Board meeting - Spring Seminar (Part 1) 07.04.2020

- Formalities
  - Conductor: Mathilde
  - Minutes: Calvin
  - Not present: Lucas, Simon (alt.), Malte (AR)
- Orientations
  - **Chairpersonship**: We have been in contact with the administration frequently regarding the current corona situation. Mathilde has been invited into the university's emergency preparedness group. We have also hired a new student employee, Signe, who we are very happy to have onboard. We have also hired BW coordinators who are just beginning their work.
  - **Unipol:**
    - Process:
      - Since the UDDU meeting the 11th of March, the process about the masters reform have looked slightly different. UL changed its nomination to UB, so that they would only have to decide to start a reform.
      - Since then this side on intra has been made:
      - https://intra.ruc.dk/dk/for-ansatte/kvalitetsportal/kandidatuddannelsesreform-2020/
      - It doesn't say much but is worth having an eye on.
      - Because of the corona virus, the UB meeting where they were to decide upon starting the reform, has been postponed to May. They did this, to ensure that the reform had been discussed in all organs at RUC before UB deciding anything. The academic council decided that an important discussion as this couldn't be taken while we were not able to meet in person. It is simply to important to be taken as a written decision.
      - There aren't yet a finished process plan for the reform with dates and so on. But a less precise plan, is that the reform is supposed to move into the "idea-fase" after the UB meeting. UL were supposed to put down a more precise process plan, but because of the corona situation, that has not yet been send out.
    - Content:
      - UL are still working based on their own proposal. On the other hand, they said at the UDDU meeting in March that the whole proposal was still open for discussion. For example, it was said that "samlede uddannelsesudbud" was open to interpretation.
      - The biggest problem we see, in UL's proposal, is a great deal of instrumentalization. There is too much business (erhvervs) direction, and too little academic and didactic considerations.
    - Unipol's work:
      - Initially, the student side refused to relate to the content. We did so due to lack of involvement. We could not, as a democratic organization at a democratic university, relate to an undemocratic-based proposal.

- However, since the UDDU meeting in March this has changed, and since then we have been working on what the students should think and how it should be expressed.
- We found that the best way to express student desires was to create a new set of design principles and dogmas that could represent our desires.
- For the past month, therefore, we have been working on it jointly in UNIPOL.
- The work is now going towards the end and is being quality assured by discussions based on feedback from relevant VIPs.
- The content of our proposal is especially trying to make the instrumentalization of UL's proposals dimmed. In addition, our proposals are trying to remove the great focus on labor market relevance, and we try to save smaller subjects, by insisting that education as a whole must be sustainable. The idea behind is that the largest and most economical educations can carry smaller educations to some extent.
- In addition, our proposals enroll the global labor market, focus on the academic aspect and emphasize a meaningful process in the education, which is, however, still flexible for the individual student.
  - **EC:** Cecillie went to PK online. It was a short meeting regarding the process moving forward, as the official spring PK was cancelled. The process that was decided was that the fall PK will continue as planned, and the following PK in the spring will treat two policy papers (instead of one) in order to make up for the gap. Additionally, we have been having weekly meetings with DSF and the member organizations (MO's) where we discuss how things are going across the nation. It seems that RUC is doing quite well in handling the crisis as compared to other uni's.
- Student Handbook – See appendix for BM
  - We propose replacing the physical handbook with a digital app. The appendix contains an outline of the reasoning for this idea, as well as pros/cons/proposals.
  - Two main app proposals:
    - Cheap (~25,000kr)
      - Basically just a pdf in app form. Like a digital newspaper
    - Expensive (~72,000kr)
      - 'Deluxe' version. More functionality – to include English/Danish versions, a search function, a calendar with events which can link to Facebook pages and events, and more.
  - Discussion – can we support spending so much money?
    - Who's making it? - an app development firm will do the work
    - Can the template made be reused? - yes
    - Can ads be included? - Yes. In fact, ads can be included with links to websites and such, so this adds value.
    - It would be cool if we could have maze map somehow added to the app – either embedded or through a link

- Do we have previous data from other Uni's, do apps work? - CBS has an app, and they've been able to get more money from sponsors due to the nature of being able to track how many users are following links and such. Evidently people do use the app fairly frequently at CBS
- If information in the app is only available in the app, we may be excluding those who do not have the hardware necessary to use that app. We should have a plan for people who cannot access the app natively. It should probably be accompanied at least with info on the SR website or something similar.
- The cheap option may be able to be made by a student or volunteer, as it is simple – possible money saving opportunity should we decide to go with the cheap option
- How easy could the app be updated – they (the firm) claim it should be fairly easy to do, however if wanted the firm provides a service where they update the app for you for a low cost. Here, update refers to changing content from year to year, not fundamental changes to the app.
- We should double check with our sponsors that having an app is okay and within our agreements with them. If we see that the app isn't getting many views, this could work against us regarding our sponsors.
- The decision being made here is to give us the mandate to move forward with this project, and look into spending that much money, and possibly end up doing it. The output of this discussion is not necessarily meant to be a definitive decision on creating an expensive app.
- Micky would like to help with what information to include
- We can hopefully get additional funds from the university to help, considering that things need to be more virtual.
  - Suggestion: We decide to give a mandate to continue with this project on the basis that there will be an alternative to the app, and that decisions regarding funds are contingent on our fundraising capabilities and will be postponed to the discussion on the budget.
    - The suggestion was approved
- Student Employee - See appendix
  - We have suggested hiring a second employee to compliment our current employee's skillset, both at 7.5 hrs / week.
  - Main con is the cost of hiring another, and the cost considering time and resources to support another employee. Main pro, is we have a greater capability to support the organization.
  - Discussion – We would like the mandate to hire a second employee
    - Hiring and getting a new employee working is a process that takes a considerable amount of time. It would be best if two employees could be effectively working for us by election.
    - A second employee would be especially helpful during election and would be extremely beneficial for handover of the position and in cooperation with next year's chairpersonship, considering that Signe will be leaving us at around that same time. A second person will provide continuity.

- o   Mandate: We hire a second employee in the fall, once we can again be working in the office. The new position will start in around October
- Budget
  - o   Income from RF has been taking out of the budget (as it is cancelled). Income from unions has not been removed, as those agreements are still standing (currently).
  - o   Maria goes through the current budget (not what has been sent out to the board in the appendices, what we are looking at will be saved after this point is completed and added to the minutes)
  - o   Because of the situation we are currently in, there is a lot of uncertainty regarding what money will be spent for things like tutoring. As such, things that we are not sure of how they will proceed have not been changed in the budget
  - o   The budget has been adjusted from the changes of RF being canceled and the loss of income that results from that. Note: We found out about these changes less than 24 hours ago, and in that time, Maria has readjusted the budget to compensate as best as possible. This is commendable.
  - o   After changes, we have a surplus of 6,000kr – this is not a lot, however it is very promising given the circumstances
  - o   Discussion
    - ▪   The draft we have been presented is a very good first draft. It includes buffers and reasonable amounts. It is well organized and *robust*.
    - ▪   Most people are on board with it currently. Some small, specific changes have been made through this discussion. These discussions have not been documented directly, as the final budget approved will reflect changes made.
    - ▪   Do approve the budget as is now, or do we add more money to the student handbook budget?
      - •   Approve now is the consensus. We will give a mandate to EC to search for funds to pay for the rest of the handbook (budget currently set at 30k, we need 72k for the handbook app)
  - o   The (altered) budget has been approved.
- AOB
  - o   The EC would like to introduce the board members via Facebook. A post will include name, picture, committee memberships, and some fun questions – maybe email address as well if people are comfortable with that.