Preliminary summons
Chalmers Student Union Council, Meeting 4 22/23

You are hereby summoned to a meeting of the Chalmers Student Union council.

Location: Kårrestaurangen, Johanneberg
Time: Wednesday 14th December 2022, 18:00
Language: English (primarily)

Agenda (Föredragningslista)

1. Preliminaries (Preliminärer)
   a. Opening of the meeting (Sammanträdets öppnande)
   b. Calling of the electoral roll (Justering av röstlängd)
   c. Election of two adjusters as well as tellers (Val av två justerare tillika rösträknare)
   d. Due announcement of the meeting (Sammanträdets behöriga utlysande)
   e. Approval of the agenda (Godkännande av föredragningslista)
   f. Co-option (Adjungeringar)
   g. Minutes of the previous meeting (Föregående mötesprotokoll)
   h. Follow-up of decisions (Uppföljning av beslut)

2. Messages (Meddelanden)
   a. Speaker’s presidium (Talmanspresidiet)
   b. Student Union Management team (Kårledningen)
   c. Others (Övriga)

3. Resignations (Avsägelser)

4. Reports (Rapporter)

5. Discharge matters (Dechargeärenden)
   a. Operational report 2021/2022 (Verksamhetsberättelse 2021/2022)
   b. Annual report 2021/2022 (Årsberättelse 2021/2022)
   c. Auditors’ report 2021/2022 (Revisionsberättelse 2021/2022)
   d. Lay auditors’ report 2021/2022 (Revisions-PM 2021/2022)
   e. Ratification of income statement and balance sheet for 2021/2022 (Fastställande av resultaträkning och balansräkning för 2021/2022)
   f. Discharge of last year’s board, managing director and other groups and elected officials (Ansvarsfrihet för föregående års kårstyrelse, VD samt övriga organ och valda funktionärer)

6. Elections (Val)
a. Committee for review of the Cortège (Cortegèns granskningsnämnd)
b. The union’s members in the board of CSB (Kårens ledamöter i CSB:s styrelse)

7. Simple questions (Enkla frågor)
8. Interpellations (Interpellationer)
   a. Interpellation 6 — Regarding the nomination process

9. Ratification of decisions (Fastställande av beslut)
10. Board bills (Propositioner)
11. Member bills (Motioner)
   a. Member bill 7 — Reducing the Influence of Nomination Committee Members in the Candidate Selection Process
   b. Member bill 8 — A constitutional rescue of Chalmersspexet

12. Closing of the meeting (Sammanträdets avslutande)

Göteborg, Wednesday 30th November 2022

Hugo Simonsson
Speaker (Talman)

Mauritz Kööhler
Deputy Speaker (Vice Talman)
Attachments (*Bilagor*)

1. Interpellation 6 — Regarding the nomination process
2. Member bill 7 — Reducing the Influence of Nomination Committee Members in the Candidate Selection Process
3. Member bill 8 — A constitutional rescue of Chalmersppexet
Interpellation 6 - Regarding the nomination process

Background
The nomination committee task force has worked on three main areas, according to the bill that was passed to start the task force. The first area is the purpose of the interviews to determine a candidate’s appropriateness, namely the committee’s presidents and, if present, treasurer. The committees nominate for all positions and hand the nominations in to the student union board. The nomination committee interviews only the president and treasurer, but with 20 committees that is a lot of hours dedicated to interviews. As stated in the original bill on FuM2, this has been discussed for several years in the nomination committee as something that takes more time than can be justified. It often results in the nomination committee being unable to focus on continuity since the majority of these interviews happen during study period 4. Additionally, there have been very few examples of where this practice has had an effect on who is chosen for a position. Which adds to the problem of it taking too much time than is justified.

Our current solution to this, that we have talked to the president of the nomination committee about, is to give the nomination committee a more overseeing role in the recruitment for members of committees. That would mean that we would take away the task of interviewing all presidents and treasurers from the nomination committee. Instead, the nomination committee would be responsible for having an overview and knowing if the committee’s recruitment processes are fair and well managed. The nomination committee are positive toward this and if FuM thinks it is a good idea, our plan is to write documents that instruct the nomination committee on what they can look at in the committee’s recruitment processes and what information they should gather from the committees.

We think this would result in less total work for the nomination committee, since they could gather information about the recruitment processes via email or shorter meetings with the committees if needed. It would not affect the student union board’s workload if done correctly since it would not change what is reported to them. Instead of the nomination committee presenting that the candidate is appropriate or not they would guarantee the quality of the recruitment process to the board. A possibility could be that it would result in more work for the committees, but in our opinion it is only good if all committees are required to have a fair and organized recruitment process.

The second area discussed is how to generally take away workload and make the nomination committees work more efficient. Here, the task force has discussed several ideas but none of these are on the level where FuM has to make a decision. Therefore, we plan to hand these ideas over to the nomination committee.

The third area has to do with the transparency of the recruitment processes. We believe that the above-mentioned solution of overseeing by the nomination committee can be a solution
for this too. An additional idea is that the task force could write a document that can support the committees in having a fair and transparent process, which the nomination committee could be responsible to maintain and hand to the committees.

Our plan is to further discuss this with the nomination committee, but we would like to hear what FuM thinks before we start writing the report to FuM6 and possibly a bill. Especially about our suggestion to remove the interviews of presidents and treasurers from the nomination committee’s work.

**Important note:** In the constitution it says “Valberedningen skall bereda val av ordförande och, i förekommande fall, kassör i samtliga kommittéer” (the nomination committee shall prepare election of the president and treasurer in all committees). We have not investigated if the interpretation of this hinders us from making the suggested change. But as we know, there is a task force looking into changes of the constitution and we therefore see an opportunity to change the formulation if FuM thinks this is a good idea.

Hence, we present FuM with these questions and if the student union board has the time, their opinions and thoughts are welcome to:

**Questions**

What does the council think about the main idea presented above (removing interviews of presidents and treasurers and adding a task to have an overview over the recruitment)?

Does the council think this proposal falls under the current constitution or do we need to propose a bill to change it (perhaps in the revision task force’s bill)?

Is it a good idea to make this a permanent change or is it better to have a test period and task the nomination committee with making an evaluation?

__________________________________  __________________________________
Lovisa Eriksson                                                                 Filip Lindset
Förbundet                                                                      Förbundet

__________________________________  __________________________________
Alexandru Golic                                                                Jesper Keijser
Capspartiet                                                                   Capspartiet
Member Bill 7 - Reducing the Influence of Nomination Committee Members in the Candidate Selection Process

Background

There are many appointments that take place every year in the student union. Most of the candidates are usually students associated with the student union. There is some degree of subjectiveness in the selection process based on the understanding between the interviewers and interviewee. I would like to emphasize that the selection for different positions should be objective as far as possible within the student union, respecting the principles of the democratic process.

I would particularly like to address the situation in which there is only one candidate application for an open position. So, if there is any vacant position that is announced and only one candidate applies, the position must be given to that candidate regardless of the view of the selection committee if the candidate fulfills all the mandatory requirements related to the position, such as language proficiency, being a member of the student union, etc.

Yrkande

With above as background, the undersigned claims:

that the board and management team express their views to make the nomination process more objective and unbiased for the candidates in the case of single application

__________________________
Rahul Aggarwal
FuM member, 22/23
Member Bill 8 – A constitutional rescue of Chalmersspexet
(En stadgeenlig räddning av Chalmersspexet)

Background
At FuM3 22/23, a member bill (no. 6) was tabled proposing a violation of the constitution to allow the Union Board to appoint a Directeur of Chalmersspexet that is not a member of the Union, with the reason that unless this exception is made, as no other candidates have come forward Chalmersspexet will not be able to function in 2023.

We agree that it would be incredibly unfortunate if Chalmersspexet would have to suspend operations, being the institution of our University that it is. Nevertheless, there are some constitutional issues that cannot be ignored in the solution that the bill proposes, most notably that it (in our opinion) cannot be safely passed barring further violations of the constitution in time for the deadline for appointment of the Directeur according to the bylaws §15:4s. Therefore, we table an alternative solution through amendment of the bylaws which will allow the appointment in time if approved FuM4 22/23 at the latest.

Motivation for this proposal
Omitted from the previous proposal is the crucial fact that this is not the first time this very crisis has occurred. In fact, the year 21/22 posed the exact same difficulty in recruiting a Directeur and the Union Board resorted to violating the constitution by appointing a non-Union member after weighing the alternatives and possible consequences. To repeatedly raise this problem in the Council or the Board when it more than likely will reoccur will take a lot of time and energy; we should find a solution with an acceptable status quo pending a complete investigation.

Hence, the change in this proposal will be valid until further notice, although we couple it with an inquiry in the Constitutional Task Force to follow up if possible. We do not wish to cause a third Board and year of Chalmersspexet the anxiety of possibly having to suspend operations.

The proposal relies on the ability to statute exemptions to the final clause in the constitution §5:2. It must also be immediately entered into the minutes to take force in time.

Issues with the previous proposal
We have four principal objections to the previous bill as written:

The decision is inherently out of order.
The ability to explicitly sanction a violation of the constitution in advance cannot be in order, as it would completely sideline the usual procedure to amend the constitution. It is unclear what the quorum required for such a decision would be, or what questions this procedure could be applied to. Most appropriate is probably to treat it as a constitutional amendment; but then it cannot be passed in time for the appointment deadline.

Violations of the constitution do unfortunately occur. Nevertheless, we cannot recall any instance where such a violation was sanctioned in advance. There is an important distinction between advance permission and actual violation.

The decision is not appropriate in principle.
We believe the Council in principle should strive to uphold the constitution. The precedent of this decision if admissible would not be desirable. Sometimes violations may be forced or occur by error, but they should never be accompanied by advance sanction.

Decisions of such philosophical significance should not be made under duress of the potential collapse of Chalmersspexet.

**The decision should, in part, not be made at this level.**

The question of the composition of our Union Committees is a matter for the Union Board, who evaluate the nominated candidates and decide on their appointment. The Council should not bypass the executive freedom of the Board in this area.

The matter of the constitution is solely reserved for the Council. A decision to sanction a violation of the constitution, if admissible, could only be made at the highest level. The result of the sanction in question is however not a matter for the Council in this case.

**The decision is contrary to precedent.**

Last year, the same issue arose; no eligible candidate came forward for the Directeur. In that case the Union Board took responsibility in the above manner and the issue never came to the Council.

Previous violations of the constitution have occurred at Council level. We have strived to proceed by unanimous consent, and most importantly satisfy the spirit of the constitution if not the letter.

In this situation, the constitution is clear that we cannot elect non-members to positions in the Union. An exception should be made in the proper manner and not by ad-hoc decision.

### Bylaw amendment (Reglementesändring)

Reglementets §15:4s "Chalmersspexet" ska ha följande lydelse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuvarande lydelse</th>
<th>Föreslagen lydelse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalmersspexet har till uppgift att:</td>
<td>Chalmersspexet har till uppgift att:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offentligt och inför kåren framföra spex.</td>
<td>• Offentligt och inför kåren framföra spex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommittén består av directeur/-er samt de ledamöter som erfordras.</td>
<td>Kommittén består av directeur/-er samt de ledamöter som erfordras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommitténs ledamöter utses för ett år av kårstyrelsen på förslag av föregående kommitté.</td>
<td>Kommitténs ledamöter utses för ett år av kårstyrelsen på förslag av föregående kommitté.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Överskott från kommitténs verksamhet tillfaller spexfonden och nästa års kommitténs egna kapital.</td>
<td>Överskott från kommitténs verksamhet tillfaller spexfonden och nästa års kommitténs egna kapital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*English translation of the amended paragraph: The president of the committee [Chalmersspexet] is appointed 15 December at the latest for the duration of one year, and need not be a member of the Union.*
Yrkande (Motion)
Med ovan som bakgrund yrkar undertecknade:

att fullmäktige antar reglementesändring enligt ovan
att stadgegruppen (Constitution Task Force) åläggs särskilt utvärdera reglementesändringen i sitt uppdrag
att besluten anses direktjusterade

In light of the foregoing, the undersigned move

that the Council approve the bylaw amendment according to the above
that the Constitution Task Force is enjoined to in particular evaluate the bylaw amendment in their assignment
that the decisions are immediately entered into the minutes

______________________________________  ______________________________________
Ruben Seyer                             Lucas Glimfjord
Förbundet (the Party)                   Förbundet (the Party)

______________________________________  ______________________________________
Moltas Hultin                           Amanda Dehlén
Förbundet (the Party)                   Förbundet (the Party)

______________________________________  ______________________________________
Jesper Hermenius                        Arvid Nyberg
Förbundet (the Party)                   Förbundet (the Party)