

Extraordinary Board Meeting 11-03-2020

Present:

Thorkil, Marc, Lauge, Lukas, Lise, Julie L, Anne Mette, Rasmus, Micky, Sif, Maria, Calvin, Mathilde, Cecillie (Victoria joined later)

Agenda:

Formalities

- Minutes: Cecillie
- Conductor: Mathilde & Calvin

Orientation about proces and content

Mandate for content and mandate for future possible escalation

Minutes:

Orientation about proces:

Mathilde and others orient about the proces about the master's reform and how we have (and have not) been involved thus far.

Mathilde oriented that we got our demands (so far) met. The demands were that the University Board should only decide on april 1st that there should be an reform, nothing else. We got this demand met. They are also going to decide the budget frame for the reform, which we think is fine. Our other demand was that we want a new proces plan where students will be more involved and actually listened to. We are still waiting to see a new plan in where this is clear.

There is some unclarity about who is in the working group for making a new proces plan. Micky voices that is propably a working group in UL.

Mathilde orients about the campaign RUC wants to do with us and the subject councils. The idea is to get input from more students, but RUC is quite ambitious about how many students will be envolved in this.

Orientation about content of the Masters reform:

UNIPOI has discussed what they don't like about the current suggestions, and are getting closer to what they actually do like and want to be in a reform.

UNIPOL has consulted with the EC.

Micky voices that he thinks the board should keep it quite broad in terms so that there is a bit of wiggleroom for UNIPOL.

Discussion of content of master reform:

Micky voices what he has interpreted is important right now for UNIPOL + EC contentwise:

- Flexibility
- “valgfrihed”
- Connection between bachelor and masters -> also protection of the smaller subjects
- A design principle says that each education should be economically sustainable. We don't think that. There are more values in education than economic profit.
- PPL
- Find “professionalising” of education problematic. It neglects subjects that do fundamental research.
- Ensure a better admission system.

Other points:

- Interdisciplinarity
- “bredde” versus depth in the master education.
- We should try to push for an experimental thesis on other institutes than INM. A point was made that we might not be able to because of the “Universitetsbekendtgørelser”.
- Like to use the 3rd semester to retain some form of the combi structure. We should exploit that UL made somewhat of an opening to take stuff from the alternative model proposal.
- UNIPOI had a discussion about flexibility in a lot of different ways some weeks ago. In the current proposal from UL they want a clear progression from each semester to another. Clearly, progression can be nice, and to do that we need to “lock” our education a bit. We need to have some clear opinions about that in regards to do restructuring your education, go abroad etc. That can mess up progression. We should be clear about that we want flexibility that is also meaningful for your academia, you should be able to have some sort of progression (that is better than now). It is voiced that some think flexibility is as important as progression, which the current proposal from UL does not reflect.
- The sam council is quite sceptical about the content. They think it is a democratic problem that the “dogmer” is still in the reform. Also they think it will, in the future, tripple down to the bachelors --> they have to fit the masters.
- Marc thinks that an eight of the semester (5 ECTS) should be “undefined”, as to secure the flexibility
- Calvin --> has noticed that they changed the word “dogmer” but not what the content of the word. Thinks we “need to put a lid on the activism but keep the water boiling” - now is the time for diplomacy not activism -> we need to be ready though. Regarding Marcs suggestion: Would be a good idea to make it possible to go on exchange to other subjects or at least give some flexibility
- There is a general support for Marcs suggestion. One of the things we should criticise about the reform: The reform so far is to improve RUCs “erhvervsretning” not the academia.
- How do we define interdisciplinary needs to be discussed.
 - One point the VIPS made today is about the research environments. It should definitely not be like that all research environments should be interdisciplinary in a closed way, where researchers are not allowed to decide for themselves.

-Interdisciplinarity should be supported. Whether it be in projects or in courses etc.

-Research-based interdisciplinarity in the way that it is supported. An (expensive) example of this is that you get two supervisors on a project.

-We should be very sharp on what we think tværfaglighed is. Like Forvaltning could be tværfaglighed. And that kind of tværfaglighed can be better than “to-faglighed”.

- Vigtigt at tværfaglighed skal være tæt på den forskning der foregår på RUC

- We need to be closer to the researcher rather than the corporate world.

General discussion:

- We should be prepared, if a new including process plan is not presented. We should be ready to do stuff quite quickly.

Suggestions for escalation + discussion thereof:

Category A:

Writing opinion pieces (potentially with professors)

Posters (with or without SR-logo)

A+ Brining campaign to national foras (DSF+medias)

(+) SOME campaign

Category B:

Banners

Demonstrations

Interactive demos

Election strategy (flyers, coffee, lectures)

Protests

Put up Martin Luther-like thesis

Personal letter from stud.+ vip

B+ Symbolic manifestations (like funeral for inclusions, inviting UL to supervisors mtgs. Etc.)

Category C:

Occupy offices

Humanizing the issue (Marc's thing with pictures of people)

National campaign on topstyring

Category D:

In meeting activism

#Æhbæhbuhstudentermagtnu

- The board discussed how to involve the board quickly if we need to escalate at some point.
- The escalating categories will be moved into subcategories, and if we need to move from one category to another the board will be asked.
- Micky voices that EC should have more flexibility than that and should be able to escalate if need be. Also no “threats” yet. Also we should not be scary to our co-students, but many of the things in our escalation plan are not that scary unless we end up in the C, D category.
- Proposal: A and B stands as is, and C will be divided in two categories.