion on what needs to be done to make the office more usable.
- **Meetings in the future - it is important to remember the:**
 - Framing of the meeting
 - To let us know
 - What are we discussing?
 - What should we bring to the table?
- **Snapchat group:**
 - Signe T. invites everyone to the board snapchat group.
- **Instagram:**
 - Pia asks if anyone would like the instagram this week?
 - Signe B. would like to take it.
- **Comment on facebook post about the study boards**
 - Remember to be accurate and be very clear about the things that are implicit.

Appendix 5 A

How should we do our minutes?

By Marcus Turunen and Johan Hedegaard Jørgensen

It is currently in our rules of procedure that we take ‘discussion-minutes’ (diskussionsreferat) and that names are not written down unless specifically asked for. This, can however be changed if we need to.

In general, there are two ways of doing minutes:

Decision-minutes (beslutningsreferat): Only decisions, results and incoming suggestions are written down unless explicitly noted.

The main debate here is whether to write down how people vote automatically or only if people ask for it.

Debate-minutes(diskussionsreferat): The debate and the differing opinions voiced will be recorded. The level of detail can vary and often if opinions are repeated they can be left out, depending on how the minute taker judges the debate.

The main debate is on the level of detail, and whether names should be recorded.

Names or not?

Historically the Student Council have not written down specific names unless asked by the person. The same goes for opinions, that names or other details are often only written down if the persons who are against the majority decision wishes it.

Pros and cons for names in minutes:

Pros:

- It is transparent what people vote
- It is easy to pinpoint what the different delegated mandates votes/say in debates, such as the subject council members, the UB’s FU etc.

Cons:

- People might hold back opinions in the debate if it is explicitly noted down
- The job of being conductor gets harder the more the person has to pay specific attention on who said what, and who voted what.

The board should decide whether we should have decision minutes or debate minutes, and if they should contain the name of the person that raised an opinion and/or how people vote.

Appendix 5 B

Appendix to the order of conduct relating to minutes

Bilag til Forretningsordenen: Retningslinjer for referater

Indledning

Studenterrådets bestyrelse skal referere fra sine møder, så Studenterrådet og andre studerende på RUC kan følge arbejdet uden nødvendigvis at deltage i møderne. For at sikre gennemskeligheden af bestyrelsesreferaterne er det vigtigt, at der er en kontinuitet i udarbejdelsen af referater ved at de fx ligner hinanden fra møde til møde. Det kan i øvrigt være svært at vide, hvordan man skriver et referat. Disse retningslinjer for referater er derfor også ment som en hjælp til nye referenter. Følgende retningslinjer skal læses som en uddybning af Bestyrelsens forretningsordens pkt. 4, der pålægger Bestyrelsen at offentliggøre referater fra sine møder.

Principper for referater

- Navnene på fremmødte noteres i referatet. Det noteres, om de fremmødte er medlem formandskabet (FS), bestyrelsesmedlemmer (BM), medlemmer af universitetsbestyrelsen (UB), formand for UNIPOL (UNIPOL), observatør fra Akademisk Råd (AR) eller gæster (gæster).
- Eventuelle bemeldte afbud noteres i referatet.
- I øvrigt udeblevne bestyrelsesmedlemmer noteres i referatet.
- Med mindre et bestyrelsesmedlem kræver det, noteres det ikke hvem der tilkendegiver hvilken holdning.
- Hvis der er uenighed i en debat refereres et synspunkt første gang det bliver fremført.
- Det tilstræbes, at der kun refereres første synspunkt for et forslag og første synspunkt imod, med mindre et medlem af bestyrelsen specifikt beder om at få sit synspunkt ført til referat.
- I tilfælde af afstemning refereres kun stemmetallene, hvis et bestyrelsesmedlem kræver det.
- Mødelederen formulerer konklusioner til referatet, som referenten noterer såfremt bestyrelsen godtager konklusionsforslaget.
- Godkendte referater offentliggøres på Studenterrådets hjemmeside.

Appendix 6

Revised action plan for UNIPOL

Action plan for UNIPOL 2018

Overall goals

- Represent all students at RUC to our fullest influence, and strive towards making the work and the committee more accessible and inclusive to more RUC students.
- Be the forum in which the Student Council's representatives in AR, UB, Chairmanship and other who do political work, meet and coordinate RUC-political work. In UNIPOL, we set the strategy for reaching the political objectives of the Student Council and work to achieve these.
- Furthermore our purpose is to develop politics on the basis of our contributed knowledge from the students at RUC and use that knowledge to fight for bettering the life of RUC students, both on the educational and social aspects of the student life on RUC.
- And to follow through on the student representatives in the studyboards, institute councils and the AR committees work and bring it to the agenda of AR and UB.
- Work to make the slogans (paroler) of election 2017 come true.

Execution of the goals

- In order to be up to date on what goes on in the educational political landscape both locally and nationally, we will have biweekly meetings in the committee to discuss the the educational political situation both at RUC and on the national level. Furthermore we will keep the board updated on current subjects in this area and the ongoing work in UNIPOL in order to be more inclusive in the process of creating our political standpoints. In addition to this we strive towards sending out orientations regularly to both STUNE and to RUC students by writing articles in RUCpaper.
- The overall focus of our work this year will both focus on the slogans we were elected on and how to get them on RUC's agenda. We will be working with these slogans in both AR, UB and other local organs, therefore it necessary for the members of UNIPOL that we attend and prepare properly for our meetings rather it is in AR, UB or any of the under committees of AR.
- We will continuously work towards an quality assurance process, which truly and honestly evaluates the quality of our education. We will in this process especially focus on ensuring that the administration does not manipulate this process, we see this as important because it would be to create a backward process of governing. Quality assurance is a process through which the internal quality assessment process is assessed by the government.

Representation areas in academic council

Goals:

1. Lay the groundwork so that Representations areas can be done in the next election cycle.
2. Make the proposed changes to the statutes

There is already been made a lot of work on this parole by the former UNIPOL/academic council. It's fair to say that there already is a consensus in academic council that it's a good idea, and there are only a few obstacles left.

a) The employee in the election office is long term ill, and the main work load for IT are implementing the " Person Data Forordningen" from EU. Therefore it's not realistic that representations areas will be implemented for the next election.

b) The most realistic model for the system is that you vote based on your first subject. Some subjects are on more than one institute, so some of the possible work doing this year is assigning a institute to each subject. This should be done up to the election, like august. I think that it should be possible for folks finishing their bachelor, and starting on their masters at RUC, to sit in the masters study board on their 6. semester.

Prioritize Internationals – more subjects in English

Opening more subjects, in English or otherwise, will surely prove itself challenging. There are many arguments that can be made against this such as the lack of resources. Therefore it is important that as much research as possible is done into what resources are available and what subjects have been closed in the past and why. All the research should serve the purpose of coming up with a proposal to present to AR that is as realistically doable as possible.

Milestones

- The first step to take is to study the process that led to the opening of Psychology of Everyday Life as a new subject in English in the Fall semester of 2017.
- Another important step will be to outline and make clear what the rules are for RUC to be able to offer a bachelor subject in regards to its progression.
- Finally, student interest and amount of resources needed should be taken into account when figuring out which subject to focus on this year. In doing this, it will hopefully become clear what direction to take in regards to which subject areas we should prioritize opening English subjects in. One of our initial ideas is that it is worth looking into opening Medicinal Biology in English. It is worth looking into expanding the options within the SAM-Bach area, as the program currently only offers English courses in the areas of Politics and Business. The basic courses offered to SIB students are not reflected later on in their subject choices at the moment.

Rethink basis – raise the quality

Goals:

1. Rethink basis (especially humanities' basis)
2. Raise the quality of humanities' basis

Milestones:

1. Actively participate in HumBach's study boards work with the in January started process of "revision of HumBach's dimension descriptions".
 - Include the HumCouncil and other student where it makes sense. E.g. ask them to participate in discussions and comment on ideas and suggestions.
 - Ensure that the study board includes the students critique and wishes both from evaluations and through the student representatives.

After the new descriptions have been approved, we will ask the study board to:

2. Find a better solution for the "dimension crosses"
3. Require more lecture hours

Generally we will require a raise in basis educations' quality wherever possible (eg. in UDDU, Study Board and AR meetings).

Create Subjects That Match HumTeks Subject Knowledge

Goal: The goal is to make sure that there are created subjects for Humtek, which suits its basis programme and therefore continues to work with the knowledge the Humtek students acquire on their basis courses.

Milestones:

1. Make sure that the conversation and discussion around the subjects at Humtek that is already happening in the HumTek study board will be carried through.
 - a. Student representatives have been fighting for more and better subjects at Humtek for years, which means that it is an ongoing conversation in the leading bodies. This fight has resolved in that the institute council now are discussion creating a new subject called “Maker”, which they will be considering creating in 2018. At the moment the subject is not fully defined, which means that we as students and as UNIPOL has the possibility to be a part of creating the definition of the subject.
 - b. By working together with the study board and the institut council have the possibility to make an impact on the local level of the university. A study board for a bachelor programme has the possibility to define the subject description for subjects and through them and the institut council we can have influence on making sure that the subject matches the subject knowledge of the basis programme.
 2. Make sure that the subject offers at Humtek and especially the lacking amount of subject offers that are suits the subject knowledge in the basis program is part of discussion of the subject offers on AR in June.
 - .
- When the discussion of creating new subjects for HUMTEK comes up in the UB or AR, we should work towards creating subjects that incorporates the subject knowledge of the basis programme and support changes that will makes this an reality.

Study-life environment or chaos – for our wellbeing

Overall the goal is to make RUC think study-life environment as a part of the quality of our education. This is very broad and unachievable but it is still the goal, that we will be pursuing, since it helps with the mindset. This parole does not have an end goal nor does it have any milestones. This means that it is more of a working mindset than a specific thing, that we want to change. Altho this is true there is specific areas and times, where the paroles values should come into play.
Akkreditering: We should make sure that study-life environment is a part of the akkreditering. This mean that we have to connect quality in education and study-life environment.

Strategiske Rammekontrakt: Den Strategiske Rammekontrakt is a contract that RUC makes with the ministry. The contract contains development goals, that RUC have to fulfill. The strategic frame-contract could also contain goals for study-life environment. This is a goal, since this sets the direction of RUCs evolution and progress.

Communication: There is a focus on RUCs online-portals. Here we can help ensure clear information for the students. This will improve the environment for many students.

Student ombud now – justice for all students!

Goal: To get a student ombud at RUC.

Too many students are being treated unfair by RUC, which creates great frustration and insecurity. An independent attorney hired by RUC can help students who have been treated wrongly and unfair by RUC and ensure legal certainty. A student ombud should have a couple of functions: help clarify information, resolve disputes and give legal advice to students. At the moment the function of securing justice for students is mainly done by students elected in councils and boards of RUC, the student council and to some extent by the Student Guidance Service. A student ombud would be a

clear and concrete function that will take care of the students' legal rights and make sure that there will be a function paying attention to these issues in the future.

Milestones

- Map how the justice for students sucks at the moment
- Get student ombud on the agenda for a meeting in Academic Council and get a working group
- Propose a structure for a student ombud through the working group.
- Make the University Board to vote for a student ombud.

Time for immersion and flexibility – stop acceleration and standardization

This parole is a framing on how to work and vote in the leading bodies at RUC, and therefore doesn't have a concrete goal. It commits us to work against any proposals proposed in any leading bodies reducing the students flexibility, in regards to how they want to put their education together, and proposals forcing the students to do their education quicker. Furthermore it is our job to make to influence the ruling discourse in the leading bodies at RUC. So that the discourse about the relationship between the university and the rest of society, is one that underlines the point that RUC produces knowledge for the whole of society. And that it is the role of RUC to question and challenge the general societal discourse of commercializing of education.

But there are some processes we as the Student Council should be aware of in regards to this parole. RUC want to ease the rules implemented in relations to the progress reform - the new and better rules will come into force the fall semester of 2018. It is of high importance that this actually happens. If this issue is presented in the board, it's our job to voice the students opinion about this matter: we love the new rules!

Stop pseudo involvement – Real student influence

Student influence at our university is of essential importance for the future of our university, especially in a time where we again and again see structures build up to suppress the voice of students. This is a battle that has to happen on levels of the institution RUC, and therefore also in the university board of directors. The nature of this parole is such that the main battlefield is a discursive one. Therefore it is of paramount importance that we insist on the right way of viewing students, as a resource and not a problem. This is an effort that is most effectively persuaded through continuous conversating the topic at all possible times and in all relevant contexts. This could be in both formal and informal settings.

As an example a presentation and subsequent discussion about the internal governing bodies of RUC and how these can be utilized as a positive contributing factor and be seen as such by the administration. This is set to happen on the board seminar in May. The goal of this initiative is to put the parole agenda in order to affect long term change in the management of our university.

- Goal: Create on understanding in UB that Students Influence is a resource and not a drain
- Method: Putting it on the agenda and create a space for the board, without the rektorat. Implementing a two year period for student representatives in the university board.

Concrete activities 2018

Annual cycle of work:

MONTH* *ACTIVITIES

<i>February</i>	
-----------------	--

<i>March</i>	AR-theme: Basis (Also quality in study life) • Intra quality meeting w. Pia, Katrine & Micky
<i>April</i>	UB-theme: Student ombud • 12. april on the agenda in UB
<i>May</i>	UB - Board-seminar - Putting student involvement on the agenda
<i>June</i>	AR-theme: Internationalisation & subjects on HUM-TEK. • International strategy both in AR and UDDU (Amanda) • Discussion of subject offers (Pia)
<i>July</i>	
<i>August</i>	AR-theme: Opening new subjects (Med. Bio. in english) & Areas of representation. • Erik, Pia and Amanda.
<i>September</i>	
<i>October</i>	SN-valgbarhed. Can you be in a bach-SN after ending you bach. • Erik
<i>November</i>	(UB)-theme: Focus on the budget.
<i>December</i>	
<i>January</i>	

Notes to the of annual cycle:

Anne-Sophie: In the HumBach study board we will work with the new dimension descriptions and discuss HumBachs' basis courses all year. I will try to involve other students in the process when it makes sense. The SB has also agreed to have the 'dimension crosses' on the agenda soon. Here I will fight for a better solution as many students are unhappy with the current system. In AR there will be timeslots on the agenda where we will point out that the issue of the lecture hours students lost because of them is still not solved. Here it might make sense also to point out humanity students general dissatisfaction regarding their few lecture hours.

The calendar of Unipol 2018

Februar				Marts				April			
Torsdag	d. 1.	13:00-15:00	UB	Torsdag	d. 1.	10:00-12:00	HAU	Tirsdag	d. 3.	11:00- 13:00???	AR Formøde
Tirsdag	d. 6.	16:00 - 19:00	UNIPOL	Mandag	d. 5.	09:00-11:00	UDDU	Onsdag	d. 4.	13:00-14:00	AR (Årsrapport)
Onsdag	d. 7.	09:00-11:00	Studeledermede	Mandag	d. 5.	13:30-14	Dagsordensmøde AR	Torsdag	d. 5.	16:00-20:00	Bestyrelsesmøde
Mandag	d. 9.	09:00 - 13:00	AR - Seminar	Onsdag	d. 7.	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL	Fredag	d. 6.	14:00-16:00	HSU
Onsdag	d. 21.	16:00 - 19:00	UNIPOL	Tirsdag	d. 6.	09:30-11:30	Studeledermede	(1. møde med: Annessort)			
0	?	0		Tirsdag	d. 13.	11:00- 13:00	AR Formøde	Mandag	d. 9.	09:30-11:30	Studeledermede
				Tirsdag	d. 13.	14:30-15:30	ØU	????	????	????	UB Formøde
				Tirsdag	d. 13.	16:00-20:00	Bestyrelsesmøde	Onsdag	d. 11.	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL
				Onsdag	d. 14.	13:00-16:00	AR	Torsdag	d. 12.	13:00-17:00	UB*
				Onsdag	d. 21	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL	Fredag	d. 13.	09:00-11:00	Forskningsudvalget
				Onsdag	d. 28.	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL	Onsdag	d. 25.	16:00-20:00	Bestyrelsesmøde
								UB*			
								• Årsrapport 2017 og revision 2017, herunder status for udviklingskontrakt 2015-2017			
								• Strategisk tema: kommunikation			
				AR*				AR - Note			
				Fast punkt om forskning				• Indstilling om tildeling af aeresdoktorgrader ved skriftlig behandling			
				- Statusdrøftelse i AR vedr. kvaliteten af ph.d.-bedømmelser 2017				• Eventuelle andre skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, aeresdoktorgrader mv.)			
				• Drøftelse af oplæg til strategisk bestyrelses tema: kommunikation							
				• Drøftelse af fuldtidsstudier (undervisnings-og vejledningsnormer)							
				• Orientering: status på arbejdet med institutionsakkreditering							
				• Orientering: Erhvervskandidat							
				• Eventuelle skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, aeresdoktorgrader mv.)							

Maj				Juni				August					
Onsdag	d. 2.	09:30-11:30	Studieledermøde	Fredag	d. 1.	10:00-12:00	UDDU	Tirsdag	d. 14.	09:00-11:00	UDDU		
Onsdag	d.2	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL	Lørdag	d. 2.	12:00-20:00	Bestyrelsesmøde			10:00-12:00	FOU		
Fredeg	d. 4	13:00 - 16:00	AR*	Onsdag	d. 9.	09:30-11:30	Studieledermøde	Torsdag	d. 30.	13:00-16:00	AR*		
Mandag- tirsdag	d. 7.-8.	12:00-13:00	UB-seminar	Tirsdag	d. 12.	08:30-13:00	Budgetseminar	Fredeg	d. 31.	10:00-12:00	HSU		
Onsdag	d. 9.	13:00-15:00	HSU/HAU temamøde	Onsdag	d. 13.	13:00-16:00	AR*	AR* • Fast punkt om forskning • Drøftelse af oplæg til strategisk bestyrelsesstema: forskning • Drøftelse af oplæg til strategisk bestyrelsesstema: Økonomi • Drøftelse af EVU • Orientering: status på arbejdet med institutionsakkreditering • Orientering: Selvevalueringsrapporten • Orientering: Ansøgningstal 2018 • Eventuelle skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, æresdoktorgrader mv.)					
Tirsdag	d. 15.	13:00-15:00	HAU	Onsdag	d.13	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL						
Onsdag	d.16	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL	Onsdag	d. 27.	14:00-16:00	HSU						
Mandag	d. 28.	13:00-15:00	FOU										
Onsdag	d.30	16:30-19:30	UNIPOL										
AR* • Fast punkt om forskning • Årsrapport 2017 og revision 2017, herunder afsluttende status for udviklingskontrakt 2015- 2017 • Orientering: status på arbejdet med institutionsakkreditering • Eventuelle skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, æresdoktorgrader mv.)				AR* • Fast punkt om forskning • Nye fremdriftsregler til orientering og drøftelse af formidlingsplan • Orientering: status på arbejdet med institutionsakkreditering • Strategisk temadrøftelse: RUC's uddannelsesudbud • Drøftelse af evaluering på International strategi • Eventuelle skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, æresdoktorgrader mv.)									
September				Oktober				November					
Onsdag	d. 5.	09:30-11:30	Studieledermøde	Tirsdag	d. 9.	09:00-12:00	HAU	Torsdag	d. 1.	13:00-17:00	UB*		
Torsdag	d. 13.	13:00-17:00	UB*			09:00-12:00	LAU	Tirsdag	d. 6.	09:30-11:30	Studieledermøde		
Fredeg	d. 21.	?	Årsfest på RUC			09:00-12:00	LU	Tirsdag	d. 20.	10:00-12:00	UDDU		
UB* • Forslag til Finanslov 2019 • Strategisk tema: økonomi • Strategisk tema: forskning • Status for udviklingskontrakt 2018-2021 • Bestyrelsens selvevaluering				Onsdag	d. 10.	09:00-11:00	UDDU	Onsdag	d. 21.	10:00-12:00	FOU		
						10:00-12:00	FOU	UB* • Prognose 2, 2018 • Vedtagelse af budget 2019 • Strategisk tema: organisation og campus • Redegørelse fra rektor - om medbestemmelse og medinddragelse på RUC					
						13:00-14:00	ØU						
AR - Note • Eventuelle andre skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, æresdoktorgrader mv.)				Mandag	d. 22.	13:00-15:00	HSU						
						Onsdag	d. 24.	13:00-16:00	AR*				
						AR* • Fast punkt om forskning • Prognose 2, 2018 / budget 2019 3 • Drøftelse af oplæg til strategisk bestyrelsesstema: organisation og campus • Orientering: status på arbejdet med institutionsakkreditering • Eventuelle skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, æresdoktorgrader mv.)							
December				Januar 2018									
Mandag	d. 3.	09:30-10:30	Studieledermøde										
Onsdag	d. 5.	13:00-16:00	AR										
Torsdag	d. 6.	13:00-15:00	HSU/HAU temamøde										
AR* • Fast punkt om forskning • Drøftelse af udkast til RUC's statusredegørelse for arbejdet med rammekontrakten • Orientering: status på arbejdet med institutionsakkreditering • Eventuelle skriftlige behandlinger (tildeling af ph.d.grader, godkendelse af bedømmelsesudvalg, tildeling af doktorgrader, æresdoktorgrader mv.)													

Budget 2018

Månedato	Budget	Kommuleret	Brugt	Difference
Overlevering	0		490,85	-490,85
06/02/2018	454	-36,85	382,4	-419,25
21/02/2018	454	34,75	471,6	-436,85
07/03/2018	454	17,15	650	-632,85
	454	-178,85	420	-598,85
	454	-144,85	420	-564,85
	454	-110,85	420	-530,85
	454	-76,85	420	-496,85
	454	-42,85	420	-462,85
	454	-8,85	420	-428,85
	454	25,15	420	-394,85
	454	59,15	420	-360,85
	454	93,15	420	-326,85
	454	127,15	420	-292,85
	454	161,15	420	-258,85
	454	195,15	420	-224,85
	454	229,15	420	-190,85
	454	263,15	420	-156,85
	454	297,15	420	-122,85
	454	331,15	420	-88,85
	454	365,15	420	-54,85
	454	399,15	420	-20,85
	454	433,15	420	13,15
Sum=	9988		9974,85	

→ https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/14z6SdjzKLOSBtKGG_GOa0ZjS3_ozxuWT4DBa-z14DeQ/edit#gid=0

Appendix 7

The study environment prize

By Peter Nicic

The purpose of this point is to give an orientation about the study environment award and then have a debate about especially the communication strategy and the suggested text for post in relation to this.

Background

At RUC we have a study environment award which is awarded by the Student Council in cooperation with the University Library (RUB), to an initiative which aims to improve the study environment at RUC. This can both be in a social, academic or physical way. When nominating for, and awarding the award, it is worth considering the following:

- Has the initiative made it possible for students, who don't participate in social events to get an alternative?
- Has the initiative increased the social participation among RUC students?
- Has the initiative improved the academic environment for RUC students?
- Has the initiative improved the motivation for academic participation among RUC students?
- Has the initiative contributed to a lower drop-out rate among RUC students?

To ensure that the award is given to the best initiative, a jury will be assembled, which can act and represent as many students at RUC as possible. This can be done by giving a seat in the jury to each subject council or "self organized" student organizations at RUC (besides the Student Council and the library).

Examples of "self organized" student organizations:

- RUC Bar
- Kamarilla
- IC (International Club)
- The Student House
- Reality Bites

Communication strategy

To ensure that RUC students get information about the award and the possibility to nominate an initiative, which they think has had an influence on their study environment, a communications strategy must be made. I suggest that we use the COPE method. COPE is an acronym for "Create One Post Everywhere". That is, to make a post or message with the same text and then post it both in physical form as posters as well as digitally as Facebook-post or in an e-mail to the students.

I suggest using the following text:

The University Library and Student Council at RUC will once again celebrate the good study environment by awarding the Study Environment Award to students or student organization that have done something good for the common study environment on campus. The price of 10,000 DKK will be given to the winner.

The award will be given in connection with the summer party the 11th of May

Do you have a good study environment, or do you want to nominate someone who does something for our joint study environment, then write to the Student Council at studenterraadet@studenterraadet.dk.

Deadline for nominations is the 8th of May and both students and employees are welcome to nominate

Best wishes

The Student Council and the Library