



## University College Student Representatives of the Netherlands

---

### March General Assembly Minutes

Chairing the GA:

Stephen McCarthy

Minutes:

Mai Thai de Rijk

Presenters:

Stephen McCarthy, Mai Thai de Rijk, Justin Smael, Chandeni Bissumbhar, Noemi

Noveck

---

*Date of General Assembly*

2nd of March, 2019

*Location of General Assembly*

University College Utrecht

*Time of General Assembly*

16:00 (Doors open at 15:30)

## March General Assembly Agenda

1. Approval of the Agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes of November 3rd, 2018
3. IB Audit
4. First-Half Academic Year Review and Update
5. SC Update: Progress on Goals
6. AC Update: Progress on Goals

### Short Break

7. Proposed Policy Manual Changes
  - a. Vote on Changes
8. Budget Changes for Spring 2019
  - a. Vote on Change
9. UCSRN Tournament Update
10. Independent Body Recruitment
11. Open Floor

## Second General Assembly Minutes

### Attendance of the General Assembly:

**UCU: 6**  
**AUC: 6**  
**EUC: 4**  
**LUC: 4**  
**TUC: 4**  
**UCT: 2**  
**UCM: 6**  
**UCG: 4**  
**UCR: 6**

**Total:** 42 votes

No proxy for other UC's.

### Introduction

**Stephen:** Hello. Thank you for coming. Just a reminder to how voting works, each UC receives 6 votes, which can be distributed as you wish amongst your UC members. No proxy forms has been sent in, therefore, no UC is allowed to represent another UC. When voting, the IB will come up here and count at each vote. Vote decisions are based on

majority vote. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment please state your name and your UC. Alright, let's begin.

### 1. Approval of the GA Agenda

**Stephen:** This is our Agenda for today's GA. There has been a slight change in the agenda since the document shared on the website and via email. Just a restructuring of orders, of AC and SC updates and the addition of the Audit and Tournament update.

*Approval by acclamation.*

### 2. Approval of the Minutes of November 3rd, 2018

**Stephen:** Next up is the approval of the minutes of november 3rd of 2018 GA at LUC available on the website as well.

*Approval by acclamation.*

### 3. Approval of the Minutes of November 3rd, 2018

**Stephen:** Now the IB will present the Audit.

**Amber (IB):** Currently the UCSRN is financially healthy, with 5000 euros in reserves. We would like to address a few recommendations we have for the future board is to be clear with bookkeeping. The treasurer and the UCSRN EB in general needs to be very clear with bookkeeping, which includes financial administration such as invoices. There weren't many faults but it does need more attention. All UC's, not just UCSRN EB, Social and Academic board should make use of the bonding budget as it's only useful in the beginning of the year. Whereas EB, as well as IB should have made use of training budget. The available budgets have yet to been used, so for the next years the budget should be set on the agenda to be used as soon as possible. It only really is a good investment if you use the budget in the beginning. We noticed that the EB budgeted a 1000 euros was budgeted for sponsors which later after talking to the UCSRN, there is no incentive to receive sponsorship as we still are very financially healthy. It should not be budgeted if not expected. EB needs to consider whether sponsorship should be for EB tasks or Event Team tasks. The UCSRN can only get sponsors which in turn would be used for advertisements for the tournament which the tournament team should and are able to do themselves. If UCSRN events are funded, which the two current main ones are TedxAUC and AUCMUN, with possible more on the table. Currently we notice that there was no proper contract signed up. Everything was done through email correspondence. There should be a proper contract for the future events. The most important thing to note is that the IB was not able to do a full audit as UCSRN does not have access to their ING account but they do have the receipts. Which means UCSRN treasurer, EB and ourselves only had access to administration. Unfortunately, the transfers cannot be seen as of now through the ING portal, thus unable to do a full audit. This should be avoided in the future with a more detailed guideline on how KvK and ING should be approached. Finally we urge the EB that send in documents full and on time. What would normally now happen is that we'd vote on the audit. However, this is difficult as the

audit is not complete yet. We would like to propose to vote to approve at this moment conditionally, that if nothing alarming is found in the rest of the audit that you accept and approve the audit. If something is found, we would do a new vote at the next GA. Is that clear or are there any questions?

**Ruben (UCM):** Can we receive context or background information as to why UCSRN currently has no access to the bank account?

**Justin:** From our previous transition, it became clear that in the ING and KvK it was registered with 2 people from the board from 3 years ago. We knew that this needed to be fixed. We (*refers to Mai Thai and Justin*) went to the KvK and ING multiple times to solve this however, there was a lot of paperwork to be approved, it was difficult as documents needed to be signed, thus we had to physically be present at the same time, making it difficult. A couple of weeks after we've solved KvK and now we are waiting for the ING to respond. Hopefully we will be in the upcoming one and a half weeks, we additionally just received confirmation from the ING stating that they have received my confirmation from this morning. It should be done in that time.

**Phineas (UCM):** I'm a little confused. I understand that you're not the owner of the account but what has been done over the past few years as there clearly has been access? To see the statements, there must be an old password that you can use?

**Justin:** Indeed, we do have the old password. That is what the UCSRN has been using. However, there is an official fine that in doing so, namely unofficially login procedure, there would be chance of getting a 400 euro fine. Therefore, I want to avoid this and change this now. I want to additionally now create a transition manual that will state how this will need to be done carefully, rather than just passing on a password. I want each treasurer to be able to pass on the procedure and methods instead. Does that answer your question?

**Phineas (UCM) :** To an extent. I understand that you're fixing this, thank you for doing that, but why can't you login with the old password since you have that ability?

**Justin:** We do not currently have the ability. Right now the account has been blocked. Since the expiration date was 1st of march and would have been fined. I went a couple weeks back to the bank to prevent this. Now temporarily we are blocked by ING and are pursuing the access. We understand the needs of being blocked and accept the short term condition as long as the account. All administrations of finances are online on the UCSRN google drive. I have asked ING, and not to worry as no transfers or automatic transfers has been made since and we are still in 'control'. Any other questions concerning the back account? Seeing there are none, I will pass it back to the IB.

**Jonathan (UCM):** Since audit is only half complete (*IB corrects this to the GA as speaking that it is two-thirds complete*) as we speak, therefore it is confusing. Can I propose to move this to the next GA when this is actually complete?

**Amber (IB):** Just to clarify first, I proposed in terms if the IB does not find anything, checking the transfers to the administration. So then similarly to what you're saying, if we do not find anything, we can on this condition pass it. When something is found, we inform you and vote on it at the next GA.

**Marik (AUC):** As i agree with the flexibility of the idea, i think we are deviating too far from

the policy manual. Let's move this to the next GA incase something is found. I'd like to raise a motion to vote on the audit on the first half year of the academic year at the next GA.

**Amber (IB):** *Re-Explains the Motion suggested by Marik.* All in favour raise your hand.

*Vote by acclamation to postpone the audit vote to the next GA.*

### 3. First-Half Academic Year Review and Update

**Stephen:** We are moving on to the year review of the UCSRN. We've made quite a bit of progress in some aspects and has had a rocky start and a delayed filling of the board. Staggered elections made the transitioning process difficult, with difficult communications with LSVb. Therefore, the EB has had a lack of training itself. We've been progressing forward through with the transitioning received and our personal experiences, helping one another out. Thus we ask for a small amount of lenience, but understand the importance of this. So the EB has worked towards working on our presence through attending UC events such as Iustrums, borrels and others that are on our radar like conferences and panels. We try to share articles and posts, running newsletter now thanks to Mai Thai, promotional materials are being distributed at GA's, we will give more out at UC visitings such as stickers and posters. Our professional aspects are being improved such as dress codes, website which will later be presented, business cards. There has been additionally a change in SoCo chair. We've been working on representative reach as well, we have met with ISO, LSVb and more. We've discussed in hand with UCSRN tournament for sponsorships from FlixBus and Decathlon for the UCSRN whole as well. We have been working on the policy manual and the difficulties we face as a board. We realise that future boards could benefit the changes that we will present today. Changes on established policies as well as new amendments. Additionally we want to work on election GA earlier on and organise the training of the board for them. SC and AC are also working on databases to help the future respective boards. We are working on flexibility, consistency by continuing the bottom up approach, by sending event proposals made by you guys. Yet still keeping tabs on how the tournament team and spotlight is doing. This has had mixed results but not too many hurdles to jump over. We have had consistent meetings with SoCo and AC, we meet bi weekly for the most part and sometimes weekly. It has been fairly consistent. There have been issues, our EB had a delayed start. First Juliette and I stepping into the UCSRN. Then joined by Mai Thai, Justin and Victoria later on, thankfully. We've been working since September but have fully functioned since November. Which is a late start historically for UCSRN. We've struggled with previous books, ing, kvk, and participation and attendance of UC representatives. We have been working hard on improving the communication and coordination with you, but we need you to show interest and support for this organisation. We've also had small event proposals the past semester. The only event that ran for this was TedX and MUN. So let's promote this more to actually spend our budget. This is the sample of the website Mai Thai has been working on, to prove that things are being done. Mai Thai will now come up here to present it to you.

**Mai Thai:** Hello guys, so i've been mentioning the website a lot on the newsletter and on our skype call meetings that the website is currently being worked on. I understand that it can be seen as big talk, using big words. Therefore, I wanted to share a few screenshots of the pages I have been working on. The goal of the new website is to firstly, make it more simple. I personally find myself struggling with the website, navigating everything. I can't imagine how difficult it may be for you. I wanted the website to be more modern and dynamic. We want it more professional in terms of coherence of looks. I wanted to make the website not

only user friendly, but additionally editor friendly. This would mean the next EB could also edit the website with ease, such as adding drag and drop options. On the landing page, I hope to have an 1 to 2 minute animation video to explain what the UCSRN is. This is for students, all members of the UCSRN, as well as companies that may consider sponsoring the UCSRN or its events. I am trying to keep the website refined to 5 tabs maximum if possible. If you would like to give any input please do contact me. As for goals and missions, I hope that it not only shows the mission of the UCSRN but new ideas and goals set up by boards each year. This will hopefully provide a more visually engaging way to follow what the UCSRN hopes to do. Social media handles and board introductions, we'd like to keep these pages active. Board images and introductions will be done for the social and academic board as well. I want to add individual photos, UC's and a small text. In this way, it decreases the distant feeling between the UCSRN and the community. I will now move on straight to the SC Update.

#### 4. SC Update: Progress on Goals

**Mai Thai:** Recently, as you may or may not know, I am the interim chair for the Social Committee. Prior, I was only a secretary for the EB. At first the chair of SC was Juliette, I would like to say she did a great job, thank you so much. Thus right after, Stephen stepped in to the position of chair. As Stephen is the Chair of the EB, to alleviate stress and to allow smoother progress, I offered to help take the position for him. I have enjoyed the position so much. I would like to thank you dearly for trusting me. There main updates for the SC what we've been doing the past semester, we've had a platform for sharing information and best practices. The conversations i've been most involved in includes the website, unilife app, facebook and whatsapp - how does each uc promote events and materials. How do we pass on information. Board transitions have been discussed, in relation to baby board going to full board, how each UC approaches this. If you have questions or would like access to any documents, it's all public though on our drive. So just send an email to [info@ucsrn.nl](mailto:info@ucsrn.nl). We talked about different kinds of merch and who sells and designs them. We additionally keep up to date with the spotlight and tournament team. Shout out to Livian and all the hard work he has done. Be sure to attend tonight after the GA. As for the tournament we will be receiving an update later in the GA. I have to say a kudos to the tournament team as well as the EB was hesitant in the beginning of the year due to previous experiences with the previous tournament teams, issues related to budget and organisational skills. However, you guys have been doing amazing. SoCo has been relatively active, i'd like more numbers to show up to our meetings and give more input. I must say on the chat, or when I message or email you, you've been very cooperative and helpful. Which I genuinely appreciate. Lastly, the SoCo is in charge of the Fortuna Challenges. If you did not know that the UCSRN LUC tournament team has decided to add a set game or challenges which participants can do throughout the day of tournament. These fun activities involve taking photos with other UC board members, in addition to any challenges the SoCo sees fit. The SoCo has full control of Fortuna Challenges. If anyone would like to add anything or suggest ideas be sure to email that to us as well. Thank you!

#### 5. AC Update: Progress on Goals

**Chandeni (EUC):** Hey gus, I'm stepping in for Bart (*AC Chair*) today as he could not make it.

It will be a short update on the four goals that we've set up. First goal was to be a platform for sharing information and best practices. This is what we have been working on mostly by facilitating discussions important examples are masters transitions which has been very helpful. Mental health practices. We've also set up some smaller focus groups on specific discussions such as language opportunities, which are different among many UCs. Our third goal was to review the budget proposals, we've done this with TedxAUCollege and AUCMUN and Extra Muros, and have decided to fund all three. We still have some budget left but we don't want to spend it without cause. Last point was to organise and academic event ourselves, we decided not to do so as it was too difficult as all ac's are scattered around in the Netherlands. We are open for event proposals. We are making a UC database with general information like mentioned, the transition, mental health but also curriculum and academic year structures. We decided to make the database due to the lack of understanding in the beginning of the year, causing difficulty in discussions. Ideally this this will hopefully be updated every year and kept up for the transitions from old boards to new boards. That is all.

**Stephen:** We will have short break now for 15 mins.

## SHORT BREAK

### 6. Proposed Policy Manual Changes

**Stephen:** Welcome back. Hope you had a nice break. We will now begin with the second half of the GA. These are the policy manual changes that we are hoping to make. We have some proposed PM changes, we will go through the current iteration of the PM and then review the changes. Some proposals are new thus have no basis. Firstly we are changing the structure of the UCSRN board. The specifically the nature of the SC and AC chair. We would like to change them to technical chairs, which will now be open to anyone not just SC and AC members. The voting power within the committee will be limited by the chair.. Reasoning behind this is that previous SC and AC chairs were difficult to appoint as each representative had obligations from their respective UC on top of UCSRN. This should alleviate the work towards UCSRN and the problems regarding electing full boards. We shall vote on a policy by policy basis. Any questions?

**Phineas (UCM):** What do you mean by technical chair? They can't vote right?

**Stephen:** Yes. They will not be able to vote.

*Many confusing looks from GA and outbursts of questions.*

**Stephen:** By technical chair, they're elected to help facilitate. They will be the liaison between the committee and the EB. They will not having voting power within the committees. They will guide discussions, make sure meetings happen consistently, and guide the topics. They will communicate what the committee has decided on to the EB. The chair will not provide a second vote to their respective UC.

**Elise (UCR):** Technical Chair is a confusing name in comparison to AC and SC Chair. Why did you choose this name?

**Stephen:** I believe Bart came up with the name. He is not currently here to defend it. Chandeni, did you discuss this with Bart?

**Chandeni (EUC):** We did not discuss the matters of technical chair and the proposed changes.

**Stephen:** Well regardless, the phrasing is up for change.

**Marik (AUC):** The phrasing is a bit ambiguous. I understand what you are trying to say by it. I think that the position already implies that they will not have voting rights. Maybe we should, I'd like to propose, that we change the technical term?

**Alex (UCR):** Move to strike the term technical from chair title.

**Mai Thai:** I'd like to first explain what I believe Bart meant with the term technical, so we can make an informed decision what should happen next. The reason behind not remaining the name of SC or AC chair is due to the structure of the UCSRN being the same over the past 5 years. We have associated SC and AC chair with an image of what tasks and requirements are associated to it. The term technical, which may of course be changed, is for purpose to know that when students are running for the position, they are not only chairs of the committees, they are in addition extensively a part of the EB as a general board member.

**Phineas (UCM):** I would like move to amend the strike of technical to prevent the use of voting power, as technical may infer that you still have voting rights, which is what we're trying to avoid. Instead an idea is to call it Chair ex officio instead, implying no voting power.

**Sush (UCG):** What's the current meaning of being the SC or AC chair?

**Mai Thai:** So the current structure of the UCSRN is that there is a Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, External, and currently there is a Social Chair and an Academic Chair. The Social Chair and the Academic Chair are elected based on the members of the representatives in the respective boards. However, with the new change, although you are chair, and you don't have voting rights, you will now be more committed to the EB than you are to the committees. Currently the chairs, do not take on as much responsibility in the EB as each member has a lot of commitment to their respective UC association. Doing this would increase man power within the UCSRN EB, which would increase opportunities and number of tasks completed in the future.

**Noemi (LUC):** Would the technical be part of the EB, and my second question is would they have voting power at the GA?

**Mai Thai:** The members applying for Chair of the committees will be a member of the EB, as well as manage the committees they are appointed to. The same as the current members of the EB, we do not have any voting power at a GA. Any more questions regarding the technical chair position?

**Rebecca (LUC):** Are you confident you have people for the position for both committees?

**Stephen:** I believe that with the clauses that will be added to the PM, that if there aren't enough people running there will be a solution. Currently there is nothing in the PM that addresses what would happen if not enough people ran. Seeing that there is a wider scope, there should be.



**Juliette (UCM):** I personally think we will have more people if we advertise it properly. A lot of people did not want to take up SC chair because of respective UC obligations.

**Stephen:** We are also moving the elections earlier on in the year (*referring to rather than summer period*), so that more UCs may participate. Any more questions regarding this PM change?

**Marik (AUC):** Is this what would be added to the PM what currently is on the slide?

**Stephen:** This currently is what we want to change it to. Aside from the typo and formatting, which will be fixed, yes. It is currently not structured to how it will be added to the PM, this was for ease of reading.

**Jasmijn (AUC):** Does not make sense to vote since the clauses are not specified?

**Stephen:** We can let this be on your radar for now and have this completed and voted on at the next GA before elections.

**Jonathan (UCM):** This is about the election GA, is the next GA not the election GA? How would you fit this in?

**Stephen:** We hope to have another GA before the election GA.

**Zoe (UCU):** Are voting on this? As this cannot currently be implemented.

**Stephen:** We have moved to not vote for this as it is not structured in the required clauses of the PM.

**Justin:** I propose to do this now, and vote on this later in this GA.

**Stephen:** We will address this policy change later on in this GA.

**Marik (AUC):** I want to vote on second slide

**Stephen:** We will address the second slide with the other change later.

**Stephen:** Next we will address the language requirement to the treasurer and external position. Not only to speak fluent dutch to be able to speak dutch with partners and companies throughout the Netherlands, but to additionally be able to read and respond to official dutch documents. The specific levels of dutch are not set in stone, thus is up for discussion, however the EB has seen these to be at reasonable level.

**Elise (UCR):** Two points 1. Clause 2.5.2 change Nederlands to Dutch and additionally on a more serious 2. would like to change the whole clause rather than strongly recommend, to be should or must.

**Stephen:** Amend the current policy from recommend, to should or must. The reason why it is recommended, in case future elections we don't get enough people there is possibilities for others to run too.

.

**Jonathan (UCM):** Somehow related to this, in the statues 2.5 all verbal or written language must be in English, though it doesn't relate to the requirement, it relates to communication with other social boards. I think we should adhere to our statues and keep all communications in English.

**Stephen:** Victoria will come up to the stage to defend her stand point.

**Victoria:** So my experience as an external this year, quite a few ISO, LsVB does everything in dutch, therefore I must bring either Justin or another friend that speaks dutch. Just so that the partner feels comfortable. Speaking dutch would make the job easier. So therefore, we do not require the person to speak dutch, but would definitely strongly recommend as it would help.

**Phineas (UCM):** I know talking directly about ISO. ISO is working on communication in English. This is also done at many other universities. Not only in networking but in faculties as well. Implementing language recommendations for certain positions is contrary to our aims.

**Victoria:** I believe so too, however, for example, when in parliament, we had the meeting with the VVD where the whole meeting was in dutch. I sat there not understanding what had been said. I can understand but could not participate. There's a demand for taking another Board member to ensure effective communication. ISO and faculty may be changing but the parliament is not.

**Sush (UCG):** Not necessarily related to the PM. But given that both positions require some dutch, is there a provision in the UCSRN to teach the Board Member Dutch?

**Victoria:** I would not know how quick one could learn a language.

**Mai Thai:** I'm almost native speaker, most don't recognise that Dutch is not my first language. Even legal documents such as from the KvK and ING, regardless of how i can casually speak dutch, I still don't completely understand and struggle writing with formal professional communication that is required behind many emails and documentations. I couldn't imagine some just starting to learn dutch having to go through the same experience and struggle I did.

**Victoria:** All emails addressed to my position are in dutch, so i have to use google translate. Of course, we don't want to make it a requirement as we don't want to hinder applicants from applying. So "strongly recommend" is the current phrasing.

**Alex (UCR):** The problem is void meaning of recommendation, we either have the option to not allow for non-Dutch speakers or we do? Either not to do it at all, or must speak dutch.

**Zoe (UCU):** I do think that even though you don't put it in the PM, you can still strongly recommend applicants to be able to speak dutch. Recommendations can also be made at GA's. As required dutch speaking could limit applicants.

**Amber (IB):** What's the exact reason for the treasurer to be Dutch?

**Stephen:** Legal documents, communication with ING, KvK, potential speakers.

**Stephen:** Let's vote on whether the amendment is to be required or not.

**Ruben (UCM):** Since this is a motion, we should vote on the motion amendment. The specific ad hoc motion is to change "strongly recommended" to "required" on external.

**Stephen:** before voting on the change, we must vote on the motion of changing it from 'recommended' to 'required', including that Nederlands would be changed to Dutch.

*Voting results: amendment does not pass for external language requirement*

Favour: 14

Against: 28

Abstention: 0

*Voting results: amendment does not pass for treasurer language requirement*

*Majority vote in favour (counts were not taken in)*

*No change to the policy regarding language requirements.*

**Stephen:** Moving on to the malfunctions within the EB. This is what is currently in the PM, if under any circumstances the chair, secretary, external or treasurer is unable to continue in the long term, elections are made vacant within 6 weeks. The next slide will be what is proposed.

**Siem (AUC):** Is this added clause incorporating the assumptions that there will be electoral provisions for the SC and AC chair?

**Stephen:** So as you're asking if this PM change was made with the assumption with electoral change. The current elections are held within the AC and SC. This would address both internal issues for EB and Committees.

**Sush (UCG):** Clause 2.8.1. The phrasing is awkward. What does "the long term" mean?

**Stephen:** That's already there so that's irrelevant to the proposed changes as it currently is in the PM. If you'd like to propose an amendment please do. The EB proposed addition is 2.8.3. Any questions?

*Voting on the proposed amendments:*

Favour: 41

Against: 1

Abstention: 0

*PM Change of the addition of ' 2.8.3 If under any circumstance the Vice-Chair of the respective committee cannot replace the respective chair, elections will take place within six weeks' Passes*

**Stephen:** The next policy manual change concerns the finances. Under 4.2.5, the current date is set to september first, that would change to before the third monday of August. 4.3.4, 4.3.5. And 4.3.6 have been added.

**Zoe (UCU):** When it states “are encouraged”, it is not binding, so should we even change it? Either you have to or not.

**Stephen:** Are you proposing an amendment?

**Zoe (UCU):** I don't know if people here agree.

**Marik (AUC):** Two things, First, I think we should discuss the definition of core event, secondly, we should vote on these amendments separately.

**Stephen:** This is addressing the new definition that is included in the policy change. Understandable this may be confusing as it has not been included in the PM itself.

*Change of slides to the definitions.*

**Marik (AUC):** The current number of definitions only goes up to 11 whilst the EB is referring to 12/13.

**Stephen:** The correct number will be put in place. Thank you.

**Elise (UCR):** 4.4.1 needs to be amended for the definition of a core event, it is called core UCSRN event, which should be changed to just core event.

**Jonathan (UCM):** Concerning the formatting of a policy manual: vagueness expressed through “are encouraged/ i.e.” should not be contained in a policy manual. It does not carry meaning to use those words.

**Marik (AUC):** I think it would be nice, Jonathan already said, to form it in a more concise way. They describe the same event but described differently. Additionally, it is already defined elsewhere, this clause would provide a double definition which is confusing. If anything changes, it would clash. It would be better to define only one clause. Motion to take 13.2 out.

*Remove “the tournament is hosted by the elected University College each year within the Social Committee” which leads to a clash within the policy manual.*

**Itai (TUC):** I'd like to recommend for the EB to propose a better formatted version at the next GA or after the break rather than remove.

**Zoe (UCU):** Does that also mean that the other motion will not be voted upon?

**Stephen:** Correct.

**Phineas (UCM):** Propose to vote on the the definition rather than the subclauses, allowing amendments to be made but not substantial changes.

**Jonathan (UCM):** I'd like to ask the EB to rewrite the change, then let IB should review this, GA should vote on it.

**Stephen:** Current proposal is to move the vote to the next GA, and having the IB review it first after addition revision of EB.

**Alex (UCR):** Does this mean we are unable to vote on any definitions regarding core events? That would be unfortunate.

**Marik (AUC):** The definitions should be agreed upon first, allowing 13 to be in as 12, but the subclauses to be reviewed for the next GA.

**Natasha (IB):** IB should not influence the Policy Manual since its task is to make sure the EB follows the policy manual.

**Stephen:** the aforementioned proposal should not include the part of review by the IB. Since this is not able for the IB to comment on, I propose we have a focus group with the allocated budget. We can look at language, definitions and clauses, then bring them up at the next GA. All second?

**Mai Thai:** That does require members to attend and contribute to the focus group.

**Jonathan (UCM):** For sake of final clarification, we now vote to keep in clause 13 but change it to 12. And asking a revision of the subclauses at the focus group?

**Stephen:** Yes

*Ask for revision in 13.1 and 13.2 (12.1 and 12.2) which is to be changed by the next GA*

**Alex (UCR):** 13 is to be changed to 12, do we ignore the other proposals for motions since they're to be postponed to the next GA?

**Stephen:** That would technically be ideal, to have focus group who would like to add more and expand to do it for the next GA. Limit vote 13 to 12, and keep definition and ignore the subclauses 13.1 and 13.2.

*Vote to only address 13 and ignore the other 3 definitions.*

*Pass by acclamation*

Stephen: Vote to change 13 to 12 and keep the definition

**Marik (AUC):** Can we move to vote this by acclamation, and ask who would like to vote? And if no one raises their hand it is approved by acclamation, as this will speed up the process.

*Future votings can be held by acclamation, approved by acclamation*

**Stephen:** Alright, is anyone opposed to on the 13 changed to 12 and keeping the definition?

*Approved by acclamation for vote to change 13 to 12 and keep the definition*

**Stephen:** For financial PM changes, this is what is proposed.

**Jonathan (UCM):** Motion to change instead of fee reduction, we call it fee change

**Stephen:** Is anyone against the proposed amendment?

**Berend (AUC):** I think it would be better to say would anyone like to vote on this rather than is anyone against this. This saying would be more neutral.

**Stephen:** Thank you for your recommendation

**Itai (TUC):** Some comments are made on the language, namely recommended, void meaning of “recommendations” for some people, however, this allows for urging, encouragement instead of requirement, as it would have the power to allow for exceptions. The body UCSRN should have that flexibility at the last moment to have a leeway.

**Zoe (UCU):** Policy Manual should be a guide, something to go by, since there is no current consequence for not doing something, it should not be encouraged and agree on something outside of the PM it self.

**Itai (TUC):** If I may reply, i think there is convenience to have strong structure but not as binary as saying something or not at all. If you miss the deadline, then you are unable to contribute.

**Jonathan (UCM):** In my understanding, the IB audits the EB with the PM, the IB controls EB through this document. Therefore, should be binding.

**N/A (TUC):** Every UC comes from different backgrounds, thus works differently, there should be flexibility. Being strict can be detrimental to some UCs in some cases. We should take it seriously but not overlook that we are a student association. There should be some flexibility.

Stephen: I'll allow 5 more follow up points.

**Rebecca (LUC):** I agree that every UC is different however, PM is a binding document to check the EB. If it's not binded, it should be put on the web or document but not in the PM.

**Pippa (UCU):** A possibility would be to make a document that is binding but not as binding as the PM, for example rather say 4 months before date rather than a date for flexibility. Would this be possible?

**Zoe (UCU):** Similar but slightly different proposal, deadline can be changed in discretion of EB, instead of a date only. It is binding but with power to change it in discretion.

**Alex (UCR):** For consensus sakes, we come from different backgrounds. Allowing flexibility that isn't viewed the same by all ucs. Keeping the current date is best.

**Marik (AUC):** All the events happen during different times and dates, let the EB get jurisdiction of date rather than choosing one. Gives flexibility and makes it binding. If time, ask questions or answer. If time allows, I'd like to raise a motion.

**Stephen:** Are there any more questions or remarks? Are there any specific motions to be put forth?

**Marik (AUC):** I'd like to motion to change 4.3.4 'Proposed core events are to be handed on the date decided by the EB' namely, EB has discretion over the date.

**Stephen:** Would anyone like to discuss this amendment?

**Alex (UCR):** Motion for this amendment “ Proposal for core events are required to be submitted in by the deadline set by the EB and confirmed at latest a month after receipt.”

**Stephen:** Would anyone like to discuss this amendment? Would we like to vote on this amendment? Alright. Is any one against?

*Approved by acclamation for 4.3.4. To be “ Proposal for core events are required to be submitted in by the deadline set by the EB and confirmed at latest a month after receipt.”*

**Stephen:** Now to continue. 4.2.5 reduction to change instead. Would any one like to discuss this? Is anyone against this?

*Approved by acclamation to change ‘Fee reduction’ under article 4.2.5 to ‘Fee change’*

**Berend (AUC):** Sorry to repeat against, can you say would anyone like to vote this instead of against? Saying if anyone is against would mean that we are voting.

**Stephen:** Apologies thank you for correcting. 4.3.5 would anyone like to vote on this?

*Inaudible sound from GA*

**Marik (AUC):** If agreed, do not say anything.

*4.3.5 Pass by acclamation*

**Stephen:** Finally 4.3.6, with the term encouraged.

**Marik (AUC):** We’ve discussed encourage, we shouldn’t do that, I’d suggest to change to shall instead of encouraged. Put it as a specific number of times that should be met. I suggest to be written as shall meet every set amount of time dependent on event.

**Jonathan (UCM):** Maybe, once again at discretion of EB, maybe that is too much power to them, however, 1-2 months is a long time.

**Rebecca (LUC):** Being part of LUC tournament, 2 months should be good. You could do it more often if you like, but 2 months is enough.

**Ruben (UCM):** Looking back at issues core events in the past of the UCSRN, 2 months is not adequate. Some events are organised in less than a month. I would like to amend a change one month update at least. It can be shorter , but each core event should update one a month and received by EB.

**Rebecca (LUC):** EB has access to everything. 2 months is enough for that.

**Stephen:** Would anyone like like to further the discussion? There are currently two proposed amendments to the wording

**Ruben (UCM):** I withdraw my amendment.

**Stephen:** This leaves us with Marik's amendment on the table.

**Marik (AUC):** The EB and the organisers of the core events shall meet at least once every two months.

**Stephen:** Alright, would anyone like to vote on this?

*Vote by acclamation, 4.3.6. The EB and the organisers of the core events shall meet at least once every two months.*

**Jasmijn (AUC):** To be added from the moment the team is formed to the PM.

**Stephen:** Would we like to vote on this?

*Vote by acclamation, 4.3.6. The EB and the organisers of the core events shall meet at least once every two months from the moment the team is formed.*

**Stephen:** The next bit concerns proxies. This will be discussed in the focus group. Next is the changes made to elections.

**Megan (UCU):** For clarification, in 6.13.1 is it AB or EB?

**Stephen:** AB for Advisory board. Would we like to discuss this proposal? Would we like to vote on this proposal?

*Pass by acclamation for 6.13, 6.13.1 and 6.13.2*

**Jasmijn (AUC):** It was not in the proposed clauses, however, I would like to motion, 72 hours application in written form of candidacy for point 6.5

**Stephen:** Any discussion? Would anyone would like to vote?

*Vote by acclamation for 6.5 to add '72 hours application in written form of candidacy'*

**Sush (UCG):** Instead of interimmed, to be **filled**, in 6.13.2

**Stephen:** Any discussion? Would anyone would like to vote?

*Vote passed by acclamation to change the word interimmed (does not exist) to filled.*

**Stephen:** Now the SC changes will be presented by Mai Thai

**Mai Thai:** This is what it will be changed to. Any questions?

**Jasmijn (AUC):** Can we have a summary of the changes?

**Mai Thai:** Social Chair of the Social Committee, the general roles remains the same, namely lead discussions, provide answers and give advice. The new thing is the fact that they are to take on more EB duties. Previously SC and AC chairs could vote, now being part of the EB entails no voting.



*Voting rights should be included in the focus group about whether or not there are voting rights of the EB member, to be brought up at the next GA.*

**Zoe (UCU):** Where is it stated that the Social and Academic Chairs are not allowed to vote?

**Mai Thai:** SC and AC chair previously were allowed to vote in SC and AC committees. Since there are 9 representatives per UC, the additional chair would amount to 10 representatives, 1 UC having an additional representative. Therefore, the chairs are now not allowed to vote, to prevent biases. This goes conflicts, events and so forth.

**Alex (UCR):** Propose for the title to be changed to “SC Coordinator”, with a clause that says they are ex officio chair of the SC.

**Mai Thai:** Would anyone like to discuss this further?

**Marik (AUC):** Terminology should first take into account the “technical chair” or “coordinator”, maybe we should have this better formulated, and rounded off. As that is the point of this GA. Maybe we should discuss this next time.

**Mai Thai:** Is the current concern the name of the position, or the position itself?

**Berend (AUC):** I believe people are dissatisfied with how it currently is phrased. Let's change is to be discussed prior to the next GA where it should be motioned for.

**Mai Thai:** To elaborate a little, that the only thing currently added and not changed, is point number VII, the rest is from the current PM. We can add more after the focus group regarding voting and the title name. Is there anything else that anyone would like discuss as to defining the position.

**Stephen:** We will now vote. For is to pass, against would be to be brought up at focus group.

**Zoe (UCU):** 2.6.1. VIII is currently being voted on correct? Are we adding more clauses on voting?

**Stephen:** Yes we are voting on 2.6.1. VIII and we are not adding any clauses. We will give you a minute to discuss with you UC.

**Jonathan (UCM):** Are we voting on the 8, and the rest is to discuss in the entirety at focus group later?

**Stephen:** Yes. Alright let's vote.

*Voting on the addition of 2.6.1 VIII*

Vote for: 20

Against: 14

Abstain: 8

*Vote passes.*

**Stephen:** Now concerning the AC Chair proposal.

**Juliette (UCM):** Motion to do the rest after the focus group, and stop looking at the current desired change of amendments. Waiting for the correct formulation by the focus group, as it's currently getting late.

**Stephen:** Do we second this? The motion, is to have the rest of the policy changes about to be discussed at the next GA. Would we like to vote on this?

**Jasmijn (AUC):** From this slide and onwards? What would have to any of the additional changes?

**Juliette (UCM):** Let's have an open group call with proposals sent in by all members.

**Ruben (UCM):** I would like to agree. We could make proposals in the open floor. Make all of our proposals, we don't have to come up with formulation right now but come up with what we actually want or intend during the open floor. They with that bring it to the focus group, where it can be formulated correctly for the PM to be brought up to the GA. All uc's may bring up recommendations that they'd like to bring up, not just from the EB.

**Stephen:** This would mean the focus group would then intend to exemplify the changes by intent?

**Marik (AUC):** We're at the GA right now, the focus is to change the policy manual at GA, every change should be given a consideration. If you prepared you'd know what you'd like to propose and bring up. It does not happen often that we come together to discuss so let's do it now. I'd appreciate if we could do the changes now that the EB suggests rather than skipping it.

**Stephen:** Would we like to discuss this?

**Noemi (LUC):** How many are they left?

**Stephen:** Shows the slides, the AC chair position, basically the last slide.

**Juliette (UCM) :** I'd like to withdraw the motion.

**Jonathan (UCM):** What is currently being proposed?

**Stephen:** AC change, exactly the same as SC chair position. Addition of article VIII. Would we like to discuss this further?

**Jonathan (UCM):** I'd like to motion to remove brackets from temporarily from both AC and SC.

**Stephen:** Would we like to vote on this?

*Pass by acclamation to remove the brackets from temporarily, in article IX from both SC and AC*

**Stephen:** Would like to discuss this further? Would we like to vote on point VIII of the AC?

*Vote on number VIII for AC, approved by acclamation.*

**Stephen:** Now moving on to the budget.

**Marik (AUC):** Can we discuss now the changes that I'd like to bring up before budget.

Stephen: Would anyone else like to discuss this?

**Rebecca (LUC):** I think it'd make sense to do this now. Also did were you guys not going to reformulate something and we would then later vote on it?

**Mai Thai:** That what we just voted on.

**Stephen:** Any other questions?

**Itaï (TUC):** Before we move on, may we have a short 5 minute break.

**Stephen:** Before we have this well deserved break. Are there any other remarks or quick questions?

**Zoe (UCU):** One PM or Statues amendment, is that there is no point stated that the EB members cannot vote at the GA.

**Stephen:** Very interesting. Let's discuss that after the break .

## SHORT BREAK

**Stephen:** Can everyone please be seated. Welcome back. Thank you for everyone's enthusiasm and patience. We are unfortunately running out of time in this GA. We will wrap up the policy discussion, and continue at the focus group for the next GA. We rely on you guys to also prepare.

**Mai Thai:** Every document, everything seen on the screen right now, was sent in an email. It was sent prior to the invitation of the GA itself. As an active member, we depend on you to read these documents and when asked for recommendations, questions or comments. We expect within that time given to say something. A lot of time was allocated to this. It is up to your secretary, internal or external, or the UCSRN representative to pass on the message to the board. We prepare these documents, with mistakes or not, for you to call out on our work. The long discussions we've had today with many shared opinions would not have occurred if we were told about it prior. We will now move on, we will send out an email with topics discussed today, invite you to a focus group and have the AB and IB there if possible. If you'd like to have a say in the changes, we'd like for you to attend as well. We have allocated budget of 75 euros for this session. We will now move on to the budget changes. Any questions?

**Marik (AUC):** Thank you for the changes. I don't think anyone means to bash. We weren't aware that we had to submit these changes before hand. It is good that we talk about it here, because we can all talk about it, rather than sending emails back and forth. I understand the EB's frustration, but let's not talk about It was not clear to send in recommendations prior.

**Mai Thai:** I didn't request comments via email, the documents were sent. However, this was mentioned in SC meetings, to look over the policy manual and see what changes were desired. There was an agenda point to ask questions, make remarks, and everyone said they have read it and had no further comments.

**Marik (AUC):** May I recommend then to send an email to the whole board.

**Mai Thai:** I will be sure to do that, thank you for your recommendation.

**Marik (AUC):** I would really like to ask this before we move on. Motion to talk more about this. Motion to add something to the PM.

**Grace (AUC):** We already agreed to continue to speak about additional suggestions.

**Mai Thai:** Let's have some additional suggestions then, Marik?

**Marik (AUC):** I'd like to raise a motion. To the UCSRN Committee definitions 3.1.1 "*The AC and SC are responsible for deciding on event proposals from Members to organise academic and social respectively activities for Students. Proposals should be made in accordance with the submission process published by the EB*" We would like to change this. Change to not AC and SC vote and decide on the event, but rather "nominate the UC or person to speak to EB", so if unrealistic then alright - have a talk but then one proposed candidate. I think the biggest decisions made in the UCSRN are made by the SC and AC. I think that it's best that the highest authority power, except GA of course, does make this decision. If a proposal is not financially sound or is unrealistic, or the SC is malfunctioning, this can be mitigated by the EB. I understand the initial reasoning, due to equal representation. Therefore, I am suggesting the SC and AC proposes that and have the final decision made by EB.

**Mai Thai:** Thank you for your proposal, I will re read what is being changed for everyone. Article 3.1.1 "*The AC and SC are responsible for deciding on event proposals from Members to organise academic and social respectively activities for Students. Proposals should be made in accordance with the submission process published by the EB*" And now it is changed to:

**Marik (AUC):** 3.1.1 would then be changed to "*The AC and SC are responsible for proposing a candidate by looking over event proposals from Members to organise academic and social respectively activities for Students. After which, the EB has to decide on a vote. Proposals should be made in accordance with the submission process published by the EB*"

*This will slightly be adjusted with wording from Marik (AUC) himself to the Policy Manual*

**Mai Thai:** Would we like to discuss that? Would anyone like to vote?

Vote by Acclamation.

**Mai Thai:** Would anyone else like to make a suggestion or remark on the PM right now?

**Elise (UCR):** For the proposed changes, can you additionally add the old statements in the email, as I found it for be confusing to have to look at the document myself.

**Mai Thai:** Will do!

**Stephen:** We will add that to our email for the next GA.

## 7. Budget Changes for Spring 2019

**Mai Thai:** So we have heard from the IB and Stephen himself, that unfortunately, we were unable to get any board training. This is due to being a fully functioning board in November. Therefore, being so late, when trying to schedule a training session, they were unresponsive. Regardless of not training, we'd like to make the most of the budget we have. We proposing to take the EB training of 150 euros, to move 60 euros for promotion for the website and for a video. And then 60 euros with additional 30 euros for trophy transcription. Total amounting back to 150 euros, divided to promotion and representation.

**Megan (UCU):** Clarification of the columns please.

**Mai Thai:** This is the original budget, this is the change since last GA, and the additional column is the new math of what is going to be added.

**Sush (UCG):** Why is there a 400 euro jump in representation and administrative costs.?

**Mai Thai & Justin:** This has been approved at the previous GA at LUC. Any other questions? Would anyone like to discuss this? Would anyone like to vote on this?

*Vote by acclamation - approved to have the budget reallocation.*

**Justin:** In terms of expenses made this year from the event fund. We have allocated 500 euros to spotlight, where it was budgeted for 1000 euros. Only 500 euros was needed, therefore is equally left over. We see that we allocated 400 euros to TedX which has already been wired to their account. Furthermore 500 will be allocated to AUCMUN, and 4500 will be allocated to the tournament team like discussed at the last GA. This will happen in the upcoming weeks once we have access to our bank account. For now we have in the academic event fund, 700 euros, 200 euros was requested by Extramuros, potentially with you guys agreeing will be given to that event. 400 euros is left from the other proposal fund. Total we have 1600 euros left. My question is for you guys to send in proposals so that we can allocate that money. There's a career event at AUC that will happen, which I'm on the board on, so will probably request that. 900 euros has already gone to AUC, so please make use of the funds for your events! Simple requests can be decided on by the EB (*made easier by Mariks amendment*). Need no vote just an update. There was a football match that happened last night, requesting only 70 euros, for beers and travelling costs. No decision has been made yet. We are ready to allocate but would need proposals to do so. I hope that is clear. Any questions?

**Jonathan (UCM):** Can you quickly go back to the budget? Because this GA has been going on for very long, I don't want there to be a discussion on this but from the February update 7740 euro which means that less than half has been spent on events. They have spent by february a total of 757 euros, when 11,000 was available. I don't want to start a discussion but want to notify the GA that maybe for next GA consider how we want to budget and consider what role we want UCSRN to play. Because money doesn't get spent.

**Justin:** I'd like to add to that, we have have 2000 euros for travelling costs for these events. Thus if we have a football match between 2 UC's, UCSRN can provide money to travel to the location. The money is available and allocated. Let's spend it and promote ourselves more to our student body.

**Berend (AUC):** For money to be spent on an event, shouldn't it be an event where all UC's should be able to attend? Since it's two UC's, I question the validity of the 70 euros?

**Justin (AUC):** Though it technically is open to all UC's we can understand that and would have to look in together in the EB.

**Jonathan (UCM):** I'd like to get back to that, 2000 euros to reimburse travelling, if only 70 euros is used maybe we should all collectively go back think about what UCSRN should have as a role. We should budget it correctly.

**Daniel (AB):** To get back to the football match, Kirsten and I were discussing but we weren't sure, you should check last year the exact changes as there was a discussion on this (e.g. even if open to 2/3 UCs). It has been changed last year - EB should check.

## 8. UCSRN Tournament

**Noemi (LUC):** Hey guys I'm Noemi from LUC. Sign up sheets have sent. Rules are not, but will be soon. With SC we are going to remove cooking from event. Maybe we will consider cold food cooking? But not possible. Budget is complete - everything proposed has been budgeted and is within it. Adjustments have been made (e.g. party preparations have been done), refer back to the SC. The two points go together regarding the budget. There will still be an awesome opening show. Deadlines have been sent to SC few weeks ago. We would like by march 9th for quotes for promo video: I received some which were weird, i've found out by texting the guy taking care of the video. They want quotes that describe sports moment memorable to each UC, they want footage from world cup with the quotes passing it. We need volunteers (counting points, challenges work) - a link will be sent to help with fortune challenges. Next is the ticket sales for spectators. That will be done on an online platform, not excel. April 1st we want the list of participants, including accommodation and diet options for participants and spectators. April 7th, payment for participants and 5 euros for accomodation for both participants and spectators. Finally april 10th, this is for the hype video. We can start pinning UC's against one another.

**Stephen:** Bring on the memes!

**Noemi (LUC):** So lastly, we really need quotes! Please assemble a team to start qualifications. Do that if you need! Finally promotional material - we were supposed to print posters but our contact hasn't been too responsive. But we have stickers which rebecca has! Please 1 member from each board come up and get some. Distribute them around to start promotions. Any questions?

**Jonathan (UCM):** Thank you for the update and all the work you've done so far. We had a question. We all want to go to the tournament but tickets are expensive than those who have to travel less, tickets goes 10-20 euros more than the rest. Can you or the eb find a way to fix and compensate.



**Noemi (LUC):** From my side unfortunately, there's not much we can do.

**Stephen:** I believe there has been discussion in the past about this, about possible additional travel funds. Previous treasurer is with us. Could Kirsten from the AB verify this statement?

**Kirsten (AB):** It was acknowledge that some UC's have to travel further and not discussed, but not did not do anything because of the diversity. Past 3 GA's is was decided to keep things the same.

**Stephen:** Thank you for the clarification and correction

**Marik (AUC):** I would like to make a recommendation for the treasurer to look into calculating per kilometres as it works here at AUC.

**Jonathan (UCM):** if include in policy next GA it won't affect this years (tournament)

**Stephen:** Interesting suggestion, this is in the policy manual, therefore we will look into it at the focus group.

*A lot of people talking at the same time with no clear cut remark*

**Stephen:** Can one person state this?

**Itai (TUC):** Funds are meant to lower the bar to make it accessible, it diminishes this.

**Jonathan (UCM):** We can take this into account. We need the money, will do if get semi compensated before the tournament we do it in 2 GA's so it does not affect this year.

**Itai (TUC):** Funds are meant to lower the bar and increase accessibility to students. Retroactively working like so, diminishes that. Students can only pay so much.

**Jonathan (UCM):** UCM pays forward while knowing that some of it will be paid back.

**Itai (TUC):** If you were to be reimbursed as a university college, I think what I said doesn't apply any more as there is more accessibility in that sense.

**Daniel (AB):** I think it's good if I give a outline of why things have happened like so in the previous GAs: if we settle to km pricing, it is undoable work. Reasoning was that a large amount goes to tournament. You blow up budget immensely if we do it differently it is difficult to calculate how much money they need (example: add a euro to each will blow budget out of proportion). Hard to weigh, conclusion: lower other fees such as those for UC's so that their respective budget can be spent elsewhere like travelling.

**Noemi (LUC):** Are there any other questions?

**Marik (AUC):** Who owns the UCSRN Trophy facebook account?

**Stephen:** I was unaware such a page existed.

**Marik (AUC):** it's not page, but a personal account for the trophy. It would be nice to bring it back.

**Stephen:** If anyone knows please contact Marik. Any other questions before we move on?

**(EUC):** We are still waiting for our flag. Bring at the battle of the boards that's fine, either way, we do want it back.

**Stephen:** Thank you Noemi for presenting the UCSRB tournament update. Stickers are going to be passed out. We would like advertise IB recruitment. We have 3 as of now, and are in need of 5.

## 9. Independent Body Recruitment

**Natasha (IB):** Hello everyone, it's been a long GA, so we'll make this quick. The IB is recruiting! Our tasks are rather simple. They're in the policy manual; you count votes and administering them, check the EB is following the policy manual, act as an appeal court, and we do 2 audits. We need at least 3 members for a functioning IB. Next year Amber and I are graduating. Therefore, we highly encourage you to promote it in your respective UC. We have a few flyers and if you want more we can send them to you via Email.

## Open Floor

**Stephen:** Last but not least, we have the open floor. Would anyone like to bring something up for the open floor?

**Itai (TUC):** This is my first GA, it was a lot of fun. I would like to ask EB if I could motion something to look into something. I know noticed that you are with ING and it's not a very ethical bank to do banking with. For example they have recently been fined a huge amount of money for money laundering and investing in fossil fuels. Motion to look into changing.

**Stephen:** Is this a non binding motion for us to look into options? As asking for us to do so does not require a motion.

**Itai (TUC):** I just wanted to motion for you look for different options and propose them at the next GA.

**Justin:** What do other UC's think?

**Jonathan (UCM):** I agree, ING is unethical and environmentally unfriendly.

**Kirsten (AB):** Last ga of 2 years ago when Jonathan was still treasurer had this discussion, ING was chosen as there is an option to do things in English.

**Rebecca (LUC):** ABN also has english, it's not a sustainable bank either though.

**Marik (AUC):** TRIODOS was our switch a couple years ago, we are very happy with that bank. Customer service is terrible due to being a smaller bank, and can be harder to do as it is in dutch.



**Itaï (TUC):** I very much appreciate the feedback. Seeing the amount of money the UCSRN controls, I would still like to table the motion to look at propose it for something more ethical, clean and environmentally friendly. You seem nice, I don't want to pressure you even more, understanding that there's been many obstacles for you. Ask for you to look in the light of proposed policy changes, we can look into the policy manual to be able to facilitate our money to be placed in the right places.

**Justin:** Thank you for your feedback. I'm not too happy with ING myself either. I will definitely be able to do this. It's worth a look. If you know other options, feel free to email it to [info@ucsrn.nl](mailto:info@ucsrn.nl).

**Stephen:** The EB will look into more options, and we always welcome support. Do we want to discuss this motion further? Do we want to vote on this motion?

*Vote by acclamation to look into changing banks and propose this at the next GA*

**Stephen:** Does anyone want to bring up anything else to the open floor?

**Jasmijn (AUC):** Experiencing troubles with Uni Life, not only AUC, but others too, unilife can't solve their issues without money. Functions in the app aren't good enough. Suggest a discussion about dedicating a small amount of money towards it. I understand not all UC's use unilife, but 5 do.

**Jonathan (UCM):** What is unilife?

**Jasmijn (AUC):** Unilife was originally made for euc, an app for events and over views to buy tickets etc etc and currently 5 UC's are using it. And trying to expand the app including other UCs that aren't using it

**Rebecca (LUC):** tournament will also use Uni life, we've made seperate account for Tournament! Where sports events are and other information will be on the app.

**Sush (UCG):** While I do agree with AUC, that some problems may be solved with a little monetary help. When you make an tinder for event, smaller associations doesn't really benefit as they're not going to use it regularly. Given all UCSRN members pay the same membership, it wouldn't be fair, as some UC's won't benefit from it.

**Unknown (Did not claim name nor UC):** It sounds like they're looking for an investment and I don't think that that's the purpose of the UCSRN.

**Berend (AUC):** All valid points, there is an underlying problem. We still have 5k in saving, and is approaching a higher number as this year is likely to under spend again, I would like the UCSRB EB to look into the spending how it can be fixed

**Jonathan (UCM):** Maybe it's a good idea to look at it after the tournament. Just incase, to look it into at next GA.

**Sush (UCG):** The app is used by 5, doesn't make sense to be voted on, helping kind is better than helping cash.

**Jasmijn (AUC):** What I'm looking for is technically an answer to the problem with promotion

with student associations, more people move away from facebook, especially first years. We are trying to find a solution which almost all UC's experience. It doesn't have to be unilife, but just something that helps.

**Sush (UCG):** I'd like propose some kind of focus group to discuss this?

**Daniel (AB):** Just like all funding go through proposal, vote on proposal. Rather than discuss at the GA.

**Stephen:** Good point. We can make this a topic at the focus group if necessary.

**Phineas (UCM):** How will this focus group happen? We never specified details.

**Stephen:** EB will organise it and sends out invitation to AC, SC, AB and IB to join. Any members who would like to join feel free to.

**Marik (AUC):** That's great, I would like to advise you to send notice earlier than 14 days. This week email and next month would be the focus group. As many of us are busy.

**Itaï (TUC):** Now that you have a newspaper up and running, I'd propose it to be added to newsletter.

**Stephen:** That we will do! Any more questions? Anything more to be brought to the floor?

**Sush (UCG):** You guys did a great job guys.

**Stephen:** Thank you! Please enjoy spotlight!