

# Stipendiatororganisasjonene i Norge

## Board meeting

Date: 16.12.2020

Time: 17:00

Place: Zoom

## Agenda

1. Invitation to attend Kontaktkonferanse for forskning og høyere utdanning tirsdag 12. januar 2021 kl. 09:00 – 12:00
2. Administration: SiN has Statutes but no guidelines. (Guidelines are a more general and detailed description of “work and responsibilities”.)
3. Workshop about “Stealing of research ideas” as discussed in the quarterly meeting. When should we aim for it and how to organize? Who to invite?
4. Nominations for teacher education representative in UHR
5. Newsletter
6. Any other business

## Attendees

- SiN board: Camilla, Grace, Idd, Ingvild, Miroslav, Bikal, Enrico, Margret

## Minutes

*Meeting start: 17:03*

1. *Contact conference for research and higher education*

We need to send two delegates. Yannik and Idd will sign up and attend the digital meeting.

2. *SiN guidelines*

SiN has statutes but no guidelines. There is a draft document from 2018 stating the responsibilities of different roles, but this is only a draft and not up to date. Updating the guidelines will be beneficial to streamline tasks and ensure continuity. The statutes state that SiN should have “by-laws”, which most likely is a bad translation and refers to the guidelines. These have to be shared with the board two weeks before the board meeting where they will be approved by the board. In addition to formulating guidelines, we should also implement some cosmetic changes in the statutes to reflect the difference between the statutes (i.e. by-laws) and guidelines. Margret and Yannik volunteer to set up this document. Idd asks whether working groups should be included in the guidelines. The general parameters describing how a working group is defined and operates could be included, but not the details of each individual working group. Margret volunteers to implement the cosmetic changes in the statutes. Camilla will send her some suggestions highlighting the sentences that were a bit unclear in the statutes, including paragraph 5 (defining membership of local organisations). We need to make sure that this

definition is not restricted to board members, because each local organisation may have their own statutes regarding this. Yannik also brings up the suggestion that the board should be restricted to nine members, and whether to make a hard rule for next year. This is something to think about for the next AGM.

### *3. Workshop on how to protect your research ideas*

As discussed in the last meetings, we aim to organise a workshop to raise awareness of the problem as well share experiences and information. Yannik suggests it should not be longer than two hours, and given the corona restrictions it will definitely have to be digital. Margret asks if the organising committee has to be exclusively from SiN or can also source contributions from local organisations. Someone from SiN should be responsible, but people from local organisations are welcome to join in the organisation. Yannik will definitely be part of the group. Two people from UiODoc would also be interested, in addition to one person from TODOS. Margret will share the email addresses from the interested UiODoc board members with Yannik so he can set up a first meeting. The workshop would ideally be hosted in February, at the latest March.

### *4. Representatives from Teacher Education to UHR*

SiN is responsible for nominating two candidates. There are three confirmed nominations from OsloMet and one possible nomination from UiT. Margret wonders what the general procedure is for nominating candidates, and what responsibility SiN has in recruiting possible candidates. Camilla states that every local organisation should have the necessary information and time to find candidates. Apart from a small mention at last quarterly meeting, we did not share any information to other local organisations. Camilla forwarded the request to the Teacher Education faculty at OsloMet, who had an internal discussion and this yielded three nominations that were endorsed by the PhD Forum. Ideally all other universities with relevant faculties should go through the same process. Margret seconds this and proposes we ensure a fair process next time we receive such a request, and to cement this in the guidelines that Yannik and she will draft. It should also be clear who will compensate for the hours spent working as representative. Ingvild explains that the travel costs for her positions in UHR are covered by SiN. SiN is not tasked with sending a delegate, only with finding a delegate, so we are not responsible for compensating their hours but we may choose to compensate the travel expenses if the delegate has no other funds to cover this. This decision also to some extent depends on how many delegates represent other disciplines in the UGHR. There are six disciplinary subunits of UHR ([fagstrategiske enheter](#)), so theoretically this amounts to at least 12 delegates. Arguably, the delegates represent their local organisation and the bill should go to the university. But practically it makes little differences for the finances of SiN because our budget is more than sufficient to allow some extra travel expenses, especially in the foreseeable future when most travel is suspended.

Practically it is too late to advertise this position more widely before the nomination deadline of 5 January, so it is decided we will choose two candidates from the four nominations available now. Margret suggests it is preferable to have candidates from different institutions. The arguments pro and con are presented and the candidates are ranked and unanimously chosen. Yannik will inform the candidates about the outcome.

### *5. Newsletter to local organisations*

Newsletter: Margret will check the newsletter before Yannik send it out tomorrow. Camilla highlights that not all member organisations received the press release of the covid-19 report, so that it might be good to update [medlemmer@stipendiat.no](mailto:medlemmer@stipendiat.no). Yannik will take care of this. This time the newsletter is sent after the quarterly meeting, but the communication strategy states that it will be distributed several weeks before the quarterly meeting. However, if the next quarterly meeting will be held in February, that means the next newsletter will already have to be sent in January. In practice it makes more sense to keep sending the newsletter after the quarterly meeting, with a recap of the discussion and decisions, a link to the minutes and any other relevant news. The communication before the quarterly meeting will then consist of setting a date and sharing the agenda. This will be updated in the communication strategy and the guidelines.

#### *6. Any other business*

Camilla says that if the communication strategy is going to be a part of the guidelines, then we did not approve it in the way that was outlined in the statutes, because they were not shared two weeks in advance of the board meeting. We will review the communication strategy again when voting on the general guidelines in the near future.

Camilla also brings up two additional points that can be deferred until the next board meeting in January. The first point concerns how cross-institutional research organisations can become integrated in SiN, because all their members are theoretically represented by other institutions as well. This is something we should think about because one of these organisations was present at the last quarterly meeting, which implicitly acknowledges their standing as potential members. The second point concerns the demand for a general introduction event for new PhD students in Norway. These will be discussed after the winter holidays. Yannik makes a general point that any board member can add agenda points to the google docs that is uploaded whenever a date for the next board meeting is set. This prevents unnecessary emailing back and forth.

*Meeting end: 18:23*



Stipendiatorganisasjonene i Norge

Org. nr: 885 485 472

---

Margret Veltman

Date: 16.12.2020