



Stipendiatorganisasjonene i Norge

## PARTICIPATION REPORT

**Report number:** 20130408-0002

**Name of the person filling in the report:** Julien S. Bourrelle

**Date of filling in the report:** 8<sup>th</sup> April 2013

**Name of event:** EuroDoc AGM

**Date and time of event:** 6-7<sup>th</sup> Aprils 2013

**Place of event:** Lisbon, Portugal

**Organizers:** EuroDoc / Portuguese national doctoral organisation

**Type of event:** AGM

**Topic of event:** Updates to statutes, regulations and election of new board, WG leader, President

**Expenses covered by SiN for participating:** Partly

**Speaker(s):** N/A

**Main ideas:** Yearly meeting

**Overall outcomes:** Representation of Norway and SiN. Networking. Presence at the European level.

**Overall opinion of participants:** Positive

**Connection with SiN activity:** Umbrella organisation for SiN

**Your personal opinion:** Good discussion and interesting. Good networking. Some lack of professionalism from certain delegates.

### Key Points:

- Changes to the EuroDoc Statues
- Changes to EuroDoc Internal Regulations
- Election of new Board, President, Vice-President, WG leader, policy officers

**Signature:**

Contact details: [julien.bourrelle@ntnu.no](mailto:julien.bourrelle@ntnu.no) / @gmail.com

## **EuroDoc Annual General Meeting April 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> 2013, Lisbon**

### **Background EuroDoc and Involvement:**

Eurodoc is involved in Promodoc (<http://www.promodoc.eu/>), Doclinks (<http://www.doclinks.org/>) and Educoach (). It is partner in Euroscience (), Studyportals (), Ise (), EUA () and European Commission. EuroDoc is currently involved with the following organisations / activities:

- Council of Europe
- EuroDoc questionnaire
- European Young Researchers Platform
- BFUG WG on Third Cycle
- New Eurodoc website
- Eurodoc Active Collab
- No Cut on Research Initiative

### **Funding**

I asked what initiative the board has taken to secure funding at the European level. The answer from the board and president was vague, mostly criticising the European funding system that does not fit within the framework/realities of Eurodoc (e.g. that grants require permanent employees, already proven spendings and needs, etc.) France said that it is interesting to see option at the European level and ask more precision on my question. I pointed out to the funding scheme for the European Student Union (ESU). They seemed to be unaware of it. The board stated that we were no students and that it is more difficult to fulfil requirements for funding related to education. I did not have the opportunity to reply to this.

While PhD candidates shall not be considered as student, they do receive education and thus should be eligible to grants in the education sector.

### **Advisory Board and Board of Trustees**

The proposal for an advisory board and a board of trustees was accepted. Only Portugal voiced objections to the proposal. They opposed the proposal arguing that such board is dangerous for EuroDoc on the premise that external actors may influence the administrative board.

The role of the advisory board is to provide practical inputs from former members of EuroDoc's leadership. The advisory board is appointed at the AGM each year and sits for one year. The board of trustees is composed of former delegates, former presidents or external actors that have personal network or experience that is of high value to EuroDoc. This is a way to provide continuity and increase EuroDoc's lobbying force. The members of the board of trustees are appointed for a period of 3 years, and may be appointed by the Council outside the AGM.

### **Other changes to the statutes / regulation**

Other minor changes were proposed and accepted. See EuroDoc website. One significant change to the statute proposed by Germany was refused. They proposed to provide the Council with the power to change the strategic focus of EuroDoc between the AGMs. The main reason for the proposal to be refused was that the proposed changes would require a simple majority of the Council, whereas a 2/3 majority of the AGM would be required to adopt the same changes. The proposal implicitly gave more power to the Council than the AGM, which is against the structure of the organisation. I pointed this out, and received support from many of the other delegates; however the German delegation seemed not to understand the side effect of their proposal. The proposal was overwhelmingly refused. This is regrettable since, in essence, giving the Council the chance to reorient EuroDoc between AGMs is desirable. However for it to be acceptable it does require that both the AGM and the Council stand on the same power level, i.e. same type of majority requirement.

### **Interesting Information/comment for SiN (outside the official discussions):**

- National polish organisation yearly budget: 60 000EUR (ministry of higher education).
- A board of trustees on the model described in these notes should be implemented for SiN.

**Election of the new Board and President:** See official minutes for the results.