



## 1. Welcome

Daniel (Chair): I declare the GA opened at 13:31. Firstly, thank you all for coming. There is a little less turn-out than previous times, that is okay, there are just some important things we need discuss and have voted on it before the next GA.

Bojana (UCM): With the members presence to we reach quorum?

Daniel (Chair): We need a delegate for at least 6 of the Members, and we have this so we can make binding decisions.

Stephen (UCM): There are 4 UCs present here.

Daniel (Chair): There are 5 UCs present and there is a proxy vote for EUC. Those two people are representatives for different UCs. I sense some hesitance so I would like to clarify, two out of the three major topics we are discussing are implemented after the next GA; so we are making preparatory steps, but they are advisory votes and concerns can still be voiced before implementation. I also wish more people would have been present.

Daniel (Chair): We also do not have the IB present due to circumstances, so we have two options, one is that Mirre (Academic Committee Chair & EB Member) does the vote counting, and the other is that one of the delegates gives up their vote and counts the votes.

*There are no objections to Mirre counting the votes.*

## 2. Approval of the GA Agenda

*There are no objections to the Policy GA agenda so the agenda is approved!*

## 3. Approval of the previous GA Minutes

*There are no objections to the Policy GA minutes so the minutes are approved!*

## 4. Composition of Executive Board

Daniel (Chair): I will now give a short introduction and explanation to the proposed new EB position. The reason for adding a new position is that we've noticed there is a relatively low feeling of ownership in the EB for specific tasks. We want to have more expertise for specific tasks, but giving people the ability to focus on these. In the past weeks the executive board has made a list of tasks and projects we want to focus on, like the Master's Transition, economic diversity in UCU students. From this we have created portfolios to

organise these tasks and allocate them better. We noticed while doing this that there was a series of portfolios with a specific skillset, which the treasurer, chair or secretary may have; but that is unique enough that someone may run because they like this aspect but does not have the “chairing” etc. skills needed. That’s why we thought it made sense to move these two portfolio’s, “external contact and political organisation” and “press” to a new position. We know that a concern may be, we do not see enough of this political contact or press now, to which we say “exactly!”. We see it is easy to gain entrance to political parties and lobbying events, but it’s harder to find the time to get the invitations; so the “limiting factor” is that none of the board members as of right now, have the time to do so.

Daniel (Chair): So we would like to vote on adding this position to the policy manual, and we would like to add this clause, which explains the external as someone who builds and maintains the political network and someone who actively seeks out PR moments. An example is that programmes like Buitenhof ask for representatives from organisations like the UCSRN, but we don’t have a member that can go.

Daniel (Chair): Before we vote on this, and this vote is our only binding vote of the GA. but first I will read out the statement sent in by UCTwente as they could not be here today, and then we will answer your questions.

Letter (UCT): Our only concern is that the organisation should be able to function smoothly. However, we urge the GA to come up with a back-up plan in case there is not enough interest in this position.

Bojana (UCM): To what extent will we be associating with political associations, because the UCMSA policy manual prohibits us from doing so? And we were given very little information prior to the GA, so my proposal would be for the EB to write and put up a proposal on this position, send that before the next GA and then vote on the position there.

Daniel (Chair): Such a proposal is on the website and was sent out with the GA call in advance following the documents procedure in our policy manual. But to answer your question regarding the association with political parties, we aren’t changing anything from the UCSRN trajectory, we are just creating a position to facilitate the tasks the GA has assigned us. The long-term vision will still be set by the GA, from this the EB will approach all the political parties, adapting each encounter with the components of our goals they are most linked to. For example: this year we visited CDA and PVV, and we’re visiting D66 tomorrow, when we visited VVD we talked to them about their stance on “Dutch talent retention” as that is a point on their agenda and we linked this to the loss of talent when UC students go abroad because Dutch master’s do not accept them. If we approach Groen Links we are more likely to talk about socioeconomic diversity and the threat to this due to increasing tuition fees as that is closer to their agenda. There is no official affiliation with any party, and there is no bias in who we approach, and we also will use this position to attend lobby events that are hosted by the VSNU which are on neutral ground.

Bojana (UCM): A second question is then, do you need a separate position?

Daniel (Chair): This is outlined in our proposal, and I can understand that with the things we have shown you output wise, you do not think there's a demand for this position, but that's because there has been no "output" because there was no person with time to do these tasks as other EB members have other priorities. With these portfolios we are making a clearer division of responsibilities, this frees up time for secretary and chair to do more internal communication i.e. keeping you informed on the tournament. The external communication is more time-consuming and needs someone's focus and as such we believe it warrants a full position.

Bojana (UCM): How will the network be strengthened and transitioned if the position is also for just a year?

Daniel (Chair): During the transition process; the predecessor will introduce the new board member to the networks that are close to the UCSRN.

Bojana (UCM): I motion to move this decision to the next GA.

Daniel (Chair): Would we still call for the position, then in the chance it will be approved at the election GA, we still have someone running?

Bojana (UCM): I see that, but I do not see it as being that urgent, this is a decision for the more long-term vision of the UCSRN. The organisation doesn't depend on this aspect, we can postpone it to next year when we have a more valid GA with more members and the IB.

Louise (AUC): Don't you think that it would be better to approve this now so someone can run for the position for the election GA, and then the UCSRN can work on these goals with this position implemented. If we move it to the next GA, then the person wouldn't be able to transition with the whole board if someone even runs which means having to wait another full year for this to be implemented. One of the main reasons UCSRN is valuable is that it is that one body that can do all this lobbying for UCs, the social aspect is great as well, but this lobbying is also one of the main reasons AUC joined for. I fear delaying this decision for one GA will delay this progress for an entire year as the next GA is elections GA.

Bojana (UCM): I understand that, I understand their need for more manpower but it doesn't seem as urgent, so we can postpone this to a more valid GA, since it is an entire position and someone that will represent the UCs politically.

Louise (AUC): But you still choose the person to represent you at the election GA, it's just adding the position now, we're not voting on the UCSRN representing us in lobbying events, that is already one of their project and

mandates, we're voting on giving them the manpower to do so, with the specific member to be elected at the election GA. It makes sense to have more people to do these tasks, but you still get to choose the specific person at the GA.

Bojana (UCM): If only the people present vote on it, then it's not a valid decision.

Louise (AUC): The documents were sent well in advance, I read them, there's enough UCs present to be valid. So this could have been avoided if you'd read the documents.

Stephen (UCM): We didn't know where to find the documents

Louise (AUC): On the website were the documents always are.

Daniel (Chair): I would like to clarify that we have 5 UCs present with a delegate and EUC has a proxy vote and we have a statement from UCT.

Marjolein (UCR): For those of you who maybe haven't read the document yet, if we give them some time because it's a pretty clear document that answers all the questions of why and what.

*A small amount of time is given to read the proposal.*

Bojana (UCM): My concerns still stand as there is no IB member present.

Daniel (Chair): Yes, and we voted on the alternative 10 minutes ago, Mirre is counting votes, and you raised no objections to this.

Stephen (UCM): There is a difference between having an IB and not objecting to the AC counting votes.

Daniel (Chair): We can also do a roll call vote, which will take longer but have an overview.

*The consensus is reached, Mirre will count votes out loud and tally on the whiteboard.*

Bojana (UCM): Could you remind me of the tasks for this position, I don't see them listed.

Daniel (Chair): They're listed on the bottom of the document, and they are: General Political Lobby and External Awareness Creation. To clarify these are portfolios with some allocated to each position and some loose ones that are not position specific but have been outlined so they can be clearly assigned to a board member upon internal agreement.

***Voting on the motion to move the vote on the External Position to the next GA.***

*The motion is not approved.*

***Voting on the addition of the External Position ( the PM changes ).***

*The external position is added.*

**5. Travel Policy**

Daniel (Chair): The last GA we also had a discussion session on the travel reimbursement; from these discussions we have gathered some options. What we are going to do with these options is an advisory vote, with tally so that we can show this preference to the next board and hope they take it on, without forcing them and their GA into a situation that may not be wanted, such as happened with the event structure and long terms goals last year. Essentially we're going to count what people think so they take that into account for policy to be made for their year, we recommend that they follow this majority.

Daniel (Chair): There's essentially 4 budget options. The first is, despite the costs for the traveller changing we keep the reimbursement price as is, which is nice for the budget and budgeting but not for the travellers. The second is, we add an exception clause, the formulation is up to the next year, but it's essentially if a student comes from a far UCU they have a higher amount that can be reimbursed. The third option is increasing the general amount reimbursed per ticket, and the fourth option is both the general exception clause and the amount increase. The implications of these options for the contribution fees are as follow, for option one the systems remains the same so no change, for the second it depends a bit on the formulation but no huge extras are predicted as the exceptions don't happen too often. The third will be a harder constraint on the budget with the fourth option being even more, these both mean the money has to come from elsewhere either directly from events or from contribution fees.

*There are no questions.*

Letter (UCT): As we all know, the far-away UCs are the ones that are most negatively impacted when the group ticket does not come through. Considering that UCSRN events are usually held quite far from UCT, a favourable travel policy would be extremely beneficial in promoting more students to attend UCSRN events, and thereby increasing and enriching the diversity of students at the events. In this regard, UCT would like to support the options (2) and (3) for travel reimbursement, with a higher support for option (2). We are quite against the option (1) of keeping the same system as it exists now, because being a relatively small UC, the new / increased travel costs would be very detrimental to our participation at UCSRN activities including the General Assemblies. As for option (3) of scaling up the reimbursement to match the increase in group ticket costs: the UCSRN membership fee was lowered just last year, and we have to make a choice between having consistency in the travel reimbursements and having consistency in the membership fees. However, this option would definitely make the next year's system relatively easier to set up. Finally, our strongest

support is for option (2) of making an exception clause, because it is the most fair option for all UCs as equal members of this organisation of representatives. It is of course harder to define the guidelines for such a system, but with the cooperation of all UCs, the process can be made smoother!

*There are no motions or questions on the floor.*

### **Voting on the Travel Policy option**

Option 1: 0  
Option 2: 18  
Option 3: 0  
Option 4: 0  
Abstain: 6

As such the recommended option is option 2; and the tally will also be shared.

## **6. Event Structure**

Daniel (Chair): I would like to invite the Treasurer to the stage to explain the proposed event structure update.

Kirsten (Treasurer): We would like to recommend the next board to move the tournament, spotlight, and one academic event out from the event fund, and assign these at the start of the year. The reasoning is that these are important events and them being dependent on the fund cause flexibility. The event because it is the biggest UCSRN event and spotlight and one academic event is for one event for each committee to assign. We would like to set clear deadlines for when the proposals have to be in, when the committees have to be voted on and when the events should happen for these three categories, to ensure that these are known and planned in advance. So that the proposals are sent in and voted on in the first 3 or 4 meetings of the committee, and part of the money will still be in the fund as a lot of event are proposed regardless of the big events and we would like those events to still ne able to receive sponsoring.

Kirsten (Treasurer): We now have a new survey form, it was sent out a while ago, but it will now be put on the site. This means there will be a clear set-up of what a committee wants to know before voting on an event and allows easier comparison between events. We are still thinking about adding co-ordinator portfolio's, so that there is a single point of contact, where all the questions can be addressed to.

Louise (AUC): What is the difference between hosting and sponsoring? Hosting the event would then be the UCSRN's event taking place at a UC whereas sponsoring is a UC event that gets some UCSRN money; then who takes up the liabilities? I.e. profits and losses.

Kirsten (Treasurer): It's not up to me to decide that, it's up to the new board, but I would not necessarily prefer for the EB to be liable, because us being liable means we will be way more involved in the organisation to the point of

making most big decisions, and knowing all the details. Because if we as liable parties don't know all the details, then it is not a good idea to be liable.

Louise (AUC): But you can see with the current tournament that you need that involvement and knowledge regardless and you say there is a co-ordinator that is contacting the team; but then who should take the responsibility of profit and lost.

Daniel (Chair): It is not the case that we recommend that not be a part, it's more that we do not have a clear recommendation to the next board. If you want to add that, then go ahead. With the co-ordinators it's more that they are there as an informant from the first meeting and can help with knowledge and resources as opposed to now where we find out issues way too late.

Stephen (UCM): I like the proposal and I'm in favour of it, but I'm not sure what we are voting on, what's the implication and practical implementation of the vote. We don't know all the period and time schedules and proposal templates yet.

Daniel (Chair): The problem is that those things are things the next board has to decide on with their GA, but we don't want them to "propose" something based on an old system that many people want changed so we want to recommend them to base it on these tips. Then they can propose something different to be voted on by their GA. The time spans will be up to the Social Committee; so that's not yet decided. We are advising the next board to take the three events out and assign them; and have a more set structure.

Stephen (UCM): I'm still confused, as there's no practical changes in the policy manual and/or transition manual.

Daniel (Chair): The way it works now, is that there's no policy but it's based on approving the budget in a reflection of an event format. As such we are voting on an advice to give the new board in the creation of their new board.

Bojana (UCM): I think Louise brought up a valid point in terms of liabilities, but we are not sure of the relevance or implication of it.

Unidentified (AUC): So what's the difference in hosting and sponsoring.

Kirsten (Treasurer): The difference is are we involved in organising it with a co-ordinator or do we contribute some money and PR it.

Louise (AUC): I remember with the Spotlight, you stated the UCSRN did not want to be liable, whereas that was a good part of the SoCo last year, that the liability meant everyone was informed and knowledgeable. So if the organiser could have a member in the SoCo.

Daniel (Chair): My suggestion would be then to raise a motion to include that in the advice we give.

*The motion is to change the hosting and sponsoring so that it is clear that the hosting category is a delegation of organisational tasks with the liability lies with the UCSRN, with the recommendation that a SoCo representative has to be involved in the organisation committee.*

Daniel (Chair): There have been a couple of points raised that these things are not currently in policy anywhere but solely through the budget, and we will look at the PM and where it could be inserted and we can bring that up at the election GA. So if there are policy changes to be made, we will look at these.

Stephen (UCM): How are minutes taken right now?

Daniel (Chair): They are recorded, and these will be listened back to and transcribed, but in case of failure we take notes during the GA.

### ***Voting on the motion***

*This motion has been approved and will be added to the vote.*

### ***Voting on the proposal, including the motion that was just approved.***

*The motion has been unanimously approved.*

## **7. Open Floor**

Daniel (Chair): Any questions, comments, statements and motions?

Stephen (UCM): Where is the EB Secretary?

Daniel (Chair): She could not be here today due to personal circumstances.

Menno (UCU): Can we talk about the tournament?

Daniel (Chair): I went there last week, so I have a lot of knowledge and can answer a lot of your questions but I am not officially part of the team so I can not make promises or commit myself to my answers. So I suggest, we close the GA and have an informal Q&A session after the GA.

Menno (UCU): Just so it's somewhere in the minutes, the team hasn't been very organised and they haven't been responsive to messages. Especially regarding the rules and procedures, which they made in a Google Doc that they are still continuously making edits and changes to. The changes of the rules makes it very annoying with finding people to represent them.

Daniel (Chair): The internal agreement is that they will finalise the rules today, and will make no more changes to it.

April 15<sup>th</sup>

UCSRN General Assembly Minutes  
Mirre Stevens & Kirsten Kapteijns

Louise (AUC): If you have any concerns send the EB an e-mail and the EB will answer them quickly and in depth.

Daniel (Chair): Yes, we can do things with those comments, and we can also let the tournament know.

Claudia (UCU): For future purposes it is very recommended to have the SoCo rep also be involved in the organisation, because this Tournament Team is quite “distanced” from the associations.

Daniel (Chair): That is why we approved the proposal, it's to set some safeguards into place.

Stephen (UCM): What's with the ticket prices? The changing prices and the independent websites and things.

Daniel (Chair): We were made aware of this at the same time as you were, we have gotten to an agreement that the website is now solely for spectator tickets, participants are done through their UC. Gilles is sending an e-mail and an apology to the SoCo.

Louise (AUC): Yes, we in the SoCo has not received all the e-mails and main updates from Gilles.

Daniel (Chair): Yes, I will check with Milou (SC Chair) on that, but also our GA call has been in some members spam folders so please check there as well!

Daniel (Chair): We have election GA promotion packages for all of you, posters and stickers, so please share those at your UCs.

## **8. Closure of the UCSRN GA**

Daniel (Chair): The GA closes at 14:25.