



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

1. Welcome

Joris van Schie (Chair): Thank you all for coming to Utrecht. Welcome to the first GA of 2016 and 2017. (time is 14:05)

We have quite a few things to discuss today. Basically we will be discussing the budget, three reduction fee proposals, the mission, and what we have been doing for the last 3 months.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Joris van Schie (Chair): We have quite a lot to discuss. So let's try to keep a nice pace. Also if you have a question, please raise your hand and state your UC and name for the minutes. You can also introduce motions; you can do so by raising your hand. Please make sure to be polite and professional about your comments.

Are there any questions/comments to the agenda?

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Can we switch agenda point 3 and 4?

Faye Bovelanders (UCR): Why would we want that?

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): The Executive Board was voted in at the last GA. It would therefore be good to first have the minutes of that GA approved.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Okay, let's do that. Then the Agenda is hereby approved by acclamation.

3. Approval of Minutes of last GA

Joris van Schie (Chair): Are there any questions/comments to the minutes?

No? In that case the Minutes of last GA are hereby approved by acclamation.

4. Appointment of the Independent Body

Joris van Schie (Chair): We would now like to present the new Independent Body members. We would like to welcome them onto the stage: Jan Willem Bruggeman (AUC) – Chair, Pedro Arias (UCT), Mees Mouwen (UCM), Anouk Ide (AUC), Lotte Bouwman (LUC) and Iris Donker (LUC).

The Independent Body has 4 basic tasks: making sure the PM and statutes are upheld, counting the votes at the general assemblies, perform an audit twice a year and settle disputes within the UCSRN.

The Independent Body will present the audit of last year's finances in a couple of minutes.

Lance Bosch (AUC): Outside of being a general member of the IB, and Jan Willem being the chair, do you also have specific roles?



Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): No

Joris van Schie (Chair): If there are no comments, we approve of the IB by acclamation.

5. Current Status of the UCSRN

Joris van Schie (Chair): So we were elected 3 months ago. And what have we been up to since then.

Today we took pictures of the EB at UCU. They will also be on Facebook and the website.

Regarding the website. This was a large project, which is finally completed. It is a nice website, where you can find all the documents, also for GAs and other information. We are also working on opinion articles, of which the first one will be online soon. You can find the website on ucsrn.nl. It is really the first thing that is accomplished by this EB.

We are also working on the UCSRN video, through which we can explain what the UCSRN actually is and what it does. This year we will put effort into promotion, which will be discussed in our mission as well. Many people don't know what the UCSRN actually is, and only know the Tournament. Therefore, we have put energy into the website, an active Facebook page, with about 1600 likes at the moment (applause), and the video.

We have also been working on the Independent Body and the Advisory Body.

And even though the last 3 months were sometimes difficult, with me having to skype in from Spain, I am very happy with what we have accomplished so far. My fellow board members are dedicated and motivated.

Please give a round of applause for my fellow board members! (Bas, Aleksandra, Jonathan and Hannah)

6. UCSRN Mission

Joris van Schie (Chair): We will then move on to the Mission of the UCSRN.

One of the first items is promotion. Many people don't know the UCSRN. Last week Hannah, Jonathan and I went to visit three UCs, but many students there don't know us yet. Therefore, we have built the website, and will make a video. Another part of the PR strategy is Facebook, with sponsored Facebook posts you can reach students more easily. This is to improve awareness of our own association. Not only to our students, but also to the outside world. So we can get into contact with national organisations, such as the ISO and the LSVB. But also with European organisations, such as ECOLAS. And also with the parliament, we have for example send an email to Sjoerd Sjoerdsma of the D66. We can use this to pave the way for lobbying there. One of our goals therefore is to improve promotion internally and externally.

I would now like to invite Bas, the chair of the Academic Committee to elaborate on the Academic Committee Mission.



7. Academic Committee Update

Bas Kellerhuis (Academic Committee Chair): Hello everyone, my name is Bas Kellerhuis and I am the Academic Committee Chair.

Today I am going to tell you what the main responsibilities towards the Members are of the Academic Committee. We have two main goals:

1) We want to become a platform for sharing academic interests and passion among UC students. Such as through the Conference, which was on utopia last year.

2) Other than being a platform, we want to improve education. As an organisation that is bigger than an individual UC, we have bigger resources to improve the situation. We can use the UCSRN to discuss academic and social matters between UCs. A very good example of this, is the Master Transition. Many UC students cannot enter their Master directly, and need to fulfil a pre-master first. With lobbying in first the Netherlands, we want to change the way they treat UC students. As one UC mentioning this problem, you do not have much power. As the UCSRN we are therefore the perfect organisation to bring this problem to their attention. We will work on lobbying for the Master Transition as well as other opportunities. Thank you very much for your attention.

Joris van Schie (Chair): I would now like to welcome Aleksandra Blazeusz, the Social Committee Chair to present the Mission of the Social Committee.

8. Social Committee Update

Aleksandra Blazeusz (Social Committee Chair): Hello everyone, I am the chair of the Social Committee. I will present you with the vision that the Social Committee has for the upcoming year.

1) Our goal is to develop and maintain the open learning platform

a. A place where UCs can talk about their social struggles and present issues of the UC where we can help or even solve it. This goes for both committees and the Boards of the associations. The UCSRN is also a platform to learn from each other. Also we want to improve committee communication. The bigger UCs can help develop smaller UC committees. They can learn from the bigger UCs, how to deal with certain things, or organise events. For this we would like to update the database, and make sure that committees use their email.

2) We will also be hosting events this year. We will definitely have the UCSRN Tournament and the Spotlight. We are also still planning to organise a third event. For the events we want to focus on quality not quantity. We don't want to host a lot more events, but instead make sure they are well-attended and of good quality.



3) We would like to develop a sense of unity so that people not only feel part of their UC, but also like they are part of the UCSRN. This is a long term goal. We won't reach this within a year, but it is definitely something to start and aim for.

This also brings me to my last point: promotion. We would like to make sure that students know what UCSRN is and how it can help your UC, how they can reach out to us and what we deal with. As a national organisation, we want students to know what they are part of and what we can do for them.

Thank you for listening, I will now give the floor back to Joris.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Are there any questions/comments on the Mission? No, then we will move on to the Advisory Body.

9. New Advisory Body Members

Joris van Schie (Chair): The current Advisory Body members are the Executive Board members of last year, and Aram Zegeerius. They were always there for us in the last 3 months, and we would like to thank them for preparing us for our Executive Board year. As the Advisory Body is still developing however, we would like to present some more new members.

Today we would like to additionally present:

Daniël Janssen (a UCR alumni), who was a part of the Executive Board of 2013-2014, and therefore knows a lot about the statutes.

Yanick Verkerk (UCT), Josephine Strijker (UCG) and Thomas Gardien (UCM), who were all members of the Social Committee of the UCSRN last year. We think that these members will be of value to us in the Advisory Body.

As the Advisory Body is a relatively new body of the UCSRN, the roles and tasks are still being developed. We are in the process of establishing it more. Right now the Advisory Body is there to give us feedback and formally come together twice a year for a more extensive feedback session. We are thus being advised by them, also if we don't ask for the advice ourselves.

Are there any questions about the AB, or comments/objections to the new members? Then we hereby approve of the four new AB members by acclamation!

10. Membership Fee Reduction Proposals

Joris van Schie (Chair): This year we have 3 membership fee reduction proposals, by UCT, UCG and EUC. I would like to first ask Atlantis (UCT) to the stage to present their proposal.

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): There are two parts to our explanation of why we ask for a reduction of the membership fee:

1) First of all, we are a small UC, consisting of only about 100 members. Which why we think it would not be fair to pay the whole amount, and we also don't really have the money.



2) We also teamed up with UCG during the Tournament, since we are smaller in size. We are sort of a half UC.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Keep in mind that if you decide to disapprove of the proposal by UCT, that will have negative consequences. They might have to leave the UCSRN because they will not be able to pay the full membership fee.

Are there any questions/comments to the proposal?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): How do you encompass membership fees?

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): We receive membership fees of our members, acquisition money and subsidies from the University Twente. If we would pay the full contribution fee of the UCSRN, that would account for 13% of our budget, thus receiving the same amount as 3-4 committees. It would make for a weird balance.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): How will the number of members be increasing over the years? And we also know that Atlantis has some members that are not from UCT?

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): The plans are still quite vague. For now, the average is 80 new students per year. They think the maximum will be 100. But it will remain relatively small.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Will it increase?

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): For this year the amount of students will increase for sure, maybe not next year. We are still growing, maybe we will be able to pay the whole fee at some point.

Lance Bosch (AUC): There is no proposal for when you are going to have a new / higher membership fee? So you don't expect this to change in the upcoming years?

Joris van Schie (Chair): Do not forget that this proposal proposal is just for this year.

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): Based on the current information, UCT will still be super small next year. So then we would probably request the same reduction.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Last year there was also a proposal for reducing the membership fee, then there was a repercussion imposed on the reduced membership fee by also reducing the amount of votes. If anyone has an idea about that, feel free to propose a motion! Are there any objections, or more comments on the proposal?

Radu Cracan (EUC, Treasurer Academic Committee): What is the difference in percentage of total income for UCT?

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): We receive about 30-40% of our budget from the faculty.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Rozemerijn Pieplensbosch (EUC): If you are not planning to pay the full membership fee, how else are you expecting to contribute to the UCRSN, what else do you plan to contribute to the UCRSN?

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): We are very willing to host events. We are willing to do a lot. We tried to perhaps organise the Tournament, however that did not work out. Maybe we will host the third social event. In terms of money it is difficult, but organising an activity is not a problem.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Anything else? Then I think we can move on to voting on the proposal.

Marta Dawydzik (EUC): Are we voting on the membership fee?

Joris van Schie (Chair): We are voting on the reduced membership fee proposal by UCT.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Can I raise a motion to do this vote with the other two votes on the membership fee reductions?

Joris van Schie (Chair): Are there any objections to that motion? Jan Willem asked to vote on the other two together with this one.

We accept the motion by acclamation. We will then have 3 individual votes at the same time. We will do it via secret ballots. Are there any objections? Since there are none, we will do so.

Then we will now continue with the next UC, which is UCG.

Hanna Dosenko (UCG): We would also like to ask you to vote in favour of the membership fee reduction of UCG. We only exist for 3 years, and are still relatively small. We have a little bit more than 100 members. We joined the Tournament last year, and we loved it. It gives our members an opportunity to meet other UCs, and for me personally as External Affairs Officer this is really important. It gives us a change to connect with other Students. However, our membership fee is only €20 per semester. We therefore really do not have the money to pay the full amount, but would still like to participate. We hope you can consider our situation and help us.

Louis Parker (UCU): How much is your yearly fee of the association for students?

Hanna Dosenko (UCG): Our fee is €20. We have not discussed this for the future. When we are going to grow, we will discuss increasing the amount, as we will also be hosting more events etc. At the moment we don't have that many events.

Louis Parker (UCU): Our membership fee is a little bit more per semester, this is also reflected in a bigger budget. However, as the number of members and UC students expands, do you have a plan to increase the budget?

Hanna Dosenko (UCG): I can't predict this, but it would be logical when we have more members.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Right now, our third years are on exchange. They have not paid yet. We therefore face a problem, as they won't participate in events this half of the year. We are not trying to make it that dramatic, but it is very unfortunate.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I would like to ask, seeing that last year you had a bit of a difficulty with your board. I assume that is more stable now? But if you look at the UCSRN fee and the amount your students pay, is that amount feasible to you? How much of your budget is that? And how much is that per student?

Hanna Dosenko (UCG): Our total income is €23.000, of which €2.500 would then be the contribution fee. This year we can't pay some of the committees, as we don't have enough income. Some only receive €50.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): But will you be able to pay the €1.250? In case we reduce the fee?

Hanna Dosenko (UCG): Yes, it would be possible, the €1.250 that is.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Okay.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Are you saying all your third years are on exchange? How many members do you have?

Hanna Dosenko (UCG): We have 86 new first years. And we have around 120 members in total.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Okay.

Joris van Schie (Chair): If there are no more comments/questions we will move on to the next UC: EUC.

Daan Friese (EUC): Good afternoon everyone. I am Daan Friese, the treasurer of EUCSA. We have 3 reasons of why we are applying for a reduction of the membership fee

- 1) This is only the 4th year of EUC, and EUCSA, we are therefore still developing internal and external relations. At the moment we have little to none external relations
- 2) Furthermore, we heavily depend on subsidies. This year our subsidies have been cut in half again. The UCSRN fee would constitute 10% of our budget.
- 3) We have grown in members since last year. We have 75 more members this year, however we still did not reach what we expected, as we have 200 new EUC students. At the moment we do not see how we can pay the full fee.

In return, we would like to offer facilities for GAs, and other UCSRN events. We are really excited to host these. Lastly, on the policy for losing votes, we would be 100% okay with that.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Rick Schumans (UCM): We have exactly the same percentage we pay the UCSRN, it is also 10% of our yearly budget. I don't see any point for reducing your fees, if we have the same situation. I don't see why we should differentiate from newer established UC.

Daan Friese (EUC): We have a budget of €23.000, Twente has the same. We have less members, only 300. Therefore, we have less money to spent per member.

Rick Schumans (UCM): So you say you have 300 members, we have 600. So we spent even less per member. I don't see why EUC would need this reduction. For UCT and UCG I see the point, but I don't agree for EUC.

Lance Bosch (AUC): So you guys are 4 years old right, just as a response. I think the UCSRN is there to help among the UCs, and the UCSRN can help UCs, like EUC grow. How important is it then how much we spent relatively to each other? It is also an investment.

Daan Friese (EUC): Correct. We are lucky with our number of members at the moment. Being a student at EUC namely does not automatically make you a member of EUCSA.

We are setting up an Acquisition committee this year, to be able to pay the full fee next year.

Lance Bosch (AUC): So you are applying to pay the full membership fee next year?

Daan Friese (EUC): Absolutely, we are going to be able to pay the full fee next year, as we will generate enough income for it.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I have two questions:

1) How are you going to make sure to pay the full fee next year, as you have said so the last 2 years? Are you going to have a system? How will you help EUC with their financial situation, and the acquisition team?

Daan Friese (EUC): Last year, there were some problems concerning domestic affairs and no external acquisition was generated. This year we do expect external income.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): But this promise has already been made 2 times. How will you make sure that next year's board is going to be able to pay for it? Maybe EUC will reduce your subsidy again.

Daan Friese (EUC): We have put money aside for next year's board. We are growing exponentially as well. We have 180 new students this year, and will have 250 new students next year. Also we could increase the membership fees. Our predecessor did not have any plans for acquiring the money. This year it is more of a focus point.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): (second question)

2) Last year it actually turned out to be okay, because EUC paid more than €900 for the conference. However, this was mainly due to Saskia (secretary 2015 – 2016) lobbying for it at EUC. Do you have anything set to do something similar upcoming year?



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Daan Friese (EUC): We have nothing set, but would in any way be open to those things.

Manon Peek (UCU): I had a question for the UCRSN in general: because now we are just throwing numbers at each other. I think it would make sense to have every student going to a UC pay a set amount of money as a contribution to the UCRSN. Indeed, it is not really fair that the percentage is not the same for the UCs. I think it should relatively be the same for all UCs. Of course it can't be done for this GA, but it might be something to think of for the future.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Alternatively, we could look for sponsorships. Maybe we can think about acquisition teams working together to generate funding. Sponsorship teams could then collaborate.

Faye Boveland (UCR): In this case, I would like to make a motion: That the Executive Board should re-evaluate the membership fees construction.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): Before when should this be done?

Faye Boveland (UCR): This would be something to complete before the next semester.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): So to set a deadline, the EB should re-evaluate it before the first GA of next semester.

Joris van Schie (Chair): We should vote on the motion.

Manon Peek (UCU): Could you repeat the motion?

Faye Boveland (UCR): The EB should re-evaluate the membership fees construction, before the end of their Board year.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I have an objection. This would be a restriction on next year's Executive Board. This would be something that can only be implemented next year. Right now we are going to vote on the evaluation of the fees. Then it would result into a recommendation for the new Board, who would have to implement it.

Faye Boveland (UCR): It would not necessarily be agreed upon yet; it will just be a recommendation/proposal for the next Executive Board to take up.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Okay.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): This was the way the membership was set up. They decided on this format 2 years ago. Essential to the discussion was the number of votes relative to the number of students or contribution that was paid. In the end, it was decided that one fee, independent of the number of students would be used. All UCs would then pay the same amount, and have the same number of votes. In case we want to change this, we would have to change the statutes.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

So the motion would tell us to re-evaluate, then make a proposal, which can then change statutes. This would change the membership fee construction for the next year and the years afterwards.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Just as a recap, we are trying to vote on something we should be thinking about. Is it necessary for it to be a motion? I think we all sort of agree.

Joris van Schie (Chair): The motion tells us that we have to think about this.

Shall we then proceed to voting. I would like to ask the IB to come to the stage.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Just out of curiosity, as we should stay independent. When is the next GA, around what month/time?

Joris van Schie (Chair): We don't know yet; it would be in around 3 months from now.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Could you survive the next 3 months without money?

Joris van Schie (Chair): We are voting on making a proposal for the next GA, but not changing the membership fees for this year. So the motion is: The GA asks the Board to re-evaluate the fee system and to come up with a proposal in this year. It is just re-evaluating the system, so it has no influence on the fees of this year.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): I am just wondering how the voting works with proxies.

Hannah Vreeburg (Secretary): You can put up two hands.

Voting happens.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): There are 46 votes in total. This motion has to be approved by a simple majority, 50% of the people, so 23 people have to approve of this motion. Abstaining is the same as voting against in practice.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): We need 24, because we need 50%+1 is needed to have a majority.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): You are correct, we need 24.

With 27 in favour, 10 against and 6 abstains the motion has been approved and the re-evaluation will be done.

Joris van Schie (Chair): We will then proceed to voting on the membership fees.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): We will do it by secret ballot. Since we don't have voting ballots, what you do is write UCT, UCG and EUC on your paper and your own UC and name. Then you can write a + for in favour, a - for against and a / for abstain.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Is that clear for everyone?



Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): The reason we ask for your name is so we can make sure all votes are counted. In case you have a proxy vote, you just put that person's name underneath your own vote and do the same as for yourself.

Rozemerijn Pieplenbosch (EUC): So for a proxy vote you just add the word proxy?

Louis Parker (UCU): Can you clarify, so abstaining is the same as voting against?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Yes.

Louis Parker (UCU): So you are not removing the abstains from the number of votes?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Yes.

We need a simple majority of the total number of members. 50% have to approve, whereby abstaining practically means voting no.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Actually two-thirds +1 of the GA has to approve.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Please write down your votes and then we will take a 15 minute break.

Break of 15 minutes.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): So I was wrong, there actually needs to be an absolute majority, which is two-thirds +1. The abstains are also not included in the majority. Therefore, we would like to do a revote, but then just for EUC's proposal.

Carolina Silva (UCU): Why are we only doing a revote on EUC? Why not for all UCs?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): We could do that, but for the other votes it is not relevant because the two other proposals (UCT and UCG) have already been accepted anyway with a two-thirds majority.

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): So are the abstains now not included in the total?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): If you abstain your vote is not included in the majority.

Voting happens.

Joris van Schie (Chair): The proposal has passed for all three UCs, so these UCs got their reduction of the contribution fee.

We will now go on to the financial accounts of last year, which will be presented by Stefanie, last year's treasurer.

11. Financial accounts 2015/2016

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body, Treasurer 2015 - 2016):



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Hello, I am Stefanie Berendsen, I was in the Social Committee last year, and I was also the treasurer for the UCSRN. I was also the treasurer for AUCSA. And this is Helene, she was the chair of the UCSRN last year and also in the Academic Committee.

So what did we do last year. Well only two months before we took office, the statutes were approved. So we could set up the financial administration, chose which system we were going to use and propose a budget. We also established a bank account, on recommendation of the GA we sought a sustainable bank: Triodos. We tried to incorporate a lot of the financial procedures in the Policy Manual.

Does anyone have any questions? The finances were sent out beforehand so maybe some has some questions about that?

Joris van Schie (Chair): Maybe you can give a summary or further explanation.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body, Treasurer 2015 - 2016):

Sure, obviously, compared to the budget in the beginning of the year, the expenditure was not always aligned. You can see, the first column is the budget at the GA in October. And in green is what was spent in the end. We adjusted the budget in March, which when we had a clearer picture of what was going to happen. You can see the income; you can see that we had one UC joining us in March: UCT. We also had some changes for the social and academic committee, some places where we slightly overspend was for example the spotlight and the tournament. Also some funds we didn't use: such as innovation funds, as well as some administrative costs. The gala did not take place, and neither did the summer event. We are leaving the new board with €3355,85 of profit. This is the end result.

Are there any questions now? No, then I want to thank the UCSRN.

And on behalf of the Social Committee, I am still very grateful for the people joining us for the event. We had 590 people joining us at the Tournament, as well as 330 people for the Spotlight and also we had the conference, there was a great turnout! So especially to the Social and Academic Board, thanks!

Joris van Schie (Chair): Thank you Stefanie, then I would now like to proceed with the audit. Then we can approve of the financial accounts of last year. Then we may or may not discharge the old board of their responsibilities. Then I would now like to invite the IB now to present the audit.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (Chair IB):

So the IB has a two-fold role: one of them is the audit. When it comes to auditing we can give a recommendation. So what we did today is the auditing of Stephanie's books. A round of applause for her work.



She did a great job in establishing the first budget and the books. Last year's Executive Board had to start from scratch. We also have some recommendations, with regard to next year of course. So Jonathan pay attention.

So for our recommendations. These are for next year. Consider it to be feedback to do something with:

- 1) Taxes. The UCSRN does not pay taxes, but we need a formal declaration that we do not have to pay that. Our advice is to get that declaration. The AB might know where it is, otherwise you could request a new one.
- 2) Transparency of unforeseen costs. There was €1600 budgeted for unforeseen costs, but nothing has been spent. Well, not actually €0. You cannot see it clearly from the financial administration what has actually been spent and what the income and the costs are. We recommend that, since there are actually quite some unforeseen costs, to make sure that these are evident from the way the budget is set up. Take into account that there is enough space to reallocate stuff. We know that only reallocations of over €1.500, need to be communicated. The treasurer therefore has a lot of freedom, but do let the students/members know.
- 3) Increase of permanent savings. We believe it nice to have these savings to ensure financial flexibility. In case a lawsuit or something comes up. Therefore, we recommend the members to bring up a motion to embed in the PM that annually 10% of the budget is put in savings, to be used when needed. I.e. for when unforeseen costs are not enough and/or in the case of lustrum events.
- 4) Consistency of membership fees. Thank you Manon for bringing this up. We would like to encourage the EB to think of a membership fee system that is fairer in more consistent way, rather than binary model right now.
- 5) Also we would like to stress the importance of good communication between EB and SC/AC treasurers. If multiple treasurers are in charge it is difficult. We therefore recommend to communicate who is in charge of what exactly. This is because of confusion in the past.
- 6) Lastly we appreciate the detailed budget for 2016 – 2017 made by the current Executive Body. However, we would like to also get a downloadable Excel file, to be able to get a quick overview.

Are there any questions?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So should the books be approved?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Yes, we should approve the books. The recommendations were for this year.



Joris van Schie (Chair): So now I would like to move to approve the financial administration and the official discharge of last year's Executive Board. Thank you for your work last year, the UCSRN is an established organisation now. You have worked hard on the PM and the statutes. We can now actually start working with the UCSRN and do not have to work on the internal structure. We are very happy you are still a part of the AB.

Then I would hereby like to vote on closing the books and discharge the previous Executive Board.

Joris van Schie (Chair): Are there any objections to voting by acclamation?

Faye Boveland (UCR): I have an objection against vote by acclamation.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Would you like to vote by ballot again then?

Faye Boveland (UCR): No, I am simply against voting by acclamation.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Then we will vote by raising hands.

With a clear majority it has passed, and the books of last year are officially closed and the previous Executive Board has been discharged of their responsibilities.

Joris van Schie (Chair): We will then proceed with the Travel Cost Policy.

12. Travel Cost Policy Proposal

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): The Policy Manual states how reimbursement should be done. However certain things were not clear, so we wanted to clarify those. We put this in a document, the Reimbursement Policy Proposal.

We received a great comment by Bart, the UCSA treasurer, that something was still not clear in this Proposal, which we wanted to include. That is that you may still wish to spend the reimbursement money for Social and Academic events on Busses. Therefore, we propose to add the following clause.

At "travel cost reimbursement" under "social and academic events" add:

"5. A member may decide to not allow individual students to receive travel cost reimbursements in case the member takes care of transportation for all students to the event. In such a case, the member receives the travel cost reimbursement multiplied by the amount of students."

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): This is not the Policy Manual; we have also stated in the document why we didn't want to include it in the PM.

Rick Schumans (UCM): Where do we find this document?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): You can find it on the website, but it was also sent to you.



Cris van Eijk (LUC): Can you explain what this policy means in a practical sense?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Instead of students actually requesting travel cost reimbursements from the UCSRN, the Member, you, agrees you will take care of the transportation for your members to the event in exchange for the travel cost reimbursement. So if you want to arrange busses to the Tournament for example, you can decide to do so. Which as Bart correctly pointed out, the policy, as it was, didn't allow.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): Why did you decide to make it €3,50 instead of €7, as it should not be a barrier for students to come?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): In the budget we explained this. It is interesting, because a travel cost reimbursement is actually a re-distribution of funds. We collect money and for attending events, we give part of it back. For us the unwanted result was that last year, €5.000 euros were spent on travel costs. In comparison, one-third of the money budgeted for events, was spent on travel cost reimbursement. But we did not want get rid of it altogether, therefore we decided on a fair middle way. €7 is the amount for NS Groepsretour that you actually have to pay to travel to the event, and 50% of that we thought would be a fair compromise.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Can you repeat the numbers you just mentioned?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, if you actually open up the budget, you can see that in the summary, which is on page 4. In total €16.749 was spent on events, and €5.429 euros was spent on transportation. If you divide this €5.000 by €16.000 you will get approximately one-third.

Any other questions?

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Why did you decide to construct it this way? Why not set a €3,50 maximum per student that attends the event, instead of mentioning the NS Groepsretour.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): That is actually what we proposed, we just recommend everyone to use the NS Groepsretour, because it is the cheapest way of travelling by public transport. Please remember that we did not put in that people actually have to use the NS Groepsretour, only that people are recommended to do so.

Rick Schumans (UCM): But you state that in two very long sentences. You could just state travel cost reimbursement is €3,50, if you buy a ticket to the event.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): If you want to change it, fine, let's change it. We just wanted to make sure all cases are covered. But if you would like to make it shorter, I recommend you make a motion to do so.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): I understand your earlier explanation. However, I still think it is super important to not have travel cost be a barrier to go to a UCSRN event. So I would like to have €7, instead of €3,50.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, in that case I do ask you give me 10 minutes to change the budget around, which was based on the €3,50.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): So my motion is to upgrade the reimbursement to €7, giving students more of an incentive to go to events.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Is Marieke's idea shared by others? So, formally does anyone second her motion?

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Is this perhaps because some associations have budget for travel costs themselves.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): This is not necessarily the case, but I do know that RASA has budget for this.

Rick Schumans (UCM): We do not have travel costs in our budget.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): I repeat my question, is there any second for Marieke's motion?

Rick Schumans (UCM): Second.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So do we want to discuss it first. Maybe I can show you what the result/impact on the whole budget will be?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): So the NS Groepsretour is €7 per person, per event. But don't you think that is more favourable to the students from the central UCs, as most events will be hosted in the Randstad?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): That is actually the funny thing about the NS Groepsretour, from anywhere in the Netherlands, you can travel to one central place for €7. As long as there are 10 people who buy the ticket together.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Yes, but then how do you arrange these 10 people.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): This is why I very much recommend you make one FB group in which everyone can find other people to buy a ticket with.

Rick Schumans (UCM): That is not how the NS groupsretour works, you need to start at the same location.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): No you actually do need to start at the same location, you can start from anywhere in the NL, you just need to travel to the same location.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So the impact, let's go to page 12 of the budget. Currently we have €1.050 euros budgeted for the transportation to the Spotlight, if we want to change €3,50 to



€7, that means that we need to double the budget (€2.100 euros). That amount, €2.100, is based on the number of attendees. We then would have to either take the additional €1.050 away from the €1.700 budgeted for the quality of the event. The alternative being, we host less events, and for the events that we do host there is a higher travel cost reimbursement. Final option, we use some of the reserves and/or positive result to fund this. You can use the method to increase the costs for all the events, and the solutions remain the same.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): As the Auditing team, do you have enough budget to do that?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): No. Compared to last year, it should be possible. However, if we state that someone has the right to €7 of reimbursement, we have to pay the moment they ask. So as a treasurer I budget for the maximum amount to reimbursement that can be requested. The argument that there is people that have a free Weekend-OV is true, but we cannot budget for this. The result at the end of the year can then still be positive, if not everyone requested it.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): So can then maybe the people that came up with the motion, provide a solution for it.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, but since the motion was seconded I believe we have to vote on it.

Does someone maybe have a motion, or an amendment to the motion, based on Jan Willem's recommendation to provide a solution?

Rick Schumans (UCM): A solution might be to increase ticket prices for the events, so that we can save money on the event and still provide €7 of travel cost reimbursement. UCM students would then still have to travel a long time, but at least their travel costs are compensated.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, then as a rule of thumb: every ticket price would be raised by €3,50. But is this then a motion, Rick?

Rick Schumans (UCM): No it is just a suggestion.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): But if we think about it very practically, the NS Groepsretour can only be used after a certain time in the week (9.00 am), so then if a UCSRN event would start at an early time in the morning, the far away UC students would not be able to make it on time.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): The nature of your problem, I don't think is financial, but the starting time of the event. So in case Maastricht can't make it, we would simply change the time of the event, or ensure that hosting is provided for the night before.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): This seems to affect one UC in particular: UCM. Why not set up a meeting in which special provisions can be made?



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): I think this does not only affect Maastricht, but for example Groningen as well. As we need to travel to all events, we would have to pay a lot more.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Everyone has to pay €7, no matter from what UC you travel. If your UC does not have enough people attending the event, for an NS groupsretour, we can bring you into contact with students from other UCs to make that the 10 people maximum.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): My point is not that we have to pay more for a train ticket, but that we have to travel to all events, since there is never an event hosted in Maastricht. So we would have to pay more often.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): And that is the redistributive nature of travel cost reimbursement.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Could you restate the motion?

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): To make the €3,50, €7 instead.

Lance Bosch (AUC): Just to clarify the effect of this motion would be that €3,50 extra would be charged.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): Not that would be one solution.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Let me just state all solutions, one is to increase the ticket price, another would be to redistribute the money in the budget or to delve into our reserves.

Lance Bosch (AUC): Maybe then we should state that we don't choose the solution first, before you spend money that you don't have. That we should pick the best one.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): I think the motion is fine on this.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Are there any amendments on this? No? then we go into voting on the motion by Marieke.

Joris van Schie (Chair): The motion is just about the €7.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, so in case we approve of this motion, the GA should allow for 10 minutes to change the budget so we can have a discussion about that later.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB chair): With 33 against, 6 in favour, 4 abstains, the motion of Marieke to increase the reimbursement maximum to 7 euros per person did not pass.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Thank you IB, so then we now go back to adding the clause. Is there anyone that does not wish to add this clause?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): I have question of clarification: for me it is not clear what we are voting on right now. Is it a policy?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): No, we actually wish to change the policy by adding this clause, before we vote on the actual policy itself.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I don't think it yet clear, if this proposal is passed, does it then only apply to this year. Or is it also for next year?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Right now we are not voting on the proposal, but on adding this clause to the proposal. Is that clear?

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Yes, but what is actually the status of the proposal?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): I think this actually something more relevant to discuss once we talk about the proposal in general. But I can explain it to you now, the proposal is an outline. We do not yet wish to change the PM. We rather want to give it a try as a policy this year. After this year, based on your recommendation we can make it official in the PM next year. This is also what was stated on page 5 of the budget proposal. Are there any other questions on adding this clause?

Matthijs Roobeek (UCR): What exactly do you mean by Member?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Members are the student associations of the UCs. Students are then members of the Members.

So is anyone against adding this clause, because I would like to move on? Then we add it by acclamation.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So now for the next vote will be on the general policy of the Travel Cost Reimbursement. Does anyone have a question on this document as a whole?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): I would like to add an amendment, because I believe it is very important for people to find these travel mates. So it should be added in the policy that actually it is the EBs responsibility to assure every student gets a chance to travel by a group retour ticket.

Rick Schumans (UCM): Second.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So the motion is to make it the EBs responsibility to assure every Student gets a chance to travel by a NS Groepsretour ticket. One way of doing so would be a FB group, or on the website etc. And if you really cannot find it, you can email us and we will take care of it.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Was this not the EBs responsibility before?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): We did want to initiate this, but it was not put in the Policy yet.

Rozemerijn Pieplenbosch (EUC): Maybe you guys make the groups. So that Students have the responsibility to sign up. So not that you are trying to get into contact with everyone, but that Students sign up based on locations etc.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So Stefanie, would you like to rephrase your motion?



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): So let me rephrase: It is the responsibility of EB to ensure the possibility to travel by NS Groepsretour.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Are there any other comments?

Faye Bovelander (UCR): I don't think this should be the EBs responsibility. I believe the EB has better things to do. Individual Students can take of it themselves.

Marta Dawydzik (EUC): Does this have to be in the PM?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): It is not actually in the PM, it is just a Policy.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Anyone that has any more comments please come forth? So then can the IB please come forward to vote on the motion?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): With 12 votes in favour, 11 against and 17 abstains the motion passed.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Are there any other general comments?

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I would like to recommend to include this policy proposal is only for this year. If you want to make it a legal document, you want to have it in there. And also that you should change the terms to the official ones used in the Statutes and the PM. This might be more clear.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Is anyone against approving both points by acclamation?

Is there anyone with still any comments to the policy as a whole. Then we can now move into voting on the proposal with the amendments.

Hannah Vreeburg (Secretary EB): So now we are actually voting on the policy as a whole.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I actually still want to say something. Please everyone be aware that with this policy there will be no more room for the SC or AC to go over the €3,50 for the event. It is really the maximum amount, there is no legal room above this.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, this also means that if we still want to change it we have to ask the GA, which is also still possible.

Then we will now move into voting, IB please come forward.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): With a clear majority the motion passed.

13. Proposed budget 2016/2017

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So then, this means that we can move on to the next agenda point, the Proposed Budget. With the Reimbursement Policy accepted, nothing effectively changes in the budget, so that means we don't need more time to change it.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

I have two points before I delve into the budget:

- 1) I will accept the recommendations by IB, and upload the Excel sheet of the budget after the GA.
- 2) As was also sent around per email, the expense of the AC of €1.550 euros for the Masters fair, we want to change to a reservation, as the event will no longer take place in our financial year, but rather in fall 2017. The event itself will still be organised by this year's AC, in collaboration with the next AC.

Then more general points of the budget:

- 1) We tried to make the expenses of the AC and the SC more equal, so to bring the expenses closer to each other.
- 2) For the travel cost reimbursements: we want to spend more money on events, not travel costs.
- 3) Then next we will have a positive result. Some people have stated to add it to an unforeseen post, but we do not want to spend money without the GAs permission, which would be possible for an unforeseen post. We decided that the GA should understand and know where the money is spent on, instead of the EB making use of the discretionary power to reallocate money without informing the GA.
- 4) Also we want to generate other sources of income, not every UC is able to pay the full fee. We can think of subsidies, sponsorships etc. So to make sure that there is more money flowing in.
- 5) And we might want to spend it differently than just by the AC, SC and EB, via a bottom up approach. LUC, for example, hosts great speakers, because they are in The Hague. Other UC students are interested in those. So we would also like to recommend you, that if there is an event that other UC students might also like to attend, contact us! We want to have money available to make other people able to attend those. So maybe to partially fund events to make sure an invitation is sent to all Students.

This is a summary of what our budget is about, is there still anything unclear to you, that you did not send to us in email before?

Matthijs Roobeek (UCR): About the Journal, how many copies does the AC expect to print?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Last year around 700-800 copies were printed.

Bas Kellerhuis (Academic Committee Chair): I believe it was 600.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): This year we have significantly budgeted more, because we want to make more copies/higher quality copies.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): I read that you guys also want to put it online, why are you then are you spending money on printing then?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): In case the printing costs are too high, we might decide to put it online instead. And in case not everyone that wants it actually gets a copy, we will put a PDF online.

So I assume there are no more questions on any of the posts?

Matthijs Roobeek (UCR): Why do you want to make more copies?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): With 4000 students, they only printed 600 copies last year. This year we actually want to print more. Because more copies mean that more students can read it.

Matthijs Roobeek (UCR): Yes, but we for example did not get all copies distributed last year, so why then would you want to increase the amount of copies?

Bas Kellerhuis (Academic Committee Chair): We did not receive explicit requests for this. But last year the journals were given out at last GA to individual members, to give to their student associations, who could then distribute it among students. As this was in the middle of transition as well, follow up to check if copies were given out, didn't happen. So not all UCs will have seen it. More copies would mean more exposure.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): The journal is one of the typical events that we want to spent quite some time on, to create a high quality Liberal Arts and Sciences undergraduate research journal.

Matthijs Roobeek (UCR): I understand the value of the Journal, but I would just like to stress to the AC that all copies are distributed.

Joris van Schie (AUC): We will.

Rozemerijn Pieplenbosch (EUC): I think it had more to do with the distribution method, that the amount of copies.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): For the planning, a €1.000 in sponsorship is quite a lot. Do you have any concrete plans for this? As this only the second time you make the journal.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): We have mentioned some potential advertisers in the budget explanation. Essential is that we don't know if we will receive the amount for the sponsorship. But in my experience, it is possible. There must be potential advertisers that will want to advertise in it.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): What if you don't get the sponsorship?



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): If don't get the money, we might not print the Journal, but instead make it digital. Another option is to use the savings or (part of) the positive result, for which we will ask the GAs permission.

Joris van Schie (AUC): As EB we are dedicated, and ambitious to get the sponsorships, and/or subsidies. This is one of our priorities this year.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): As the IB, we think this is the right time to mention savings. We would like to suggest that you propose a motion to allocate budget as savings.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): We have two accounts, one of them being our current account. We can, as Jan Willem stated, take some of the money from that account, and put in it a separate 'Savings account'. Which then we cannot use, unless permission is given by the GA.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair). No, you still have your discretionary allocation power, meaning that redistributions under €1.500 do not need to be approved by the GA before-hand.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Okay, yes.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): You simply label it as savings, which means it is intended to be saved.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): In that regard, I agree with you. I think you mentioned 10%, so can I then make the motion to allocate 10% of €22.000 to our savings account.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Actually we would like to add a clause to the PM that every year, 10% is added to the savings account. So we would like to advise the members to make the motion!

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So that means there will be another expense of 10% of the total budget, which you cannot use to organize events.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Yes.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Okay, does anyone second this motion?

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): Yes.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So what does this mean for this year's budget. If we have to spend 10% of our budget on savings. We then need to get €2.200 from somewhere in the budget, so where do we take it from?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): No you can just take the positive result from last year.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Okay, but that means that next year people cannot do that anymore. They will actually have to budget for this. So right now we allocate the surplus of last year to a savings account, whilst your recommendation states to make a motion, which means that next year they should actually budget for it.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Yes.

Marjolein Becker (UCR): Why do you want to allocate at least 10%, which would mean that we cannot organise certain events with that money?

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): I would like to reply to that, that next year there will be a new budget proposal by the new Executive Board, in which there won't be a budget gap for the events, as they will make sure to allocate enough money as savings.

Lance Bosch (AUC): If the savings can be spent, is it not just a change in labelling in the budget.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, so what we will approve/vote on now, is that €2.200 euros of last year surplus will be put in a savings account. And that for further GAs we, the EB, together with you, will work on a Policy clause. Do we agree on that? If there are no objections then by acclamation we will do 2 things, 1) EB will work on proposing it into a PM clause, and 2) €2.200 of €3.260 positive result of last year goes to the savings account.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): What will happen to the rest then?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): The rest of about €1.000 is just on our current account.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Maybe put it in unforeseen costs?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): So then if there are no other comments, then by acclamation the two points are approved.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Are there any more general comments?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Yes, what happens to the rest? Of the €1.000 euros.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): That is just on the bank account, which we can use on things in the Budget without having to ask permission from the GA. But we can only use it on things that are in the Budget.

Are there any more general comments to the budget? About our line of reasoning, or the thoughts behind the more equal expenses for the AC and SC? Are there any objections on the budget as it is?

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Yes, for the Tournament: comparing the amount that you will spend on the tournament and what we spent, you have lower costs for pretty much everything, how are you going to do that? At AUC you will need to lend a lot of facilities that you didn't have to at UCU.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): For food, for example, this actually does not matter, as we set an amount of how much we can spend per person, which we believe to be a realistic assumption. For the other posts this is similar, it is an estimation of what we reasonably can spend on it.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Aleksandra Blazeusz (Social Committee Chair): In addition, we are expanding external relations, by for example getting sponsorships for beer or other aspects.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): As was also stated in the document we really want to try to have the tournament on one venue. In this specific case, reallocations can be made, for example from the party to the venue, if everything is hosted in one place.

Hannah Vreeburg (UCU): It also stated in the document that the ticket prices for the tournament are not set in stone, which might be altered if sponsorships are not sufficient to cover the costs.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): Maybe we can set up sponsorship teams from all the UCs to help cover costs, or remove part of the burden from the contribution fee.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): I love that idea.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Also there are many things you don't know yet. There is no unforeseen part, but I believe this is very important.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): There is a small post called other, so we have a little bit of freedom.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Yes, but this not enough, I would like to propose a motion to move the €935 euros of positive result plus the €1.000 surplus of last year to an unforeseen post.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): We did not actually want to do this. As we wanted to leave room for bottom up suggestions for events. If we entertain this motion, there will be no money left for bottom up or other events. We still have the savings, but for this we will need the recommendation of the GA.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): You are essentially moving the surplus to an unforeseen post. In case there is an event, you can allocate this money to it.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, but I would rather ask permission in case extra costs happen.

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): Yes, but you still have to update us on what you reallocate.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Indeed, a financial update is sent out every eight weeks.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Right now the €1.000 of last year are not in savings, so they are not accounted for anywhere. Therefore, I would rather have them go to an unforeseen post.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): The savings is an extra safety net. So basically we are reallocating the money, the €2.200 in savings, and these €1.000 + €935 to an unforeseen post.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Marieke van der Maden (UCM): You cannot use the unforeseen costs for basically anything, as it will still be audited next year.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, in that sense the IB will check it after the expense has been made. But we would rather ask your permission beforehand.

Cris van Eijk (LUC): But concerning the unforeseen costs, we have voted on you, as the Executive Body, so we trust you to spend that money wisely.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Okay then, I would like to ask the IB to come forward to vote on the motion as presented by Stefanie:

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): That the money left over from last year's surplus, and €935 go to unforeseen costs, to be used in case of emergency.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): This will mean that the result of the budget will be negative, as the €1.000 surplus of last year is not an income, so only appears as a cost.

Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): Wait why is that, wouldn't it be zero.

Bas Kellerhuis (Academic Committee chair): the €935 and the left over money of last year, that would together put in the unforeseen cost post, however since the leftover of last year is not an income, our result will be negative.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Okay can we now move to voting? Does everyone understand the motion?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): The motion is to put the €935 and the left over money of last year in the unforeseen costs post.

Joris van Schie (chair): Let's proceed to voting.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): With a majority, the motion has been passed.

Rob Verbeek (UCT, Treasurer Social Committee): So you can spend the money on anything, without the GAs permission?

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): That is a very good question, so before we vote on the budget proposal as a whole would you like to make a motion to suggest anything that we cannot use it for?

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Well I mean the obvious, personal expenses etc.

Louis Parker (UCU): Maybe this is something that can be discussed later, between the Executive Board and the IB.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Sure.



Stefanie Berendsen (Advisory Body): I think every UC should think about it and then discuss it at the next GA maybe.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Or you can discuss it with the members via email.

Lance Bosch (AUC): Yes, just make sure to contact us and ask us via email.

Jonathan Seib (Treasurer): Yes, if nobody objects than we approve of the budget by acclamation. An updated version of the budget, including an Excel sheet and the changed explanation of the budget will be uploaded to the website.

Joris van Schie (AUC): Congratulations, so the Budget has officially been approved, so we can now start working on the fun stuff.

14. Open Floor

Joris van Schie (AUC): So then we still have the open floor. Anyone?

Faye Boveland (UCR): Yes, I would like to suggest the IB to take a more objective stance, as I felt the IB did not do so in this GA.

Jan Willem Bruggeman (IB Chair): Could you please repeat that?

Faye Boveland: I would like the IB to take more of an objective stance, rather than the subjective stance I felt they took this GA.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): So as you have heard, we are now the AB. However, this is still open in the PM. We would like the GA to formally state that there should be a proposal from EB 16-17 about the obligations for the AB. Right now for example there are 5 people abroad in the AB, which makes communication difficult etc.

Joris van Schie: We are already working on this.

Helene Koekkoek (Advisory Body): Yes, but we would like you to formally state this in the GA.

Joris van Schie (Chair): I then hereby state that we will come up with a proposal for the AB.

Anything else?

Vera Vrijmoeth (UCU): I would still like to promote the FB group. Last GA at the end, it was discussed that a FB group for all board members should be set up, it is there, and I am really proud of it. So I just want to promote it here.

Joris van Schie (EB chair): Okay then I would like to state that we will have some drinks at Mi Barrio, about 10 minutes walking from the campus, which I would like to invite all of you to join us at.

15. Closing



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands
Hannah Vreeburg | Minutes of the GA (25th September 2016) at UCU

Joris van Schie (AUC): Then I hereby close the GA (time is 17:04)