

1. Welcome
  2. Appoint IB/Counting Votes
  3. Approval of the Agenda
  4. Approval of Minutes
  5. General Updates
    - a. Committees (AC&SC)
      - i. Academic Committee
      - ii. Social Committee
    - b. Lobbying
      - i. LSVB
      - ii. ISO
    - c. Website
  6. Timeline
    - a. Election
    - b. Transition
    - c. UCG
  7. Statutes
  8. Budget
  9. Open Floor
  10. Closure
- 

### **1) Welcome**

Several attendees arrived a bit later, so we are starting later than planned. Tessa outlines the agenda and the Summit procedures for discussion: one should stand, state his/her name, UC and question.

### **2) Appoint IB/Counting Votes**

The Board asks for volunteers to count the votes. Steven Verboom (UCR) and Sharona Boonman (EUC) stand up and volunteer.

### **3) Approval of the Agenda**

As nobody disapproves of the idea, we decide to vote by acclamation for the entire Summit. The agenda is hereby also approved.

### **4) Approval of Minutes**

Before the minutes were approved, Tijmen Lamers (LUC) requested that the name Joe Carpenter is changed to Joe Cotton, as the former is his Facebook persona. Gustaaf van Oosterom asks if the same can be done for Laura Arts. The names will be changed and the minutes are approved.

### **5) General Updates**

#### **a) Committees**

##### **i) Academic Committee**

Bram Jaarsma (UCSRN) reflects upon the main academic event of the year: the very first UCSRN Conference. For the rest of the year, the Academic Committee will mainly focus on making sure that there is a smooth transition for the next Committee.

## **ii) Social Committee**

Janine de Jong (UCSRN) thanks UCU for hosting the Spotlight – a new event showcasing UC talent – and enthuses the attendees about the UCSRN Tournament, which is coming up in a week. Thank you AUC for the organization!

### **b) Lobbying**

#### **i) Landelijke Studenten Vakbond (LSVB)**

Tessa elaborates on the lobbying updates, starting with the LSVB. The LSVB is an organization that aims to represent the students of the Netherlands to the Ministry of Education. To assess how we – the UCSRN – can get some influence in this, we were presented with two options: a member organization (*lidbond*) or collaborating partner (*samenwerkingspartner*). This is what the Board wants to “ask” the Summit.

The latter means that you pay €50 per year. In exchange, you get to play a lobbying role, you are invited to discussions and workshops, but only when the topics of these events are related to you. We would get one free training in which we would learn more about having effective meetings and how one can lobby. An important note is that we would not get any voting powers in the LSVB (e.g. in a GA).

Being a member organization means that you pay a percentage of your income (2-7% of our total budget). This would make us a full member, meaning that we would get voting powers, and access to all information and events. However, the statutes of the LSVB need to be changed in order for us to become a member organization, which the LSVB is currently working on regardless of us joining. We might need an extra year if we want to opt for membership. Are there any questions?

*Question Vincent Gerez, UCU:* Is the LSVB the only channel towards the Ministry for UCSRN?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* We could try our own path, but the LSVB has a lot of experience in lobbying, and also has an important network that we can use.

*Question Iris Bos, EUC:* Do you mean that the UCs respectively become partners or members, or would this be for the UCSRN?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* This would be for the UCSRN only.

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* What is the timeline for this plan? What have you got planned for the coming half year?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* We cannot do much with membership right now, because of the LSVB statutes. However, if we want to get involved, they would speed up the process for us. They appear to be very welcoming to UCs, because of their growing importance.

*Question Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* Would we have to pay LSVB for this year still?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* Finances have not been discussed, but we can argue against that.

#### **ii) Interstedelijk Studenten Overleg (ISO)**

Because ISO has not yet been very clear on how we can work together, we shall not be voting on this today. They did tell us that we could become a *convenantpartner*, meaning that we would not get formal voting rights, but we would get to attend GAs.

Tessa puts forward the central question: what do we want from the LSVB? Collaboration partner or full member?

The attendees respond to her question with a considerable degree of confusion. Many claim that there is too little information and preparation for the UCSRN to join one (or both) of these organizations. It is agreed that the UCSRN needs to be better informed before this question is brought to a vote, which could e.g. be done at the next GA. Thus, the UCSRN shall be getting a clearer picture of what exactly the organizations can mean to us and what our vision is on certain educational matters.

### **c) Website**

Tessa van Hoorn (UCSRN) gives an update on the UCSRN website. We hope that it is finished before the election of the new Board.

## **6) Timeline**

### **a) Election**

The statutes say that the UCSRN Board year finishes on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June, meaning that we should aim to bring the newly elected representatives together at the start of June and host the Election GA mid-June. After that, we can start transition.

### **b) Transition**

Now that the Dropbox has been reorganized, the UCSRN is working on a Board Book to make sure that the next Board receives a proper transition, as this document will include reflections, recommendations and suggestions for the Policy Manual.

*Question Esther Baar, AUC:* Is it an idea to include all of the UC boards in the evaluations as well? To get an idea of their opinion on how the UCSRN functioned in the past year?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Great idea! We will make sure to take this up.

*Question Iris Bos, EUC:* As we are new here, I was wondering: how will the elections be organized?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* In the statutes it says that *any* student can run for an Executive Board position, although this is still a part of the Policy Manual discussion. I would say that we keep it as we have done it in the past, meaning that the UCSRN representatives from each UC can send in an election statement in which they express their motivation and preparedness for the position. The 6 delegates of each UC will then vote on the next Board.

### **c) UCG**

As some might know, UCG is aiming at visiting the UCSRN Tournament to check if they like the atmosphere. Tessa (UCSRN) introduces the idea to invite them to the Election GA, where we can vote them in- or out of the UCSRN. At this GA, they will not have the right to vote yet and will not be able to have a representative running for the Board.

*Question Tisha Hupkes, EUC:* So they will join the UCSRN (and its committees) next year?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Yes. We will also try to have an admission policy by the end of the year for future admissions. Finances will be sorted out at another GA.

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* As we experienced at the previous Summit, where we discussed the fee for EUC, financial discussions can take quite long. Do you propose that we discuss this at another GA than the Election GA?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* Yes. Keep in mind, it is also still up to UCG if they even want to join.

## 7) Statutes

After a lot of phone calls and emails, we received approval of a notary located in Middelburg. He says that, if the statutes remain unchanged, they are in accordance to Dutch law can thus be passed. He already made some slight alterations. The process in total would cost us €450.

The statutes will now be discussed, and you are free to propose amendments. If we were to amend, we would have to bring the statutes to the students. It is up to the UCs to decide how they want to vote on (dis)approving the statutes. It is the aim to have the statutes before the Election GA.

*Question Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort, UCU:* What happens if the students make changes to statutes?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* We would have to look at the amendments, bring them to a Summit, approve the amendments and go past the students and the notary again. In sum, it would suck, as it means more time – and probably more money.

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Which UCs need to bring the statutes to a GA?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* Only UCM, UCR and UCU.

*Response Gustaaf:* There's a high chance that there will be amendments.

*Response Haris Kalic, UCSRN:* Keep in mind that I will be there to defend these statutes.

*Conclusion Tessa, UCSRN:* At UCR, we will only inform the students of the statutes and answer any question they have in an information session. The approval will occur by means of an online vote.

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* Does the statutes budget include translation?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* We translated by ourselves. Only the Dutch statutes are binding, and there should not be any (large) inconsistencies with the English version. We chose this option because translators are expensive. The legal "stamp" does not go on the English statutes.

**NOTE: THE STATUTES DISCUSSED IN THIS SUMMIT CAN BE FOUND IN THE DROPBOX OR IN YOUR ASSOCIATION'S OR COUNCIL'S MAILBOX**

### --- ARTICLE 1 ---

#### 1.3 – Fortuna

*Question Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* Officially, Fortuna is not a representative of the LUC, and I thus feel like Fortuna cannot join under this provision. Fortuna is not elected to represent students outside of LUC.

After some discussion, we come to the conclusion that the issue is a matter of wording, and thus, a motion to leave out "representing" in Article 1.3 is brought to a vote.

*Vote on leaving out "representing" in Article 1.3*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**The word "representing" shall be left out of 1.3.**

*Question Niaz Ali Khan, UCU:* Wasn't there a discussion about the voting majorities last time?

*Response Tessa van Hoonr, UCSRN:* Correct, but the notary confirmed that the majorities defined in these statutes are correct.

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 1 is approved.**

--- ARTICLE 2 ---

**2.5 – Wording**

Gustaaf van Oosterom (UCU) makes a proposition that we **agree to adopt**, meaning that “or” in Article 2.5 will be changed to “and”.

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 2 is approved.**

--- ARTICLE 3 ---

**3.3.2 – Students of UCs**

Somebody proposes to change “stimulating exchange of experience to benefit of the UCs” to “the students of UCs”. Nobody objects to this amendment, and it is thus **accepted by acclamation.**

**3.4 – Wording**

Tijmen Lamers (LUC) proposes to change the first “gender” in Article 3.4 to “sex” in order to avoid repetition. **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 3 is approved.**

--- ARTICLE 4 ---

Geke Hasperhoven (UCM) addresses the inconsistency that in the Dutch version, the statutes state that “the association consists of”, whereas the English version includes “shall have”. **This inconsistency in the English version shall be changed to fit the Dutch.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 4 is approved.**

--- ARTICLE 5 ---

Tessa van Hoorn (UCSRN) clarifies upon a question that was sent in pertaining to the death of members (in the Dutch statutes). In order to elucidate the issue of associations dying – which they technically cannot – **the Dutch statutes will be adjusted to say “ceasing to exist”.**

**5.5 – Division of Delegates**

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Does the division of delegates between council and associations need to be specified in the statutes?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* This cannot be in the statutes, as all but one council are not legal entities. However, **this provision will be included in the Policy Manual.**

**5.6 – Committee members being Delegates**

*Question Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* Would this include Committee members?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* This depends on next year’s Board and how they want to arrange this, but by this definition of “Board”, Committee members are excluded. Keep in mind that “the Board” in the statutes refers to the Executive Board.

**5.8 – Entitlement**

*Question Tijmen Lamers, LUC:* I feel like the statement that all students shall be entitled to participation in all UCSRN activities contradicts what is stated in Article 12.7, which states that the GA needs to approve of any other person than a delegate at a GA.

To solve this issue, Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) proposes to change Article 5.10 to the following: “A Member may be removed by the General Assembly if it acts contrary to the UCSRN’s Statutes, PM or resolutions, or unreasonably prejudices the UCSRN.” **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

#### **5.11 – Annual fee**

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Maybe it is an idea to change “still be owed” to “still be paid”. We had some issues with the interpretation of this as debt.

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* As this is already correct in the Dutch statutes, we will change it in the English version too. **A time period of when payment is due shall be specified in the Policy Manual.** The amendment to change “still be owed” to “still be paid” is **approved by acclamation.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 5 is approved.**

### --- ARTICLE 6 ---

#### **6.5 – Wording consistency**

To make the statutes consistent, “owed” will be changed to “paid” in Article 6.5 as well.

#### **6.2 – GA and benefactors**

Several attendees feel like the GA does not have enough say in the approval of a benefactor.

*Vote on amendment to change “The Board” to “The GA” in Article 6.2 and taking out 6.3*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**The wording shall be changed and 6.3 shall be removed,** meaning that **the GA shall decide on the admission of benefactors,** and the Board shall still send a written statement whenever a possible benefactor has approached them.

#### **6.4.1 – Death & ceasing to exist**

We also adopt a wording amendment proposed by Ivar Troost (UCR), which changes “death” to “ceasing to exist” in Article 6.4.1.

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 6 is approved.**

### --- ARTICLE 7 ---

#### **7.2 – Translation error**

Mauro Stel (EUC) points out that the Dutch statutes should include “van” instead of “of”, which we accept.

*Question Tijmen Lamers, LUC:* Would it not be useful to include a maximum number of honorary members per year to keep it exclusive?

*Response Daniel Janssen, UCSRN:* As the GA decides on this, they can decide to keep it as exclusive as they want it to be.

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* The 10% threshold seems quite low.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* This is the percentage set by Dutch law.

To specify voting majorities, Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) proposes that we add “by an absolute majority” to Article 7.1 and 7.3.4. **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 7 is approved.**

--- ARTICLE 8 ---

**8.6 – Suspension after violation of the law**

Gustaaf van Oosterom (UCU) and Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) raise concerns about 8.6.1. being too, and propose to change “will” to “change”. **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

**8.10 – Period of notice**

*Question Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* I think it would be better not to specify the two-month period of notice in the statutes, as sometimes board members leave because of unexpected reasons such as health complications. Maybe move this to the Policy Manual instead?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* The notary added this to bring it into accordance with Dutch law.

*Vote on amendment to add “all regulations regarding termination of Board membership will be provided for in the Policy Manual”*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**This line shall be added to Article 8.10 and Board membership termination shall thus be provided for in the Policy Manual.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 8 is approved.**

--- ARTICLE 9 ---

**9.7 – Wording**

Tijmen Lamers (LUC) proposes to add “not” to this clause, meaning that the Board shall not have this authority. Tessa van Hoorn (UCSRN) admits that this is a mistake, **and it shall thus be changed.**

**9.2 – Time for convening GA**

*Question Thomas Giacoletto, LUC:* Isn't it better to include a certain period in which the GA must convene instead of leaving it up to “as soon as possible”?

As there is some discussion about whether this should be in the Policy Manual and what the number of days should be, one vote makes it to the floor:

*Vote on amendment to change “as soon as possible” to “within 60 days” in Article 9.2*

**Approved** (with 1 disapproval).

**The time shall be specified to be “within 60 days”.**

**9.8 – Testamentary dispositions**

*Question Geke Hasperhoven, UCM:* Why is this clause in this article?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Good question – I am not sure – so we will ask the notary whether the placement of this is correct.

**9.3 – Contradiction with Article 14.4**

Tijmen Lamers (LUC) points out that this article contradicts Article 14.4, as one says that any board member may do so and here it says that he or she must be granted power by two others in writing. Tessa (UCSRN) responds that this clause is more to make sure that the

power of attorney is granted in writing by at least two board members. However, **Article 14.4 shall be changed to bring it into accordance with Article 9.3.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 9 is approved.**

--- BREAK ---

--- ARTICLE 10 ---

Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) raises an issue: there is currently no provision for a budget with which you can host the first GA of the year. In other words, Thomas suggested that it may be a good idea to have an amount of money ready for the first GA. Jan Willem Bruggeman (AUC) even suggests that the Board should be able to make (some) expenses before approval. The question: should we define what amount the Board can spend and where – statutes or Policy Manual – should we do so? Thomas wants it in the statutes, as this is where other financial provisions are outlined. Daniel Janssen (UCSRN) voices that he is against outlining a specific percentage or amount in the statutes, as the UCSRN is likely to increase over time – the Policy Manual is more flexible.

*Vote on amendment to include in the statutes that there is a possibility to spend money before the budget has been approved*

**Approved** (with 9 disapprovals).

**The statutes will mention that there is a possibility for the Board to spend money before approval.**

It is also approved that **this will be provided for in the Policy Manual.**

### **10.3 – GA vote on the budget**

Gustaaf (UCU) proposes to change the second line of Article 10.3 to “the budget will be subject to the GA” instead of “there must be a vote at a GA”, as this provides the Board with a some budget in the case of budget disapproval.

*Vote on amending Article 10.3 to “The budget that will be presented shall be voted upon at the first GA of the year, in case it has not been approved at that GA, it shall be voted upon at the first following GA.”*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**Article 10.3 shall be amended to the above**, in effect meaning that the Board has the possibility to spend a certain amount of money before the budget is approved.

There is some disagreement after this approval. Should the specification of whether the Board has budget they can spend before approval (and if so, how much) be in the Policy Manual or the statutes? The Policy Manual would of course be equally binding, but is much easier to change. Tessa (UCSRN) says that, regardless of the vote, this shall be checked with the notary.

*Vote on completely providing for this in the Policy Manual*

**Disapproved** (with 2 abstentions).

**The provision will be outlined in both the statutes and the Policy Manual.**



*Vote on approving Article 10*

**Approved** (with 1 disapproval).  
**Article 10 has been approved.**

--- **ARTICLE 11** ---

**11.3 – IB audit**

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* The IB reports its audit twice a year, correct? Can we make a provision for this?

*Response Haris Kalic, UCSRN:* Good point, I propose that we then add “twice a year” to Article 11.3.2. **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

**11.4 – Mistake**

Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort (UCU) suggests that Article 11.4 refers to the wrong article (11.5 instead of 12.3). **The amendment to correct the mistake is approved by acclamation.**

**11.7 – Disagreement with IB**

Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) argues that the threshold for calling a GA – which is currently set to 10% of the delegates – should be lowered in cases of disagreement with the IB. Daniel Janssen (UCSRN) says that it might be a better idea to first vote on lowering the percentage instead of setting a specific percentage. Several attendees oppose Thomas, finding that the GA threshold would otherwise be too low.

*Amendment to add to 11.7 “In case of disagreement with the decision of the IB, a GA would be called for by a # of delegates”*

**Disapproved** (with 1 abstention).  
**The threshold shall not be lowered.**

**11.3 – IB audit**

Esther Baar (AUC) brings us back to the addition of “twice a year” by stating that a “lazy IB” could also just do both audits at the end of the year, thus vouching for a specific time period for the audits. Tessa van Hoorn (UCSRN) proposes to add to Article 11.3.2 “as provided for by the Policy Manual”, **which is approved by acclamation.**

**11.7 – Binding advice**

There seems to be disagreement about whether the IB should have binding advice in case of conflicts. Currently, the GA has the power to reverse this decision. Some say that this gives the IB too much power, opting for non-binding advice instead, whilst others defend the idea that the IB should be a judicator in disputes.

*Vote on completely removing that the IB can have binding advice in Article 11.7*

**Disapproved** (with 6 approvals).  
**The IB can give binding advice.**

*Vote on changing the first line of Article 11.7 to “The IB can give binding advice in case of appeals made by members, students or the Board”*

**Approved** (by acclamation).  
**The IB can give binding advice in appeals.**

**The above amendment should also be applied to Article 11.5.**

### **11.1 – IB serving time**

Tijmen Lamers (LUC) proposes to include in Article 11.1 that the IB serves for a year, to make the time more specific. **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

Because there are some concerns about how the IB will be structured and whether the diversity of UCs in IBs will be upheld, Tessa (UCSRN) proposes to add one more line to the statutes, referring that these matters will be provided for in the Policy Manual. **It is thus approved that Article 11.9 shall read “All other regulations of the IB will in the Policy Manual”.**

### **11.3.3 – Mistake**

Thomas (LUC) points out that “administer” should be “administrate” in Article 11.3.3. He is correct, **and this amendment is therefore approved by acclamation.**

### **11.4.a – Expert advice**

*Question Thomas, LUC:* I think it should be added that the GA checks whether the advice of an expert is necessary.

*Response Jan Willem Bruggeman, AUC:* The GA has to approve the budget, so this is already provided for. Of course, the Treasurers are also very capable of helping.

Marc de Liedekerke Beaufort (UCU) proposes the compromise to add “only after consulting its members” to Article 11.4.a, **which is approved by acclamation.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 11 is approved.**

## **--- ARTICLE 12 ---**

### **12.2 – Wording**

People suggest to change Article 12.2 to the following: “GAs will take place at least twice a year, of which the first no later than three months after the financial year starts”. **This amendments is approved by acclamation.**

### **12.4 – Absence of the Chair**

*Question Esther Baar, AUC:* Should the responsibility of a back-up Chair in the case of the Chair’s absence be in the statutes?

**It is approved to change 12.4 to** “The chairperson of the Board will chair the GA. In the event that the chair is not available another Board member shall take up its position, unless the GA decides otherwise.

### **12.3.1.ii – IB audit presentation**

*Question Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Presenting the audit is optional in this clause, but it should be mandatory right?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* The reason why we did not make it mandatory is because there might be a time that all IB members cannot make it to the GA. A mandatory provision would make that impossible.

*Vote on amendment to change Article 12.3.1.ii from “can” to “should”*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**Article 12.3.1.ii shall be changed to make the audit presentation mandatory.**

*Question Geke Hasperhoven, UCM:* I think that for GAs there should be at least a certain amount of people attending. Should we define a minimum in the statutes?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* You cannot force people to attend GAs, but big decisions – such as an amendment to the the statutes – need a minimum of attendees already, so that is provided for.

*Geke waives the motion.*

*Question Meike Brouwer, UCU:* Do you have financial insurance or are you looking into that?

*Response Tessa, UCSRN:* This is already accounted for by Article 12.3.1, but I will ask the notary to make sure.

#### **12.3.4 – Wording**

There seems to be some vagueness about whether to add “previous” or “outgoing” to “the Board” in this clause, to make this more specific. Tessa (UCSRN) will check with the notary what wording is preferable, but a motion is still put to the floor.

*Vote on adding “outgoing” to Article 12.3.4*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**Article 12.3.4 shall read “... the outgoing Board”.**

#### **12.10 – Proxy voting**

Meike Brouwer (UCU) suggests specifying a timeframe in this clause, or more specifically, asks to add “before the GA opens”. Although Tessa (UCSRN) says that it would be better to have this in the Policy Manual, a motion to amend is put to the floor.

*Vote on amending the final line of Article 12.10 to “These proxy votes need to be communicated to the IB before the GA opens”.*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**Article 12.3.4 shall read “... the outgoing Board”.**

#### **12.7 – Consistency**

Tisha Hupkes (EUC) points out that Article 12.7 should still be made consistent with previous provisions. **It is approved by acclamation** that the first line of Article 12.7 should read “The UCSRN’s Members, Delegates, Students and Honorary Members shall be admitted to the GA.”

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 12 is approved.**

### **--- ARTICLE 13 ---**

#### **13.1 – Wording**

Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) suggests to change “may” to “must” in Article 13.1, and change “bylaws” to “Policy Manual” in 13.4. **These amendments have been approved.**

*Question Thomas, LUC:* I think it is a good idea to specify the voting majority to change Policy Manual clauses, and specify who can motion to change the Policy Manual.

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* I think a simple majority often suffices.

*Response Geke Hasperhoven, UCM:* Any GA decision standard is already set at a simple majority, so we should not have to specify, correct?

*Response Thomas, LUC:* Shall we then still add who can propose motions? A student, member, delegate or Board?

*Response Gustaaf van Oosterom, UCU:* Sure, but instead of referring to Policy Manual, you should write “these articles”, because then you include the statutes as well.

*Vote on adding to Article 13 who – students, delegates, members, Board – can propose changes to “these articles”*

**Approved** (by acclamation).

**This provision shall be added to Article 13.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 13 is approved.**

--- **ARTICLE 14** ---

**9.3 – Complying to Article 9.3**

Thomas Giacoletto (LUC) suggests to solve the 9.3 conflict by adding “complying to article 9.3”, as discussed previously. **This amendment is approved by acclamation.**

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 14 is approved.**

--- **ARTICLE 15** ---

As there are no further objections, by a vote of acclamation, **Article 15 is approved.**

**8) Budget**

As we have limited time left, we cannot really go into the budget right now. However, Haris Kalic (UCSRN) will be very happy to answer all of your questions elaborately by mail.

**9) Open Floor**

*Question Laura Arts, UCU:* Do you want to get these statutes approved before the end of the year?

*Response Tessa van Hoorn, UCSRN:* Absolutely.

*Question Steven Verboom, UCR:* Are the minutes available to all students?

*Response Daniel Janssen, UCSRN:* Absolutely.

**10) Closure**

Some serious closure here... What is possibly THE FINAL UCSRN SUMMIT is closed. To celebrate, people are going to take a tour of the amazing EUC building!