

Minutes from the board meeting of the Student Council

Date: 15. September 2018

Members of the board present:

Johan Hedegaard Jørgensen (FM), Signe Tolstrup Mathiasen (FM), Louise Mattesen Provstgaard (FM), Phillip Crilles Bacher (UB), Thomas Juul Handgaard (UB), Pia Maagaard Hansen (AR), Erik Lørup (AR), Micky Winther Ronnenberg (AR), Anne-Sophie Schröder (AR), Katrine Damberg (AR), Signe Bøtzau Paulsen, Rasmus Duus Daugaard, Lea Holritzer Pehrson, Mennan Şerefoğlu, Morten Jensen (alternate), Erik Slot Malmqvist (alternate), Nicolai Otto (alternate),
17 people

FM: Formandskab / the Chairmanship

FU: Forretningsudvalg / Executive Committee

AR: Akademisk Råd / Academic Council

UB: Universitetsbestyrelsen / The University Board

Absent with abolition:

Julie Lund Jensen

Absent without abolition:

Sofie Holmbjerg, Yavuz Inekci, Peter Dusan Nicic Sørensen, Amanda Costa Bizarro (AR)

Observers:

Maja Andreasen, Marc Backhausen Erichsen

Point 1: Formalities

B/

Election of conductor:

Rasmus and Pia

Election of minute taker:

Mennan

Approval of the agenda:

Changes made to the agenda. The changes can be found throughout these minutes.

Approval of last BM minutes:

Some of the points in the minutes were written in Danish, but it was only the closed points. Therefore no correction is needed.

The last BM minutes is approved.

Orientations :

B/

- Johan: he and Louise had a meeting with the rectorate, about evaluation of the tutoring. Overall good feedback (fewer complains about the use of alcohol, but fewer respondents)
- Pia: attended the Politics Conference. Good and productive conference. They decided to blank the vote about the *Boligpapiret* (DSFs paper about housing). A lot of good progress about the work for a greener profile in the working paper. Johan and Signe were chosen as chairman and vicechairwoman in DSF.
- Pia: one meeting in Unipol since the election.
- Micky: discussed the *censornormer* in the AR. More about that later.
- Phillip: changes in campus were discussed in the UB.
- Maja: General Assembly in Samrådet (new name). New articles of association will be presented on Facebook. A new board was elected.
- Katrine: Stud.rep. had a meeting last week, a lot of people in attendance. Also discussed the censornorms. Discussed how to work as a representative. In general they feel listened to in the Study Boards, which is a very good trend.
- Johan is meeting with RUCPaper, so go to him, if you want to give an input.

Changes in campus:

B/ Peter Lauritzen, University Director

- A short presentation of Peter
- There has been a focus on keeping the campus together historically.
- The campus is naturally a big cost, so it has been a point of discussion qua the cutbacks
- Therefore they asked consulenthouse Struensee to make suggestions for points of cutbacks. From that the focuspoints have been cutbacks in the 1. Buildings, 2. Administration and lastly 3. Academics
- The goal is to reach 28 mio. in savings from buildings – Struensee suggested specific buildings, where the last buildings is being discussed. The original

idea was to transform fx building 16 and 17 into colleges, but that idea has been dropped, as it could not be secured that the tenants would be RUC students.

- To make changes it would necessary to create a *Helhedsplan*, and through that, change the *Lokalplanen*.
- The rectorate is now working to make a Helhedsplan for the area, where they are working closely with the Ministry.
- Originally they discussed to drop the buildings 10, 11, 12 etc. But since they didn't want the same fate as fx 16 and 17 they decided to look another way.
- Therefore they are now leaning towards dropping some of the Sam-houses (24, 23, 22, 21, 20, 19). Other than that they have discussed 40, 41, 42 etc.
- Under that they are trying to make a *tomgangslejemål*, so it is a possibility to overtake the building in maybe 5/10 years. Nothing has been decided.
- Other than that it could be possibility that the Sam-houses could be turned in the University-related building (shops, up-starts etc.)

Question: is there a plan for the people now occupying the current Sam-houses?

P: there is not a plan yet, but a possibility is to clear some of house 26, to make room for changes.

Q: is there room to keep Sam together?

P: the houses/teams will be kept together, but all of Sam will not necessarily be kept together, although they support the idea of keeping it together.

Q: is it possible to sublet the building?

P: it is only possible to sublet if it to a university-related purpose. But right now the idea of the *tomgangsleje* is more realistic.

Q: would it be possible to work the studentlife (fx RUCSport) into the dropped building?

P: yes, it is a part of the discussions. We would like to work together with already well-working studentlife.

Q: could it be possible with a reading hall?

P: yes, if it is possible to pay for it.

Q: you could take note from CBS, who has gotten funding to their reading hall etc.

P: we would like that, but it is not possible to say right now. But I am optimistic.

Q: how much more do we need to save to reach the 28 mio.

P: by dropping building 19-24, then 25 mio is reach. To reach the 28 mio, we have to include 14. But it depends on what the Ministry is willing to do. But it is too early to say, for sure. We are trying to work around 21, but it is hard to say at the current time.

Q: would the 40's be enough?

P: I do not know that at the current time.

Q: how closely do we have to sit, if we change buildings?

P: the actual room for the classes shouldn't be affected, or only get better, regarding the actual volume of the rooms.

Q: who should we go for the detail planning?

P: is not me, but the architects that is working with the detailplanning. But we are really working to create a plan.

Q: when is there going to be made some actual decisions?

P: after the UB meeting in February. We are doing a workshop, to get inputs.

Q: thank you for coming. A short push for the idea of including fx Samrådet in the detailplanning.

P: yes, I agree, when we get to the more detail-planning. It is not always possible to include other agents in the discussions, but we will try to do it to the extend it is possible.

Election evaluation 2018:

B/ Rasmus and Johan

- Not so much the technical, but more overall

- SR got seven out of eight seats, with a relatively good voting percentage
- It was overall hard to find candidates, therefore the Election Committee had to be more active in search of candidates
- The election was held during BW, which had an influence on the volunteers
- Sambach Study Board was a hard fought battle, where Frit Forum stood strong.
- We got the dates pretty late, but we were also late to get to the preparations
- But we got eight very cool candidates!
- Erik and Micky has been elected to two years, which will influence next years election.
- A discussionpoint: was is success? Seven out of eight was a success, but it would be good to be discuss.
- Another point: we were able to actual do politics during the election, which is a big success

The process beforehand:

- Another balance needs to be found: active search for candidates contra not “harassing” too much
- More streamlined work with the volunteers, talk less, create more
- Earlier talks with the elected whether they want to rerun, before summer
- Starts talks earlier in the Subject Councils
- Seminars beforehand: a lot of repetition for older volunteers. How can we make more streamlined for the older, without losing the newer volunteers?
- We have to rethink or work around pushing the tutors during the tutoring, due to the workload in August
- The Subject Councils could, like Humrådet, have their own Election Committees
- More social events for the candidates

The actual election, attractiveness of the election:

- Continue the direct daily contact with volunteers
- Early “aggressiveness” in the visibility
- A document with all the names we have written to

- More pølleposters, it works
- Memes!
- Not enough reach in the small subject groups
- Need to think about how the already elected campaigns for the new candidates

In the office:

- Good energy in the office
- A good thing that we didn't have all the materials in the office during the election
- Too few people attended to evening meetings – make the idea of the meeting clearer to the volunteers
- It would be nice to get more people to attend the dinners
- It is also important to ensure that people not get too overworked. When do we need the volunteers?
- Good that we had soda and beer available
- We should work towards spreading the workload, so other than fx the Chairmanship takes on all the work
- “Sjatisfest” for the volunteers

AOB:

Annual accounts:

B/ Patrick Kulas

- See Tilskud 2017 and Årsrapport 2017
- There have been done some mistakes in Tilskud and Årsrapport, but since Kulas and Louise is in contact with the administration at RUC it shouldn't be a problem
- It is not clear what the consequences of the problems in the Årsrapport will be, but we will work towards finding a better solution forwards
- It has been approved that there has been granted dispensation from the rule of two weeks notice, due to the meeting a week from this meeting

Study start 2019:

B/ Johan and Louise

- The rectorate has suggested making the rusperiod two days shorter and also push the rustrip a month into the semester. They have also suggested to erect a position between the Ruschairmanship and the administration.
- Its important to deal with economics of a shorter period in good time
- It would be a big problem to move the rustrips to September, which is filled up at the time being
- It can be very hard to make the volunteers work so much into the semester
- It may very well reach over an exam
- It will ruin a lot of the social aspects, and potential for the group formations, if the rustrip is moved. It makes better sense to make the days shorter
- On the other hand, maybe the house communities will be stronger, if the rustrips are placed later
- It would make sense to ask the tutors, but make sure that we ask in the right way
- We should work towards, hand in hand with these changes, changing the economy, so it is not dependent on alcohol sales
- The ruslings may not have time at a later date
- We should use all these potential cases as a tool as getting hold of the economy
- We not want US in the Rusperiod, as we risk losing it over a long time
- As the contact with the fx the Studylife coordinator is as bad as it is, it would be very problematic
- There is potential for positives, but only if it well-discussed
- It would be nice with a employee, that can put time into it, we who we hire
- Although the problems with fx US, it definitely makes sense to communicate with VIP'ers, as their input actually makes sense

Censor norms:

B/ Katrine

- A significant downgrade in censor norms
- There is a lot of pushback against these new norms, from us and the VIPs

- It makes sense to do push back, potentially with signatures
- It makes sense to work with the VIPs, so it is important to state that they are on our side
- It is important to weigh the consequences of pushing back a lot
- There is a lot of possibilities of activism, but we should probably to communicate it to Rector beforehand
- Can we get enough people to do meaningful activism?
- We should work through SoMe, it doesn't make sense to do a physical event
- We shouldn't go too hard on the administration, as they aren't the bad guys
- We should get some local knowledge and communicate it locally
- The information should be made clearer to the students
- Idea: make event/possibility to write the administration in January

A.O.B

- Remember the General Assembly this Saturday!
- In regard to the Assembly Chairmanships presents their Report, which should be approved by as many as possible
- The next board meeting has been moved the 18th of January, as the Christmas Lunch will be the same evening
- DSF also has a Christmas Lunch the 8th of December. Signe will share the event.

