

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: Formandskab / 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 Şerefoğlu (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.

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, (Studentersammenslutningens 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 $\frac{1}{3}$ 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 censorkorp-sammensætning 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.