Minutes

Of ordinary board meeting in the Student Council at RUC

Date	18.11.2024
Location	Student House – Yellow Room
Meeting participants	*BM - Board member / AR - Academic Council member (no voting rights) / AL - Alternate (voting rights if a BM is missing) / OS - Observer (no voting rights)* Mads (BM), Amir (BM), Aleks (BM), Gustav (BM), Celina (BM), Rosa (BM), Lucas (OS), Magnus (BM), Samuel (OS), Marie (BM), Lærke (BM)
#1: Formalities	Conductor: Mads Minute taker: Lucas Minutes from the last meeting: APPROVED Agenda: APPROVED
#2: Orientations	Amir: The new masters reform (cutdowns of amount of masters), has become public, in terms of what the new, and lost, master educations are, as well as which ones will be changed from 120 ECTS to 75 ECTS. All faculties are changed due to this. In the HUM faculty (IKH), Danish, Philosophy and History (the magistrates) are put together into one. The entire process has begun. If the material isn't available, contact Amir. It will not effect us, but will effect the future. Mads: We've been invited to give a consultation response, about how the students feel about this^, we have a month to do it. We're fortunate that we have an Academic Council who supports the students. They still want to ensure that our bachelors aren't solely directed towards a single masters degree. Mads: The future of the student council chairperson is now active. We currently have a single application. Last year was the same, and we extended the period. We might do the same now. There's some issue about the thesis period (exams overlap with the time you should have for your thesis, 5 months). They want to fix this for the future, most likely by changing when exams are placed throughout the 3rd semester of a masters. Aleks: Roskilde Festival Coordinator is up, we currently have one applicant, but would always like more if people are interested. Spread the word. Rosa: Thrifting day is in 11 days, it's during the election. Mads: We've been to Political Conference, and approved "optaget adgang"* and digitization papers. There's also been some changes in the DFU EC, and need more members. Let Lauge know if interested, it's dire. It's also been BW this weekend. It's gone well. The leftovers from storage is in the office.

	Amir: General Assembly is the 7th of December. Remember to invite friends if they want to be on our board.
#3:Future Renumeration	We've talked a lot about how we do renumeration and honorariums. Magnus has sent us three different amendment-suggestions; • **Amendment 1:** Assuming an amendment to the University Board members honorarium from 4000 a month to 2000 a month was agreed upon, the money is to be used to increase the chairmanship's remuneration by 1333 kr. to 6333 kr. This would correspond to a compensation of 12.5 hours instead of the original 10 hours or an increase in the hourly remuneration from 125 kr. to 158 kr. • **Amendment 2:** The chairmanship's compensation is increased to 12.5 hours instead of the original 10 hours. This increases the remuneration by 1333 kr. to 6333 kr. per month, similar to the first amendment. Meanwhile, the Unipol-coordinator and the remaining members of the Executive Committee are reduced to being bought-out for 8 hours per week, corresponding to 4000 kr. per month at the same hourly rate. • **Amendment 3:** The chairmanship's compensation is increased to 11.3 hours instead of the original 10 hours. This raises the remuneration by 666 kr. to 5666 kr. per month. Meanwhile, the Unipol-coordinator and the remaining members of the Executive Committee are reduced to being bought-out for 9 hours per week, corresponding to 4500 kr. per month at the same hourly rate. The EC has suggested a fourth amendment: • **Amendment 4:** The EC and Chairpersonship continues to be renumerated 5000dkk/month for an expected minimum work amount of 10 hours/week with the idea that work that supersedes 10 hours/week is seen as general volunteer work. As an add on to this amendment the EC agrees on recommending that the EC and Chairpersonship of the next year experiments with time logging internally, to help each member getting a better overview of their own work, and self-expectations. This is especially due to the fact, that the work hours don't represent the ACTUAL work and hours put in. This points to the fact, that these positions aren't seen as jobs, but volunteer positions, and the renumeration/honorarium is simply to ensure, that there's not a need for another job, meaning they can put in the hours necessary. --- 5 minute break to ensure everybody could orientate themselves in the appendix --- The baseline for the discussion will be amendment 4, as suggested by the EC. One BM points out that last meeting had a general consensus that the chairpersonship should be compensated more, which isn't represented in amendment 4. Another points out that the raise in honorarium both represents but also brings the extra responsibility and expectation of them to do more. Because of this, there was a point to not raise the honorarium, and to keep the compensation across EC and chairpersonship equal. The first BM points out that the chairperson, in pretty much every other organization, has some sort of difference between them and other workers. This is also to differentiate between the responsibility and expectation, and that that is fair and should be the case, since they're also the face and 'leader' of the organization. A third points out that we're currently in a budget deficit, which is a good reason not to raise salaries right now. They see the value in making a difference between EC and chairpersonship, since it is a bigger responsibility. The practicalities of pragmatics of it is different however; We're students, not a business, and if the position could be done without any pay (and still have a personal financial situation be fine), they would be more than willing. A fourth argues that, the chairpersonship simply works more than the other EC members. They argue that we could discuss if that is how it should be, but that chairpersonship still requires a different role, more hours, etc., than an ordinary EC member. They believe that the chairperson should be compensated more due to this.

	A fifth argues that as a baseline, this should be seen as volunteer work, and that the problem isn't as much with economy, but with responsibilities and workload. Maybe a point could be to, instead of talking about the financial aspect, we should talk about the organization role and structure, to instead ensure more equal and realistic workloads between the different members of the organization. A clearer role, workload and responsibility differentiation could be more helpful. They also point out, that it might be very different from every chairperson to every other chairperson, how they want to be compensated and what they deem fair. The third BM points out that they very much agree, to both points, and that such discussion are very important. There's a difference in how much you do depending on your experience too, since you simply know more of what happens. Some aspects are also lost throughout the amendments, such as the fact that we previously raised the honorarium of EC so it matches up with the costs of living, and that lowering it could result in them needing to have another job on the side. The second BM points out that we're not paid for experience. It's simply to ensure we can provide for ourselves, without needing another job. Thus, it's not a salary, and shouldn't be seen as such. *Discussion of how to come to a decision – important to point out that this is a symbolic decision/suggestion for the future board.* With several ways pointed out to come to a decision, the process will be; change amendment 4, and incorporate the time-logging in all the amendments. Afterwards, we'll vote for amendment 2, and wether or not that should be eliminated. It has been eliminated. Amendment 4 has been suggested to be eliminated, due to the fact that time-logging would be incorporated in the other amendments. Afterwards, we'll vote on, if we need to change to one of these, which would be preferred. Then we vote wether or not we change, or keep the status quo. Amendment 5 (using half of the money from UB being cut) has been added;* An amendment to this ^has been made, that instead of it being half of the UB-compensation. Instead we should raise the honorariums with a flat amount, to change it from hours or resources being made, but more of a responsibility (putting their face on the organization). There's disagreement wether or not the honorarium should be compensated for hours, or be a symbolic buy-out of the volunteers time and efforts, ensuring they can do the work necessary. Compared to other student councils, even though we shouldn't compare, we spend a severely smaller amount, and also do very different work, where they are more political, we're more social. The discussion should from now on be more on the fact of what the responsibility of the chairperson is (such as being the face of the organization, and potential shitstorm). We keep discussing the specifics of why and what instead of actual amendments. From here; We have added Amendment 6* Amendment 7* Amendment 8* --- We will vote, by voting HOW we would vote on what change is preferred, and then wether or not a change should happen. From here, we vote on wether or not we agree with amendment 1-8. Amendment 1: 0 Amendment 2: 0 Amendment 3: 0 Amendment 4: 1

	Amendment 5: 1 Amendment 6: 4 Amendment 7: 0 Amendment 8: 2 This means amendment 4, 5, 6 and 8 continues to another round.* Amendment 4: 2 Amendment 5: 1 Amendment 6: 0 Amendment 8: 3 Amendment 4 and 8 remain. Amendment 4: 3 Amendment 8: 5 We now vote on amendment 8 vs status quo; Before this, a quick round for discussion and orientation of amendment 8 and that against the status quo. Voting on amendment 8 vs status quo: For or against the change 3 for, 2 against, 3 blancs. The amendment has been eliminated. Even though the amendment has not gone through, the discussion has been fruitful and positive and necessary for the organization, which is important to point out.
#4:AOB	Question; Can amendments to the article of association be made at these meeting? We cannot, but they can be suggested for future meetings. NERF GUN RANGE IN THE OFFICE IN 20 MINUTES
Next meeting	*Next meeting will be held on* 11th of December *at* 16.15 *in* the student house