

Student Parliament 1 2016



Report

Chairmen: Alf Halvar Næsje and Lasse Hjelle
Secretary: Maria Sibbern

Tuesday February 16th 2016
5:15 – 9:00 PM

The Canteen at Sørhellinga
Campus Ås

The case documents are also available at:
<http://www.nmbu.no/student/studenttinget>

AGENDA

STUDENT PARLIAMENT MEETING no. 1 - 2016, TUESDAY FEBRUARY 16TH AT 5:15PM, THE CANTEEN AT SØRHELLINGA.
COMPLETE CASE DOCUMENTS ARE ONLY SENT TO PERMANENT STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES.
THE DOCUMENTS ARE ALSO PUBLISHED ON CLASSFRONTER AND THE STUDENT BOARD WEBSITE:

<http://www.nmbu.no/student/studenttinget>

Registration begins at 5:00 PM!

1611	CONSTITUTION	4
1611.1	APPROVING TODAY'S AGENDA AND SUMMONING	4
1611.2	APPROVING THE PREVIOUS MEETING REPORT	4
1611.3	APPOINTING A COUNTING COMMITTEE.....	4
1612	REPORT CASES.....	5
1613	CASES TO DISCUSS.....	5
1613.1	ELECTED OR HIRED RECTOR.....	5
1614	ADMINISTRATION CASES	7
1614.1	ELECTING DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE NORWEGIAN STUDENT ORGANISATION (NSO).....	7
1614.2	COMMITTEE FOR THE BEST LECTURER OF THE SEMESTER	8
1615	STATUTE CASES	9
1615.1	RULES OF PROCEDURE AND AGENDA	9
1615.2	AMENDMENTS FOR "STATUTES FOR THE STUDENT DEMOCRACY AT NMBU"	10
1615.3	INSTRUCTIONS FOR ELECTRONIC STATUTES	11
1615.4	REVISE THE RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE ALLOCATION OF INCLUSION FUNDS	12
1615.5	ACTION PLAN FOR THE STUDENT PARLIAMENT 2016.....	13
1616	INFORMATIVE CASES	14
1616.1	ORIENTATION ABOUT THE COLBJØRNSSEN RAPPORT AND THE REORGANISATION OF NMBU	14
1617	MISCELLANEOUS	15
1617.1	EVALUATION OF THE MEETING	15

APPENDICES:

1. Rules of procedure and Agenda
2. Amendments "Statutes for the Student Democracy at NMBU"
3. Instructions for electronic statutes
4. Rules and regulations for Inclusion Funds 2016
5. University Board (US) decision regarding the Colbjørnsen rapport.

Short orientation from SiÅs about the canteen at Samfunnet:

Before the meeting SiÅs director Einride Berg wanted to inform the student Parliament about the termination of the canteen at Samfunnet.

The offer has been terminated due to financial reasons. After a review of the accounting for 2015, SiÅs found that one of their biggest losses were the canteen at Samfunnet.

The operation of Samfunnet is being processed now, in cooperation with the administration at Samfunnet. This will probably result in staff cuts

There will still be production of food for meetings and events at the kitchen.

The reconstruction will not be stopped due to the closing of the canteen.

1611 Constitution

1611.1 Approving todays agenda and summoning

A case is submitted about housing at Pentagon allowing dogs.

One case is submitted for the agenda.

The case is about that one representative of the election committee wish to run for an election. The Chairmen do not wish to handle the case since it goes against the rules of procedure and the statutes.

All cases have to be reported to the Student Board minimum 14 days before the meeting. The case should be presented to all students at NMBU no later than 7 days before the student parliament meeting. This is in accordance with the statutes.

The representatives vote over if case 1615.3 should be processed at the meeting. The proposal is dropped, and the agenda remain as presented in the summoning.

The Chairmen propose to move the statute cases and orientation cases before the discussion cases. The Student Parliament accepts this.

1611.2 Approving the previous meeting report

Reports are uploaded to our homepage (<http://www.nmbu.no/student/studenttinget>) as well as the Student Democracy room on ClassFronter a week after each Student Parliament Meeting. If you need a paper copy of the report please get in touch with the Student Board at their office (next to the student post-boxes)

The report from the previous meeting is accepted without any objections from the student parliament.

1611.3 Appointing a Counting Committee

1. Kathrine Østraat

2. Andries v d Wijk

3. Stine Marie Nielsen

1612 Report cases

Reports are to be submitted directly into the Student Democracy room in ClassFronter by 12:00 PM, Wednesday before the Student Parliament meeting.

This is done to ensure up-to-date reports, and to minimize paper consumption. A copy of the reports will be printed and kept at the Student Board office, along with the case documents of the current Student Parliament.

Those who are obligated to submit reports to the Student Parliament are:

- The Student Board (AU)
- The University Board (US)
- The Committee of Study Issues
- The Committee of Student Welfare in Ås (SiÅs)
- The Student and Academic's International Help Fund (SAIH)
- The International Student Union (ISU)
- The Committee of Research Issues
- The Learning Environment Committee (LMU)

The chairman of SiÅs, Per Fredrik Rønneberg Nordhov, inform that the membership fee for GG-hall has not been determined yet.

1613 Cases to discuss

1613.1 Elected or hired rector.

Case preparation: Pål Adrian Clausen Ryen

Purpose:

Discuss which alternative the students want regarding a new rector. This is to give input to the administration and the University Board (US) before the US meeting in March.

Background:

As a result of the Colbjørnsen committee's evaluation and following report about NMBU management model and organisation, the University Board (US) has to decide if NMBU should have an elected or hired rector for the next period (Summer 2017).

The Norwegian Parliament will soon make some changes in the university and university college law (UH-law). The most important change is that the main model for the rector will be changed from being elected to hired. This is a change suggested by the Ministry of Education (KD). KD, which is the owner and "boss" of the university prefer that the rector is hired, therefore it might be unwise to go against this preference when we know a change in the law will happen soon.

Rector is the board's leader. On behalf of the Board the rector has had the overall responsibility for and to lead the institution. An elected rector is responsible for the academic of the institution. When the rector is elected, an external Administrative Director is hired to be the highest leader for everything administrative at the university.

A hired rector will be the daily manager for the academic and administrative at the university. When the rector is hired, KD will appoint an external chairman for the Board.

NLH, NVH and UMB have always had an elected rector, in 2013 the Felles-Board (the Board before the merge) decided that after the current rector period we would go back to electing the rector.

The model we have today is something in between where the rector is first elected and then hired by the Board, which practically means that the rector is hired.

For more information see the law for Universities and university colleges' chapter 10.

Institute round

IHA:

Point out the wording in the case papers as leading. Prefer elected rector.

IKMB:

Prefer elected rector to promote the students interests.

VET:

Prefer elected rector since other qualifications are being valued than a hired rector.

ILP:

Also believe the text was leading. Would like an elected rector and believe this protect what is best for NMBU, both as an institution and in regards of the students.

IMV:

Point out that NMBU is a niche university with small classes. They believe that NMBU stand out from other universities in this regard. IMV wants an elected rector, but at the same time they see that a hired rector can bring new knowledge to NMBU. The majority at the institute believe that an elected rector will maintain the students interests best.

IPV:

Is an institute with few students, wish for someone that will protect small directions of study and prefer elected rector.

INA:

Would like an elected rector since it will probably strengthen the democracy and increase the results around the electronic ballot.

IMT:

Thinks it's difficult to see clear benefits and disadvantages. Find it positive with an external chairman, but decided on elected rector.

Noragric:

Difficult to understand the total picture with electing. Doesn't wish to give a conclusion. Would like more information in order to make a decision.

Elements from the discussion:

- With an elected rector the students can receive knowledge about the candidates before the election on the basis of the process of an election.
- An example from HiOA is pulled forward where they changed from elected to hired rector. With an elected rector one can get untraditional candidates that can bring something new to the "table".
- An elected rector receives support because it gives the students an unique possibility to

participate and affect the elections of a new rector. Tradition and the “fear” that KD will send someone unknown is also mentioned as elements.

- We have no guarantee that an elected rector will maintain the small unites at NMBU, and a hired rector can see NMBU with new and fresh eyes.
- Hired rector HAVE to have a PhD. This can result in that we not necessarily get a rector with “fresh eyes”.
- An elected rector is what gives the students an opportunity to affect and engage themselves in the elections.
- A hired rectors competence against an administrative directors competence. It is not necessarily accordance here.
- The Colbjørnsen report wish to remove the students from rectors leader group. An elected rector preserve the opposite. A hired rector will probably not preserve this.
- Will promises during elections be binding?

1614 Administration cases

1614.1 Electing delegates to the National Assembly of the Norwegian Student Organisation (NSO)

Case preparation: Pål Adrian Clausen Ryen

Purpose:

Elect 5 delegates and deputy delegates who will represent NMBU at the annual meeting for the Norwegian Student Organisation (NSO) 21st – 24th of April 2016.

Background:

Norwegian Student Organisation will have their National Assembly 21st – 24th of April 2016. At the meeting you have the opportunity to engage yourself in the national student movement, and participate in working for the interests of 230 000 students at a national level. The National Assembly is the highest organ of the Norwegian Student organisation (NSO). Here, the biggest and most important decisions will be made. The agenda consists of action plans, accounting, budgets, rapports, orientations, electing the new Student Board, Central Board, new committee member etc. The National Assembly is an annual event with representatives from all members of NSO. The National Assembly is a huge meeting with 350 delegates. In addition to attending the National Assembly, it is expected that the delegates attend 1 pre-meeting in Ås to prepare for the Assembly. The cost for travel and housing will be covered by the University.

Candidates:

- Sunniva Hustoft
- Mariya Khanamiryan

- Johanne Sveen Hempel
- Daniel Iniesta
- Ina C Storrønning

Elected by acclimation

Deputy candidates:

1. Pål A C Ryen
2. Lina Herstad
3. Ina Lindmark
4. Sunniva Brajkovic
5. Kathrine Østraat

Elected in stated order by written election

1614.2 Committee for the Best Lecturer of the Semester

Case preparation: Pål Adrian Clausen Ryen

Purpose:

Decide on candidates for the committee that will select the best lecturer of the semester.

Background:

As an important effort to increase quality of education at NMBU, the students elect the best lecturer of the semester. The award "Best Lecturer of the Semester" is highly regarded by professors, and the idea is to encourage lecturers to improve their teaching. All students at NMBU may nominate lecturers.

The Committee of the Best Lecturer of the Semester shall consist of four students, and the position is for one year, from February 16th. A gender-balanced committee is preferable. The committee has meetings when they find it necessary. They are responsible for promoting the award and encourage all students to nominate lecturers, attend the nominated lectures, and decide on a winner. The Vice-President of the Student Board will assist the Committee with their work.

Candidates:

- Lauren Guido
- Elisabeth Rønneberg
- Helen Hoem
- Christine Thormodsrud

The candidates presented themselves for the Student Parliament, and the candidates presents answered questions from the audience.

Elected by written election.

1615 Statute cases

1615.1 Rules of procedure and agenda

Case preparation: Anne Aase-Mæland (Leader of the committee)

Appendix:

Rules of procedure and agenda (Appendix 1)

Purpose:

The purpose of new rules of procedure is to make the Student Parliament (ST) more efficient, and to update it to how it is done today.

Background:

At ST-6 2015, it was decided that case 1565.3 “new rules of procedure for the Student Parliament at NMBU” will be postponed to Student Parliament meeting 1, 2016. The Student Board received the task to find a relevant committee to work on the rules as a whole.

The committee:

- Anne Aase-Mæland, leader of the committee
- Ingrid Larsen Wigestrånd
- Ingvild K.R. Strøm
- Mariya Khanamiryan

Proposing Resolution:

Ratify the new rules of procedure

Regarding the appendix: What is marked with yellow is the new changes. What is marked with red is removed. Some is marked with grey - this is a mistake and means nothing.

Elements from the discussion:

- It is pointed out that this suggestion is very equal to the existing one, like the number of cases. A more democratic procedure is wanted that gives the students more “power”.
- The committee has sent out the document to all the institutes without receiving any form of feedback. Therefore the suggestion is presented like this.
- It is pointed out that there is no accordance between the rules of procedure and what is done in practice. It is requested to look at the statutes and not just the rules of procedure.
- The fact that cases have to be submitted two weeks before the meetings secure the efficiency of the meeting.

- The main debate should be about changing the statutes.
- Regarding the report from the Colbjørnsen committee, the student Parliament have to go through the statutes. Therefore the committee have not looked into the statutes during this process.
- Its asked that the process should start because its not long before the new organisation will take place.
- It is asked what exactly is wrong with the rules of procedure presented?
- It's focused on that everything is wrong, but no constructive elements of change/improvement are being made.
- The chairmen struggle when cases har presented directly at the meeting and not before.
- From Noragric is is suggested that one have to answer in English is one receive a question in English.
- It is pointed out that Norwegian is the organisation language.
- The statutes was created in accordance with the merge of UMB and the veterinary school. This fact makes it time to review the statutes.
- The Student Parliament have to decide if they actually wish to process this, and make new statutes.
- The chairman should contribute to translate to English when necessary.
- A run-through of how the cases are being decided, who can vote and how this is done.
- As the statutes are presented today it makes it difficult to implement electronic decisions.

The chairmen points out that the debate lost focus a few times, and that the statute cases was debated over each other.

The presented rules of procedure was elected and approved by voting.

1615.2 Amendments for “statutes for the Student Democracy at NMBU”

Case preparation: Anne Aase-Mæland

Appendix:

Suggested amendments for “Statutes for the Student Democracy at NMBU” (Appendix 2)

Purpose:

The purpose is to pinpoint and to clarify certain paragraphs in the statutes.

Background:

The editorial committee decided to revise the statutes and see if any amendments were necessary after the revision of the new rules of procedure.

The committee did not find any paragraphs that had to be change because of the new rules of procedure, but they discovered several points that should be improved and/or added.

Proposing Resolution:

Approve the amendments

In accordance with existing statutes stating deadlines for changes of the statutes.

Form for absolute majority, an editorial change is wanted where this is clarified.

Suggestion 1:

Changes presented by the editorial committee regards paragraph 3-8
Unanimously approved

Suggestion 2:

Changes presented by the editorial committee regards paragraph 3-10
Unanimously approved

Suggestion 3:

Additional Changes presented by the editorial committee regards chapter 6
Unanimously approved

Suggestion 4:

Additional changes presented by the editorial committee regards chapter 10
Approved

The changes are presented as a whole in separate appendices.

1615.3 Instructions for electronic statutes

Case preparation: Anne Aase-Mæland

Appendix:

Instruction for electronic statutes (Appendix 3)

Purpose:

Make it easier to ratify statutes between the Student Parliament (ST) meetings.

Background:

Electronic statutes are used at other university colleges and Universities and we find it relevant to implement at NMBU as well. We hope that this will contribute in making the Student Parliament more effective in their work.

Proposing Resolution:

Approve the instruction of electronic statutes.

Suggested changes:

From IMT:

The background for the suggestion is that it is easier to cheat by electronic decisions than decisions made in person.

Voting: approved

From IMV:

Additional suggestion: If elected in, AU will decide where they place the suggestion in the instruction.

There is a an area for comments, to open for discussions.

Voting: Unanimously approved

From the leader of AU:

Change from dot to comma at line 488. Gives a minimum deadline to give the vote within 48 hours.

- Can this lead to conflict which should be determined with the student counsels?
- The student representatives are competent enough to make these sorts of decisions without the student council.
- In accordance with the statutes cases should have 7 days. AT ST2 one can change this deadline in the statutes to 48 hours?

Suggestion no.2 from the leader of AU:

At least 7 days to vote.

The two suggestion put up against each other. 48 hours versus 7 days deadline.

7 days deadline decided by clear majority.

The Student Parliament approve the suggestion as a whole for the instruction of electronic decisions by voting.

1615.4 Revise the rules and regulations for the allocation of Inclusion Funds

Case preparation: Jonas Wettre Thorsen

Appendix:

Suggestion to rules and regulations for the allocation of Inclusion Funds (Appendix 4)

Purpose:

To revise the rules and regulations on request from the previous international officer.

Background:

The previous international officer found some of the elements in the rules and regulations as confusing and easy to misinterpret by the applicants, therefore an update is necessary. The current international officer has cooperated with the previous officer to clarify the relevant points.

Proposing Resolution:

Student Parliament approve the suggested changes.

Voting: The suggestion unanimously approved

1615.5 **Action plan for the Student Parliament 2016**

Case preparation: Pål Adrian Clausen Ryen

Appendix:

Suggested action plan for 2016 (will be handed out at the meeting)

Purpose:

Ratify the Action Plan for the Student Parliament NMBU 2016. The action plan will give guidelines for the Student Board on what they will work on the coming year.

Background:

During the Student Parliament Spring Conference 6.-7. February the finished suggestion of the Action Plan 2016 was established.

Proposing solution:

The Student Parliament ratifies the suggested Action Plan for 2016.

Suggested changes from IKBM:

Regarding international student and integration of them

(input – do NOT wish for separate events for international students. Just have all information in both languages while others would like to have something especially for international students.

The challenge already begins during the Buddy week by separate events, many find their friends and groups already the first week.)

Voting: The suggestion fell in benefit of the suggestion from the student board by Mariya Khanamiryan.

Suggestion from the student board by Mariya khanamiryan:

Work to strengthen the relation between Norwegian and international students.

Voting: The student boards suggestion against IKBMs suggestion.

The students vote for Mariyas suggestion. It is voted in as a separate point in the action plan.

Suggested changes from Noragric:

- Regarding environment:

- Voting: Approved

- Regarding visibility

- Voting: approved.

- Regarding education

○ Voting: approved

- Regarding organizational development

○ Voting: Approved

- Regarding involvement, increased visibility Buddy week
 - Voting: Approved

The action plan for 2016 was approved.

1616 Informative cases

1616.1 Orientation about the Colbjørnsen rapport and the reorganisation of NMBU

Case preparation: Jørgen Nordvik Skeide

Appendix:

- "The university Boards decision for US case 13/2016" (Appendix 5)
- Link to steaming of the general meeting:
<http://mediasite.nmbu.no/Mediasite/Play/66557042380946348c875cff87041aa21d>
- Link to the complete report:
https://athene.nmbu.no/emner/pub/AOS234/Dokumenter/Colbjornsen_2016_NMBU%20Presentasjon%20rapport.pdf

Purpose:

Inform the Student Parliament about what the Colbjørnsen committee have decided, immediate consequences and the road ahead.

Background:

The University Board (US) started a process in Autumn 2015 based on a lot of turmoil and problems with the existing organisational structure. A committee consisting of former rectors at NTNU, SLU and BI received the task to evaluate NMBU's structure. The evaluation was finished just after new years and presented for US 25.01.2016.

In the presentation of the report many problem areas were pointed out. US does not give rector the space of action needed, the structure of responsibility is overly complicated, The faculties do not have any real power, and most important of all, the merge has not created the synergies which created the basis of the decision from the Parliament.

The Colbjørnsen committee presented clear recommendations. NMBU is overly administrative and heavily structured. They recommend among other things to reduce the number of management levels from 3 to 2, have 5-6 academic organisations, give more money and responsibility to the rector and simplify/clarify the administrative sector.

US was very happy with the report and decided to give rector full authorisation to immediately begin the process of planning the possibilities of a new way to organise. Based on the recommendations US gave the following mandate: "

- Through delegation the board will strengthen the role of the rector, responsibility and full authorisation for cases regarding the academic and administrative.
- Reduce the number of management levels from 3 to 2.
- Simplify and make a more efficient administrative sector to support the academic in the

best way possible.

- The number of academic organisations on level 2 will be maximum 6.

Within this frame the University Board ask rector to develop a suggestion to the process, time frame, budget, organisation of the process within middle of February to be presented to the University Board for approval.”

This means there will be a huge re-organisation of NMBU as we know it today. The shape of the new levels and organisations will be presented for hearing at Student Parliament 2.

The Student Parliament finds themselves informed about the case.

It is referred to the web page where one can follow the process. See NMBUs internal pages. Follow this link:

<https://www.nmbu.no/user?destination=/ansatt/omorganiseringen>

1617 Miscellaneous

1617.1 Dog houses at Pentagon

- Dog houses at SiÅs housing
- It is wanted more houses allowing dogs. And it is wanted more information and revision of the rules around this. There will be a case on this later.
- General input on animal housing.
- Optionally several can go together to write the case
- Joined ventilation system
- Important with being open and good information about which houses that allow dogs.
- One dog per house group today.
- Can the student board take this to the living environment committee?
- There are not a lot of student houses and many wouldn't like to live with a dog.
- Many considerations to take care of. A clearer set of rules is wanted.
- The housing rules from 2005 gives a clear answer to this.

1617.1 Evaluation of the meeting

- Changing of the date for the Student Parliament meeting should not happen over facebook, but it a more proper way in accordance to the statutes.
- A bigger room is wanted
- The discussions have been all over, one have to stick to the subject!

- Good with warm food!
- The chairmen can be stricter and maintain the schedule more strict.
- Everyone have to talk loader!

Appendix 1

Rules of procedure and agenda for the Student Parliament (ST) at NMBU

Rules of procedure

1) In general

- 1.1 Everyone present with the right to vote have to be registered at the beginning of the meeting.
- 1.2 If someone leaves before the meeting is adjourned, name and during which case number the person left must be registered.
- 1.3 The chair of the meeting consists of 2 chairmen

1.4 The Student Parliament secretary is responsible for the minutes. It should contain:

- Who was chair of the meeting;
- Representatives with compulsory attendance present
- Outline of the debate
- Entries in the minutes
- Result when voting over alternative solutions.
- Results from elections

1.5 The meeting papers have to be translated into English.

1.6 The case documents and the minutes will be sent to the Student Parliament

representatives, the University Board student representatives, Study committee and the research committee, Tuntreet, Samfunnet Board, International Students Union (ISU), SiÅs student representatives, candidates running for elections, Norwegian student organisation (NSO) and the leaders of NMBU.

1.7 The case documents and minutes have to be published on the Student Parliament webpage, fronter and available at the Student Board office.

1.8 Majority rules follow the statutes

2) Implementation of the meeting

2.1 ST have to be chaired in accordance to these rules of procedure and normal meeting practices. In situations of doubt, the chair of the meeting will interpret the rules of procedure and the practice. The chairs evaluation can be overruled by a simple majority.

2.2 Cases will be processed in accordance to the agenda.

2.3 All proposals of change or solutions have to be written down and presented to the chair of the meeting.

2.4 All statute- and discussion cases will begin with an opinion round among the institutes, preferably by the SR-leader (Student counsel leader), if appropriate. Speaking time: 2 minutes per institute.

2.5 The following rules applies for entries and comments.

- Entries should be no longer than 2 minutes
- Two comments and one answering comment per entry is allowed. Speaking time: maximum 30 seconds.
- The chairmen of the meeting can make changes to the two elements above if necessary.
- Registration of case information/rules of procedure will be given speaking time of 30 seconds immediately after the on-going exchange of comments are finished.

2.6 Allowed during the meeting:

- Maximum two entries per case per ST representative
- Maximum two entries from the case presenter for the relevant case.

- Maximum one entry from other participants of the meeting.
- Introductory opinion round and case presentation is not regarded as entries.

2.7 With a qualified majority, the Student Parliament can open for extra entries if the case take an unexpected and important turn. A written proposal have to be submitted from a different person than the person concerned. A proposal of extended speaking time for everyone at the meeting can only be proposed by a representative with the right to vote.

2.8 Signs:

- Entries are one finger in the air
- Comments are two fingers formed as a "V". Should be used to comment on entries and have to be registered during the entry. A reply comment have to be registered while a comment is stated.
- Case information about the agenda or rules of procedure is two hands formed as a "T". The sign should only be used for case information or a proposal of changing the agenda or rules of procedure.

2.9 When registering for the speaking list, the speaker should receive a sign of confirmation from the chairmen that the speaker is registered. The sign can be a nod. If the chairmen shakes his/her head it means that one cannot register for the speaking list.

2.10 The chairmen will inform the meeting when speaking time approaches the end.

2.11 The chairmen should:

- Inform each speaker if he/she has an entry, comment or case information.
- At regular intervals, refer to the speaking list and after every entry inform of any comments to the entry.
- When they see it necessary, prioritize speakers who haven't spoken during the relevant case or meeting.

2.12 The chairmen can decide to set a speaking line. The chairmen will inform the meeting that it is possible to register for the speaking list before and during the next entry. The speaking line can be revoked by 2/3 majority.

2.13 At least one representative from each institute have to master the Norwegian language. Entries, comments or case information presented in English should be answered in English. The chairmen are responsible to translate to Norwegian if necessary.

3 Elections and voting

3.1 All ST-representatives with the right to vote will be given a voting card to use when voting.

3.2 The chairman will inform about how the elections and voting will be performed.

3.3 When there are elections and voting the chairmen will present a suggestion to ST about speaking time and number of questions. The counting committee is responsible for the voting and the voting paper.

3.4 If there are several options to vote for, the chairmen will find an appropriate way to vote. ST can by simple majority decide on a different way to vote. As a general rule two opposite suggestions will be set up against each other.

3.5 After elections, every candidate can request to see her/his own voting number.

3.6 The meeting cannot be adjourned before all results are announced.

Agenda

Different cases can be presented for the agenda:

- Constitution

Cases regarding game rules, approving and appointing. Cases for miscellaneous have to be registered before or during the constitution.

- Informative cases

- Cases that only inform. If a debate is wanted the cases have to be presented as a discussion or statute case at the next ST.

- Report from the University Board (US), The Student Board (AU), The Committee of Study Issues, The Committee of Student Welfare in Ås (SiÅs), The Student and Academic's, International Help Fund (SAIH), The International Student Union (ISU), The

Committee of Research Issues , The Learning Environment Committee (LMU). It is opened for questions to the reports. If a debate is wanted about the elements of a report it have to be presented.



- Statute cases

Cases demanding binding decisions. It regards amendments of statutes and other steering documents, new of clarification of politics, economical cases and other cases where voting is relevant.

- If necessary, an electronic statute can be used between ST meetings. An electronic statute cannot be used if the case is of significant importance, unless ST has approved this in advance in accordance to the instruction for electronic statutes.

- Discussion cases

Will not be voted over, but is fundamental for the Student Board's further work with the relevant case.

- Administrative cases

Elections and appointments. Will be ended after elections or voting.

- Miscellaneous

All participants of the meeting can present cases outside the agenda as long as these cases are registered before or during the constitution. The cases cannot result in any decision.

- Evaluation of the meeting

All participants can state their opinion about the meeting and award ceremonies.

Appendix 2

Amendments Student Parliament NMBU

– write clearly!

Case №:		Case title:		
Proposition №:	1	Page/paragraph and line number:		
Name, proposal:	Redaksjonskomiteen	Department:		
	Additions	Deletions	Changes	
Put a cross (X) →			X	
Original text: (Write a paragraph so that it is easier to understand what should be changed.):				

§ 3-8 Permanent observers

The following people meet as permanent observers at Student Parliament meetings.

- Student Board
- The Student Parliament secretary
- Student representative of the University Board
- Student representatives of SiÅs board
- The leaders of the Student Councils
- The Student representatives of the Faculty Boards
- One representative from the International Student Union (ISU)

One representative from NSO

Changes/Additions/Deletions (describe the changes briefly, do not give justification):

New text (continue at the back if needed):

§ 3-8 Representation at the Student Parliament

The following people have compulsory attendance at the Student Parliament, and is obliged to give written notice before the meeting if prevented from attending:

- Student Parliament representatives
- Student Board
- Student Parliament secretary

The following must have at least one representative present at the Student Parliament.

- Student representative of the University Board
- Student representatives of SiÅs board
- International Student Union (ISU)

The following people is strongly encouraged to participate at the student Parliament:

- The Student representatives of the Faculty Boards
- Leaders of the Student Counsels

All students at NMBU have the right to meet and speak at the Student Parliament meetings.

Justification:	Clarify who has obligatory attendance and the right to attend the Student Parliament.
-----------------------	---

Case №:		Case title:		
Proposition №:	2	Page/paragraph and line number:		
Name, proposal:	Redaksjonskomiteen	Department:		
	Additions	Deletions	Changes	
Put a cross (X) →			X	
Original text: (Write a paragraph so that it is easier to understand what should be changed.):				
Changes/Additions/Deletions (describe the changes briefly, do not give justification):				
§ 3-10 Plassfratredelse ... - Board of the welfare association. ...				



New text (continue at the back if needed):	
§ 3-10 Plassfratredelse ... - Board of Welfare Association in Ås (SiÅs) ...	
Justification: Language precision.	

Amendments Student Parliament NMBU

– write clearly!

Case №:		Case title:		
Proposition №:	3	Page/paragraph and line number:		
Name, proposal:	Editing committee.	Department:		
	Additions	Deletions	Changes	
Put a cross (X) →			X	
Original text: (Write a paragraph so that it is easier to understand what should be changed.):				
Changes/Additions/Deletions (describe the changes briefly, do not give justification):				



Comes in as the first § in chapter 6: Distrust As a result §6-1 becomes §6-2 and §6-2 becomes §6-3.	
New text (continue at the back if needed):	
§ 6-1 Confidence motion A confidence motion can be presented by a Student Parliament representative or an organ of the Student Democracy, and will be presented written to the Student Parliament secretary. When processing a confidence motion, the relevant person is given the opportunity to present his/her case.	
Justification:	Specify who can present a confidence motion and how to do it.

Amendments Student Parliament NMBU

– write clearly!

Case №:		Case title:	
Proposition №:	4	Page/paragraph and line number:	
Name, proposal:	Redaksjonskomiteen	Department:	
	Additions	Deletions	Changes
Put a cross (X) →	X		

Original text: (Write a paragraph so that it is easier to understand what should be changed.):	
Changes/Additions/Deletions (describe the changes briefly, do not give justification):	
Addition chapter 10	
New text (continue at the back if needed):	
<p>Kapittel 10: Begrepsdefinisjoner</p> <p>§ 10-1 Majority rules</p> <p>Simple majority: The option with the most votes among the representatives present.</p> <p>Normal Majority: More than ½ of the present representative vote for.</p> <p>Qualified majority: More than 2/3 of the present representatives vote for.</p> <p>Absolute majority: More than ½ of the total representatives present.</p>	
Justification:	Specify what the different majorities mean.

Appendix 3

Electronic statutes/decisions

Instruction approved at ST1 – xx.xx.2016

Purpose

Make it easier to make decisions between Student Parliament meetings.

General

Electronic statutes/decisions can be used by the Student Board (AU) between Student Parliament meetings to determine cases without waiting for the next meeting.

Electronic decisions will be administrated by AU and a suitable electronic platform will be used.

AU will inform the representatives with the right to vote about the electronic statute.

Representatives with the right to vote is responsible to give their vote within the time frame given by AU. The decision demands absolute majority. If more than ½ of the representatives refrain from voting, the decision is not valid. AU can, under these circumstances, make a decision if the case is considered urgent, but submitted votes will function as guidance to the final decision. Other cases is postponed to the next Student Parliament.

The following applies for electronic decisions of the Student Parliament

- During Student Parliament meetings AU can ask if simple cases can be determined by electronic statutes/decisions. The decision is determined by the Student Parliament with normal majority.
- Electronic decisions can also be used by AU with urgent matters where AU finds it necessary.

Electronic decisions can only be used to make decisions for individual cases as mentioned above.

Electronic decisions cannot be used to make decisions about the following:

- Elections
- Questions of distrust
- Changes in the Student Parliament instructions and management documents.
- Appointing Student representatives for temporary councils and committees
- Other cases of significant character

Permanent Student Parliament representatives has the right to vote for electronic statutes/decisions.

Postponement of decisions made by electronic statutes/decisions

If one or several Student Parliament representatives express a wish that the relevant case should be processed at Student Parliament, this should be followed. The representatives who express this wish should immediately inform AU about their reasons so this can be taken under consideration before the case is processed at Student Parliament.

Appendix 4

Rules for Inclusion funds

2016

Objectives:

The main objective for the inclusion funds is to promote the inclusion of international students to the student environment at NMBU. The inclusion funds will contribute to this by creating contact between Norwegian and International students, and to give International and Norwegian students an arena to share knowledge involving culture, language and history. Other forms of inclusion are also taken into consideration although students applying for larger social/pro-active activities or initiatives will be prioritized (i.e. groups larger than ten).

Entitled for support:

- ☐ The funds must be used for socio-cultural activities/initiatives.
- ☐ The applicant(s) must be (a) student(s) from NMBU. Both individual persons and groups/associations can apply for funding.
- ☐ Both upcoming and previous activities/initiatives can be applied for. Applications for previous activities/initiatives should be applied for within one month.
- ☐ Applicants also applying for Welfare Funds for their event may still be eligible for funding, however, the amount may be reduced.

Not entitled for support:

- ☐ Expenses for tobacco and alcohol
- ☐ Expenses for activities/initiatives which are only educational and/or political.
- ☐ Expenses for fieldwork.
- ☐ As a general rule costs for transportation will not be covered by Inclusion Funds, however, transportation may be covered in special circumstances.
- ☐ If the demands below requirements for the application and/or the applicant are not fulfilled.

Requirements for the application and the applicant:

- ☐ The application and the report must be written in English.
- ☐ The application must contain a budget with explanations for each post.
- ☐ The applier must advertise the activities/initiatives in both English AND Norwegian. Posters can be printer for free at the Student Board Office within reason.
- ☐ A report with receipts must be sent to the International Officer during the first three weeks after the activity/initiative.
- ☐ The organization must seek to make as many students as possible benefit from the activities/initiatives to which it is applying for. Closed or internal activities/initiatives will normally not be taken into consideration.

The Inclusion Funds Committee:

- ☐ International officer and welfare officer from the student board.
- ☐ One person from Samfunnet Board.
- ☐ One person from ISU.
- ☐ One person from SIT.
- ☐ One observer from Campus Adamstua.
- ☐ Committee members who themselves are board members of the organizations applying for funding, or are actively involved in planning the event will not be allowed to participate or be present in the processing of the application. This includes the general discussions and outcome of the application.
- ☐ There should be at least 3 committee members present in order to make decisions concerning applications.

Other:

- ☐ Decisions made by the committee are final, and cannot be appealed.
 - ☐ The deadline for application is the 5th every month. Funds will be transferred within the 15th every month.
 - ☐ Applications will not be processed in July.
 - ☐ All funds not spent must be reimbursed within one month of the event to account 1654.20.29092.
- Please** Include organization name, mark it as Inclusion Funds repayment a clear description and notify the International Officer about the transfer.

Report from evaluation of NMBU's management model

The sample ballot gave 9 votes for maximum 6 units at management level 2. Two voted for 5 to 7 units on management level 2 (Haug and Sørli).

Resolution

The report from the evaluation of NMBU's management model was presented 21st of January 2016. The University Board believes that the committee consisting of professor Tom Colbjørnsen (leader), Professor Torbjørn Digernes and professor Lisa Sennerby Forsse has completed an evaluation of NMBU's management model in accordance to the mandate given by the Board. The report is thorough and is highly substantiated and justified. The Board is very pleased with the committees work.

The University Board agrees with the committee in the opinion that NMBU has moved on from a merging phase to a more operational and developing phase. The Board want to change NMBU's management model with the following measures to strengthen NMBU's opportunity to fulfil the vision, goal and social responsibility:

- Through delegation the board will strengthen the role, responsibility and full authorisation of the rector for cases regarding the academic and administrative.
- Reduce the number of management levels from 3 to 2.
- Simplify and make a more efficient administrative sector to support the academic in the best way possible.
- The number of academic organisations on level 2 will be maximum 6.

Within this frame the University Board ask rector to develop a suggestion to the process, time frame, budget, organisation of the process within middle of February to be presented to the University Board for approval."

The University Board assumes that necessary decisions regarding the future management model will be done during the first half of 2016. The Board has given this time frame because they believe that NMBU cannot wait any longer with developing a model that enables the institution to better handle the future possibilities and challenges.

The question about recruiting of rector (elected or hired) from the next period has not been handles by the committee. This is a case that will affect the central administrative organisation. The Board will clarify this question during the first half of 2016.

The Boards decision is unanimous.