

- 
1. Opening (12:00)
  2. Approval of the Agenda
  3. Approval of Minutes last Summit
  4. Appointing Temporary Independent Body/Audit Committee
  5. Presentation of the Board and Approval of Executive Board
  6. Board Messages and Committee Update
  7. Application of EUC
  8. Statutes
  9. Budget
  10. Open Floor
  11. Closing (16:00)
- 

**1) Opening (12:00)**

Welcome, welcome! Before anything else, Tessa elaborates on Geke – the previous Executive Chair – stepping down from her position. Tessa will chair the entire Summit in her place. The procedure for the Summit is as follows: state your name, UC and comment. Abstentions are counted to determine the majority. If we disapprove of this in the Statutes, it will only change next Summit.

**2) Approval of the Agenda**

There will be a break around 13:00, between the discussions on the application of EUC and the Statutes. We close at 16:00, unless we seriously disagree with one another. Afterwards, happy hour starts at the bar! *The agenda is approved.*

**3) Approval of Minutes last Summit**

As there are no minutes of the previous Summit, Tessa suggests to have a symbolic approval, to which nobody protests. The voting procedure is as follows: Tessa will ask for an approval, disapproval and abstain vote. Delegates raise their green ballots for their own votes, and their red ballots for their proxy vote.

**4) Appointing Temporary Independent Body/Audit Committee**

For the Summit, we will need to appoint a temporary IB (Independent Body) or AC (Audit Committee) to count the votes. Tessa proposes to merge the IB and the AC into one body, saying that “it would be difficult to find enough people for an AC *and* an IB.” This body would be there mostly for solving internal and external issues, as well as counting the Summit votes and giving advice on financial matters.

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Does the IB have a final say with regards to a decision? Do they have the power to overrule the decision of the board?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* The GA always decides – the IB is there more for negotiating.

*Response Gustaaf:* That is assuming that all of the issues are discussed at the GAs – which often is not the case.

*Response Tessa:* If 10% of the GA decides that a GA should be called for, then it happens.

*Response Gustaaf:* The IB mediates without authority. Having to call for a GA every single time would be inefficient.

*Response Joe Carpenter, LUC:* Would you give the authority to the GA? How does this work for you?

*Response Gustaaf:* If there is a conflict, the students should have the right to appeal to the IB.

*Response Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* Remember that we are not voting on the policy manual, we are voting on the merge of the IB and the AC.

*Response Tessa:* This is very important to keep in mind for the rest of the Summit: we are voting on the Statutes.

*Conclusion Gustaaf:* If you have anything to say about the IB and AC, we have to discuss this at the GA, right? Because it relates to the Statutes.

*Response Tessa:* We are discussing this article by article, so bring up your comments then.

*Vote on merging the IB and the AC*

**Approved** (25 approvals, 3 disapprovals, 1 abstention)

**The IB and the AC are merged into one body.**

Moving on to the people who will be in this body. Tessa asks who is interested in the position. Bram raises his hand, but because he is already in the UCSRN board, Tessa states that it would raise a conflict of interest. There are four people that would like to run, to which Tessa responds that this would be “one too many”.

*Comment Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* I find it quite contradictory to have association members in an IB. They can always appeal in favour of their association.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* This is temporary – we simply need to have it for this summit. The decision to merge the body is permanent, but the IB for now would be a temporary structure.

*Question Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* How about we vote for the people that will be counting the Summit votes, and not for the merge? If we do not know what exactly that is going to be...

*Question to the audience from Tessa:* Let’s see a raise of hands.

*Question Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort, UCU:* Do we really need a voting counting committee? Seems overly complicated.

*Response Thomas, LUC:* We need to have an IB for the Summit.

*Conclusion Tessa:* This is nice and professional, and we need a voting committee, because EUC’s application is done by a closed ballot vote.

We are only voting on the IB for this Summit!

In response to a lot of people raising their hands, a LUC representative asks if only the delegates can raise their hand when voting. Tessa clarifies once more that only delegates can vote.

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* If we appoint the IB, then I think different UCs should be represented in that body.

*Response Tessa:* This discussion is for the Statutes.

Although there were four people interested in counting the votes, two would suffice. **Josje Groustra (UCR) and Juliette van Winden (UCU) are the voting committee volunteers for the Summit.**

## 5) Presentation of the Board and Approval of Executive Board

Tessa explains the “new” structure of the UCSRN: we shall comprise of an Executive Board – consisting out of five members (Chair, Secretary, Treasurer and the two Committee Chairs) – an Academic Committee, a Social Committee, and the members (all the UCs, minus EUC). Every member shall bring six delegates. The official members are only the associations, because councils are not by definition legal entities, and only legal entities can become member of an association. Therefore, the members can only be the UC associations.

Tessa explains that we will now be moving onto the Committee updates. First, a “symbolic” approval of the Executive Board is needed, as it does not officially need approval. Unfortunately, Geke Hasperhoven, the previous Executive Board Chair, could not join us today. Because of the shuffling that occurred afterwards, the Academic Chair position is currently unfilled.

*Vote on approving the Executive Board*

**Approved** (unanimity)

**The Executive Board is “symbolically” approved.**

**6) Board Messages and Committee Updates**

**a) Social Committee Update**

Janine steps up to present the Social updates. Firstly, the extra event – UCSRN Spotlight at UCU on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November. The Spotlight event focuses on the arts, as the Inter-UC Tournament already focuses on sports. The evening is set up in such a way that every UC gets 25 minutes for acts, which they can divide in whichever way they prefer. There are no rules or limits as to what is performed, as long as it is enjoyable – so be as creative as you like on stage! The Social Committee will put up posters at your UC’s facilities this week, and a Facebook event has already been created. Tickets are 3 Euros, which includes snacks during the evening. After the Spotlight part of the evening is finished, it will be time to party! Karaoke and alcohol from the UCU bar should help this process. Sleeping places will be provided for anyone who wants to stay over. So spread the word and get as many people of your UC to come as possible! We’re very much looking forward to it and think it will be a great evening!

Of course, the Inter-UC tournament will also be planned for next semester after Spotlight has been.

**b) Academic Committee Update**

Daniel steps up to present the Academic updates. Whereas the Academic component of UCSRN had always organized the Dean’s Debate in the past, this year, there will be no such event – after the deans have expressed their discontent with the repetitiveness of the Debate. So, currently, the Academic Committee is looking at organizing two new things: a conference or academic symposium and an undergraduate research journal. We are trying to get really good speakers to fill the plenary sessions in the conference, whilst we hope that the smaller (parallel) sessions can be run by students. We have not decided on a topic yet, but it will be close to “personal development” or “solving issues of the world”. Very vague, but some more concrete decisions we have made are that we want to include skill workshops – teaching you things like speed-reading – and that the conference will not be about Liberal Arts & Sciences.

Secondly: the Inter-UC Journal. This would be an undergraduate research journal that presents the best student work from the different UCs. It can also be of great help in showing the “outside world” what we do at University Colleges.

**7) Application from EUC**

Clearly, everyone is very excited, as this point is being welcomed with a big round of applause. Tessa elaborates that the EUC Dean has been admitted to the UCDN – which the UCSRN has looked at for its admissions in the past. Last year, it was decided that EUC should not enter the UCSRN, but this year, it was decided that they should (if it passes the vote). They have a student association, they have academic representation – basically, they have all the necessary parts for becoming a UCSRN member. However, EUC representatives will not be able to run for a board position, but they will become members of the Committees. They will be allowed to vote *from the next Summit onwards* and they will *pay the same fee*. Are there any questions?

*Question Tisha Hupkens, EUC:* I have two questions. One concerning the membership fee – why do we have to pay the full one if we are a smaller University College? Secondly, why can we not run for the Executive Board?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* The membership fee is used for organizing events, and you student body is just as welcome to join as the rest. It does not depend on the size of your association. If you want to join, you will have to pay the membership fee. But do keep in mind that the fee is already lower, which you will see in the budget later as well.

*Response Tisha:* But LUC also paid a lower fee in the past?

*Response Bob van de Mortel, LUC:* We had a smaller student body. What is the current size of your student body?

*Response Tisha:* About 150 students now study at EUC.

*Response Bob:* The membership fee was dependent on the size of the student body right? If so, shouldn't EUC pay less? I think we should be able to vote upon this.

*Conclusion Tessa:* So it is proposed that EUC pays a lower fee.

*Question Amandeus van Rossum, UCR:* What kind of implications does it have for the budget if there is a lower contribution from EUC?

*Response Haris Kalic, UCSRN:* The current budget has been set up with the five UCs in mind. We will be voting on what to do with EUC money. It might be smart to take this vote to the budget discussion.

*Response Henriette Hoogervorst, AUC:* But Haris, we vote on both admission of EUC and the budget separately, right?

*Response Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Should we then vote on budget first, and the EUC admission afterwards?

*Response Tessa:* We will vote on changing the EUC membership fee.

*Response Bram Jaarsma, AUC:* I feel like people are focusing too much on economic advantage in this discussion – that should not be the case.

*Response Amandeus:* If we disapprove, we want their admission discussed right now.

*Vote on: Pushing the admission of EUC after the discussion of the budget*

**Disapproved** (7 approvals, 21 disapprovals, 1 abstention)

**The admission of EUC shall be voted upon immediately.**

*Question from Han Nugteren, UCR:* We can still discuss the fee later on, right?

*Response Tessa:* Yes, we will only vote on admission now.

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* We hear that Groningen would join. What about them?

*Response Tessa:* UCG will not be joining this year. They have no academic representation yet and they just started their UC, so we advised them to focus on internal issues and setting up their own structure first. Next year, they could focus on entering the UCSRN.

*Closed ballot vote on: The admission of EUC*

--- BREAK ---

The votes have been counted: **EUC is now officially a member of UCSRN (by a vast majority).**

LUC has approached Tessa with a suggestion to have a vote on including a Praesidium, or in other words, an independent and external Chairperson who can “chair” the discussion of the Statutes by e.g. asking the Executive Chair for feedback on issues.

*Vote on: Praesidium for the Statutes discussion*

**Disapproved** (9 approvals, 16 disapprovals, 4 abstentions).

**The UCSRN Chair will act as Chair for the rest of the Summit.**

Before we start the discussion of the Statutes, Tessa has a few pointers. Firstly, one should not raise objections about grammar and other language issues. Keep in mind that a notary will also review the Statutes. Secondly, there will be a Dutch translation of these Statutes, either to be done by the Executive Board or the notary. Thirdly, we will not have a discussion on the Policy Manual – that is for another Summit. And finally, make sure to check your own associations' Policy Manual, because the Statutes might need approval at your own General Assembly.

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* About the notary – after the revision, what is the procedure concerning the GA?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Where we take it from here would be something to discuss after the discussion of the Statutes.

*Response Niaz Ali Khan, UCU:* Might it be best to pass it by a notary?

*Response Tessa:* We will translate it back to English after the Dutch translation. If we want someone to do this professionally, and thus, pay someone for it, is also up for discussion. Of course, we would prefer a vote on the final Statutes.

One final thing: only give comments and ask questions after Tessa has finished speaking about the entire article.

State article and letter AFTER Tessa talks about the full article. In these minutes, you will first find the Articles, after which the comments & conversations are outlined. The Statutes are not always discussed in the order described in the Statutes – the minutes will follow a chronological structure.

## 8) Statutes

### Article 1 – Terms

In these statutes

- A. 'University Colleges' (hereinafter to be referred to as: 'the UCs') are liberal arts and science colleges that are part of a university in the Netherlands.
- B. 'Student' is a full-time student at a UC.
- C. 'associations' are formal representing bodies of students of the UCs, either directly or indirectly chosen by students.
- D. 'the Board' is the body of the Association that is elected by the delegates to represent the UCSRN and consists of at least three members.
- E. 'Absolute majority' is the majority of at least two-thirds of a General Assembly, including abstentions to determine the majority.
- F. 'Simple majority' is the majority of 50% plus one of all eligible voters present at a General Assembly, including abstentions to determine the majority.

### **1A – Number of Universities**

*Question Bram Jaarsma, AUC:* Our UC is part of two universities – the UvA and the VU. We feel like this definition would exclude AUC and we therefore propose to amend it.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* So it is proposed to change "a university" in Article 1A to "at least one university".

*Question Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* About the voting – what majority do we need for the Statutes?

*Response Tessa:* For this Summit, we determine majority by including abstentions. If the upcoming article is amended, we will take this into account for the next Summit. You can ask for a revote, then one will be only allowed to vote "approve" or "disapprove".

Vote on changing “a university” to “at least one university” in Article 1A

**Approved** (12 approvals, 7 disapprovals, 11 abstentions)

**Article 1A amended to:** ‘University Colleges’ (hereinafter to be referred to as: ‘the UCs’) are liberal arts and science colleges that are part of at least one university in the Netherlands.

### **1E/F – Definitions of Majority**

*Comment Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* The definitions of the majority as outlined in the Statutes are incorrect. We are defining it for the sake of this document. I propose that we take out simple majority and use “two-thirds majority” throughout the Statutes document.

*Response Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* We should change the inclusion of abstentions, otherwise the majority does not make sense anymore.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* So you propose that we move on to deleting Article 1E and change 1F – interrupted.

*Comment Esther Baar, AUC:* Where did you get that definition? I found something different.

*Response Tessa:* I propose that we will leave this up to the notary then. We can still vote on the name of the majority definition that we shall use in this document.

*Response Bob van de Mortel, LUC:* Can we change it to 50% plus one and 67% for this discussion?

*Response Tessa:* We propose to, for the sake of this discussion, **call “absolute majority” 67% and “simple majority” 50% plus one.** Let’s proceed to a vote.

Vote on changing “absolute majority” to 67% and “simple majority” to 50% plus one.

**Approved** (unanimity)

**Majority terms are changed to 67% and 50% plus one.**

After the audience starts clapping, Tessa asks everyone not to clap. We have a long day ahead of us, still.

### **1C – Academic Representation**

*Question Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort, UCU:* I have a comment about Article 1C. Councils are supposed to be full-fledged members. ASC (UCU Council) is a formal entity. What does this mean for UCSRN affairs?

*Response Haris Kalic, UCSRN:* ASC might be registered, but the other councils are not. This article is in place to include all councils.

*Response Marc:* Yes, but ASC is an association, so they are full members.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Then I propose that councils pay a membership fee.

*Response Marc:* But for now, the finances have gone through the associations, not the councils. I propose an amendment.

*Question Bob van de Mortel, LUC:* What if we change it to “associations admitted to the UCSRN”?

*Response Janine de Jong, UCSRN:* There is another problem with Marc’s proposition. There are six votes per association (member). UCU would get more votes with this proposal.

*Response Laura Aarts, UCU:* Councils do not have a constitutional vote in UCSRN. We want clarification on the vote division in order to ensure representation of the academic councils.

*Response Haris:* In the Policy Manual, we will define that half of the votes will go to the councils.

*Response Marc:* I think that we have come to two issues here. The first issue is that ASC would be a separate member as a council with these Statutes. The second issue is that it is very important to clarify on the representation of the Academic Councils in the Statutes, because in case of conflicts, the Statutes override the Policy Manual.

*Response Tessa:* So, what do we do? Many councils are no legal entities, but we want to be inclusive to them.

*Response Bob:* We need to find a legal way of associations delegating votes to the councils in the Statutes.

*Response Tessa:* First of all, we will not be able to solve this legal issue, and therefore, I propose to take it to an Internet vote before taken to a notary. Secondly, dividing the votes between councils and associations is an issue that we come back to later.

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* The word “associations” is only mentioned once after this in the Statutes. We can just take it out, right?

*Response Tessa:* We will take this to a notary.

*Response Marc:* Why do you want to take this to the notary? To exclude or include councils?

*Response Tessa:* To have statutory representation of the councils in a correct and legal way, without them becoming a member, because this creates problems with payment.

*Response Bob (to Marc):* The problem is that it needs to apply to all the UCs, whilst you are only focusing on UCU. You can never have councils as members for all the UCs. We want to exclude them and formalize the rights of council votes in UCSRN.

*Closing comment Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* We should not postpone this decision. It is impossible to include LUC and EUC because of their democratic deficit. Delegates need to be elected by law.

With every change, we increase the costs of the notary.

*Closing response Tessa:* This discussion proves that we should bring this to a notary. Therefore, I will propose to bring the topic of ensuring the rights of the academic representation in the Statutes to a notary.

*Vote on taking the topic of ensuring the rights of the academic representation to a notary.*

**Approved.** (24 approvals, 3 disapprovals, 2 abstentions)

**This discussion will be taken to a notary.**

*Question Stan Mencke, LUC:* I have two questions. First: what is the merit of capitalizing the word “Association” in the Statutes? Secondly: why connect UCs to universities in the Netherlands? This would exclude the possibility of having independent University Colleges.

*Response Tessa:* Then we put forward the proposal to change “Association” to “UCSRN”.

*Response Vincent Prins, EUC (to Stan):* In response to his second question, I would say that the use of this line in the Statutes is to exclude Universities of Applied Sciences and University Colleges that do not have Liberal Arts & Sciences.

*Response Tessa:* Just a quick side note: the GA always decides on the approval of a member.

*Question Bob:* Do we want to keep the option of Universities of Applied Sciences joining?

No one responds to Bob. Instead, Stan is persuaded by the arguments presented and withdraws his question.

*Question Marc:* If we were to be more inclusive in this clause (concerning who can enter the UCSRN), could these Statutes override the GA?

*Clarification Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* If we do this, we give the GA the power to override the Statutes.

*Response Marc:* This is already the case – the approval of members is already in the hands of the GA.

*Response Thomas:* When the GA refuses the application of a potential member, it would not refer to the Statutes.

*Response Tessa:* Here’s a hypothetical situation – a UC asks to be approved and the GA denies access. If the Statutes would support the UC’s case, they would technically be able to join, and now, the GA would be able to override that.

*Thomas concurs.*

*Response Amandeus van Rossum, UCR:* The GA looks at the application objectively and not subjectively – we do not judge someone or liking.

We are currently discussing whether or not to exclude the line about connection to university. Therefore – proposition to vote on whether or not university colleges need to be tied to a university.

*Vote on keeping in the ties between University Colleges and universities (Article 1A)*

**Approved.** (21 approvals, 7 disapprovals, 1 abstention)

**University Colleges need to be connected to at least one university in order to qualify as a UC.**

**Because the discussion and voting is taking quite long, somebody proposes to vote by acclamation.** Thus, we move on to a vote about this.

*Vote on using a procedure of voting by acclamation*

**Approved.** (28 approvals, 1 disapproval, 0 abstentions)

**For the remainder of the Summit, we shall vote by acclamation.**

Also, there was still no vote on whether we should change “Association” to UCSRN.

*Vote on changing “Association” to “UCSRN”*

**Approved.** (by acclamation).

**“Association” shall be replaced by “UCSRN”.**

*Comment Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* For the other votes, it might be nice for the Chair to only ask for objections, and if there are none, we will move on.

## **1B – Definition of Students**

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* In Article 1B, “students” are defined. Isn’t this unnecessary, as we are associations and members (of associations)?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* So you would propose to amend this article to “the student is a member of one of the members of UCSRN”?

*Comment Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* If you change that, all of the honorary members of the UCSRN members could also attend.

*Response Jan Willem:* I would like to amend it to “Students are members of the UCSRN members, with the exception of honorary members.”

*Question Bram Jaarsma, AUC:* Can we make it “fee-paying members of the associations?”

*Response Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* We can also make it more inclusive by changing it to “full-time student and member of association.”

*Question Samuel:* So I think that the main question is – are honorary members entitled to attendance of UCSRN events? I propose that we vote on including honorary members.

*Vote on allowing honorary members of the members of the UCSRN to attend UCSRN events*

**Approved.** (15 approvals, 9 disapprovals, 5 abstentions)

**Honorary members are allowed to attend UCSRN events.**

This not only means that we cannot use “full-time students” in the definition of Student (Article 1B), but also that guest members can attend.



*Vote on the amendment of 1B to a Student being a member of a UCSRN member*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**Article 1B amended to:** 'Student' is a member of a member of the UCSRN.

### **1E/F – Including abstentions**

Before moving onto the vote on whether to include abstentions in the majority, we briefly discuss whether this cannot better be moved to the Policy Manual. Samuel Hopcroft (LUC) illustrates that the Policy Manual is equally binding in comparison to the Statutes – it is just easier to change.

*Vote on leaving the voting procedure out of the Statutes (but in the Policy Manual)*

**Disapproved.** (11 approvals, 15 disapprovals, 2 abstentions)

**We are defining the voting procedure in the Statutes.**

*Vote on changing “including” to “excluding” abstentions in Article 1E/F*

**Approved.** (18 approvals, 11 disapprovals, 0 abstentions)

**Article 1E/F will state “excluding” abstentions.**

### Article 2 – Name, Registered Office, Duration

- A. The name of the association shall be: **University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands**, abbreviated as: '**UCSRN**' (hereinafter to also be referred to as: 'the Association').
- B. The registered office shall be in Utrecht
- C. The Association was formed on the ... and will exist indefinitely
- D. The Association year will also be the financial year, and runs from the first of July to the thirtieth of June of the following year.
- E. The official language of communication, either verbal or in writing, shall be English.

The Chair makes clear that, from now on, one can only propose motions to make specific changes in the Statutes, mostly because of time constraints. Nobody has any objections, and thus, **one can only propose motions for changes. Also, nobody protests Article 2, which is therewith approved.**

### Article 3 – Objectives

- A. The aim of the association is to assist students of UCs of the Netherlands in creating an optimal academic and social environment for personal development.
- B. The Associations objectives shall therefore be to represent the students of the UCs, through their own associations and councils, in the broadest sense of the word and with a view to their missions and visions.
- C. The Association shall seek to achieve its objectives:
  - a. Acting to represent students of UCs to external parties;
  - b. Aiming to stimulate the exchange of experiences, to the benefit of the UCs;
  - c. Actively stimulating student interaction between the UCs through organized events;
  - d. By maintaining contacts with organizations relating to the Association's objectives;
  - e. Using all such other means necessary and available to it under law.
- D. The Association pursues objects without differentiating on the grounds of gender, nationality, race, personal beliefs, religion, gender identity or sexual orientation.

*Comment Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* I want to propose a grammatical change, but I will send it later.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Whatever does not change the essence of that what is in the Statutes, send it (the motion) to [info@ucsrn.nl](mailto:info@ucsrn.nl).

### 3A

*Question Stan Mencke, LUC:* In Article 3A, what exactly is meant by “an optimal academic environment for personal development”?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* This is the ambition of UCSRN, achieved by the points below.

*Comment Daniel Janssen, UCSRN:* You can see it as a kind of “capstone” goal.

*Response Joe Carpenter, LUC:* I propose a motion to add the facilitation of Inter-UC events to 1A.

*Response Ivar Troost, UCR:* Isn't that already in there?

*Vote on adding the facilitation and coordination of activities between UCs to Article 3A*

**Approved.** (approvals disapprovals abstentions)

**Article 3A amended to:** The aim of the UCSRN is to assist students of UCs of the Netherlands in creating an optimal academic and social environment for personal development, as well as to facilitate and coordinate activities between UCs.

No other motions, which means that **Article 3 has been approved.**

### Article 4 – Formal parts of the Association

The Association will consist of:

- A. The General Assembly (hereinafter to be referred to as: ‘the GA’)
- B. The Board
- C. The Audit Committee (hereinafter to be referred to as: ‘the AC’)

*Comment Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* The Audit Committee (AC) is not mentioned in the document.

*Response Amandeus van Rossum, UCR:* It will be used in the Policy Manual as well.

*Proposition Tijmen Lammers, LUC:* Can we change the name to “Independent Body”?

*Proposition Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* Can we instead change the name to Independent Advisory Council?

*Vote on changing the name Audit Committee*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**The name of the Audit Committee will be changed.**

*Vote on changing the name to “Independent Body”*

**Approved.** (23 approvals, 6 disapprovals, 0 abstentions)

**The name of the Audit Committee will be changed to “Independent Body”.**

*Question Laura Aarts, UCU:* Why are Social and Academic Committees not in the Statutes?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* These are open for change, so we keep them in the Manual.

No other motions or protest, which means that **Article 4 has been approved.**

### Article 5 – Members, Members’ Rights and Obligations

The Association shall have:

- A. Members
- B. Benefactors
- C. Honorary members

*Question Joe Carpenter, LUC:* Should there be a point for guest members, Gustaaf?

*Response Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* If UCSRN wants guest members, we should include it.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* What constitutes as a guest member at UCU?

*Response Gustaaf:* A guest member is not a full-time student who lives on campus and pays a fee in order to be a guest member. It seems impossible for UCSRN.

*Response Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* Haven't we already voted on this? Guest members count.

Amandeus van Rossum (UCR) illustrates that there is some confusion about guest members and regular members.

*Response Samuel:* We should first think about what a guest member would be. What is the point of guest members? Is there somebody who can respond to my question?

*Response Daniel Janssen, UCSRN:* Nobody actually proposed this as a motion.

*Question Gustaaf:* What about the inclusion of delegates in this article?

*Response Tessa:* In Article 6C, we define that members have six delegates who represent the member at the General Assembly.

No motions or protest, which means that **Article 5 has been approved.**

#### Article 6A-6H

- A. Members shall be the association of Ucs in the Netherlands, indirectly representing the students at that UC.
- B. Members can be brought forward at a GA and will need to be approved by an absolute majority.
- C. Members have six delegates, who will represent the member at the GA.
- D. Delegates will be Students who, for a period of one year, will have the right to cast one vote at a General Assembly.
- E. Delegates cannot be part of the Board.
- F. All other requirements delegates will be provided for in the Policy Manual.
- G. The Board shall maintain a register that includes the names and electronic (or other) addresses of all the members, their delegates, and benefactors and honorary members.
- H. Students shall be entitled to participate in all of the Association's activities, unless the Board decides that participation in a certain activity shall be limited to a group of students.

Because we have already discussed article 6.A – and concluded that we are taking this discussion to the notary – we will skip to Article 6.C. The topic of discussion is: do we want to be clearer in the Statutes on who the delegates are?

*Response Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort, UCU:* For me, it depends on who the members are. Because we have discussed the members, these might change, and so will the delegates.

*Response Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* This is exactly the discussion we were refraining from (on academic representation).

Tessa elaborates on a quick sidenote: delegates would now be taken for one full year. The reasoning behind this is that **most discussions are longer than just one Summit.** We want consistent delegates, so people can make more informed decisions.

*Comment Joe Carpenter, LUC:* I think it is fair, but it might be difficult with people going on exchange and such.

Because Joe's comment receives a lot of support from the rest of the audience, AUC proposes the motion of moving this to the Policy Manual.

*Vote on taking the period of active delegates out of the Statutes, into the Policy Manual*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**Length of delegate statutes moved to the Policy Manual.**

*Question Amandeus van Rossum, UCR:* With this register, who do you mean? The people in this room? Or all the UCs?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* The members.

Laura Aarts (LUC) comments that 6G should not be included in the Statutes, but in the Policy Manual, and therefore proposes to take this out of the Statutes. Samuel Hopcroft (LUC) responds that this is required to be in the Statutes.

*Vote on taking out Article 6G*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**Article 6G will be moved to the Policy Manual.**

There are no other comments on Article 6A up until 6H, and these are therefore **approved**.

#### Article 6I-6M

- I. Membership shall end:
  - a. Upon the Association disbanding;
  - b. Upon the member ceasing to exist
  - c. Upon resignation of the member; or
  - d. Upon the termination of membership on the Association's behalf.
- J. Membership shall be terminated on the Association's behalf:
  - a. If the member has ceased to fulfill the requirements for membership
  - b. If the member does not fulfill its requirements towards the Association; or
  - c. If the Association cannot reasonably be required to allow membership to continue.
- K. A member may be removed if it acts contrary to the Association's Charter, Policy Manual or resolutions, or unreasonably prejudices the Association.
- L. If membership ends during the course of a financial year, the entire annual fee shall nonetheless still be owed.
- M. Further requirements for membership shall be provided for in the Policy Manual.

#### **6I-6M**

Instead of having a discussion about this article – which nobody seems to have a problem with – we discuss whether we need to move on to discussing the budget because of time constraints. It is decided that we continue discussing the Statutes until 16.30, after which we move onto the budget.

#### **6J**

*Question Joe Carpenter, LUC:* Could you explain 6Jc? What it seems like now is that, if the board does not like it anymore, we can get rid of it. It's a bit vague.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* This allows for action in unpredictable circumstances.

Joe's point is considered to be valid, and thus, **we will include that this is about a GA and put it in J as a whole. Article 6I-6M are also approved, meaning that the entirety of Article 6 is approved.**

## Article 7

- A. Benefactors shall be persons or organizations who have expressed to the Board their willingness to support the Association through financial contributions or gifts and who, at their request, have been admitted as benefactors.
- B. The Board shall decide on the admissions of benefactors.
- C. If the Board decides not to admit a person or organization as a benefactor, the GA may still resolve to admit the person; the appeal against non-admission shall be provided for in the Policy Manual.
- D. Being a benefactor shall end:
  - a. Upon the benefactor's death;
  - b. Upon resignation by the benefactor;
  - c. Upon termination of benefactor on the Association's behalf; or
  - d. At the end of the financial year in which a contribution was last made
- E. If membership ends during the course of a financial year, the entire annual fee shall nonetheless still be owed.
- F. Further requirements for benefactors shall be provided for in the Policy Manual.

### **7B – Benefactor admission**

*Question Samuel Hopcroft, LUC: Why does the board decide on benefactor admission?*

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN: For the sake of efficiency: if a benefactor might come forward between two Summits, the Board can act on that. If the GA agrees, the GA can discharge the benefactor.*

*Response Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort, UCU: I am not sure whether this should be in the Statutes or the Policy Manual. Should the Board not inform the GA of (potential) benefactors? I think it should be in Statutes.*

*Vote on adding that the Board will inform members of the admission and rejection of benefactors to Article 7B*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**The Board shall inform the members about benefactors.**

### **7D – Ending to being a benefactor**

Many bring up problems they have with Article 7D, mostly coming to the idea that it is too much of a hassle to renegotiate contracts continuously as the financial year ends. Therefore, a motion is put forth to scrap Article 7Dd.

*Vote on taking out Article 7Dd*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**Article 7Dd will be removed from the Statutes.**

There are no further comments; **Article 7 is approved.**

## Article 8

- A. Honorary members shall be natural persons who, because of their special service to the Association have been appointed by the GA.
- B. Honorary members shall be appointed on the Board's recommendation or pursuant to a written request submitted to the Secretary by at least ten percentage (10%) of the delegates.
- C. Honorary membership shall end:
  - a. Upon the Association disbanding;
  - b. Upon the member ceasing to exist
  - c. Upon resignation of the member; or
  - d. Upon the termination of membership on the Association's behalf.
- D. Honorary membership shall be terminated on the Association's behalf:
  - a. If the General Assembly has decided to terminate the honorary membership by a simple majority;
  - b. If the member does not fulfill its requirements towards the Association; or
  - c. If the Association cannot reasonably be required to allow membership to continue.
- E. Honorary members shall be natural persons who, because of their special service to the Association have been appointed by the GA.
- F. Honorary members shall be appointed on the Board's recommendation or pursuant to a written request submitted to the Secretary by at least ten percentage (10%) of the delegates.
- G. Honorary membership shall end:
  - a. Upon the Association disbanding;
  - b. Upon the member ceasing to exist
  - c. Upon resignation of the member; or
  - d. Upon the termination of membership on the Association's behalf.
- H. Honorary membership shall be terminated on the Association's behalf:
  - a. If the General Assembly has decided to terminate the honorary membership by a simple majority;
  - b. If the member does not fulfill its requirements towards the Association; or
  - c. If the Association cannot reasonably be required to allow membership to continue.

Tessa specifically wants to illustrate the reasoning behind 8B: the Board believes that **one University College should have the power to call for a Summit or General Assembly**. Although some are surprised by the low amount of people that would be able to call for a Summit, we decide to stick with it, as there is no concrete objection.

The point is raised whether we should enable legal bodies to be honorary members.

*Vote on allowing legal bodies to have honorary membership*

**Disapproved.** (3 approvals, 24 disapprovals, 2 abstentions)  
**Legal bodies cannot be honorary members.**

*Comment Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Sending the notice five working days before the Summit or GA should be enough, right?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* This is something for the Policy Manual. Also, the GA approves the agenda.

No further objections: **Article 8 is approved.**

## Article 9 – Funds, Financial Year, Financial Accounts and Audit

- A. The Board shall be responsible for raising funds for the Association from:
  - a. Annual fees from members;
  - b. Contributions from benefactors;
  - c. Subsidies;
  - d. Gifts, specific legacies and testamentary dispositions; and/or
  - e. Any other income
- B. Members must pay an annual fee, which shall be determined by the GA. Classification into categories and possible exemptions shall be provided for by the Policy Manual.
- C. The Board will have the responsibility to present and discuss at least the following subjects at the first GA of the financial year:
  - a. the financial report, financial accounts and explanation with the Audit Committee’s report.
  - b. appointment of the Audit Committee for the following financial year;
  - c. the budget for the current financial year;
  - d. discharge of liability for the Board;
  - e. filling of any vacancies; and
  - f. proposals by the Board or members, announced in the notice convening the Assembly.
- D. The Board must maintain such records concerning the Association’s financial condition that its right and obligations can be ascertained from these at any time.
- E. The Board, in particular, the Treasurer, shall draw up the annual accounts each year within three months after the financial year ends. The financial accounts shall consist of a balance sheet, a statement of income and expenditure, and explanatory notes which also include the Treasurer’s annual report.
- F. The Board must keep the books and other records referred to in this Article for seven years.

### **9E – GA checking the Board’s work**

Gustaaf van Oosterom (UCU) brings up a big issue that UCU has with a point brought forth in this article. Nowhere in the Statutes does it say that the **GA has the power for checking the work of the Board**, and such an addition would fit best in this article. He therefore proposes to add “to be approved by the GA” to Article 9E. If not, Gustaaf thinks that the Board must limit spending.

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC (to Gustaaf):* Where do you see the IB come into this?

*Response Gustaaf:* That was my other point – you can also add that the IB has an advisory vote at the beginning of the GA.

*Response Samuel Hopcroft, LUC:* The Independent Body cannot have an advisory vote, legally speaking. Also, if you were to “limit spending”, you would define this in the Policy Manual, not the Statutes.

*Joe proposes two propositions, but if anything, these would be in the Policy Manual.*

*Response Ivar Troost, UCR:* I would rather locate it somewhere else. I think that 9C works better.

There is some discussion about the legality of such an addition. At the conclusion of this, Samuel proposes to add that “the budget that will be presented will be voted upon at the GA” to Article 9Cc.

*Vote on adding “the budget that will be presented will be voted upon at the GA” to Article 9Cc*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**This line will be added to Article 9Cc.**

No other objections are voiced – **Article 9 is thus approved by acclamation.**

## 9) Budget

Haris Kalic (UCSRN) takes the word, explaining that we will first look into the general budget, after which we will go on to discuss the (event-) specific budgets

Expenditure			
Administrative		Events	
Register at KVK	€ 65,00	Spotlight	€ 1.620,00
Notary for Statutes	€ 750,00	Inter UC	€ 7.550,00
Bank Costs	€ 40,00	Conference	€ 2.200,00
Travel Costs Boards	€ 100,00	Journal	€ 100,00
Promotion	€ 100,00	<b>Subtotal</b>	€ 9.850,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	€ 1.055,00		
		Unforeseen	€ 1.250,00
Summits			
First Summit	€ 350,00	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>€ 13.455,00</b>
Election GA Summit	€ 350,00		
Extra Summits	€ 600,00		
<b>Subtotal</b>	€ 1.300,00		

Income	
Membership Fee	
AUC (AUCSA)	€ 2.316,00
UCR (RASA)	€ 2.316,00
LUC (FORTUNA)	€ 2.316,00
UCM (UNIVERSALIS)	€ 2.316,00
UCU (UCSA)	€ 2.316,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	€ 11.580,00
Ticket Sales	
Spotlight	€ 375,00
Inter UC	€ 1.200,00
Conference	€ 300,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	€ 1.875,00
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>€ 13.455,00</b>

Administrative	
Register at KVK	€ 65,00
Notary for Statutes	€ 750,00
Bank Costs	€ 40,00
Travel Costs Boards	€ 100,00
Promotion	€ 100,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 1.055,00</b>

### Administrative

Jan Willem Bruggeman (AUC) proposes to move the register at the Chamber of Commerce – or KvK – to the Notary fee.

*Vote on moving the Chamber of Commerce (€65) registration to the “Notary for Statutes”*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**This KvK registration fee shall be moved to the Notary fee.**

*Question Vincent Prins, EUC: “Promotion” is quite vague. Is €100 enough if you want to promote something to all UC students?*

*Response Haris Kalic, UCSRN: This is for the general promotion of the UCSRN – not the events.*

*Question Clem Bouju, UCU: How did you actually find these numbers?*

*Response Haris: Firstly, these numbers are very different from last year, as we had a really difficult transition in terms of treasury. Most information, like the notary fee, was found online. Travel costs, for example, were more an internal discussion, on which we decided that they would not be completely reimbursed.*

*Response Bram Jaarsma, AUC: Our travel costs are covered, so why should we pay for UCSRN?*

*Response Haris: Not everyone gets reimbursement.*

This leads to a discussion on general reimbursement, but we decide **to leave it for what it is until the Policy Manual is up for discussion.**



Summits	
First Summit	€ 350,00
Election GA Summit	€ 350,00
Extra Summits	€ 600,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 1.300,00</b>

### Summits

*Question Esther Baar, AUC: Where does this €350 go?*

To this, Joe Carpenter (from the hosting UC – LUC) answers with a short elaboration on the costs, which mostly came down to €200 euros for the sandwiches during break (which were about 100 in total) and the rest of the money was

spent on drinks (for during and after the Summit).

In response, Esther proposes that we could lower the Summit budget to €100, instead bringing our own lunch to these events.

*Vote on decreasing the Summit budget to €100 per Summit*

**Disapproved.** (6 approvals, 20 disapprovals, 3 abstentions)

**The current budget remains the way it is.**

Tessa van Hoorn (UCSRN) quickly notes that you always need to take into account that more General Assemblies – or Summits for that matter – can be called for, especially considering the work on the Statutes and the Policy Manual this year. Continuing on the Summit discussion, Samuel Hopcroft (LUC) proposes to not specify the budget for Summits *per Summit*, but to have a general budget for all Summits.

*Vote on making it a comprehensive budget for Summits instead of specifying per Summit*

**Disapproved.** (8 approvals, 20 disapprovals, 1 abstention)

**The current budget remains the way it is.**

Briefly, there is a discussion on why we would want to keep this budget, but seeing how we already voted on it; we quickly decide to move on.

Expenditure	
<b>Snacks and Drinks</b>	
Popcorn Machine	€ 70,00
Cotton Candy Machine	€ 70,00
Slush Puppy Machine	€ 80,00
Other Snacks	€ 30,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 250,00</b>
<b>Transport</b>	
Bus UCM	€ 550,00
Bus UCR	€ 550,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 1.100,00</b>
<b>Technician</b>	<b>€ 70,00</b>
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>€ 50,00</b>
<b>1 Free drink pp</b>	<b>€ 150,00</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>€ 1.620,00</b>

Income	
<b>Ticket Sales</b>	<b>€ 450,00</b>
minus 75 euros to Charity	
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>€ 375,00</b>
3 euro per ticket, 50 cents to charity	

### The UCSRN Spotlight

In relation to €1.100 spent on transport, Jan Willem Bruggeman (AUC) says that we should charge the students traveling. This is met with some disagreement, as it would discourage students from coming to the Spotlight (as they would now need to pay more). Moreover, as Haris argues, we need the income of the farthest UCs (UCR & UCM) at the Spotlight.

There is some confusion about the charity that is included in the “Income” table – why is there a charity donation? What is the charity? The charity is a non-governmental organization that aims to build schools in Kenya. Because of the disagreement considering the charity, we move on to a vote.

*Vote on taking out the money that goes to charity and leaving just a donation box*

**Disapproved.** (7 approvals, 19 disapprovals, 3 abstentions)

**The current budget remains the way it is.**

Bram Jaarsma (AUC) proposes to raise the ticket price to €5, but Haris and Tessa (UCSRN) object, saying that we can make the budget with the amount currently in there, and that we want to make events as accessible as possible. This also means that we want to keep the prices as low as possible too.

<b>Expenditure</b>			
Sports		Party	
Renting Venue	€ 800,00	Decorations	€ 200,00
Equipment	€ 200,00	Free Drinks	€ 300,00
Technical Equipment	€ 300,00	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 500,00</b>
Shirts	€ 500,00		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 1.800,00</b>	<b>Promotion</b>	<b>€ 50,00</b>
Transport*		<b>Unforeseen</b>	<b>€ 500,00</b>
Bus UCM	€ 600,00		
Bus UCR	€ 600,00	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>€ 7.550,00</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 1.200,00</b>		
		<b>Income</b>	
Food			
Snacks and Drinks	€ 500,00	<b>Ticket Sales</b>	<b>€ 1.200,00</b>
Arranged Dinner	€ 3.000,00		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 3.500,00</b>	6 euro per ticket	

### **The Inter-UC Tournament**

There are some questions as to why “shirts” are in this budget. Haris Kalic (UCSRN) explains that the Board would like to partially reimburse shirts for UCSRN visibility – e.g. to put the UCSRN logo on there. Samuel Hopcroft (LUC) objects, stating that LUC shirts are paid out of their own budget. In response, Jan Willem Bruggeman (AUC) suggests that all UCs put the UCSRN logo on the shirts, and that the €500 is consequently taken out of this budget.

*Vote on taking “Shirts” (€500) out of the budget and reallocate it under “Unforeseen”*

**Approved.** (14 approvals, 11 disapprovals, 5 abstentions)

**The €500 will be moved to “Unforeseen” budget.**

*Question Catheline Peters, UCU: Why are buses more expensive in this part of the budget?*

*Response Haris: This is because the buses have to travel farther – most likely to Amsterdam.*

Esther Baar (AUC) raises a point about buying and re-selling UCSRN T-shirts, or general **merchandise** for that matter. Tessa van Hoorn (UCSRN) asks to send an e-mail about this.

When reviewing the overall Inter-UC budget, Jan Willem states that there is simply not enough money to host it at AUC, and therefore proposes to get a new budget after negotiations with an AUC representative. In response, Haris explains that the **Inter-UC Tournament budget will be revised.**

Expenditure	
Gifts for designers	€ 50,00
Promotion	€ 50,00
<b>Total</b>	<b>€ 100,00</b>

### Journal

After Samuel Hopcroft (LUC) suggests that we take out the €50 for the designer, as we cannot legally compensate students, we move onto a vote about this.

*Vote on taking out the €50 for a gift for a designer*

**Disapproved.** (6 approvals, 14 disapprovals, 9 abstentions)  
**The budgeted gift of €50 will remain in the budget.**

Expenditure	
<b>Speakers</b>	
Gifts	€ 150,00
Travel Costs	€ 250,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 400,00</b>
<b>Food</b>	<b>€ 300,00</b>
<b>Transportation</b>	
Bus for a college	€ 550,00
Bus for a college	€ 550,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 1.100,00</b>
<b>Party</b>	
Decorations	€ 100,00
Free Drinks	€ 150,00
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>€ 250,00</b>
<b>Promotion</b>	<b>€ 50,00</b>
<b>Unforeseen</b>	<b>€ 100,00</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>€ 2.200,00</b>

Income	
<b>Ticket Sales</b>	<b>€ 300,00</b>
4 euro per ticket	

## Conference

A question arises as to what the Conference will be about. Daniel Janssen (UCSRN) explains that – although this is still being discussed – it will most likely be about the role of the student in education and the future. It's vague, but still under construction.

UCSRN Membership	€ 2.316,00
UCSRN Membership if EUC Joins	€ 1.930,00
Alternatively, EUC also pays 2,316 and this year we put it into savings and extra unforeseen that come up by having a 6th member join	

### Membership Fee

Vincent Prins (EUC) gets the floor to explain why EUC should pay a smaller fee than the other UCs. He says that EUC counts only 150 students – which is not as high as the other UCs – but would still like to participate fully.

At this moment in time, EUC simply cannot afford to pay the regular fee. Therefore, Vincent proposes that EUC pays half of the original membership fee. We proceed to questions.

*Question Laura Aarts, UCU:* What was it like for LUC last year?

*Response Bob van de Mortel, LUC:* We paid €2000, as we had a bit more students than EUC (400).

*Question Laura Aarts, UCU:* Will this fee be for this year only?

*Response Vincent Prins, EUC:* That's correct.

*Comment Anne Lycia Ten Cate, UCM:* If we all send the same amount of students, EUC should pay the same fee as we do, right?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Realize that they do not have the financial means to do so.

*Response Bob van de Mortel, LUC:* We want to support them and let them be a part of this, right? We want them to participate in UCSRN!

*Question Marjolein Koppes, AUC:* What are the consequences if EUC does not pay?

*Response Vincent:* We would have to get loans.

*Vote on lowering the EUC Membership Fee (in general)*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**The membership fee shall be lower for EUC.**

*Vote on EUC paying half of the original Membership Fee*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**EUC will pay half of the fee this year.**

*Vote on adding the EUC membership fee to the "Unforeseen" budget*

**Approved.** (by acclamation)

**EUC's contribution will be added to "Unforeseen" budget.**

## 10) Open floor

Unfortunately, there is no more time for this.

## 11) Closing (16:00)

And a good four hours later, we're done with the seventh UCSRN Summit!