

Student Parliament 2 2017



Chairmen: Tord Eirik Feldt Enger and Anne Aase-
Mæland
Referent: Maria Sibbern

Monday March 13th 2017
16.30 – 21.00
TF 102, Wing III

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

AGENDA

STUDENT PARLIAMENT 2 - 2017, MONDAY 13th OF MARCH AT 4:30PM, TF102, wing III.
COMPLETE CASE DOCUMENTS ARE ONLY SENT TO PERMANENT STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES.
THE DOCUMENTS ARE ALSO PUBLISHED AT CLASSFRONTER AND THE STUDENT BOARD WEBSITE:

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

Registration begins at 16:15!

1721	CONSTITUTION	4
1721.1	APPROVAL OF TODAYS AGENDA AND SUMMONING	4
1721.2	APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING REPORT	4
1721.3	APPOINTMENT OF A COUNTING COMMITTEE	4
1722	ORIENTATION CASES.....	4
1722.1	MINUTES.....	4
1722.2	NEW RULES FOR ROOM BOOKING ON CAMPUS.....	5
1722.3	STUDENT ELECTIONS SPRING 2017.....	6
1723	DECISION CASES	7
1723.1	REVISION OF THE STATUTES FOR THE STUDENT DEMOCRACY AT NMBU	7
1723.2	REVISION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND AGENDA FOR THE STUDENT DEMOCRACY AT NMBU	10
1723.3	ALLOCATION OF WELFARE FUNDS FOR SPRING 2017	16
1723.4	WORK INSTRUCTION FOR THE STUDENT PARLIAMENTS COMMITTEE OF THE SEMESTER'S BEST LECTURE ...	17
1723.5	CHANGES TO THE SCHEDULE	18
1724	DISCUSSION CASES.....	19
1724.1	TEACHING EXCELLENCE	19
1724.2	THE INTERNATIONALIZATION CONFERENCE.....	21
1724.3	LONG-TERM STRATEGY FOR THE STUDENT PARLIAMENT AT NMBU 2017-2020	23
1724.4	PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE STUDENT DEMOCRACY 2017.....	25
1725	ADMINISTRATIVE CASES	26
1725.1	ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE BOARD OF COMPLAINTS.....	26
1725.2	ELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE CENTRAL ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE	27
1726	OTHER CASES	28
1727	MEETING EVALUATION.....	28
ATTACHMENTS		30
ATTACHMENT 4	PROPOSED ALLOCATION FUNDS FOR SPRING 2017.....	30

93	1721	Constitution
94	1721.1	Approval of today's agenda and summoning
95		
96		Approved by the Student Parliament
97	1721.2	Approval of the previous meeting report
98		
99		Reports are uploaded to our homepage (http://www.nmbu.no/student/studenttinget) as well
100		as the Student Democracy room on ClassFronter a week after each Student Parliament
101		Meeting. If you need a paper copy of the report please get in touch with the Student Board at
102		their office (next to the student post-boxes)
103		
104		Approved by the Student Parliament
105		
106	1721.3	Appointment of a Counting Committee
107		
108		1. Sol Høgset
109		
110		2. Ole Johan Holtet
111		
112		3. Daniel Hernandez Iniesta
113		
114	1722	Orientation cases
115		
116	1722.1	Minutes
117		
118		The minutes shall be put directly into the Student Democracy room at Fronter (Class Fronter)
119		within 12.00 the Wednesday before Student Parliament.
120		This is done to get the most updated minutes, and minimize paper usage. Copies of each
121		minutes will be printed out and kept at the Student Democracy office, together with the case
122		papers from the current Student Parliament.
123		Those who report to the Student Parliament through minutes are:
124		- The Student Board (AU)
125		- The University Board (US)
126		- The Education Board (SU)
127		- Student Welfare Organization in Ås (SiÅs)
128		- Student and Academics international helping fund (SAIH)
129		- International Student Union (ISU)
130		- The Research Board (FU)
131		- The Learning Environment Committee (LMU)
132		

133 1722.2 New Rules for Room Booking on Campus

134

135 *Case responsible: Mariya Khanamiryan*

136

137 **Purpose:**

138 To orientate the students about the new regulations that have been put into place by the
139 administration. Here is the link for the new rules for booking rooms:

140 [http://intern.nmbu.no/statisk/fr/godkjent regelverket for utlan av rom ved campus as 002.](http://intern.nmbu.no/statisk/fr/godkjent%20regulverket%20for%20utlan%20av%20rom%20ved%20campus%20as%20002.pdf)

141 [pdf](http://intern.nmbu.no/statisk/fr/godkjent%20regulverket%20for%20utlan%20av%20rom%20ved%20campus%20as%20002.pdf)

142

143 **Background:**

144 After an administrative meeting (Toppmøte) that was held on February 17, NMBU informed
145 about the reasoning for the adjustments that have been made concerning *Room Booking at*
146 *NMBU*.

147 Below is the statement from NMBU about the changes. The statements is adapted by removing
148 the personal content.

149

150 *"When NMBU revised the room booking regulations, it was following up on an interpretation of*
151 *the law and that the practice of the rules were not in accordance with the alcohol policies of the*
152 *Ås commune.*

153 *Because of the legality of this, there was little that could be discussed and negotiated in regards to*
154 *the booking rules.*

155 *NMBU has been contacted many times by Ås commune. They pointed out that the alcohol*
156 *regulations have been broken when NMBU has allowed the booking of buildings for events where*
157 *alcohol is consumed.*

158

159 *Excerpt from*

160 [*Lov om omsetning av alkoholholdig drikk m.v. \(alkoholoven\)* §8-9](#)

161 *"It is forbidden to drink or serve alcohol unless there is a license to do so, even when this occurs*
162 *without charging for it:*

- 163 • in locations in close proximity to where there are serving facilities
- 164 • in facilities that are usually open for public use
- 165 • in meeting halls or other public gathering spaces"

166

167 *In accordance with this paragraph, alcohol cannot be consumed or served in NMBU's facilities,*
168 *unless there is a license to do so. NMBU falls under these three categories, especially the second*
169 *point. This is an overview of the laws and regulations that are the background for the changes*
170 *that have been made in the room reservation policies."*

171

172 The President of the Student Parliament's Student Board, Mariya Khanamiryan, explains the
173 case for the Student Parliament.

174

175 There was a question from the room about if making food in the cafeterias that are rented out
176 is allowed according to the regulations

177

- 178 • The Student Board cannot answer that at the moment, but promises to take the
179 subject up with NMBU. The Student Board will get back to the Student Parliament
180 with the answer.

181

The Student Parliament asks if there can be an open presentation explaining the formulation of these regulations

- It is not the Student Board who has made this decision, but they promise to bring all feedback from the students further to NMBU's administration.

The Student Parliament points out that the alcohol law is only referred to in the decision, and it is not clear what the property department even feels about renting out rooms in relation to the legislation itself.

- According to NMBU's interpretation of the law, the entire building must be closed if alcohol is to be served in any part of it. Exceptions may not be made for individual rooms.

1722.3 Student elections spring 2017.

Case preparation: Mariya Khanamiryan and Ole Johan Holtet

Purpose:

Inform student about the upcoming elections for the president and vice president for the Student board and 2 representatives and 2 deputy for the University Board.

Background:

Student Board:

There is going to be held electronic elections of president and vice-president for the Student Board. They are case responsible for the Student Parliament, follow the decisions that are voted in at the Student Parliament, and represent the Student Parliament in between the meetings. President has the responsibility for the strategical work, while the vice-president is responsible for the organizational part in the organization. President works a lot with and towards the leadership at NMBU, while vice-president has the main contact with the representatives in the organization.

Student Board consists of 6 members: President, vice-president, international officer, welfare officer, marketing responsible and board member. President and vice-president sit at their position full time, while the rest of the members sit part time and are student on the side. Student board is a collegiate organization, which means that every member is equal member of the board. Student Board also has its own secretary.

University Board:

University Board at NMBU is the highest decision authority at NMBU. University board consists of one external board leader, and board members that are both external and internal from NMBU.

The University Board mainly works on issues regarding strategy, economy, goal management, reports and organizational development on a superior level. The University Board has 7-8 meetings per year. Beyond this it is desired that one represents at the Top meetings, the Student Boards internal meetings, and meetings held by the Senate. The Board members must also mandatory report to the Student Parliament. They should also be represented during the Student Parliament meetings.

Amongst the students there shall be elected to permanent board members and two personal deputies. According to the regulations both sexes should be equally represented. After the

merge it is no longer clarified in the regulations of the election that both campuses should be represented, but it is still the intention until the merge is fully completed.

Students that wants to run for election to the Student Board should have earned experience from working with boards (Institute Board, Faculty Board or equivalent) or experience with committees on a higher level. (UFU/USU).

Permanent representatives:

These representatives start 1st July 2016, and is elected for one year.

The president of the Student Parliament's Student Board, Mariya Khanamiryan, and the male student representative from the University Board, Ole Johan Holtet, informed the student parliament about the elections for the president and vice president of the student board and the new student representatives for the University Board. Any students who are interested or curious about the positions are encouraged to contact the current representatives, Student Board, University Board, and/or the Election committee for more information.

1723 Decision Cases

1723.1 Revision of the Statutes for the Student Democracy at NMBU

Case responsible: The committee for amendment proposals for the statutes of the Student Parliament

Attachments:

- Existing Statutes with Line Numbers (Attachment 9)
- Amendment proposal (Attachment 1)
- Entire Proposal based on the settings of the Illustration (Attachment 10)

Purpose:

The purpose of this case is to bring forward proposals to amendments of the Statutes for the Student Democracy at NMBU in line with the mandate given by the Student Parliament on 28.11.2016. The need for revision is due to both the structural changes at NMBU as an institution, and internal changes in the student democracy. The goal of the revision is to bring forward proposals that both clarify and modify the statutes so that they represent the Student Democracy we have today, with an overarching goal of keeping it in a functional format.

Background:

Since they were selected by the Student Parliament on 28.11.2016, this committee has held 8 meetings as well as working online together between the meetings. The statutes case is developed based on discussions from the Student Parliament 1. The committee has taken into consideration the input from both the Student Parliament and other relevant sources while founding the proposals that are outlined here.

The Statutes are the highest authority document in the Student Democracy. Therefore, the committee has had an overarching goal of balancing the need for clarification and the addition of new elements with consideration of the functionality and user friendliness. The committee

feels that such a balance means that the most basic elements must be as clear as possible, even though not everything can be defined concretely in the statutes.

The committee has come up with a number of amendment proposals. These are of various subjects including the reorganization of NMBU, structural changes in the document, and the implementation of new decisions. The proposals are too many to go through them all here, but all are justified for in the presentation of the individual proposals. The proposal covers, among other things: the decision about partiality, place resignation, the control committee, and electronic decisions. Together with a tidy structure and chapter division, the committee's idea is that the recommended proposals that are presented here will give the Student Democracy at NMBU statutes that are in accordance with today's needs and that balance the overarching goal.

The student board is impressed with the work of the committee for amendments for Statues for the Student democracy NMBU and means that the throughout work is very good. The student board recommends the proposals from the committee, except for the following:

- Proposal nr 2.
 - The student board means that the date of establishment of the document and only the last date of revision of the document should be written on the document, because this information should be sufficient. We see writing all the dates problematic, if the document should be edited every other year. This will make the document messy with a lot of unnecessary information.

Proposed resolution:

The proposal for the Statutes for the Student Democracy at the Norwegian University of Life Sciences is approved. This allows for editorial changes.

It is pointed out that point 51 in attachment 1 about cases of mistrust is a mistake from the committee's side. It is not included in the voting rules, and the committee no longer supports the original proposal.

Faculty feedback round:

KBM:

- Agree for the most part with the committee's proposal, but agree with the Student Board on point number 2.

LandSam:

- Agrees with KBM

BioVit:

- Agrees with the Student Board about the dates in point 2. Otherwise they support the committee's proposal.

MINA:

- For the most part they agree with the committee's proposal. With some points they agree with the Student Board.

331 VET:

- Their student council was not completely on board with all points.

333

334 Real Tek:

- Point 2; input to use a revision number in relation to the most recent revision date. By doing this one can trace issues without having to list all the dates.
- Proposal 24; wishes for more debate about who has speaking rights and the right to propose cases as they see this as being much more strict.

339

340 HH:

- Agree with the Student Board about point 2, otherwise they agree with the committee's proposal.

343

344 Highlights from the discussion:

345

- About the proposal in point 24, which handles speaking and proposing rights; this is a significantly strict proposal. A significant reduction in who can speak and make proposals.
- Editorial change to "all students at NMBU with a valid semester registration"
- It will still be possible to grant other speaking and proposal rights, it will probably not create any big problems in practice.
- What about exchange students? They do not have a semester registration here in the same way as others. What about their speaking and proposing rights?
- This is protected in the statutes proposed by the committee.
- The student parliament wondered how the statutes applied to international students if they pay a semester fee to their home university and not to NMBU. It was answered that what "valid semester registration" means can be up to interpretation. All international students are registered at SiT, even though they do not pay a semester fee. When you sign up for classes on studentweb you have two choices. 1: normal registration where you pay the semester fee and register for classes for the semester (practical for Norwegian students) 2: register for classes, but do not pay the semester fee (international students), so by definition they are still registered.
- The University Board representatives want to have speaking and proposing rights. In this case, can that be specified?
- The proposal in point 26; does only one person from the control committee have the right to meet? This is in line with the instructions for the control committee that were approved of at Student Parliament 7 in the fall (2016).
- The elaboration on point 14 about the method for seat allocation, what is that about?
- The proposal from the committee now explains how it is to be done, and how the number of seats are to be distributed amongst faculties.
- A basis for this is the number of students at the University each fall.

379

- The control committee would also like a right to propose cases under the statutes. (cf. 24.)
 - They feel that they should be on the same level as the University Board representatives.
 - You are not excluding external speakers by approving this.
 - About simple vs. 50% majority; the committee chose 50% majority because it requires more than 50% of the votes for the case to go through. With a simple majority a case can go through with very few votes in relation to the number of people voting.
 - About point 24; the Control Committee's handling of partiality; will this hinder their speaking and proposing rights?
 - With questions of partiality, an assembled Student Parliament wishes to handle it.
 - About partiality; it is possible to ask for a statement from the Control Committee, Cf. Proposal 49 from the committee. When it comes to questions of partiality, the working instructions for the Control Committee also state that they must comment on these cases.
 - The control committee informs parliament about voting and various rights the Student Parliament has, Paragraph 9.2 which handles the enforcement of adopted decisions.
 - The Student Parliament can decide that if the statutes are approved of, they go into effect immediately. They are valid immediately after the meeting.
 - If the proposals are not passed, the committee would like some reasoning so that they have something to work with further. The reasoning can be sent in a written form after the meeting.
- Proposal 2, 24, 34 og 51 were not approved, other proposals in attachment 1 are approved of through voting.

Proposed resolution:

A vote is held on whether or not to give the Student Board the opportunity to make editorial changes. This is approved of through voting.

1723.2 Revision of the rules of procedure and agenda for the Student Democracy at NMBU

Case responsible: The committee for amendment proposals for the statutes of the Student Parliament.

Attachments:

- The current rules of procedure and agenda with line numbers (Attachment 11)

- Amendment Proposal. (Attachment 2)
- Entire proposal based on the settings of the illustration to show the entire plan (Attachment 12)

Purpose:

The purpose of this case is to bring forward proposals to change the rules of procedure and the agenda for the Student Democracy at NMBU in line with the mandate given by the Student Parliament on 28.11.2016. The need for revision is due to both the structural changes at NMBU as an institution, and internal changes in the student democracy. The goal of the revision is to bring forward proposals that both clarify and modify the rules of procedure and agenda so that they represent the Student Democracy we have today, with an overarching goal of keeping it in a functional format.

Background:

Since they were selected by the Student Parliament on 28.11.2016, this committee has held 8 meetings as well as working online together between meetings. The rules of procedure and agenda is developed based on discussions from the Student Parliament 1. The committee has taken into consideration the input from both the Student Parliament and other relevant sources while founding the proposals that are outlined here.

The rules of procedure and agenda describe how the Student Parliament meetings should be conducted. The purpose is for all meetings to be consistent and for there to be tools for the meeting leaders and Student Parliament that elaborate the statutes. The committee therefore has an overarching goal of both clarifying and over bureaucratization of the meetings. It is therefore proposed to remove certain elements as these can be seen as unnecessary specifications, and can lead to unnecessary bureaucracy and hamper the flow of the meeting. The committee has also proposed a number of changes and clarifications to make the agenda a more user-friendly tool.

The proposals are too many to go through them all here, but all are justified for in the presentation of the individual proposals. However, the committee would like to outline some of the most central elements: to introduce petitions, switch from simple majority voting to 50% majority voting, to change the time allowed for responses, to get rid of the decision on the number of responses per participant and the elimination of administrative cases.

The committee's hope is that the collection of proposals that are presented here will give the Student Democracy at NMBU rules of procedure and an agenda that are aligned with the current needs, and that balance clarification and bureaucracy in a better way than previously.

Student Boards remarks

The student board is impressed with the work of the committee for amendments for the Rules of Procedure and Agenda and means that the work is very good.

The student board recommends the proposals from the committee, except for the following:

- Proposal nr.1
 - The student board wishes that the proposal from the committee stands, but suggests adding the usage of voting signs in student parliament meetings. The recommendation must be seen in context with proposal 19.
- Proposal nr. 6.
 - The student board wishes that point 2.2 remains as it does today. It is not clear to everyone what meeting culture purports. There are new representatives in the

student parliament every year, and every year some of these do not have good enough knowledge about the organisation.

- Proposal nr. 8.
 - The student board do recommend that the speech time remains at 30 seconds. A reply is supposed to be a short and brief comment about why you do not completely agree with that what has been previously said. The student board means that 30 seconds is enough. In addition, the student board finds the argument for the proposal, which is based on that “the 30-second rule is not followed through today”, to not be good enough. As a result, chairmen should be stricter.
- Proposal nr 9a and 9b.
 - The student board wishes that chairmen maintain this position, because they have control over how implementation of the meeting is going and they have a good overview of the debates and the time usage.
- Proposal nr. 10.
 - The majority of the student board wants to maintain practise we have today. The student board want the representatives to have some outlines to follow. In addition, the student board finds the argument that “these rules are not followed today”, to be too weak.
 - Dissent 1. Minority in the student board, Ina Catharina wishes the point to be removed in line with the committee’s proposal. The reason is that this rule restrains the debate because each representative only has two entries. This rule also limits the case presenters to two entries and they would have to use comments or case information’s to contribute. In addition, Ina Catharina is certain there are other outlines for debates, which chairmen can implement if point 2.6 is removed.
- Proposal nr. 15.
 - The student board disagrees that this whole part should be removed and wishes to keep most of it. The student board wishes to remove the first part, but suggests a change to the second part of 2.11: “*the chairmen should at regular intervals, refer to the speaking list and after every entry inform of any comments to the entry*”. The suggestion shall be sent out.
- Proposal nr. 16.
 - The Majority of the student board wishes to keep the original text. It is not desirable that chairmen inform the student parliament who is allowed to speak based on their previous level of activity in the debate. The rules today make it possible for chairmen to fulfil the purpose the committee seeks, without having to inform the student parliament.
 - Dissent 2. Minority in the student board, Johanne supports the proposal of the committee, because it is important that chairmen inform about the processes happening during student parliament. If this information is not communicated, some representatives will may feel overrun. With the committees proposal chairmen can suggest to prioritize and the student parliament can decide whether or not they want this.
- Proposal nr. 18
 - The majority of the student board wish to keep the original text because the proposal will add an unnecessary amount of bureaucracy for the student parliament.

- Dissent 3. A minority in the student board, Ina Catharina supports the committee's proposal. This recommendation is valid only if proposal 10 from the committee is not voted in by the student parliament.

•

- Proposal nr 23.
 - The student board does not agree with the committee's proposal and therefore agrees with Kine's dissent. The argument for this is that it will secure neat procedure.
- Proposal nr 24.
 - As a result from the recommendation for proposal 23, the student board recommend to maintain administration cases as a case type for the student parliament.

Proposed Resolution:

- *That the rules of procedure and the agenda for the Student Democracy and the Norwegian University of Life Sciences are revised.*
- *The Student Parliament's Student Board has the full ability to follow through with editorial changes.*

Faculty Feedback Round:

HH:

- Does not agree with much of the committee's proposals to cut things out when it comes to the part that describes "normal meeting practices," HH wants to keep that part. This is for the sake of those new to the student democracy, it is helpful to have a plan to follow.
- When does the written notification of leaving a meeting early need to be delivered?

RealTek:

- Proposal 7: We noticed that "probably with the SC President" is in the new proposal. This seems to be left over from when the student council leaders had a permanent place in the Student Parliament. Removing this can maybe be done administratively.
- Point 10: We agreed that this needs to be removed as it was the normal practice.

VET:

- Agrees with the Student Board's suggestion except for point 10. Feels that this should be removed, as this will bring about a freer discussion. Disagrees with the Student Board about point 6, agrees with the committee on that point.
- From point 13 onwards: normal meeting practices need to be outlined.

MINA:

- Agrees for the most part with the committee's proposal, but on point 9, 15 and 23 they agree with the Student Board.

BioVit:

- 570 • Do not with for input to be longer than 30 seconds.
571 • Remove the maximum of two responses. Wishes that the meeting leadership will
572 control this as necessary. Agrees with Kine's opinion.
573

574 LandSam:

- 575 • Agrees with the point about case papers needing to be translated to English.
576

577

578

579 KMB:

- 580 • Is not so sure about registering attendance vocally, doesn't feel like it is a good practice.
581 • About speaking time: their student council is a bit split on this topic.
582 • About point 13, 14 and 15 (handling signaling, speaking time and moderating) they
583 wish to keep this, since many don't have experience with meeting practices.
584 • About point 23 regarding disagreement; can one opt to change the "voting and
585 appointments"?
586

587 Vet:

- 588 • Asks about where the Student Board stands in regards to the point called disagreement
589 1?
590 • The Student Board answers that they agree with Kine's opinion.
591
592
593 ➤ About the point called "disagreement 1" which was about voting and appointment; it is
594 asked whether or not acclamation can be included as a form of voting?
595 ➤ Response: that is already taken up under the handling of cases for the statutes
596 ➤ Incoming amendments presented to the Student Parliament
597

598 Highlights from the Discussion:

599

- 600 • A time limit for responses is desired because people are imprecise and cannot formulate
601 themselves clearly.
602 • 30 seconds is long enough for a response.
603 • The Student Parliament expressed mixed opinions about limiting the speaking times.
604 • Limiting the time means that you CAN speak for one minute, but don't need to.
605 • Point 9 and 10, reason to expand – gives an opening to not have such strict framework
606 for replies.
607 • The moderators cannot approve of anything, it is up to the Student Parliament. This
608 gives security so that the moderator cannot allocate varying speaking times.
609 • At this point, the time limit for proposals is okay. Does not to be followed so strictly in
610 all cases, such as in cases of speech impediments or stuttering. Enforce with discretion.

- Proposal, the disagreement Johanne has taken out. It is good to have since many are slow to ask for the word. Does not take into account new members. Can only have the word early in the debate.
- Voting can also take place by asking if anyone is in disagreement.
- People need to have rules they must follow, cf. point 10 about removing the speaking time restrictions.
- Should the student parliament follow a practice that believes rules are made to be broken?
- Remove the rule about two responses per case, create other regulations to be followed.
- Removing it now doesn't mean it can be reinstated later.
- This can be voted over at every Student Parliament. Can give more flexibility as needed. Others want some more permanent guidelines to follow.
- Can we have a recommended time? Then the moderator intercedes as needed.
- There needs to be regulations for the Student Parliament and its conduct. Without regulations there is too much room for interpretation.
- An amendment proposal for regulations is recommended, and that can be voted over today.
- In regards to cohesiveness with how other institutions practice / regulate this, there are many different variations.

Results from Voting:

- Amendment proposal 1: adopted
- The committee's proposal 2: adopted
- The committee's proposal 3: adopted
- The committee's proposal 4: recommendation adopted
- The committee's proposal 5: recommendation adopted
- The committee's proposal 6: proposal not adopted
- The committee's proposal 7: recommendation adopted
- The committee's proposal 8: adopted
- The committee's proposal 9a+12b vs 9b+12a: 9b + 12a adopted
- The committee's proposal 10 vs amendment proposal 3: proposal 10 adopted (recommendation not adopted).
- The committee's proposal 11: adopted
- The committee's proposal 13: proposal not adopted
- The committee's proposal 14: proposal not adopted
- The committee's proposal 15 vs amendment proposal 2: amendment proposal 2 adopted
- The committee's proposal 16: adopted
- The committee's proposal 17: adopted
- The committee's proposal 18: adopted
- The committee's proposal 19: adopted
- The committee's proposal 20: adopted
- The committee's proposal 21: adopted
- The committee's proposal 22: adopted
- The committee's proposal 23 + 24 vs dissent 1: dissent 1 adopted
- The committee's proposal 25: (editorial) adopted

- The committee's proposal 26: adopted

Concerning the proposal to decide: there is a typing error in the Norwegian version. It should say "vedtas" (line 279).

Proposal up for decision: decided on through voting.

1723.3 Allocation of welfare funds for spring 2017

Case Responsible: Tord Hauge

Attachments:

- Overview of Applications (Attachment 3)
- Proposed Allocation for Spring 2017 (Attachment 4)

Purpose:

To approve the allocation of welfare funds for spring 2017.

Background:

Every year, the Student Parliament allocates welfare funds to clubs and societies at NMBU. A committee put together by the Student Board and Student Parliament works out a proposal for the distribution of welfare funds in accordance with the rules for allocating welfare funds. The committee consists of two representatives appointed by the Student Parliament. The rest are appointed to the committee because of positions they already hold.

The Committee for spring 2017 consisted of:

- Tord Hauge (The welfare officer in the Student Parliament's Student Board)
- Lise B. Hovd (The International Officer in the Student Parliament's Student Board)
- Fredrik F. Ellingsen (The treasurer of Student Society Board)
- Ingrid L. Wigestrang (Committee Member in the SiÅs Board)
- Halvor H. Kongevold (The previous welfare officer in the Student Parliament's Student Board)
- Anniken Løvig (Elected by the Student Parliament)
- Ida Marie Marie Munthe Sakseide (Elected by the Student Parliament)

In 2017, the Student Parliament can distribute 400,000 kr in welfare funds. In the spring, the committee decides how much of the allocated money should be set aside as society meeting funds. This year, they decided that 63,035 kr should be set aside for community meeting funds. 8% of welfare funds are allocated at the Student Parliament 5 in the fall, and the rest are allocated at Student Parliament 2 in the spring.

The Committee's Assessment:

The Proposed allocation funds for spring 2017 (attachment 4) and the overview of applications (attachment 3) are attached. Spring 2017 saw 73 applications and the total amount applied for was 678,663 kr. The welfare committee proposes to distribute 304,964 kr in welfare funds, as well as 63,053 kr in community meeting funds. The amount of community meeting funds is

greater than last time (44,527 kr), because we received a good number of applications for activity funds that we feel actually fall under the category of community meeting funds.

Many applications lacked attachments, such as accounting and budgets. The welfare officer gave the clubs and societies lacking this the opportunity to correct this. Bad budgets and accounting was something that was seen in many applications, but was corrected in most. Welfare funds were not given to those whose applications did not meet all the requirements. The committee wishes to encourage events that are open to all with an open opportunity for participation. Most funds are marked to make sure that the money goes to activities that we feel should be supported by welfare funds.

Proposed Resolution:

The Student Parliament approves of the distribution of welfare funds for spring 2017 that are outlined in attachment 4.

The proposal is presented and explained.

Faculty Feedback Round:

KBM:

- Agrees, would say that this follows current guidelines.
- Had their questions answered in the break.
- Perceives tendencies of discrimination between societies.

LandSam, BioVit, HH og MINA:

- Has no objections

RealTek:

- Had their questions answered in the break
- Tannhjulet, søknaden kom etter fristen med over 24 timer. Ikke behandlet.
- Tannhjulet's application was delivered late by more than 24 hours, so was not handled.
- There is a wish from the back bench to have it more clearly outlined who received the greatest amounts.
- This lacks a "test of needs" in the instructions for the allocation.
- Those receiving funds must provide accounting records. Unused funds must be returned. The rules for allocating funds are up for revision every other year.
- The proposal is voted over. It was unanimously approved.

1723.4 Work instruction for The Student Parliaments committee of the semester's best lecture

Case responsible: The members of the committee 2016

Attachment:

751 Work instructions for The Student Parliaments committee of the semester's best lecture
752 (Attachment 5)

753

754 **Purpose:**

755 Approve the work instruction for the committee of the semester's best lecture

756

757 **Background:**

758 The committee of the semester's best lecture contributes in the work for higher education
759 quality at NMBU by announcing a winner of the prize each semester. Today, there is no work
760 instruction for the committee, even though this distinction is considered high among the
761 academic employees. When the committee started last year, they missed guidelines in the work
762 and have now compiled a suggestion for a work instruction.

763

764 **Proposed resolution:**

765 The Student Parliament approves the work instruction for the committee of the semester's
766 best lecture.

767

768 **Faculty Feedback Round:**

769

- 770 • Various faculties who discussed the topic in their student council agree with this.
- 771 • They want to make editorial changes.
- 772 • If the election process is to be included in the instructions, it needs to be put forth as an
- 773 amendment proposal.
- 774 • Specify today's practice in the instructions.
- 775
- 776
- 777 ➤ Additional proposals: the Student Board is given full power to specify today's processes.
- 778 Approved of through voting.
- 779 ➤ The proposal is approved of through voting.

780

781 **1723.5 Changes to the Schedule**

782

783 *Case responsible: Mariya Khanamiryan*

784

785 **Attachments:**

786 Schedule 2017 (Attachment 6)

787

788 **Purpose:**

789 To move Student Parliament 3 from Monday, April 24th to Tuesday, April 25th.

790

791 **Background:**

792 Due to a holiday (Easter), the Student Parliament's Student Board would like to move Student
793 Parliament 3 from Monday, April 24th to Tuesday, April 25th. This means also moving the
794 deadline for when the case papers are out to April 18th instead of April 17, which is the second
795 day of Easter. In addition, we would like to inform the Student Parliament of a mistake in the
796 schedule. It states that the deadline to send in cases is April 3rd. This should be April 10th, but
797 due to the fact that this is during Easter holiday, we would like to make the deadline for
798 sending cases in April 7th instead.

799

800 **Proposed Resolution:**

801 The Student Parliament decides that Student Parliament 3 should be moved from April 24th to
802 April 25th, and that the deadline for when the case papers are out is moved from April 17th to
803 April 18th. The Student Parliament also approves of changing the deadline to send in case
804 papers from April 3rd to April 7th.

805

806 **Faculty Feedback Round:**

807

808 All faculties agree, but some mention the short deadline to prepare for student council
809 meetings.

810

811 The proposal is voted over. It is unanimously approved.

812

813 **1724 Discussion Cases**

814

815 **1724.1 Teaching Excellence**

816

817 *Case Responsible: Ina Catharina Storrønning*

818

819 **Purpose:**

820 To discuss what the students think is teaching excellence

821

822 **Background:**

823 In February, the Norwegian Parliament sent out a message about quality in higher education:
824 “Culture for quality in higher education” explaining that the government has put education
825 quality on the agenda. Following this, many institutions in Norway have to come up with a
826 proposal for assessing teaching that will be incorporated into the hiring and promotion system.
827 NMBU will appoint a group to oversee such an assessment system. The Student Board
828 therefore wishes for input about what the student body believes is excellence in teaching. The
829 Student Board also sees the need for the Student Democracy to have a common understanding
830 for such work in the future. These are the proposed discussion points:

831

- 832
- What do the students feel is emphasized in a good teacher
 - 833 • What needs to happen for students to be motivated in their studies
 - 834 • To what degree do the students wish to be involved in the research environment
 - 835 associated with their faculty
 - 836 • How can students become a part of the teaching process as active participants,
 - 837 and to what degree should this form of teaching be present?

838 **Faculty Feedback Round:**

839 **KBM:**

- 840 ➤ Lecturers need to have better teaching skills
- 841 ➤ Give an experience of a progressing line of study
- 842 ➤ Use more available technology
- 843 ➤ Use examples from the real workplace
- 844 ➤ Would like other learning forums (like the “flip” classroom)
- 845 ➤ More experiments that get the students engaged

846

847 LandSam:

- 848 ➤ Energized lecturers that motivate students
- 849 ➤ Interactive spaces
- 850 ➤ Follow the book, not just “Storytelling”
- 851 ➤ Be concise

852

853 BioVit:

- 854 ➤ Teach according to what background the students have
- 855 ➤ Updated PowerPoint presentations.
- 856 ➤ Don’t just read from the PowerPoint

857

858 MINA:

- 859 ➤ The teacher themselves needs to be passionate about the subject and encourage
- 860 engagement
- 861 ➤ Use Kahoot to engage the students
- 862 ➤ The lecturer must listen to the students and take their thoughts into account
- 863 ➤ The class president can sent out questions and answers to students and the lecturer.

864

865 Vet:

- 866 ➤ The student’s feedback needs to be the basis for assessing the teachers.
- 867 ➤ Key words for a good teacher: creates opportunities for 2-way communication.
- 868 ➤ Encourages engagement
- 869 ➤ Extracts the essentials of the subject.

870

871 RealTek:

- 872 ➤ Communication, English.
- 873 ➤ The teacher should always be making an effort to improve themselves.
- 874 ➤ Teaching evaluation – take it into account
- 875 ➤ Smaller lab groups. Teacher can communicate better with each student.

876

877 HH:

- 878 ➤ Engage students through things like, for example, Learning Catalytics
- 879 ➤ Establish a welcoming environment in the classroom so that the students dare to
- 880 participate more
- 881 ➤ More focus on teaching competency
- 882 ➤ Small classrooms with fewer students, this makes it easier to engage students
- 883 ➤ Variation in the teaching methods, for example case studies, role plays, group work, etc.
- 884 ➤ The teachers need to be passionate, have respect for the students and want to help
- 885 them. This makes a big difference.
- 886 ➤ Teachers that indirectly show during the lecture that they are not passionate about the
- 887 topic sets a bad environment for student engagement.

888

889 Highlights from the Discussion:

- 890 • Wishes for a big involvement of the students in research when it is appropriate for
891 the research.
- 892 • Available lecture notes (for example on Fronter) gives students the opportunity to
893 go through what was said in the lecture.
- 894 • The course responsible must be present at the lectures, and not have overlapping
895 classes for a PhD, for example.
- 896 • Mid-term evaluation is only recommended? Teaching evaluation is obligatory for all
897 course responsible. The same with the evaluation at the end of the course. If it is not
898 conducted, this must be reported to the appropriate local committee.
- 899 • Wishes for solutions to activities to be made available, the teacher can answer
900 concrete questions.
- 901 • Classroom and STAT 100: Wishes more flexibility about how involved in the class
902 one has to be. Choose seminar or lecture.
- 903 • Stronger requirements for teaching evaluations and follow through in practice. Put
904 in place over time. (Use the teaching evaluations, not the midterm evaluations.)
- 905 • Reference group for the teachers. The class president can give feedback to the
906 teachers, like the system they have in Trondheim.
- 907 • Why do some students not answer the class evaluations? How do we get more
908 students to answer? Students have answered in the past and nothing has happened.
909 Some evaluations didn't even take place.
- 910 • Evaluation isn't done here as it is nationwide.
- 911 • The end of year evaluation is useless without the teaching evaluation. This also
912 needs to take place.
- 913 • Teaching competency must be relevant to the subject/faculty. Practical training.
- 914 • If there is any more feedback, send it to the Student Board. Teaching evaluations will
915 be brought up in the Education Board meeting in March as its own topic.

916

917 1724.2 The Internationalization Conference

918

919 *Case responsible: Lise Benette Hovd*

920

921 **Purpose:**

922 To discuss internationalization at NMBU

923

924 **Background:**

925 The Student Parliament's Student Board would like input about what the Student Parliament
926 thinks about internationalization at NMBU. An internationalization conference is taking place
927 on March 15-16th with HIOA and NMBU, and because of this, the Student Board wants input
928 from the Student Parliament about internationalization at NMBU.

929 Based on input from the Student Parliament, the Student Board will create a proposal as a
930 resolution at Student Parliament 3.

931

932 Discussion Points:

933

- 934 • What do you think the international students bring to NMBU that is important?

- 935 • What do you think is crucial about Norwegian students going on exchange?
- 936 • What should NMBU do to get more Norwegian students to go on exchange?
- 937 • What do you believe is the most important experiences one gains through exchange?
- 938 • What needs to happen for the international students to be included and integrated into
- 939 the student environment at NMBU?

940 Faculty Feedback Round:

941

942 HH:

- 943
- 944 ➤ The university must advertise and encourage students to go on exchange, as well as
- 945 create more attractive exchange agreements.
- 946 ➤ Following up on students who come back from exchange.
- 947 ➤ Speak with them, see if they had a positive or negative exchange experience.
- 948 ➤ Encourage students who come back from exchange to tell about their exchange
- 949 experiences.

950

951 Realtek:

- 952
- 953 ➤ Use students who have come back from exchange as ambassadors.
- 954 ➤ Discussion: to improve integration for exchange students and make sure they don't only
- 955 associate with those of their own nationality. They need to live with Norwegians, with
- 956 certain considerations.

957

958 Vet:

- 959
- 960 • Exchange doesn't really fit well with the requirements and approach of their
- 961 program.

962

963 MINA:

- 964
- 965 • Include international students
- 966 • Buddy week should be improved in this regard
- 967 • Mixed classes
- 968 • Theme parties; better interaction and cooperation
- 969 • A lot of buddy week happens in Norwegian, this makes it exclusive
- 970 • More information (posters, signs) in English

971

972 BioVit:

- 973
- 974 • International students bring their culture, specifically their study culture, with them.
- 975 This gives Norwegians a broader perspective.
- 976 • Introduce exchange earlier in the study progression.
- 977 • Have a semester without obligatory classes to make exchange easier.

978

979 **LandSam:**

980

- 981 • Have multicultural teaching here.
- 982 • Include internationals, stop separating with the term “international” so much.
- 983 • Stop seeing them as a homogeneous group.
- 984 • There is poor quality and little updated information in English.

985

986 **KBM:**

987

- 988 • Exchange is a lot of work, there is little available information.
- 989 • More focus on the buddy week in the spring semester
- 990 • Sometimes when you order language tests abroad, they can be in poor English when
- 991 they get here

992

993 **Highlights from the Discussion:**

994

- 995 • Exchange for Norwegians; make a social, informational night with free food
- 996 • Offer information
- 997 • Common event during buddy week at Samfunnet; internationals think it is too
- 998 expensive and they don’t show up.
- 999 • International students could have their entrance fees to Samfunnet covered via
- 1000 inclusion funds.
- 1001 • Looking for international buddies, more Norwegian buddies for those coming here
- 1002 as exchange students.
- 1003 • ESN committee should market exchange a lot better.
- 1004 • NMBU’s English website is generally confusing and difficult
- 1005 • Mentoring: a program where students who have been on exchange can be mentors
- 1006 for students who will go on exchange

1007

1008 **1724.3 Long-term strategy for the Student Parliament at NMBU 2017-**

1009 **2020**

1010

1011 *Case responsible: Mariya Khanamiryan*

1012

1013 **Attachments:**

1014 The long-term strategy for the Student Parliament at NMBU 2017-2020 (Attachment 7)

1015

1016 **Purpose:**

1017 To discuss the long-term strategy for the Student Parliament at NMBU

1018

1019 **Background:**

1020 Throughout the Student Parliament’s kickoff conference 2017, the student representatives

1021 were asked to discuss and map out a long-term strategy for the Student Democracy for the next

1022 3 years. 3 years was set as the “long-term” because this is the average amount of time that a

1023 student attends NMBU.

1024

1025 All of the input that was given during this conference has been noted, and after the Student

Board had an internal seminar, a draft of a long-term strategy was created. The long-term strategy will help the organization to have a better overview over the goals for the next 3 years and will secure continuity within the organization. The plan of action will be a yearly document used to help to reach the goals in the long-term strategy.

The Student Board asks the Student Parliament to give input on the long-term strategy. A final draft will be presented as a decision case at Student Parliament 3.

Faculty Feedback Round:

KBM:

- Generally more precise
- Likes the environment stations
- Likes the digital teaching methods

Biovit:

- Generally more concrete
- Takes diversity into account

MINA:

- Concerning point 4.1 - bike stations in general
- SiÅs is missing from the strategy, and the power of the students in the board

Realtek:

- Walking and biking paths are unsatisfactory
- Safe bike parking at the train station, might cost money
- Trains going south

HH, Vet og LandSam:

- No significant input

Highlights from the Discussion:

- Biking paths – not enough space. Should not bike over the soil.
- Can restrict the main road for card. Shouldn't take up the soil.
- Point 2.2 – it is a better solution to be a subject of the reception in Oslo because it is the best in the country. How does one get there? That is the police's task.
- Better marketing of the offer. The Student Board has started work on this.
- Veterinary students have looked into integration, will not be in three groups.
- Don't repeat the same point in different categories.
- Lacks overarching things, like working with the commune and NSO.
- SiÅs needs to be more actively included.
- Instead of psychologists – better primary doctor offers.
- Do not compromise the availability of psychologists
- Focus on the train – people will live more spread out in the future.
- Reformulate point 6.1 to not be a question
- What about concrete measures for reaching the goals?

1075 1724.4 Plan of Action for the Student Democracy 2017

1076

1077 *Case responsible: Mariya Khanamiryan*

1078

1079 **Attachments:**

1080 Plan of action for the Student Democracy at NMBU 2017 (Attachment 8)

1081

1082 **Purpose:**

1083 To discuss the plan of action for the Student Democracy at NMBU

1084

1085 **Background:**

1086 The plan of action for the student democracy is a document that maps out the measures that
1087 the Student Parliament at NMBU and the Student Parliament's Student Board will work on in
1088 the coming year (2017).

1089

1090 Based on the long-term strategy and input from the Student Parliament during the kickoff
1091 conference, the Student Board has worked out a draft that we ask the Student Parliament to
1092 give input on. Based on the input and comments that come from Student Parliament 2, the
1093 Student Board will come forward with a final draft of a plan of action that will be presented as
1094 a decision case at Student Parliament 3.

1095

1096 Faculty Feedback Round:

1097

1098 MINA:

- 1099 • Not very concrete

1100

1101 BioVit:

- 1102 • Environmental stations – wishes this to be specified more concretely

1103

1104 LandSam:

- 1105 • Have not addressed the topic in their student council

1106

1107 KBM:

- 1108 • Don't just focus on the lack of space, but on using the space effectively
- 1109 • The bike paths in the action plan as well
- 1110 • Lacks a citizen perspective

1111

1112 HH og Vet:

- 1113 • Nothing to add

1114

1115 Realtek:

- 1116 • Concerning the point about a student ombudsman, has noticed the same need.

1117

1118 **Highlights from the Discussion:**

1119

- 1120 • Needs to be made easier to read and understand for all students – not just for the
1121 Student Parliament who is already familiar with it
- 1122 • Make is more concrete.
- 1123 • Is there a plan for empty buildings?

- 1124 • Bike paths; the State's road planning authorities have made a plan. The commune
1125 has put it on hold to coincide with some other projects they are working on.
- 1126 • Good case to take up when it is time to vote
- 1127 • Specify where the spaces will be?
- 1128 • Land use; the discussed draft of the campus plan has been released. Land use and
1129 efficiency. This will be brought up as a case in Student Parliament 3.
- 1130 • Quality in exchange. Work to get more to go on exchange, and it's not just Sit that
1131 needs to do this.
- 1132

1133 1725 Administrative Cases

1134 1725.1 Election of representatives to the board of complaints

1135
1136 *Case responsible: The Election Committee*

1137 **Purpose:**

1138 To elect two main representatives and two deputy representatives to the board of complaints.

1140

1141 **Background:**

1142 We need two students to sit in the board of complaints, and two deputies for these students.
1143 This is a paid position where one is paid for two hours of preparation time in addition to the
1144 entire meetings. A meeting lasts an entire working day. The board of complaints handles,
1145 amongst other things, complaints over formal errors with exams, and annulments of exams or
1146 tests. It is also the board of complaints that handle complaints about teaching and the learning
1147 environment. The position can be fitting for students interested in law, but that is not a
1148 requirement. The position begins on July 1, 2017, and lasts one year. The number of meetings
1149 vary a bit, but in 2015 and 2016 there were 8 meetings a year.

1150

1151 **Main representatives:**

1152 Two main representatives are to be chosen, and the representatives will hold the position from
1153 01.07/2017-30.06/2018.

1154

1155 Candidates:

1156

- 1157 • Martin Reigstad
- 1158 • Jenny Löfgren

1159

1160 The candidates present themselves, and the candidate who was present answered questions
1161 from the Student Parliament.

1162

1163 Martin Reigstad and Jenny Löfgren were elected through written voting.

1164

1165 **Deputy Representatives:**

1166 Two deputy representatives are to be chosen, and the representatives will hold the position
1167 from 01.07/2017-30.06/2018.

1168

1169 Candidates:

1170

- 1171 • Tony Penev

1172 • Sunniva Brajkovic

1173

1174 The candidates presented themselves to the Student Parliament. Tony Penev and Sunniva

1175 Brajkovic were elected through written voting.

1176

1177 **1725.2 Election of representatives for the central admissions committee**

1178

1179 *Case responsible: The Election Committee*

1180

1181 **Purpose:**

1182 To elect two main representatives and two deputy representatives to the central admissions

1183 committee

1184

1185 **Background:**

1186 Not all who wish to study at NMBU by applying through samordna opptak meet the grade

1187 requirements with their grades from secondary school. It is therefore necessary to have a

1188 central admissions board that can assess and rank the applications, and decide which students

1189 will be offered admission to NMBU. The committee will consist of one faculty representative

1190 from each faculty, one representative from the Student Board, and two student

1191 representatives. The committee has previously had about three meetings a year, in the

1192 beginning of July.

1193

1194 **Main representatives:**

1195 Two main representatives are to be chosen, and the representatives will hold the position for

1196 one year.

1197

1198 Candidates:

1199

1200 • Dagny Marie Vannebo

1201 • Christine Thormodsrud

1202 • Emma Kuskemoen

1203

1204 The candidates presented themselves and answered questions from the Student Parliament.

1205

1206 Dagny Marie Vannebo and Christine Thormodsrud were elected through written voting

1207

1208 **Deputy Representatives:**

1209 Two deputy representatives are to be chosen, and the representatives will hold the position for

1210 one year.

1211

1212 Candidates:

1213

1214 • Ingvild K.R. Strøm

1215 • Emma Kuskemoen

1216

1217 Ingvild K.R. Strøm and Emma Kuskemoen were elected through written voting.

1218

1219	1726	Other Cases
1220	1727	Meeting Evaluation
1221		
1222	•	Voting over the rules of procedure; was a bit confusing with two voting forms. The
1223		moderator takes responsibility for this as it went against the training received at the
1224		kickoff seminar.
1225	•	Fill out the voting in the PowerPoint as it happens.
1226	•	More food
1227	•	All the attachments gathered in one place.
1228	•	Kudos to the moderating board.
1229	•	Maybe a microphone is needed, difficult to hear everyone.
1230	•	Effective and interesting meeting.
1231	•	Kudos to the Student Board on the case papers
1232	•	State the ending time in the case papers.
1233	•	Good to change the order of the cases so that the decision cases come first.
1234	•	Kudos to all the Student Parliament representatives for holding up through a long
1235		meeting.
1236		
1237		
1238		
1239		
1240		
1241		
1242		
1243		
1244		
1245		
1246		
1247		
1248		
1249		
1250		
1251		
1252		
1253		
1254		
1255		
1256		
1257		
1258		
1259		
1260		
1261		
1262		
1263		
1264		
1265		
1266		
1267		
1268		

Oppmøteliste ST						
Fakultet	Studenttingsrepresentanter	ST X	ST 1	ST 2	ST 3	Kakebaker
HH	Halvor Helgetveit Kongevold	vara	x	x		ST 1
HH	Ane Marum Kvarme	x	x	vara		ST 1
HH	Astrid Tveitehagen	x	x	x		ST 1
HH	Signe Lindstad Isum	vara	vara	x		ST 1
RealTek	Mina Bjerke	x	x	x		ST 2
RealTek	Nina Vold Johansen	ikke møtt	x	x		ST 2
RealTek	Kristoffer Hagen	x	x	x		ST 2
RealTek	Espen Sønneland	x	x	x		ST 2
VET	Runa Malmo	vara	x	x		
VET	Emma Jensen	x	vara	x		
VET	Ane Grøndahl	ikke møtt	ikke møtt	vara		
FKBM	Maren Iren Vargan	x	x	x		
FKBM	Anniken Løvig	x	x	x		
FKBM	Johanne Østreng Halvorsen	x	x	x		
LandSam	Kerime van Opijnjen	vara	x	x		
LandSam	Amalie Rosslund Christiansen	x	x	x		
LandSam	Runar Smedås	x	x	ikke møtt		
LandSam	Jonas Wettre Thorsen	x	x	x		
MINA	Julie Westergaard Karlsen	ikke møtt	x	x		
MINA	Guro Sjursen Rivrud	x	vara	x		
MINA	Rosie Mari Jones	x	x	x		
MINA	Hogne Phillips Stubhaug	x	vara	x		
BioVit	Eilen K. Mjølhus	x	x	x		
BioVit	Elin Kristin Hushovd	x	x	x		
BioVit	Bendik Ferkingstad	x	x	x		
SiÅs	Erling Bjurbeck	ikke møtt	x	ikke møtt		
US	Ole Johan Holtet	ikke møtt	x	x		
	Sol Høgset	ikke møtt	ikke møtt	x		
AU	Mariya Khanamiryan	meldt forfall	x	x		
	Ina C Storrønning	x	x	x		
	Lise B Hovd	x	x	x		
	Tord Hauge	x	x	x		
	Sunniva Brajkovic	x	x	x		
	Johanne Hempel Sveen	x	x	x		
ISU	Maribelle L Hallee	ikke møtt	ikke møtt	ikke møtt		

1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277

1278 Attachments

1279

1280 Attachment 4 Proposed allocation funds for Spring 2017

1281

NAVN:		SØKT:			VURDERT TILDELT:			
Søker	Søknadsbeløp	Grunnstøtte	Ekstra grunnstøtte	Aktivitetsmidler	Berettiget grunnstøtte	Berettiget ekstra grunnstøtte	Aktivitetsmidler	SUM
Faglag								
AquariÅs	kr 9 700	kr 2 400		kr 7 300	kr 1 800		kr 4 300	kr 6 100
Miljøfysikerne	kr 12 300	kr 2 400		kr 9 900	kr 2 400		kr 5 900	kr 8 300
Molekylet	kr 6 200	kr 2 400		kr 3 800	kr 2 400		kr 800	kr 3 200
Jordskifterlaget	kr 9 800	kr 1 800		kr 8 000	kr 1 800		kr 3 500	kr 5 300
Jordbrukerlaget	kr 5 900	kr 1 000		kr 4 900	kr 1 200		kr 1 000	kr 2 200
Indøk NMBU	kr 20 200	kr 1 800		kr 18 400	kr 1 800		kr 5 000	kr 6 800
Fagverket	kr 7 500	kr 2 000		kr 5 500	kr 2 000		kr 1 500	kr 3 500
Energiforeningen	kr 1 400	kr 1 400		kr -	kr 1 400		kr -	kr 1 400
Globalis	kr 58 830	kr 1 000		kr 57 830	kr 1 000		kr 4 600	kr 5 600
Husdyrklanen	kr 15 700	kr 2 400		kr 13 300	kr 2 400		kr 4 200	kr 6 600
Optimum	kr 25 600	kr 2 400		kr 23 200	kr 2 400		kr 9 200	kr 11 600
La Stå!	kr 1 600	kr 1 600		kr -	kr 1 600		kr -	kr 1 600
Naturforvalterlaget	kr 12 350	kr 2 200		kr 10 150	kr 1 200		kr 4 700	kr 5 900
Skogbrukerforeningen	kr 5 650	kr 1 200		kr 4 450	kr 1 200		kr 2 000	kr 3 200
Hemulen	kr 12 750	kr 1 400		kr 11 350	kr 1 200		kr 3 750	kr 4 950
Atlas	kr 12 600	kr 2 400		kr 10 200	kr 1 600		kr 1 600	kr 3 200
Terra Forma	kr 12 150	kr 1 000		kr 1 150	kr 1 000		kr 3 000	kr 4 000
Teknikum	kr 20 550	kr 2 400		kr 18 250	kr 2 400		kr 6 000	kr 8 400
Totalt faglag:	kr 250 780	kr 33 200		kr 207 680	kr 30 800		kr 61 050	kr 91 850
Musikk og kultur								
Koneklubben Freidig	kr 16 200	kr 1 000		kr 15 200	kr 1 000		kr 6 350	kr 7 350
Dås	kr 2 200	kr 1 000		kr 1 200	kr 1 000		kr -	kr 1 000
Gents Academy	kr 15 100	kr 1 000		kr 14 200	kr 1 000		kr 4 100	kr 5 100
BB Cowboys	kr 9 400	kr 800		kr 8 600	kr 800		kr 7 300	kr 8 100
Feminin & Fornem	kr 5 000	kr 1 000		kr 4 000	kr 1 000		kr 1 000	kr 2 000
Leikaringen Frøy	kr 8 500	kr 800		kr 7 700	kr 800		kr 7 700	kr 8 500
Sangkoret Lærken	kr 7 500	kr 1 000		kr 6 500	kr 1 000		kr 300	kr 1 300
Åsblæst'n	kr 11 200	kr 1 200		kr 10 000	kr 1 200		kr 8 000	kr 9 200
Pikekoret IVAR	kr 5 000	kr 1 000		kr 4 000	kr 1 000		kr 2 000	kr 3 000
Rockklubben	kr 17 055	kr 1 400		kr 15 655	kr 1 400		kr -	kr 1 400
Budeieforenignen	kr 6 600	kr 1 000		kr 5 600	kr 1 000		kr 2 900	kr 3 900
Hankattforeningen st 1902	kr 19 140	kr 800		kr 18 340	kr 800		kr 13 050	kr 13 850
Collegium Alfa	kr 3 510	kr 1 000		kr 2 510	kr 1 000		kr 2 100	kr 3 100
Foreningen Hunkatten	kr 4 330	kr 1 000		kr 3 330	kr 1 000		kr 1 650	kr 2 650
Swingklubben Snurrebass	kr 29 038	kr 1 600		kr 27 438	kr 1 600		kr 1 400	kr 3 000
Spillforeningen: Både Kordt og Bredt	kr 7 850	kr 1 000		kr 6 850	kr 800		kr 6 650	kr 7 450
Mannskoret Over Rævne	kr 1 000	kr 1 000		kr -	kr 1 000		kr -	kr 1 000
Broderskapet Unity	kr 6 000	kr 1 000		kr 5 000	kr 1 000		kr 5 000	kr 6 000
Nordisk Landskamp	kr 11 400	kr 1 400		kr 10 000	kr 1 400		kr 10 000	kr 11 400
Den X-clusive Stiftelse PB	kr 4 500	kr 1 000		kr 3 500	kr 1 000		kr 2 600	kr 3 600
Sangkoret Noe Ganske								
Annet	kr 1 000	kr 1 000		kr -	kr 1 000		kr -	kr 1 000
NMBU Rumpeldunk	kr 4 450	kr 1 000		kr 3 450	kr 1 000		kr 2 050	kr 3 050
STUMBb	kr 25 000	kr 800		kr 24 200	kr 800		kr 24 200	kr 25 000
Totalt musikk og kultur:	kr 220 973	kr 23 800		kr 197 273	kr 23 600		kr 108 350	kr 131 950

1282

1283

Politikk, samfunnsengasjement og religion								
Spire Ås	kr 1 600	kr 1 600		kr -	kr 1 400		kr -	kr 1 400
Ås Senterstudenter	kr 800	kr 800		kr -	kr 800		kr -	kr 800
Ås Feministiske Studenter	kr 13 000	kr 1 000		kr 12 000	kr 1 000		kr 2 000	kr 3 000
Ingeniører Uten Grenser	kr 3 000	kr 1 000		kr 2 000	kr 1 000		kr -	kr 1 000
StuddFadd	kr 4 600	kr 800		kr 3 800	kr 800		kr 2 200	kr 3 000
Okios Ås - Økolag	kr 14 000	kr 1 000		kr 13 000	kr 1 000		kr 6 400	kr 7 400
Ås Kooperative	kr 10 400	kr 2 400		kr 8 000	kr 2 400		kr -	kr 2 400
StudentKRIK Ås	kr 18 950	kr 800		kr 18 150	kr 800		kr 2 650	kr 3 450
Laget	kr 19 160	kr 1 000		kr 18 160	kr 1 000		kr 9 560	kr 10 560
Ås Grønne Studenter	kr 5 800	kr 800		kr 5 000	kr 800		kr -	kr 800
Gay på Landet	kr 11 000	kr 1 000		kr 10 000	kr 1 000		kr 2 200	kr 3 200
Total pol, samf. og rel	kr 102 310	kr 12 200		kr 90 110	kr 12 000		kr 25 010	kr 37 010
Internasjonalt rettede organisasjoner								
Erasmus Student Network /	kr 1 200	kr 1 200		kr -	kr 1 200		kr -	kr 1 200
IEASTE ÅS	kr 1 200	kr 1 200		kr -	kr 800		kr -	kr 800
Total internasjonal	kr 2 400	kr 2 400		kr -	kr 2 000			kr 2 000
Stedsforeninger								
VesOppland SSG A/L	kr 2 800	800	1000	kr 1 000	kr 800,00	kr 1 000,00	kr 1 000,00	kr 2 800,00
Dale-Gudbrand	kr 800	800	0	kr 0	kr 800,00			kr 800,00
NØKKEL (Nord-Østerdals...)	kr 800	800		kr 0	kr 800,00		kr -	kr 800,00
Nordlands Trompet	kr 3 050	1200		kr 1 850	kr 1 000,00		kr 1 850,00	kr 2 850,00
Løgnaflaget	kr 11 400	1400		kr 10 000	kr -		kr -	kr -
Bergensforeningen Breiflabb	kr 6 050	1200		kr 4 950	kr 1 200,00		kr 3 005,00	kr 4 205,00
Stedforeninga Smaalenene	kr 2 700	1000		kr 1 700	kr 1 000,00		kr 1 700,00	kr 2 700,00
Hedmarks Bondeliga	kr 2 500	1000		kr 1 500	kr 1 000,00		kr -	kr 1 000,00
Det Sørlandske Selskab	kr 1 400	1400		kr 0	kr 1 400,00		kr -	kr 1 400,00
Trøndernes Fagforening	kr 4 850	1200		kr 3 650	kr 1 200,00		kr 2 050,00	kr 3 250,00
MF Svela	kr 1 000	1000		kr 0	kr 1 000,00		kr -	kr 1 000,00
Total stedforeninger	kr 37 350	11800		kr 24 650	kr 10 200,00	kr 1 000,00	kr 9 605,00	kr 20 805,00
Andre								
Studenttingets Alumnusnetve	kr 800	kr 800			kr 800			kr 800
NMBU Frilutsliv	kr 38 900	kr 1 800		kr 37 100	kr 1 600		kr 10 800	kr 12 400
Vektorprogrammet NMBU	kr 6 000	kr 1 200		kr 4 800	kr 1 000		kr 1 000	kr 2 000
United AID	kr 2 550	kr 1 200		kr 1 350	kr -		kr -	kr -
Rethinking Economics	kr 2 000	kr 1 000	kr 1 000		kr 1 000	kr 1 000	kr -	kr 2 000
Mental Helse Ungdom Ås	kr 11 200	kr 800		kr 10 400	kr 800		kr 5 250	kr 6 050
Stat NMBU	kr 8 750	kr 1 000		kr 7 750	kr 1 000		kr 2 500	kr 3 500
CRE8 Konferansen	kr 10 800	kr 800		kr 10 000	kr 800		kr -	kr 800
Studenthunden	kr 4 400	kr 1 000		kr 3 400	kr 1 000		kr 1 200	kr 2 200
Totalt andre:	kr 85 400	kr 9 600		kr 74 800	kr 8 000	kr 1 000	kr 20 750	kr 29 750
TOTALT:	kr 699 213	kr 93 000	kr 2 000	kr 594 513	kr 86 600	kr 2 000	kr 224 765	kr 313 365
Totale samfunnsnemidler								kr 54 635
Tilgjengelige midler								kr 368 000
Overføres Velferdssond								kr -