



Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

1. Welcome

Daniel (Chair): Welcome, please take your seats. I'm sorry if I'm going to be leaning awkwardly forward all day, but then at least I'll be audible for everyone. Thereby I declare the UCSRN GA open at 12:45.

2. Approval of the GA Agenda

Daniel (Chair): First we would like to introduce the GA Agenda, it has been sent to you and has been put online as well. Then we'd like to approve the GA Agenda and the GA minutes of last GA. Then we'll talk about the finances. We added an agenda point them to very quickly and briefly update you about what's happened over the last months. Then maybe a short break before going into policy changes, then we'll split into groups to have a discussion session on the travel reimbursement. After which there will still be an open floor for motions and points to be brought up. Before we close the agenda.

Daniel (Chair): The vote for approval of the agenda is done by acclamation. So are there any objections to this agenda?

No objections are raised.

Daniel (Chair): Agenda is approved.

3. Approval of previous GA minutes

Daniel (Chair): Approval of the GA minutes of last GA will also be done by acclamation, if there's any objections to the GA minutes please state them now.

No objections are raised.

Daniel (Chair): As no objections are raised the GA minutes are also approved.

4. Finances

Daniel (Chair): I would like to invite Kirsten to the stage to give the update about finances.

Kirsten (Treasurer): So since we have a yearly budget, I don't really have results that are interpretable as complete results, as not a lot has happened yet. Most of the posts while not spent before January 1st are planned to be spent this half year. This may be a skewed image due to that. The payment differences you see have been dealt with, the €100 has been transferred back to Tilburg university and the €0.01 has been transferred back the AUCSA.

For the event fund, only €7 has been spent so far, but we have a lot of events spent for the upcoming half year. So I want to give you an overview of what is coming up and what will be spend from the fund. The tournament is coming up which will take a significant amount, we are still in discussion, last year they budgeted around €4000 for it. The exact amount is still to be determined. Spotlight is coming up! The AC has elected to sponsor maybe AUCMUN, an LUC Lecture, TEDxAUCollege and the PINE proposal is at the



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

moment also in discussion. The amounts visible on screen are without the travel reimbursements, as everyone going to the event is allowed reimbursement so those are estimations.

We have received a lot of feedback on the fund, we are in the process of making it more formal and structured to make it work better than the last half year. We have noticed an increase in proposals as well. Some ideas from you guys were to divide the fund in periods with independent amounts to thereby divide the events a bit better over the year and not only in the last two months. We sent around a different proposal template and some of you gave us feedback and we will put a new version up soon. It will be more of an online survey form than a word document. An idea is to make a distinction between UCSRN hosted events and UCSRN sponsored events, for instance the tournament which has our name and others like AUCMUN which is merely sponsored and also has other sponsored, so maybe set a limit on sponsored events and consider whether they're only available to UC students or more. Or to set a separate amount for the tournament and deadlines, as it's a core event, to set a more defined structure there. If there's more input, please send us an e-mail, these are just some input we've received so far.

Any questions?

Stephen (UCM): For tournament core event, would there also be a second core event in the first semester?

Kirsten (Treasurer): That would be possible, this is not set yet and we are still thinking about it. I can also see an academic core event wanting to be outside the event fund.

Ishvar (AUC): The event expense, what was it for?

Kirsten (Treasurer): The €7 was two students travelling to the UCR Running Event.

Kirsten (Treasurer): With no more questions on to the next point.

a. Missed invoice of last year

Kirsten (Treasurer): Last November, the tournament team found an invoice which had not been paid yet. We did agree to pay it, it was also in their budget, but the invoice was never received and thus not paid. The invoice was for the bags and booklets that everyone going to the event received. We contacted the IB whether we could please pay it. We kind of had to, but we didn't want to do it without any internal discussion. And now we want to ask you if we can add it to the books of last year, we need to ask this as you already closed them at last GA. I would like to request to re-open those books to add this to the post it was meant to be under. Any questions?

Charlotte (AUC): I was wondering whether this would be put under tournament cost or liabilities? Would you put it under this year's situation that way? Would that be easier?.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Daniel (Chair): You could do it both ways, but the technically correct way to do it would be to add it to the books of last year.

Charlotte (AUC): So putting it under the financial administration of last year, alright!

Daniel (Chair): With no further questions I would like to invite the IB forward to count the vote.

The motion was passed; the invoice will be added to the financial administration of UCSRN EB 2016-17.

b. Presentation of Audit by IB

Daniel (Chair): Can the IB please step forward to present the audit.

Amber (IB): I am the chair of the audit and the IB, Amber. Currently the only remaining member of the IB, which is an issue, more on that. First I want to mention what the IB did this year, we first received a training, which you voted on last GA, which we have now done and it allowed us to complete a better audit. During the training we also got general knowledge and further explanation on how to do the audit. After having done our audit we had a meeting with the treasurer (Kirsten) and vice-treasurer (Daniel), and we were able to straighten out the small issues we had. The general audit conclusion is that the UCSRN is still a financially healthy institution, so that's great! Apart from that there were some issues with the 100 euro to Tilburg and the 1 cent to AUCSA, but those have already been dealt with. We also want to mention that in collaboration with UCSRN EB to set up a guideline document for the next IB, and we would encourage them to do a training and I wanted to then raise the point that we are looking for new members so encourage students to run for the IB. I can attest that you learn quite a lot. It's useful and it looks good on your resume as well.

Daniel (Chair): Are there still any questions for the IB?

Hande (LUC): I was wondering, so for this open position in the IB, will the task description still be sent out to the UCs? Because just saying it here, we might forget it. Will an open call be sent out? There might be people interested not present here.

Kirsten (Treasurer): We sent out an e-mail and there's a call published on our UCSRN website.

Hande (LUC): Is that not the old call?

Amber (IB): We sent out a call last year for this year's IB, but the issue is two members had to stop. Officially the IB has to have 3 members, which is why we're looking now. We will assess if enough info has been sent out, if deemed not enough we will send out more.

Daniel (Chair): We will now vote on the approval of the audit by the IB.



Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

The audit was approved.

5. Update from the UCSRN

Daniel (Chair): Now on to the UCSRN Update, I'll try to keep it short because the PM will take some time. A little later than expected but we're still doing all the UC visits, we've visited most of them and are in communication with all SAs but there's some difficulties with scheduling.

Second point is OCW visits, these are the education representatives of all the parties and we're going there to introduce ourselves and talk about the difficulties UCs have. We want to mention it as an update, to properly inform you in advance as opposed to telling you afterwards. We will provide you an update of what has been discussed and we'll keep the vision document close and talk about the parts relevant to the parties. For master-transition parties we will talk about that for parties that consider the affordability of education we will talk about that.

Then we are also doing interviews with alumni to see what they do after their UC studies, we are trying to interview an alumni from every UC and they will be published at some point.

Lastly we're still discussing bachelor – master transition, because that is quite a point on the political agenda, as multiple parties are for making the rules stricter. We are trying to force ourselves into this discussion as UCSRN as we know UC students often have difficulties with this. ISO is setting up a taskforce and we are trying to organize meeting with them to address the concerns of UC students.

Natasha (UCT): Are you interviewing one alumnus per UC? How do you choose?

Kirsten (Treasurer): We sent an e-mail to all the deans who sent us to communications officers, who sent us contact details for alumni, right now we're interviewing those that want to be interviewed by us and those that have responded to us. We're trying to one for each UC at least.

Daniel (Chair): Of course it's also if we get 4 interesting cases from one UC we're not going to turn them down.

Daniel (Chair): If no more questions I would like to give the floor to Mirre for the academic committee update.

a. Academic committee update

Mirre (AC Chair): The academic committee has been developing over the past year, we have changed from how we were last year and we're continuing that this year. We've been doing a lot of topic discussions as we were told to by the GA last year, we have also been quite rigorously evaluating the working of the AC to continue moving towards what the GA wants the AC to be so that next AC has a



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

solid base on how to do information sharing.

We also have the events as mentioned earlier which we have approved and we've discussed topics.

b. Social committee update

Milou (SC Chair): The SoCo update is essentially the same, some topics we've discussed are board transition, and cultural integration and they're mentioned in the Newsletter each month~ish. If you have any questions or want the minutes you can approach us, lately we have been discussing the event a bit more, but in an advisory and not organizational way.

6. Policy changes

Daniel (Chair): Now we get to the crux of the PM, this may take a while. Before we start I would like to have a vote on how we're going to go about this. There are two ways to do this.

If most of you have read the document outlining the changes we are proposing, I can go to a slide, stay there for 30 seconds, ask for questions and then continue. But I can also imagine you are busy and haven't read it, we can go over all the changes. This will take longer, but I honestly don't want to push through changes you don't know about. I would like to have a vote on that, so either option a: just quick questions or option b: an explanation for a change given. I'll give you some discussion consideration time now to think about it.

The GA voted for option A

Daniel (Chair): Alright, we've voted for option A, but I see some confused faces so we'll go slightly slower and don't hesitate to ask questions. We will do it by article, if you have any motions you can ask it after the article it concerns, but if you do not know what article it concerns or it's more general I will also ask for motions at the end and you can raise it there.

First we're doing a vote on over-arching changes, so this is numbering, capitalization, all instances of, indexing. An example is, scrapping a definition, and then thus changing all instances occurring, so it's a vote of consistency.

The GA voted in favor of over-arching changes.

Daniel (Chair): Ok, then to definitions.

Ishvar (AUC): Why are you scrapping the definition of the voting procedures? [Definitions 9., 10., and 11.)

Daniel (Chair): They are already in the statutes and you have two sides, one if that the PM should be able



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

to be read independently, in which case they should be in, the other is that it should be read with the statutes, in which case they don't need to be in there. We believe you should read the PM with the statutes and thus having them in here is double-up.

Ruben (UCR): I have one small point and one less small point regarding 14. The EB has never before been specified in the PM before it's used here and we are of the opinion that delegates should also not be able to be part of the IB as delegates can vote.

Daniel (Chair): The first part, is part of the general change, so we will change the order of definitions. Then the other point is that delegates should not be part of the IB, do you want to raise a motion now?

Ruben (UCR): We would like to raise a motion to add "delegates can not be part of the EB or the IB".

Daniel (Chair): Change the end of 14 to "delegates can not be part of either the EB nor the IB". It is also specified in the IB part but we want to ensure it's also here.

The motion to add to the end of 14 was approved.

Elise (UCR): Representatives of the AC are they put forward by the ARB and not the Members?

Daniel (Chair): This is the discussion we have had, the interpretation we've had is that the one who decides is the Member and that the ARB brings forward members on behalf of the Member. It was already written in a way suggesting this, but we are not doing this. Do you want to raise a motion to change it back to the earlier state?

Elise (UCR): Not at this moment.

Daniel (Chair): We will not vote on the totality of the definitions, that is the changes we proposed including the motion proposed by Ruben which was just approved.

The proposed changes in definitions were approved.

Daniel (Chair): Article 1, feel free to discuss amongst yourselves!

Elise (UCR): For 1.1.7 can you make it plural?

Daniel (Chair): That is incorporated in the earlier approved general changes, so yes.

Daniel (Chair): Also do not hesitate to ask if you want further clarification on reasoning.

Louise (AUC): I understand

Stephen (UCM): Later in the PM it states an exception is made in organizing events towards the UCSRN



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

tournament, is that also added here, or should that be later on?

Daniel (Chair): Where is the exception made?

Stephen (UCM): I don't have it memorized man.

Daniel (Chair): Regarding the event form and fund it's important to note we're still scheduling a discussion session after which policy will be written up based on what everyone wants.

Stephen (UCM): In that case, let's handle it at that discussion session.

Ishvar (AUC): I would like to question why 1.3.5.1 is scratched out of the PM, I see that it's the law, but this is also a clause that represents what UCSRN stands for, and for me it's important it's still in there as representation of what we want to work towards. Fully aware it's in the law, but it's a good opportunity to reaffirm what we stand for, not only for the UCs but for the overarching importance.

Mirre (AC Chair): It's also in the statutes.

Daniel (Chair): I'd like to answer this question as well, we expected this question. Our reasoning is, first you know the law, then the statutes and then the PM, and it's in the statutes as well so for readability we'd scrap it from the PM, but you could also argue that it's so important you want it in the PM as well.

Ishvar (AUC): I'd like to raise a motion to not scrap the clause then. [Clause 1.3.5.1]

The motion was approved, clause 1.3.5.1 will not be struck.

Daniel (Chair): Just to be clear, it's not that we disagree with the message.

Louise (AUC): I've got a question about event organization, this year you've taken a grass-root approach and this hasn't worked. The tournament isn't set yet, spotlight is only now, while it used to be in November. Shouldn't there be more of a framework from the UCSRN, I understand the want to have an advisory position rather than an organizational position.

Daniel (Chair): There's a two-fold answer to that, if there's no will from the SAs to host the events and hand in the proposals, it is probably because they're very busy with SA things and we don't want to force the burden on them. I do get your criticism and as Kirsten mentioned earlier there is the idea of moving the core events from the event fund and leave the grass-roots idea for new initiatives. There's events we want to do and events we see as core to the UCSRN, which we can discuss and decide upon and the start of the year, give to someone so that it definitely happens. I think the structure will give more freedom to UC initiatives, but there is going to be a discussion session on the event fund to get all your input on what works and what doesn't work for you.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Gerald (AUC): I can totally understand your point on the grass root system, but it's a mutual relationship, right now we get the feeling from the UCSRN that the SA is taking it on without too much support. So having the UCSRN "check-up" on the progress, set deadlines etc. would improve the support and awareness. Especially to ensure the responsibility is taken and to give feedback and I feel that hasn't been happening in the current system, and that's what we'd like to change. Ultimately it's the UCSRN's responsibility that these events happen.

Stephen (UCM): We in UCM we share these thought with AUC, but I feel we should discuss this during the discussion on the event fund and the new vision and not during the PM discussion.

Daniel (Chair): It should be clear that this is a transitioning year, this is a trial that can be adapted depending on the feedback we get.

Milou (SC Chair): I see all the arguments about the framework, but there won't be one UC doing something without it being discussed in the social committee. So that might be more related to how to set up the SC next year, and to have such a check-up body, whether that's the SC or another body. But you don't want the SC members to do the organizing as all of them are already in another full-term board.

Daniel (Chair): Finding a balance is good.

Ishvar (AUC): I see your concerns, but with scrapping this clause before having the discussion we have the issue that the UCSRN is not responsible anymore and that the structure isn't there. That's why it's essential to not yet scrap the clause while looking for a new solution, but wait until we have decided or have a new alternative.

Stephen (UCM): I'd like to postpone the voting on this clause until after the discussion session on the event fund.

The motion to post-pone of the vote on this clause was approved.

Daniel (Chair): Now we're voting on the article changes including the two approved motions.

The article 1 changes were approved, with the motions to not scrap 1.3.4 and 1.3.5.

Suzanne (Unstated): {RE: 2.3.1.I} If you read the first sentence it reads "for all and external communication", did you mean external communication or all communication.

Daniel (Chair): All external communication.

Suzanne (Unstated): What about internal communication?



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Daniel (Chair): I would see AC and SC internal communication as internal communication and as such this means that the secretary is responsible for communication to AC and SC members.

No motion raised.

Lennart (UCM): I would like to raise a motion to strike 2.1.5.II., as leaving it in with only the part about finances struck suggests a large power to the EB and that they can overrule a lot of decisions.

Daniel (Chair): I'd like to say, and it's unclear on the slides, that this is a chair responsibility [Clause 2.1.1.II], so it's there to indicate the chair is responsible of the consequences of the EBs actions, and we felt it was weird to specifically mention financial. If you still want to scrap it because it suggests too much final power for the chair, then you can raise the motion.

Lennart (UCM): All we say is responsibility should not be given to just one person but the entire board, because it suggests chair has final say.

Daniel (Chair): We now vote on the motion to scrap 2.1.1.II in its entirety.

The motion to scrap 2.1.1.II is approved.

Charlotte (AUC): I was wondering why 2.3.1. VII is scrapped? Because it's important for the secretary to have a close working relationship with especially the SC chair.

Daniel (Chair): Yes, it's scrapped here because it is moved to general board responsibilities.

The changes on Article 2 with the motion to scrap 2.1.1 II is approved

Louise (AUC): If you're moving close working relationship from Secretary, why not also from AC/SC Chair.

Daniel (Chair): We are, it is wrong in the document we sent out. So we can vote by acclamation to also remove the close working relationship clause from the AC and SC chair [Clauses 2.5.1.IX and 2.6.1.IX]

No objections, clauses 2.5.1.IX and 2.6.1.IX are removed.

Stephen (UCM): Could you clarify the change to 3.2.1.

Kirsten (Treasurer): We are changing it from the specific proposal template published by the to the submission process to allow more flexibility with the upcoming changes.

Ishvar (AUC): In 3.2.1. it's specified that it's a submission process but nowhere is there specified what the details are.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Daniel (Chair): As it's written right now, it's specifically for the form online, but with this change it's a little more vague so that once we have the discussion where we decide on a new format, we don't have the issue that we have agreements that are invalid because they may not comply to this exact wording.

Ishvar (AUC): I believe this is not specific enough.

Milou (SC): I believe it's an idea to discuss this within the SC and come with a specified idea by the next GA, but its important to have a structure for next year.

Daniel (Chair): The point is also this is quite a vague it can be any submission process.

Kirsten (Treasurer): Would an idea be to add "published by the board" to the new clause, so that the freedom of "submission process" and has flexibility it doesn't have if it's outlined in the PM, but still the structure and decisiveness because it's the one published by the board.

Ishvar (AUC): Then I raise that motion.

The motion to change clause 3.2.1 "...in accordance with the submission process published by the Board" was approved.

Lennart (UCM): I would like to submit a motion to add a clause, it would have been 3.2.7 but with the striking of others it will be another number. The idea is that each committee should be responsible for deciding upon the budget that gets allocated to events the committee approved, and that decision is made by the committee and not by the EB. So that the AC and SC decision is binding.

Ruben (UCR): I disagree with this motion. I think the SC and AC are valuable for deciding where events should be hosted and such, but they have no financial expertise or insight in finances, at least not to the level of the EB Treasurer. We elect the EB treasurer and we should trust them to make decisions, so the committees should stick to approving/disapproving events and the treasurer should decide the budgets.

Lennart (UCM): I see the point of the lack of expertise but the problem here is a) in the PM it's not clearly defined the treasurer has final voting power and b) it is the question of an AC/SC approving a money amount and then that approval being discarded.

Stephen (UCM): In the PM it does state it is the role of the treasurer to maintain close relationships and to oversee the money is spent. The isn't removing the treasurer from the process but leaving the ultimate decision to the committees.

Daniel (Chair): That interaction could also work the other way around that the committee is involved in the process and that the treasurer makes the ultimate decision. Another argument for the current arrangement isn't a lack of financial expertise in the committees but fact that the Treasurer has an



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

overview of the amount of money spent on other events and other committees as well. The treasurer has a complete financial picture of what is still coming, this new idea could result in all the money being spent in the early semester and no money kept for the tournament as there's no overview.

Lennart (UCM): The budget for AC and SC are separated, or it got communicated as separate, or at least there shouldn't be less money for the Academic Committee.

Daniel (Chair): This is why a treasurer is good, keeping the fund as one means as much value and attention is spent on both types of events. But imagine a situation where one type isn't being proposed in this case we would be okay with more money on SC events. The treasurer has an overview and can re-allocate money and alert to increased attention later.

Stephen (UCM): Can we move this discussion to after the event fund discussion as they are quite overlapping?

Daniel (Chair): Reminder that the event fund discussion is not today or during this GA, the travel reimbursement discussion is today.

Natasha (UCT): Especially because the event structure is different, I don't think it would be a wise decision to allow the Treasurer to not have a complete overview.

Lennart (UCM): Is there a possibility to discuss this motion on the open floor?

Daniel (Chair): I would like to add the note, that with this new idea of AC/SC final approval, if more gets approved than we have money, we have a problem, because your decisions are binding but UCSRN EB has a budget to stick to, and both are binding.

Lennart (UCM): I would like to clarify, that it's only about whether the student representatives decision in a committee is binding. In this case there was an AC decision, which got brought to the EB whom disagreed, so we want to know who has the final decision, the student representatives or the higher body.

Article 3 was approved, with the motion still being held discussed at open floor.

Charlotte (AUC): I have a question 4.1.4., because there seems to be a large gap right now.

Daniel (Chair): The point your bringing is that waiting until the next GA is too long of a time, I see your point. The idea behind this clause is to further restrict the EB. First because a reallocation below €1500 can be done without someone else so we want to scrap that, and then we realized that with situations such as the lost invoice, the old construction causes a problem. The new one thus says if a allocation *has* to be made, thereby implying urgency, then the EB can do what they did. The EB can act on the



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

emergency with approval of the IB and then announce and bring it to the GA. It's not for more general reallocations such as moving money from event fund to another post because there's no events.

Charlotte (AUC): It doesn't specify that right now.

Daniel (Chair): That's what the "has to be made" should imply, but if you want to motion to add "in emergency cases" please feel free to do so.

Charlotte (AUC): I would like to raise a motion to specify this article so that it's specific to emergency cases.

Daniel (Chair): The motion on the floor to change the current suggestion for 4.1.4 to "If an emergency reallocation has to be made...."

The motion was approved.

Charlotte (AUC): If you could provide more clarity on the change to September 1st from at least 21 days before the first GA [Clause 4.2.5.I]?

Daniel (Chair): The idea behind the clause is that a proposal needs to be sent in early. The call for the first GA is 14 days before the first GA, so in this situation a board could nullify a clause by sending out a GA call within a week of receiving a proposal. The change of this clause change is to not allow this screw over, but to also push for these proposals to be sent ASAP.

Charlotte (AUC): Could you still raise a motion of this at a GA itself?

Daniel (Chair): The clause is to give people "brownie points" for sending in proposals soon so that can be taken into consideration, but open floor is always available.

Stephen (UCM): Would a travel reimbursement motion be brought here?

Daniel (Chair): I recommend you wait until after the travel discussion so you raise it at the open floor.

The changes in article 4, including the motion for 4.1.4. "If an emergency reallocation is made..."

Daniel (Chair): No questions about article 5, so we're voting on article 5.

Changes to article 5 were approved.

Hande (LUC): So you can be a candidate when you're not a student of a UC, because you took out the "enrolment" part.

Daniel (Chair): No, this comes back to the definitions we've voted to add/remove. Since we're removing



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

MUC, we've changed the article accordingly and Student with a capital S is a student who is a member of a Member which is an Association at a UC.

Mirre trips across the stage like the beautiful klutz she is.

Louis (EUC): The elections are open to all, so faculty can run?

Daniel (Chair): That's the formatting, it reads "are open to all who are currently and in the following UCSRN's year, Student.

Stephen (UCM): This may be of interest, but is a student who is in a proposed board allow for a board position?

Daniel (Chair): Yes.

Article 6 is approved.

Stephen (UCM): Is 9.2 new or re-written?

Daniel (Chair): Formatting error on our part, the "the term lasts one UCSRN year, previous members can be re-elected." is added.

Article 9 is approved.

Daniel (Chair): If there are no questions, we will vote on Article 10.

Article 10 is approved.

Daniel (Chair): We will now take a 10 minutes break.

Break

Unnamed student (UCR?): I would like to raise a motion to add an article to the PM that the new IB members should also be introduced and approved at a GA.

Daniel (Chair): The motion is to add to the policy clause of the IB that new IB members have to be approved by the GA at the first GA for which they are IB member.

This motion is approved.

Daniel (Chair): We are now dividing in discussion groups for the travel reimbursement discussion, I recommend you split your UC delegates evenly amongst the three groups.



Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

7. Discussion session on travel costs

Daniel (Chair): We are now dividing in discussion groups for the travel reimbursement discussion, I recommend you split your UC delegates evenly amongst the three groups.

The GA splits into discussion groups.

8. Open floor

Daniel (Chair): Now that we're back from the travel reimbursement discussions, are there any travel reimbursement motions on the floor? They can always be brought up at a later GA as well.

Stephen (UCM): The €3.50 to €4.93, is that taken into account for this years UCSRN Tournament?

Daniel (Chair): No, which is why we are already bringing it up now so it can be taken into account when deciding the budget for next year's UCSRN Tournament.

Daniel (Chair): The EB will look at what has been discussed in the groups and will come up with proposals that take as many of the ideas into account as possible, for the rest of this year and for next year.

Daniel (Chair): Now to the open floor for any topic.

Lennart (UCM): Our concern is that in the PM is there is no clear process on how the final budget is allocated to an event, and the impression we got is that the committee decision can be overwritten by the EB, which may not be the case. An idea would be that the AC/SC comes up with a budget, to be sent to the EB treasurer for advice, and then back to the AC/SC for final approval so the final word is the student representatives.

Daniel (Chair): The current system is a proposal comes in AC/SC says yes, EB gives a number and then AC/SC gives input, goes back to EB and then a discussion is held between EB and committee with final say with EB. The new idea is the other way around, that the AC/SC give number, EB can say yes/no, a discussion is held and AC/SC has final say.

Milou (SC Chair): I don't think the SoCo has budget expertise, nor is it their task to look at detailed budget numbers when they have more important things to talk about. I do not have an opinion on who has final say, but it is my opinion that discussions within the SoCo about details of budgets is not smart.

Lennart (UCM): It's not about the expertise, the treasurer gets to give input, it's about giving the final say to the student representatives.

Marjolein (UCR): I'm in the AC as well, I feel like I got elected because I'm an expert on academics so I



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

feel like I should have a say on the content of events, whether it's academic and beneficial and thus whether we sponsor, but I'm not an expert on finances, but Kirsten is chosen because she knows about finances. So AC can do content part of the event and she can do the finances aspect. So final budget decision should be with EB Treasurer.

Undefined (LUC): I agree the treasurer should handle it, but if there is disagreement with the way the treasurer has handled, then there should be an accountability measure. So they can raise disagreement.

Daniel (Chair): That checking method is the GA, and I believe a Member can call for a GA, so if there's a disagreement you can call for a GA.

Stephen (UCM): But some events may be time sensitive, which a scheduled proposal system would solve, but that's for that discussion session.

Daniel (Chair): The IB is also for appeals, so if you believe the Treasurer or EB has been treating you unfairly, then they can be contacted.

Lennart (UCM): I think we should still vote on it.

The proposed motion as written is "In the end after advice by the EB treasurer, the final decision upon how much budget should be allocated to an approved event, should be given to the responsible committee."

Daniel (Chair): This will not be in the PM, but if it's approved it will be published in the process for the event fund.

Marjolein (UCR): How does this work, if the treasurer has final responsibility for the entire budget, that the AC/SC has approval?

Daniel (Chair): Yes, Treasurer is final responsible, but there's no final check.

Marjolein (UCR): Could we add "if they don't go over-budget?"

Lennart agrees to adding that to the motion.

Milou (SC Chair): Isn't this an element of trust in the treasurer.

Kirsten (Treasurer): The issue I would maybe have with this, is of course I can advise the committees on what is financially a good idea, but it can be completely disregarded with this motion. If I give an objective judgment of €500 as the max due to financial constraints and they ignore this and go over budget, I am held responsible. I think we can definitely outline the process of agreement in the process but I don't think it's a linear process, I believe it's more cyclical.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

The motion was not passed.

Ishvar (AUC): I would like to raise a motion, to reallocate €500 to the UCSRN Spotlight event, since we AUUSA are organizing this and due to unforeseen circumstances the location will now be more expensive than was planned and budgeted for. We tried to lower other budget posts, and we took into account the financial situation of the UCSRN and the AUUSA, but the conclusion is that €500 extra is required for this event to be feasibly hosted by AUC.

Daniel (Chair): And you asked for €500 originally, and you're asking for €500 more. Basically what happened, last year they paid an X amount for location which was cheap and which is what was budgeted for, this is not the price for the location this time around. A first note is that the responsibility of this event now also lies on AUUSA through their agreement to organize Spotlight. Another note is that there originally was an income due to an €3 per person entrance fee but due to the expected cost of the event being so low this entrance/ticket fee was removed. We've also felt we assume that if the location was a lower amount this was already known in advance to you, and that due to a miscommunication this wasn't understood and as such we don't believe all UCs should carry the burden for this. We do understand your issue, but those were the reasons we initially said no, on top of the fact that most of the money in our event fund is either allocated to another event or reserved for travel reimbursements. It wouldn't be fair.

Ishvar (AUC): We understand that the UCSRN doesn't want to take responsibility for this mishap but it is the UCSRN spotlight event, that they want us to host. We are willing to co-operate but making a loss on AUUSA's side is not an option, as it wasn't intended to be just for AUC students it wasn't in our budget at the start of the year and as it's also something we do for the UCSRN for the other colleges as it's an open stage event where we can connect with the other UCs. Therefore we feel it's therefore the UCSRNs responsibility that this event will not impact our budget, because that's not what we agreed upon.

Ruben (UCR): I don't think you then understand the structure of the event fund, because the structure is that you then ask for a certain amount of sponsorship, and you get a certain amount of sponsorship that you then have to do with, you can't suddenly change it if it all goes wrong, that's the whole idea of the event fund, that the UCSRN decides how much to sponsor you with and that you then do it with that money.

Ishvar (AUC): I understand that, which is why I'm asking now for more funds, since the original fund was accepted and we worked with that amount, but now due to unexpected circumstances we can not deal without that amount of money. I'm asking for more money because it's simply not feasible for us to host the event if no more money is given to us.

Lennart (UCM): Could you clarify how much money was given to you, how much budget you were



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

allocated, and why you are asking for more? Because I heard you initially asked and got for more money, but lowered that number down because you got a cheaper location.

Ishvar (AUC): We budgeted last year for the location being a €100, this was an internal mistake from the location, they communicated wrongly and gave us by accident a super cheap price which was not the common price.

Louise (AUC): That wasn't explained to us at the time, it was only when we went back to ask again, the guy we usually talked to was on holiday and we got sent to someone else.

Ishvar (AUC): The €100 was a mistake, but we based our budget on that, a couple of days ago we found out the price for the location turned out to be €800. To counter for this we have lowered other costs as well, so we don't end up super much higher, but we would be able to host the event with simply €500 more instead of even more as we've cut on decoration and drinks budget.

Louise (AUC): It was also an agreement that because the location was super cheap we took away ticket sales, we have not reinstated ticket sales. We initially gave out free beers to tempt people into hosting but we have cancelled that, it's still a free of charge event for all UCs. Everything else has been cut down on, and this is the money we would need to actually host the event. Because our association isn't financially in the best state to take that burden at the moment.

Patricia (UCU): I understand that it's unfortunate that this is happening to you, but is it possible for you to either find a location that is not as expensive as €800 euros, and I'm sure you've looked into that.

Louise (AUC): It's next week!

Patricia (UCU): Or, then you need to fire under those people's butt's because it's their mistake. You need to at least get them down a little bit the price based on their mistake.

Ishvar (AUC): It's not their mistake, it was their mistake earlier. The 800 is their original price. We were lucky back then to get a cheap wrong price, but not we have to pay normal price.

Daniel (Chair): When did you ask for the offer? When did you ask for the price and when did you receive their answer?

Louise (AUC): Basically in September we have our introduction, but this year I got in contact with this location and it was a little bit of a shady deal for €100, and we didn't know that was a mistake until we re-contacted them.

Daniel (Chair): When did you re-contact them?



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Louise (AUC): About two-three weeks ago.

Ishvar (AUC): After the proposal we booked the location already and this week I sat down about the details and this number came up.

Daniel (Chair): This is going to sound kind of rude, but that's why I think UCSRN shouldn't shoulder responsibility for it. If you didn't know this before handing in the proposal, what are we supposed to do? I expected that at the moment I receive a proposal, you had already met with the location and had this price set up in agreement with them. I understand that you didn't plan it to be this way, but I'm just saying that it's very late to actually ask. I think you're holding the UCSRN hostage then if you say I'm not going to do this event if the UCSRN doesn't give me extra money. I know you're not doing it on purpose, but if we set the precedent of this, that becomes super dangerous, because then for example EUC can come here next week and ask for €600 or we can't host the tournament. Then everyone can do that, and that's why we have a fund and we vote on proposals.

Ishvar (AUC): Let's point out that we took on this event, because it wasn't being hosted by anyone so we took it on very last minute. We took this on with a super-tight timeline and in that sense we tried to deal with it on a short time-note while being busy with our own event, but we care enough about the ucsrn to take it on. You may then make us responsible but we take it on because we care about the UCSRN and value this platform. On the fact that you say this is very last minute, yeah I understand it's last minute, you can point the finger at us but it's the location that communicated to us very last minute. All I'm saying here, for us it's impossible to do this event without the extra money in our financial situation. That's why we bring it up here at the GA with all the other members to see what we can discuss and how we can potentially solve this. Since for us, actually doing this event is difficult.

Louis (EUC): Did they ever tell you the price was going to be €100?

Louise (AUC): No, we've worked with the location before, but they've really rebuilt since and they've got a new PA system and this time they organize security especially because there's a lot more people, many other UC students will come, and that's why we want security.

Ishvar (AUC): We also now have to pay for security, which we don't have to do for our usual event as we AUCSA are responsible for our members. We as AUCSA are not responsible for the students of other UCs, so we want to get security so we don't have to be liable for other Students security.

Charlotte (UCU): Since you knew it wasn't going to be a different scale event, it isn't UCSRN's responsibility because you took it on. Since you're organizing, it's your responsibility and since it's an event that's bigger than my normal event you already knew you would have to pay more for the same location because of security. It's just about a bit more thorough with your responsibility, it's great you're taking it on but that also means you're prepared to be responsible for the organization.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Milou (SC Chair): I personally think it's very reasonable that if you're a SA and you plan for an event you then have the realization you need extra money, it's perfectly reasonable to come here and ask to be sponsored €500 extra. I think otherwise they won't host the event, which is perfectly reasonable in order to keep your SA financially healthy. So the question is do we want the spotlight event for €500 extra or do we not want the spotlight event.

Daniel (Chair): I have two very short questions, first of all, could you make it work without the €500 if you post-pone the event?

Louise (AUC): We could maybe make it work but it's the same location, or it would be further away, which wouldn't make it work as well. If we move it further away it gets closer to the UCSRN Tournament which I also don't think is good. A reason we did it now, which was discussed in the SoCo, because we don't want it close to the tournament. Spotlight is supposed to be in November, or it has always been the case to have one large UCSRN event in the first semester and one large in the second.

Daniel (Chair): Then my second question is how many non-AUC people are coming?

Louise (AUC): Why is that relevant? We have 50 sign-ups from AUC and then UCM I have 27, and 17 from LUC, and a couple from the other ones and two UCs with no people. I started promotion so I don't know what you want with this?

Daniel (Chair): I'm not blaming, it's relevant because we as UCSRN are also trying to spend all the money and the money has to come from somewhere, so let's say €500 has to come from the tournament, is it worth spending €10 per person from another UC extra on Spotlight to have it go through when that money could be used for way more people at another event.

Louise (AUC): Do you want spotlight to happen or not?

Stephen (UCM): A better example would be subtracting money from a less important event.

Kirsten (Treasurer): For another event a reduction of €500 would mean the entire event cannot happen.

Stephen (UCM): So it would be one less event? With the current budget and the current proposed events this semester there's still like €1500 left.

Daniel (Chair): How is it reasonable to say that if there's a mistake at AUC we have to tell another person they cannot host their event?

Ishvar (AUC): There is no mistake at AUC.

Stephen (UCM): It's not like we're taking it away from a currently proposed event, we'll just turn down a



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

proposal that's sent in in the future.

Daniel (Chair): We would be unable to accept more events.

Milou (SC Chair): It would be harsh to call it a mistake at AUC, things went wrong and that happens sometimes, we could also have co-ordinates it in another way.

Daniel (Chair): Can I be clear, I'm not blaming any one of you, I'm just asking if the solution is feasible. So don't take this as an attack on how you organized this.

Patricia (UCU): I just really dislike the way AUC brought this up, you did it in a very if you don't give us the money we won't do the event ultimatum kind of way. You brought it up as if the location was to blame and we need €500 euros now, if you'd brought it up as "hey we need a mistake" here are some ideas on how to go about solving this. You should've checked with the location earlier.

Natasha (UCT): How obligated are they to have this event now that they've accepted this?

Daniel (Chair): A cancellation is only possible.

Natasha (UCT): Is it possible to reach a compromise between ticket sales and finding the budget from other places?

Milou (SC Chair): How do you want to do ticket sales with the event so close? It would be very confusing?

Daniel (Chair): It would be an option to move the event a couple of weeks with ticket sales.

Ishvar (AUC): I want to respond quickly to things, many things are being said that with the details of the event just are not realistic. It is not possible a week in advance, to move the event, to make them pay and to move it. It simply isn't feasible at the moment to do things differently. In response to UCU saying we should check this earlier, we had a bigger introweek event there with less issues. We acknowledge our mistake, but we shouldn't talk about blame we should talk about solutions, this is the perfect example of an unforeseen cost. Second of all we organize this event not for ourselves but for the UCSRN, which is why it's important to come to a solution together. We also want to mention that last year UCSRN paid €800 for Spotlight whereas this year they're only paying €500. In my eyes spending more money on this event isn't necessary too bad.

Christina (LUC): We've find ourselves in a situation, the best thing is to blame everyone. We are down €500 and we don't wanna cancel the event a week before. It would be €56 per UC to raise enough money for the Spotlight event to have this event, I cannot understand that we cannot put that amount by ourselves to have the spotlight happen.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Daniel (Chair): That is a solution you can propose, but I don't know if the UCs agree.

Christina (LUC): It's not up to the EB it's up to the UCs. Spotlight might not be the most popular event but it adds to what UCSRN stands for, and I think that's important.

Marco (EUC): I still think it should be from UCSRN budget, it's mostly be AUCSA but it's a UCSRN event, you don't have the sole responsibility and it's a sole responsibility. Spotlight is one of the biggest event, and taking some money from a smaller event even if it then has to be cancelled is better, a small event has 20 or so people whereas spotlight has 80+ already.

Ruben (UCR): I just think that's unfair, those events have already been approved, those people hosting the cancelled event had nothing to do with spotlight and then you have to tell them they can't do it because there was a mistake with the hosting of Spotlight.

Stephen (UCM): Taking €500 from an existing event isn't the case, there's like €1500 left of the event budget.

Mirre (AC Chair): That's excluding travel reimbursements.

Stephen (UCM): It's not set to take from other events.

Daniel (Chair): Then you would at some point stop reimbursing travel and I don't think anyone wants that either.

Undefined: Is this not an argument for UCSRN to have unforeseen budget.

Daniel(Chair): A reason unforeseen was removed because it can really be misused, it was decided at the budget GA of this board year to remove that post and you all approved of that. You have reserves, because then exceptions are decided by GA if you have unforeseen exceptions are decided by EB.

Christina (LUC): Can we please have something concrete to vote upon, we've been here for four hours and people need to travel back.

Ishvar (AUC): My motion for reallocation of €500 to Spotlight from UCSRN.

Daniel (Chair): Would splitting the cost be an option for AUCSA?

Ishvar (AUC): We are deep in the minus, so no.

Ishvar (AUC): We have to reconsider our priorities, we want these two core events to exist definitely for coherency and therefore it's essential to reallocate money to this event.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Daniel (Chair): What about the option of all SAs paying €56?

Ishvar (AUC): They already pay contribution fees?

Undefined: How much left in your reserves?

Daniel (Chair): UCSRN has €1000 in their reserves.

Undefined: I don't see why it has to come from SAs when UCSRN has reserves, especially when there's five people coming from UCT but 50 from AUC. So then either UCSRN reserves or 50/50 with AUCSA and UCSRN.

Daniel (Chair): UCT do you want raise a motion for splitting?

Undefined (UCT): If you split will you cancel?

Louise (AUC): Possibly.

Daniel (Chair): There are three motions on the floor 1) €56 from all SAs 2) UCSRN 250 from reserves and AUCSA 250 and 3) 500 from UCSRN reserves.

Freya (UCG): I cannot vote for the budget of my SA.

Patricia (UCU): We also cannot vote for the budget of our SA.

Daniel (Chair): Then abstain.

Charlotte (UCU): Is the reserves the travel reimbursement money or not?

Undefined: It's different.

Undefined: Procedural question, can we only vote in favour of one motion?

Ishvar (AUC): I recommend to do it in the order of proposal.

Daniel (Chair): So the first motion to be voted upon is the 500 from reserves, then the 56 of each SA, then the 250 split.

Ishvar (AUC): The procedure says you have to do the one raised first first, so in that case you would have to do the one that I raised first.

Daniel (Chair): So if we approve the first motion, you don't do the second two.

The motion to send €500 from the UCSRN reserves to the UCSRN Spotlight is approved.



University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

Minutes of the General Assembly - 17/02/2018

Mirre Stevens – Kirsten Kapteijns

Location: UCU

Milou (SC Chair): I would like to state that we all know we don't want something like this to happen again, but I would like to commend AUCSA because they have been on top of their shit for spotlight.

Natasha (UCT): This is a situation that should not happen again, I personally voted for the motion because I want spotlight to go through, because it's an event that's traditional for the UCSRN. But on the other hand not accounting for the security of the students and/or checking the location before, but we should learn from this and double-check all our future projects and proposals.

9. Closure of the UCSRN GA

Daniel (Chair): If there are no other motions at 16:41 I declare the GA closed.