

# **Minutes from the board meeting of the Student Council**

**Date: 25th of April 2018**

## **Members of the board present:**

Johan Hedegaard Jørgensen (FM), Signe Tolstrup Mathiasen (FM), Louise Mattesen Provstgaard (FM), Phillip Crilles Bacher (UB), Marcus Turunen (UB), Pia Maagaard Hansen (AR), Erik Lørup (AR), Anne-Sophie Schröder (AR), Katrine Damberg (AR), Mathilde Elisa Vendelholt, Sofie Holmbjerg, Signe Bøtzau Paulsen, Annika Roe, Julie Lund Jensen, Rasmus Duus Daugaard, Lea Holritzer Pehrson, Erik Slot Malmqvist (alternate), Nicolai Otto (alternate), Mennan Şerefoğlu (alternate)  
19 people

FM: Formandskab / the Chairmanship

FU: Forretningsudvalg / Executive Committee

AR: Akademisk Råd / Academic Council

UB: Universitetsbestyrelsen / The University Board

## **Absent with abolition:**

Micky Winther Ronnenberg (AR), Amanda Costa Bizarro (AR), Yavuz Inekci, Sisse Marie Sjøgren Nielsen, Peter Dusan Nicic Sørensen, Morten Jensen (alternate),

## **Absent without abolition:**

## **Observers:**

## **Point 1: Formalities**

B/

## **Election of conductor:**

Signe Bøtzau and Signe Tolstrup are elected

## **Election of minute taker:**

Sofie is elected

### **Approval of the agenda:**

There has been confusion about the agenda, because the mailing system failed and it wasn't send in time. People have the opportunity to correct the agenda, no one does, the agenda is therefore approved.

### **Approval of last BM minutes:**

The last minutes had Anne-Sophie's name in the wrong committee and that need to be corrected. Both minutes are approved with this correction.

### **Point 2: Orientation**

B/

LPU: PK happened this weekend. They debated politics and education, the debate went well. They had a debate about "akredditering", and feedback and grades. We added a lot of things to the agenda, feedback and grades being one of them.

There was a debate about how much money we pay to DSF, and it will be changed.

Tutoring: In rus-committee there has not been any meetings. But there has been some informal discussions with the rus chairmanship.

STUNE: It's been busy and therefore there haven't been any meeting, but there will soon be a meeting about doing stuff from the working plan. One of the events was canceled because it overlaps with PK.

UNIPOL: They finished the working plan. They are going to discuss the OK18 situation and "akkredditering" and have been in contact with DSF about this.

CIP: They have scheduling problems. They met other international people at PK and decided to have a network.

RBC: They started planning the summer party with RUC bar, they got the contract back today. They will have a bar outside the party and it will be hawaiian themed. They are looking for bartenders at the moment and will ask the board to help with this or anything else. There will be a balloon man and someone doing face paint.

Academic event committee: They had their first event last week, it went well. There were not many people there, but the people there was happy. Next event cancelled because there is not enough time to plan it. There need to be a meeting with FANE.

PR: They had the coffee pop up. People liked that coffee was the only purpose. They had some meetings, and are planning to do a video.

Organisational committee: Are having their first meeting the 2end of May from 13-15.

Project bank: Not much happens.

SAMRåd: Not much, is has been a bit chaotic with the new chairmanship.

HUMTEKrådet: Board meeting last week. They lost their motivation, so they are going to make a whole day to make that better. They want to help the academic committees (fagudvalg) to make them more able to fulfill their role.

HUMrådet: Not much, there was a lecture lunch a while ago which went well. They need to plan more lecture lunches and get money for it. There is a disagreement between HUMrådet and Baristoteles about whether they should have a shared account or not.

NICE Rådet: there is a NICE Råd, but there is no representative in the board.

### **Point 3: Presentation and debate about how we do minutes**

B/

There was a discussion at the last board meeting about how to do minutes.

We have to do minutes, but it is debate minutes. We have to write who is present in the minutes.

Decision minutes: You only write what is decided.

Debate minutes: You sum up the debate, what was said and how did the discussion end. You don't write it many times if people say the same things.

It need to be discussed which kind we want to do, and if we will write names in the minutes. There are pros and cons with both options.

Comment about names in the minutes:

There is a new regulation from EU coming about data that says that everyone has to sign yes to having their names in the minutes. But it won't affect the part where we write who is present at the meeting.

It can come back in a few years what you said.

Everyone can always say if they will have something put in the minute that they said.

Proposal: We have two minutes, one external and one internal.

Debate:

A board member think that we should keep doing debate minutes because it's nuanced and we should just do them shorter. The same board member think that we should not write names in the minute. The existing guidelines are fine and we should follow them. Many board members agree. The minutes should reflect the board meetings, but there should be a better structure. They ensure transparency. People just need to stop repeating each other. We also need the debate minutes in the other organizations.

Another board member thinks that we should do decision minutes, because it would be easier to read and it would take some pressure of the minute taker. And we should not write names. Another board member agrees with that and adds that it will give more transparency.

Everyone is for not having names.

Voting:

Decision minutes or debate minutes: Debate minutes, we need to teach the minute takers to do minutes.

Annika will make a minute template.

Names in the minutes or not: No names in the minutes

**Point 4: Approval of UNIPOL action plan**

B/

They have added to the plan what they intend to do and how they are going to do it. They have explained “akkreditering” and “ombudsperson” and clarified what UNIPOL is. They have rearranged the structure. They put in the calendar and their budget.

Comments: there should be a part in the plan about including RUC students, so the format matched the other plans. The board member will still approve the plan, but it should be added.

A committee member think that this is already in the plan more implicit, but says that they can do it.

A board member think it's fine and it could be approved if they make a correction about STUNE, because STUNE has changed name to Student Representatives Network (abbreviated stud.rep. RUC)

Proposal: Add a point saying inclusion of RUC students so it matches the other action plans

Decision: The proposal falls

The action plan is approved by voting

### **Point 5: The Study Environment prize**

B/

We need to approve the text about the communication strategy.

Debate:

It is hard to point out if an initiative lowered the dropout number.

Clarification: That part is for internal use, and won't be send out.

The points should not be used as a checklist because it's not clear enough.

It should be communicated to the students what the "terms" of winning the prize is.

It seems like the prize is for already established groups, but is it also for new initiatives? This question need to be clarified by Peter.

The library says that the money need to be used for social og academic purposes.

The bullet should still be there, but not as questions, more as a listing of things to consider when judging the contestants. So more as suggestions to what people should take into consideration when applying.

We should keep in mind that there is already a "studuemiljøpulje" for people with good ideas and it is very big. A board member agrees with this.

The text should be coherent, it says both prize and award.

There should be examples in the text about what kind of projects you could do.

The text gets approved, but it needs to be altered to not be a checklist. We need to clarify if it's and or or. And make sure it says prize.

"Do you have a good study environment" will be replaced with "Are you contributing to a good study environment?"

## **Point 6: Debate on employee positions**

B/

This is a discussion point about what we will do with our money and if we need to hire more employees and what their role should be.

We debated in groups and then in plenum.

The volunteer positions were a good idea as long as it is well taken care of. That position would be motivating for that person. If it makes sense to have an extra

employee we could also raise Heidi's weekly hours.

The paid work should be work that volunteers won't do, bureaucratic work, organisational work and time consuming work, graphic stuff, operation tasks (driftsopgaver). We have enough work for another position.

We could hire someone for example for half year and see if it makes sense to have two employees, also then if we don't have money for two employees next year we can just not renew the position. But in that case we could try and get funding from somewhere else.

If we decide to hire volunteers it need to be handled better than last time to take care of the student councils reputation.

We should not hire someone for more than 15 hours because that is too much for a student. The workload will follow the number of hands.

A hired employee could take some of the workload from the chairmanship and EC. Instead of hiring employees and volunteers we could include students into our committees. Instead of hiring new people, we need to rethink how we think about our volunteers.

If we hire an employee we need to be clear on whether they are on "HK" or "SUL" agreement because otherwise we could get in trouble.

A paid employee should not do political work.

If we have a paid or volunteer employe that should do grammar and spelling checks and all that stuff. Not communication because they are not able to do it as well as a member of the board.

We should not talk about the work as "boring" because then no one will do it, and maybe someone don't find it boring.

A hired volunteer is making the other volunteer activities less meaningful. It can work though if it is for very specific tasks.



Maybe we need to have a talk about how the rest of the board members can support EC instead of hiring someone.

A hired volunteer would attract the volunteers who don't want to go to board meeting and stuff.

We could activate out volunteers by making people know that we hand out "frivillig beviser" when you have been a volunteer for us.

We also need to make sure to have volunteers all through the semester, so that maybe we won't need to hire someone.

Sum up and further process:

We need to make a list of tasks before we hire someone, if we hire someone. Maybe someone in the board know someone or want to do these tasks themself. If we hire someone it should be for a limited time.

From here on, EC will make a list on what they do on a weekly basis, and if possible last year EC should be included in this. We will have a follow up on how we handle our volunteers.

### **Point 7: Upcoming work tasks**

B/

- The cantina has asked us to have a member on their committee. It's three meetings a year. Sofie will do it.
- We have been contacted by DSA. They need help to back some goodie bags during summer and ask us to help.
- We should do a presentation of the committees and who is in it on social media, and it would be nice if someone would help Pia doing it. Maybe there

should be a strategy or something. The PR committee will do it and talk to Pia after the meeting monday.

- RBC is doing the summer party. The PR committee should cover that.

### **Point 8: Presentation of the RUS-chairmanship and their work**

B/

The chairmanship wants to do it the same way as last year, the same recipe. This year there is a bigger focus on #MeToo and the alcohol politics.

They are trying to make it a conversation worth having and not making it into a joke.

The chairmanship asks the board to tell them if there is anything they like to help with or if they have any inputs.

### **Point 9: Any other business**

B/

- Mathilde is moving to Greenland in August and therefore she would like for someone else to take over for her when she leaves. If anyone is interested they should talk to Mathilde or someone else in the EC.
- If anyone is interested in being in the chairmanship of SR next year, come talk to Johan or the other chairmanship. The same goes for Academic council and so on.
- People should stop doing physical expressions of their opinions when it's on a controversial subject (request).
- The academic event committee need help, from board members or people we know.
- We are getting six new tables in the office. If someone has other ideas for the office come talk to Mathilde.

- Tomorrow there is an event about the election, come with you friends. Also if you have some ideas for what the student council should do next year, come to this event.