

Opening

Helene: Welcome to the GA today. We are very happy to see you all in Utrecht today and hope you had a good travel. We are waiting for two UC's but will continue. Our goal of the day is to have a final version of the PM to present to our Member GA's. Today we will do this through what you will "approve of" to be correct. Today we also need an IB, so we would like to ask one or two of you to function as an IB today. Please come up those of you who have decided to function as IB. Does anyone object of the IB? No.

Approval of Agenda

Helene: As you can see, this is the agenda of the day. The first half will be before the break and we will try to have it as short as possible. And then we will have 5 more sections to go through and we want to come to a consensus

Board Update

Helene: The election GA will be on the 12th of June. Please if you have suggestions for location let us know. For the procedure it may be vague, but what we had intended and what has been discussed is that the representatives for the academic and social committee are under the responsibility of the associations, so they bring someone forward. We encourage you to ask that the representative bodies, that you get the academic representative in consensus with them. Although they are responsible we would like you to decide this together. For the other three positions in the EB (chair, secretary, treasure) this is up to students themselves. We hope you encourage new board remembers or other students to be candidates, but this is up to them to send statements. For the AC chair and SC chair, this can only be people who will be part of the academic board and social board. These students go through the election process like the other three EB members, so they will also have to send in a statement. Any questions? No. If you have any other questions, let us know, send an email and we will get back to you.

Helene: For the PM, today we will try to get to a consensus. Once its been approved at the individual Member GA's, then only can be vote at the UCSRN GA. We want to approve of the full PM on the 12th of June. So we would like to ask if the PM could go through your individual GA's before this date. We understand this is difficult. So we would like to receive an email from each UC to see if this can work out so we can plan around this.

Arlet UCR: The first GA that we have is the 4th week of September. We cannot call for a GA, as the last week is the 13th of May.

Helene: If it doesn't go through the GA, then we can't vote on the UCSRN PM at the election GA. If possible we would like to discuss with you because we of course want to complete the PM this year. If not, then that's not possible. But we would like the next year to start with a full PM and be able to focus on events without this extra workload.

Social Committee Update

Felice: Welcome everyone, thank you for coming and specifically thank you for those who were here last week. I am very pleased with how the tournament went. I can see that each individual UC enlarged their school spirit through fighting but the main goal was to unite which has been accomplished. I've seen loads of happy faces, especially in photos that I've seen, so I am very pleased and want to thank you again. However there is also something that isn't so fun that we need to draw our attention to. Some of our people have been very rude towards people organising. Some people have thrown plastic cups at those who were cleaning up and screamed at people who weren't helped immediately and in that sense I am disappointed in UC students as our campus was trashed and we got very little help. In that sense I want to give a special shout out to UCT and UCG, they were great and helped out and did a great job uniting when working together. In general I am very happy for how it went down and we are very excited for the summer event that will be at UCR on the beach and I think it will be a great opportunity to come together again. We are also busy working on transition to make sure that all the events next year are going to be even better than this year.

Academic Committee Update

Helene: As you might have seen Danielle isn't here. I will be doing the AC update. For the AC we are now trying to fully focus on the project for the transition to master programs in the Netherlands. This for example means meeting in Amsterdam for admission programs in Europe and how that works as well that we have been discussing with influential people and deans. On the 18th of May we have a deans meeting to discuss what they can do for us and how they can be more involved in the project. For the journal its going well although there have been some issues on getting enough pieces for creative writing which is a shame, but they are working on editing and publishing now and we hope to be done very soon.

Policy Manual

Helene: You have all received three colour ballots. The green is for if you approve, the pink is for if you don't approve, and the blue one is if you want to abstain. If I am correct you have received 6 ballots in total. We are going to show the PM on stage, Stefanie will make amendments, but I want to keep the speed going. We have seen the PM a few times and you've been able to send in comments over the months. I hope that the small additions will move quickly. To make an amendment clearly state your proposal per article, there is time for a short questions and discussion if its essential. We will ask for objections and if not we will change it. We will end with a vote.

Section 4. Finances

Helene: Are there any points to be raised on section 4.1.

Anna UCR: Reads article 4.1.2. Do delegates receive compensation?

Helene: we see reimbursement and compensation differently. Reimbursements and compensations are a different definition. Compensation is gifts, not financial.

Arlet UCR: Can we make an amendment to say monetary compensation?

Helene: Okay, does anyone have an objection to changing financial to monetary?

Daan UCR: Do you state anywhere else in the PM for reimbursements for delegates?

Helene: The reimbursement for the delegates for travel cost has been voted for this year in the budget GA, this does need to go through the budget GA every year, we don't know how many other UCs might join or what kind of costs others will have in the future. Think about the OV for example, we don't know that, and thus we vote on it every year.

Helene: No other questions, I would like to move on to 4.2.

Helene: Any questions or amendments on 4.2.1 through 4.2.3?

Helene: No questions.

Helene: 4.2.4? Any questions or amendments?

Helene: No questions or amendments.

Arlet UCR: Can you scroll up a little bit more. When a member decides to propose a membership fee. The steps that have to be taken is only if they are not able to pay the membership fee.

Helene: No, it literally means, it does not include whether a UC can or cannot pay. The second line says: the proposal clearly states why the member is not able to pay.

Arlet UCR: But it says will not be able to pay. But what if a UC wants to reduce it for a different reason because they don't want to pay the full. When a member wants to propose a membership fee reduction it should apply to everyone because some UC's will then want to reduce the fee

Helene: That is a very good question.

Stefanie: Membership fees will be decided on anyway, in the first year.

Arlet UCR: But then you are running into the problem with point 4, which is also the same problem.

Helene: Shall I then change the second line to: the proposal clearly states why the member is applying for a membership fee reduction? It would then read: the proposal clearly states why the member is applying for a membership fee reduction.

Arlet UCR: But then its true where you decide that not every UC pays the same amount while we don't know if they can pay in the future and their motives behind it.

Stefanie: It is also membership fee reduction in comparison to the other members.

Helene: I see your point but the membership fee, if they decide to all have a different membership fee, it will be voted on in the budget GA. We cannot say that they will all be equal.

Arlet UCR: But you have to apply for it the first 14 days before the GA.

Helene: Of course, the budget will be sent out, before the membership fee reduction must be discussed already.

Stefanie: We aim that every member pays the same.

Arlet UCR: If you say it cant change you are limiting yourself for the future

Helene: You are right; this is a very good point we should bring up to the next board.

Anna UCR: In the second sub clause could you change apply to is applying.

Helene: Any objections to changing apply to “is applying”? No objections.

Camilla UCR: Could we just read out all the articles because it goes

Helene: I understand, we already sent out the policy manual way before, and it has been sent out again. We saw last time that we couldn't finish the agenda and it is important to keep a certain speed. I can read it out but it will take a lot longer.

Daan UCR: Related to Camilla's questions could you wait a little longer before moving on the next section.

Helene: Will wait a little bit longer to move onto the next section.

Section 4.3

Anna UCR: Question concerning financial reimbursement outside of committees, my point is that this is not included. There is a section missing. There should be reimbursement for delegates who are not part of the committee.

Helene: You are saying we should add reimbursement for delegates who are not part of a committee.

Stefanie: How we pictured it, in a GA there are social representatives who take care of that.

Anna UCR: I am concerned that this should be included

Helene: If I say it correctly, your concern is that reimbursement for non-social or academic committee members is a problem?

Anna UCR: I don't think it will be a problem I just think now its unclear about who they should go about it for clarity sake we should add a sub clause of how it could be done- like through committee representative.

Stefanie: In the GA part we have that all requests for reimbursements need to be sent to the treasurer.

Helene: For the whole section of the finances, is there anything you feel is missing or should be added to this section? Than this is the time to bring this up

Arlet UCR: Maybe also the financial within the committee because it says we submit a proposal to the board but it doesn't say how its done within the committee. WE don't know how the academic committee works with the budget and who is responsible so should this be outlined?

Helene: The thing is, the part about the task of the treasurer includes all reimbursements and all financial administration. Anything the committee will submit as a proposal for finances or budget will go to, in this case, Stefanie. For the AC right now we did not have a set treasurer, but it worked out well because we have a treasurer. It is important in the future that we have everything go through the treasurer, she is now in the committee, but in the future she is not. But it is important that the EB can keep an eye through the treasurer.

Arlet UCR: should you also appoint a committee treasurer?

Helene: We state it in such a way that we always have to receive a budget proposal.

Helene: So we have our first vote of the Day! For section 4 Finances we are going to continue to a vote. If you vote in favour you are saying I would approve of the section, then you put up the green ballot. If you are against you would disapprove of the section, you put up the pink one. If you wish to abstain you put up the blue one.

Josephine UCG: do you want proxy votes and normal votes at the same time.

Helene: The people that have proxy votes, you have six ballots per UC maximum, each person can vote only one proxy. Maximum per person is then two.

In favour: 41

Against: 0

Abstaining: 0

Helene: I therefore approve of the PM section 4 Finances

Section 5: General assemblies

Helene: To give you guys more time we will do this per 2 articles and then continue as this may be more chill for you guys. Are there any questions or additions to 5.1 and 5.2? I would like to add that 5.2 has been added because we believe it's very important that we have a good representation to all UC's.

Minutes Summit 24-04-16

Sara UCT: Is it correct that you could theoretically make decisions with 3 people present?

Helene: We round up. It says: at least two thirds.

Sara UCT: Then it would still be only 5 people

Helene: 5.2 is the last added policy manual addition. It is important we have good representation of all UC's; we have seen before that due to transportation difficulties UCM could not be here. We don't want it to be a valid GA if there are four UC's missing.

Helene: At least 2/3rds of the UC's are represented by one delegate, we have 8 UC's so we need at least 6 people.

Sara UCT: Could you send a minimum number of people?

Helene: We were thinking about making it more than 1 delegate but that is also not practical. We also need to be flexible. I would say that its also responsibility of the member UC's to send people. But in theory you could have a GA with 6 people present.

Arlet UCR: but then you have the problem where you could have one UC with 6 people present and the other with only 1 so one UC could make all the decisions.

Helene: We think it is the responsibility of the UC's as well, that there are enough delegates. We considered making the rule to be more than one delegate but this is not always practical. In that sense I would really say it is really the responsibility of the members and the UC's to send people. Theoretically yes, we could have a GA with five people present. But you do make a good point. Sara would you like to make an amendment?

Sara UCT: I think its okay

Helene: Can we move on to 5.3? Or are there further questions?

Helene: Any questions on 5.3 and 5.4?

Josephine UCG: Should we state something about how many votes each UC has?

Helene: In the statutes it says each member has six delegates. Any other questions?

Valerie UCT: Is there anything mentioned about the board of the UCSRN having to send out documents in a specific period?

Helene: That is a very good point in our statutes. It is not in the PM because it is in the statutes and the statutes are binding.

Daan UCR: 5.4 says resolutions. What are resolutions in this sense?

Helene: Resolutions, we have them in the definition section. Resolutions means, if you want to make a whole new addition to the PM. A new rule added to the PM. An amendment is a motion to change something that is already in the PM.

Daan UCR: What is the difference between a motion and a resolution. I don't see why you need to present a new thing here.

Response Helene: I see your point that there is no difference.

Response Stefanie: It's a point for the EB to make it as structured and affective as possible.

Helene: We haven't used "motion" in the PM. We use resolution instead of motion. We can change the wording to motion, are there any objections?

Daan UCR: we can then propose to change it to motion.

Helene: The difference is that in motion, we refer to a verbal motion in a GA. Maybe we should define more clearly the difference, in our definition section.

Daan UCR: I propose to add motion to the resolution section

Helene: Very good point. Any other questions on 5.3 or 5.4?

Helene: Moving on to 5.5 and 5.6.

Anna UCR: I would propose to omit the particular in clause 5.6 . It doesn't add anything

Helene: Any objections to taking out the word particular? No objections. Any other questions?

Daan UCR: I think point 5.6- I think 10% of the delegates is too small of an amount so it should be a simple majority. I would propose to change it to a simple majority of the delegates.

Helene: I see your point, this is a point where UC's have very polarized opinions, some want it to not be in there at all, some want 20 or 30 percent. We tried to find a midway; maybe someone else would like to respond with a reason to not up from 10 percent.

Stefanie: 10% is, in terms of UC's, could be one UC. If you have one UC that really feels strongly about the IB. We should give the IB and this one UC the possibility to vote this in by themselves.

Helene: We imagine this situation might happen if there is a conflict between the board and a UC. If there are people that feel very strong about having the IB lead the GA as an impartial party that is why we put it in.

Daan UCR: I understand that you would want the possibility to be there but then I think you give too much power to one UC, then there are also 7 other UC's that disagree. Other decisions made have a simple majority so I think it should be consistent

Tine UCU: Maybe I misunderstood but its only the proposing that is voted on and then it still has to go through the voting, so if other people think it's bull shit it still has to be voted upon. So you still need the majority

Ayla UCU: if one UC can compromise, or they have a delegate that can't represent the whole UC, shouldn't we change...

Helene: As you can see in the last rule, it says, this decision shall be made by a simple majority vote at the beginning of a GA. But the proposal requires 10%.

Daan UCR: Then why not take out the whole clause at all is there needs to be simple majority in any case. So I propose to take out the third. I don't see why you need the 10% threshold.

Helene: I understand what you are saying but we have chosen to have six because then we can think about the differences within a UC. If you take ten percent it can be one UC, but it can also be two delegates from UCR, two from UCU, and two from UCM. Please note that because it is about the delegates, at the moment the decision shall be taken by means of simple majority vote. We have a certain amount of delegates in total. We have 48 delegates. Ten percent, right now, means five delegates.

Helene: so your proposal now would be to change the point 3 to a delegate. Does anyone have an objection?

Emma UCG: I think the 10% is good. First Daan said it should be one UC but now that its one delegate there should be more before you initiate such a proposal

Daan UCR: Any proposal can be brought up by one delegate so this is different, and if it needs to be approved by a simple majority anyway, why do we have a threshold anyway? You don't have a threshold for other decision that could have an impact. I don't see the point

Helene: She was saying that at first, it was one UC, now it is only one delegate, it should be more before you initiate such a proposal.

Tine UCU: I agree with Daan on this point, If we have a threshold on this we should have a threshold on anything. If you need a part of the people to agree on it, then at least not everything is brought to the GA. I think it should be 10% but I think we should change 5.4 as well then.

Helene: Okay, to explain the difference: It is that 5.6, leading the GA by a different person, is not what the PM says earlier, where the chair should always lead the GA unless they are unable to. The difference in this regard is between something that goes

against the PM and something that, of course we want everyone to bring their resolutions to the GA.

Daan UCR: Are you then saying that this clause is then against the statutes

Helene: This clause is not against the statutes. It opens up for this kind of procedure.

Felice: Article 12.15: The chairperson of the board will chair the GA, in the event that the chair is not available, another board member shall take up its position, unless the GA decides otherwise. The “otherwise” opens up the opportunity for the clause as we constructed it now.

Daan UCR: so this whole clause is actually not even necessary then. Because it already gives an opportunity to do so, and if you put it like this then it's no different than what's in the statutes. This is another decision as explained in the GA unless you want to create awareness then I would keep it in

Helene: It doesn't change anything, correct. The PM is meant to complement and explain the statutes further, this is why this article is in here, to complement statutes that do not specify who would bring this to the GA or how this procedure would go. I think we heard your point. Let's vote on a change. Would you like to state your proposal to change?

Daan UCR: My proposal is to change 5.6 part 3 into a delegate instead of 10% of the delegates

Helene: The amendment is to change 5.6 part 3 into “a delegate” instead of “10% of delegates.”

Arlet UCR: I am still wondering why did you specifically ask for a member of the IB to lead the GA because the gap is opened sure, but you hereby fill it up with an IB but why?

Felice: Shall we first vote on the amendment and then go on to discussing your question?

Proposal of changing 10% of the delegates into a delegate

Helene: In favour of the amendment, please raise green ballot. Everyone who is against, please raise pink ballot. Abstentions please raise blue ballot.

In favour: 11

Against: 29

Abstain: 0

Helene: Therefore we do not change this proposal; it will stay “10% of all delegates.”

Arlet UCR: I had a question behind the reasoning behind if the chair is not there and the board isn't there, why you would fill it up with IB?

Helene: As our statutes say that something like “don't want to do it” is not a possibility, in the case that they cannot. We made this decision because the IB knows the statutes more than any other party aside from the board. They will be objective and we imagine this situation to arise when for example the board is in conflict with a member or something will be voted upon in which the board can not be objective. The IB is there to be objective and that is why we chose the IB.

Helene: I would like to move on to 5.7 and 5.8. Any questions or amendments to 5.7 or 5.8?

Helene: Any objections to continuing? No.

5.9, 5.10 and 5.11

Anna UCR: In 5.10 the second time a delegate is mentioned its not capitalised for consistency I think it should be

Helene: No one objects, I suppose? Thank you for correcting it. Any other questions?

Anna UCR: In 5.11 it says votes will be counted by the IB, but what if the IB leads the GA?

Helene: That is a very good point, which I do not have an answer to.

Daan UCU: If the GA is led by the IB, its not led by the IB as a whole on the chair, so the rest of the IB is still there to count the votes.

Helene: In this sense, according to the PM as we have it now, the answer is yes. The question is then, is this something we want?

Arlet UCR: I propose to 5.10 to the absent delegate must notify the IB and the board in written form before the GA.

Helene: Okay, any objections to changing this? No.

Sara UCT: about this same article, clause 5.9 - for example our board only consists of 5 people but we have 6 votes. We don't have an absent delegate and we are just using the 6th vote, so there is not person that could notify the board that they are not there.

Helene: I understand, however the delegates are not restricted to your board. Each UC has six delegates; this can be a student that is not in your board. I understand your difficulty. What would your proposal be?

Sara UCT: I think it should just be clarified- should we have chosen a 6th delegate at some point- because we didn't.

Helene: It says in our statutes that you have six delegates; it is your responsibility to have six. You make a good point that delegates are flexible, no names attached for a year. We will discuss further how we will proceed with that.

Anouk AUC: I was wondering; now it says it must be in written formation, but they don't have an email address...

Helene: No, it is being set up. We don't have an IB, so that is why it is really good that we must notify the board and the IB.

Camilla UCR: what we have at UCR, we have elections at UCR and they can apply for the delegate position to be voted upon by the GA.

Helene: I think that illustrates that each UC is welcome to figure out how to distribute their six votes themselves.

Emma UCG: In the former version of the article, 5.10, it was stated that it could be signed by the voter and the absent delegate, and I want to include this because it doesn't say that the delegate has permission by the voter to vote on their behalf. There is no evidence

Helene: I think that is the point that Sara just brought that you might not have six delegates, it is important that we know if someone will have two votes. However it is not a disaster if someone is sick or unavailable. Are there any more questions or additions to 5.9, 5.10, or 5.11?

Mark UCR: in article 5.10 you say as stated in the article 12.21 in the statutes- I think you are referring to 12.10. I don't have a 12.21.

Felice: My version of the statutes does have 12.21 in it....

Helene: It is 12.10

Helene: Any more questions or amendments to 5.9, 5.10, and 5.11? No.

Helene: Anything to add to section 5 as a whole? No, then we will continue.

Helene: Vote on Section 5: General Assemblies, of the PM. Green for approval, pink for disapproval, blue for abstention.

In Favour: 40

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Section 6: Election

Helene: Any questions or additions to 6.1 and 6.2? No questions or additions. Continue to 6.3 and 6.4.

Helene: Any questions or additions to 6.3 and 6.4?

Camilla UCR: I have a question on 6.3- It will be announced at least 8 weeks before the opening. Does this mean an invitation via email or on Facebook?

Helene: it shall be announced two weeks in advance, that is already set. Any publication can be through email, so it will be through email. Any member shall be officially invited too, two weeks in advance. As you have seen before, it might be difficult to find a location two weeks in advance. It is important to have the Election GA date set two months in advance. Some UC's have their GA's earlier than others, some UC's have their GAs later than others. That is why we chose to have this rule.

Daan UCR: We already discussed this section at the last GA

Helene: During the last GA we received 3 articles, and a lot of useful feedback.

Victoria UCM: What is ARB?

Helene: ARB is the Academic Representative Bodies

Felice: The social boards are the members.

Helene: Any other questions on 6.3 and 6.4? Okay, moving on.

Helene: Any questions on 6.5 and 6.6? Any additions? No.

Helene: 6.7 and 6.8?

Vera UCU: It says that the candidate may write an election statement. Why is it open?

Helene: That is because it will be, of course in favour, to write a statement, however if a candidate chooses not to do so, it is up to them to do so or not. If you make it binding, you could, we did not see the need. Also then we already make a distinction between people who made a statement and who haven't, if we look at similar rules at individual UC's, this is in line with most of the UC's.

Thomas UCM: For 6.8- "reads 6.8". Not to offend anyone, personally if you run for the EB you should be present at the election GA. I think the PM should state that you should be present in some form at the election GA.

Helene: Okay, we chose to do it in this way, because, for example, Saskia had to do it through official letter because she was in a play and it was difficult to be present in any way. Video message is not always available. That explains why we chose to do it this way. Anyone who would like to add to Thomas' point?

Daan UCR: There are many reasons why you couldn't be present so I am not agreeing with Thomas.

Helene: You are not agreeing to Thomas? Okay. Then, Thomas, would you still like to propose an amendment?

Thomas UCM: No

Minutes Summit 24-04-16

Helene: Any other questions or additions to these sections?

Vera UCU: Would it be possible to say that either a letter or a statement if you are unable to present in any form.

Helene: I understand what you are saying; right now it is obligatory to have such as a video message or an official letter.

Thomas UCU: you wouldn't be running for EB if you didn't do one of the 2

Stefanie: It is up to the GA to vote for whom they want.

Helene: We leave it up to the GA. Vera, would you still like to propose an amendment? No. Okay. Other questions or additions? No. Okay.

Helene: 6.9 and 6.10? Any questions or additions?

Josephine UCR: in 6.10 it says that you can have one anonymous votes, but if you're proxy voting then you have 2 additional votes...

Helene: All delegates have the right to cast one anonymous vote, if you are doing proxy voting, then, yeah.

Daan UCR: with 6.11 if there is 1 person running for a position....

Helene: They will always need a simple majority; every vote at a GA requires a simple majority. This only adds to the rule.

Helene: Then, 6.12? Any questions or additions to 6.12? No. Then we are moving on to a vote.

Helene: Is there anything that you feel is missing, after last GA we tried to implement everything that you thought was missing.

Arlet UCR: I think I may be missing it- at our UC we have the option of disapprove all if you don't want any of the people running. It's not about not voting for them

Helene: As far as we consider, abstaining is disapproving of all the candidates.

Arlet UCR: I would then put it on the ballot to disapprove. Abstaining is different notion. It should be in the PM. The opportunity should be there and something for the board to think about

Helene: Okay, that is a very good note. It will be communicated to the next board.

Kevin LUC: What is the case when there is an exact tie?

Helene: That is a very good question; it is a question each association handles differently. In a tie vote, we usually do a revote.

Kevin LUC: but even if you do take a revote, and there are an equal number of delegates again than what happens?

Stefanie: A lot of associations do a separate GA if there is a tie vote. We deemed this impossible, as it is already difficult to have one GA, this cannot happen. We decided to have another vote during the same GA.

Helene: According to 6.12, in the case of a tie vote between two or more candidates, a new vote will be held excluding the option of abstaining.

Kevin LUC: But what if there is still a tie vote again and again...

Helene: That is true, this is also true for the separate associations with the same problem of running into recurring tie votes. We do not want to have a new GA, as this is really difficult for the UCSRN, therefore it will be at the same GA. At the point this would happen, think about more questions from the audience or extra debates. This is highly dependent on the situation though.

Helene: Any more questions, additions to the whole of section 6?

Helene: Voting on Section 6, in favour: green, disapprove: pink, abstain: blue.

In Favour: 42

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Helene: Okay, I would like to invite you to get lunch at the back, take your time to eat something. We will take about half an hour before we call you guys back.

Section 7 Transitions

Helene: We would like to start again. The next section to go over is section 7: transition. We received a lot of comments in written form. We have amended most of these.

Helene: 7.1 and 7.2, any questions or additions? Okay, we will continue.

Helene: Any questions or additions to 7.3 and 7.4?

Anna UCR: It says the board but I think it should say the new board

Helene: The board refers to the board, you can refer to it as the New board, it refers to the board in transition.

Daan UCR: How is clause 7.4 still necessary with clause 7.2?

Helene: The difference is that, although for the work it is not strictly necessary to understand the structures of the different UC's, we specifically put it in because it is

important and it gives more understanding to where people come from if you understand the structure of the bodies, do you think it is redundant?

Daan UCR: I think its important but should be covered by necessary knowledge. Its fine if you leave it in but I'm wondering about the added value

Arlet UCR: Reads article 7.1: I am having trouble understanding why you would limit it because it would encourage the board to drop the UCSRN as soon as they are done. Either it could be not specified or it needs to be extended.

Helene: You make a good point, I would like to note that we chose to set up an Advisory Body, we think the AB is always available for questions and advice and would like to give this responsibility to that body. Some people might leave the country and we would say that the transition period is difficult to follow if it was longer or is not specified. Any other questions or additions?

Helene: 7.5 and 7.6, any questions or additions?

Helene: 7.7 and 7.8, any questions or additions? Okay.

Aram AUC: Change to are required

Daan UCR: There is also a period missing after 7.5

Helene: Any other questions or additions to 7.7 and 7.8?

Kevin LUC: Still on 7.5 (reads 7.5)- is this solely during the transition period or throughout?

Helene: We did keep it open in that regard because we think of course it should be open for questions, we did not specify transition period here. Do you think we should change it?

Kevin LUC: I wouldn't change it per se but it would mean that there is a certain point in time where they are not obliged? It was just a general question

Helene: According to the article right now, yes. Any other questions for 7.7 or 7.8?

Daan UCR: I believe there is nothing in here about the AC and SC transition is this on purpose or is this something that should be added. The board does not include the SC and AC but does include the chair positions.

Helene: The board refers to both the EB and the committees.

Daan UCR: But the committees themselves are not elected by delegates

Helene: As we interpret the rule and as we discuss it with Tessa from the previous rule, the intent is to include the academic and social committees as they are also elected by the associations for the UCSRN.

Stefanie: Not in that sense, but obviously the chair is a part of it. They are responsible for the transition of their committee as well.

Daan UCR: yes, but the committees are not just the chair. I think the whole committee should have a transition

Felice: do you have a concrete proposal?

Daan UCR: I think there should be a whole new clause that says the committees have a transition

Helene: Okay. Like we have said before, there is the initial problem that, we consider the representatives to be part of "The Board", this is how it was intended in the statutes and is how we have been using it. I understand that it does not explicitly state committee but the representatives are elected for the board by the UCSRN and therefore are included in this.

Daan UCR: I understand what you mean but I don't agree with it as committees are not elected by delegates

Stefanie: You want the board to design everything to include members of the committees?

Daan UCR: The board doesn't include all of the committee members.

Helene: In our interpretation, that is already included.

Daan UCR: I just want to say then that your interpretation is too broad. If you forget about that then you have to add committees in there

Aram AUC: First question does the EB think that we need to have transition for the committees? If, yes this is fine, if no then just add a sentence explaining that the chairs are responsible

Helene: We do think the committees should be included.

Helene: Are there objections to this addition to 7.2?

Emma UCG: Please add respectively

Daan UCR: Add new- for the AC and the SC

Helene: Anything else to add or change to section 7?

Helene: Vote for section 7, in favour, green, disapprove, pink, abstain, blue.

In Favour: 38

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Helene: We have approved section 7 of the PM.

Section 8: The Independent Body

Helene: Now we come to section 8, this is a section where we had a lot of comments that were complete opposites, please raise any points of discussion through the GA right now. As we can see 8.1.1 is something already in the statutes, however several UC's requested to put it in the PM regardless, therefore it is included in the proposal.

Helene: Any questions or additions to 8.1.1, 8.1.2, and 8.1.3? Okay, continue to 8.2.

Helene: Does anyone have questions or additions to section 8.2?

Arlet UCR: With an exception of members of representatives- I don't understand.

Helene: Sorry- fixed it. Any other questions

Helene: Okay, any other questions or additions to section 8.2? Continuing on.

Helene: We had a lot of requests to separate auditing and IB responsibilities, however this was included in the statutes last year and we would like to keep our statutes. Any comments on 8.3?

Mark UCR: Maybe I missed it, how exactly is an IB chair chosen?

Helene: They are chosen amongst themselves

Mark UCR: shouldn't this be mentioned somewhere?

Helene: Felice can you check the statutes? This is not included in the statutes. Does anyone object to adding an 8.1.4 that says the IB chooses their own chair.

Arlet UCR: I think the word elect would work better

Helene: Does anyone object to using the word 'elect'? No, okay. Does anyone object to adding 8.1.4 as it is written here? No.

Tine UCU: As you mentioned there were quite some comments on the – UCSA would like to ask the EB to take this into account and explain this during transition so the new board knows how to tackle this next year and perhaps make any changes that need to be made

Helene: Thank you, we will take this into the board book.

Helene: Any other questions or additions to 8.3?

Arlet UCR: what are the consequences when the audit gets disapproved for any individual members because it means that something got fucked up in finances basically.

Helene: I think that is covered by the article that is already in the board member, that they cannot fulfill their role, to be voted by the GA what the consequences are.

Helene: Any other question on 8.3? No, okay. Continuing on.

Helene: Any questions or additions to 8.4.1 or 8.4.2?

Anna UCR: I'm wondering for clause 8.4.2; is one week enough time to inform the IB? Shouldn't it be longer?

Helene: We chose to do it within one week, this was a point where some said it should be short, and others believed it should be long. It differed between 24 hours and two weeks. We chose to sit in the middle.

Anna UCR: I think two weeks would be an improvement

Helene: Your proposal is to change "within one week" to "within two weeks". Is there anyone who would like to respond to this?

Aram AUC: Well, why? I'm asking because the UCSRN is an inefficient operation with all the UC's so the faster the better.

Anna UCR: That is a valid point

Mark UCR: I personally am of the opinion that if something happens that the person can be deemed worthy of the complaint. If there person is hesitant to put in a complaint they need to have the time to think about it properly and I think this isn't a nice way to handle students especially with situations like this.

Stefanie: If you consider decisions such as financial decisions, a week is already quite long. Especially considering that the UCSRN has big events and decisions are taken close to the events. A longer time will be inefficient and can bring a risk to the events. That is why I would like to leave it at one week.

Helene: I think we have two very good arguments; therefore I would like a vote. We are going to vote on the change. Voting in favour means changing from one week to two weeks, vote against means staying at one week, abstain is no opinion.

In Favour: 16

Against: 20

Abstain: 6

Helene: As we vote by simple majority it will stay at one week.

Helene: Any questions on 8.4.1 and 8.4.2?

Inky UCU: What happens if you find out after this period of time that you don't agree with the decision. Is there any way you can still change this with the IB?

Helene: There are rules that you can always bring anything to the GA or appeal to the IB or bring forward that you do not feel the board is doing their role. At this point it is open to the IB to see if they want to go forward with it or not.

Mark UCR: the way you put it the answer is no and the way you phrased it goes against the policy manual

Helene: Based on the fact that you can always appeal to if the board is fulfilling their role and you can always bring forward to the GA you are always open to bring in your opinion. Under this article it is true that not everything is immediately taken into account but the IB can still decide yes or no.

Mark UCR: I think then that the opening would then only be about a complaint saying the UCSRN doesn't fulfil its role and then you can't complain towards a decision specifically. Then the content of the complaint would not be the same.

Helene: It is true that it is slightly different.

Anna UCR: What is the point of this clause then if you can always appeal to the IB or the GA. Then why is this there as a rule? It should be as a guideline instead of how it is put right now.

Helene: Okay, would anyone like to respond to that? Are there any concrete proposals or amendments?

Anna UCR: Maybe just say as a guideline or in principle in front of the whole thing

Helene: For 8.4.2, you would like to be included "in principle," Any objections to this change? No.

Helene: Continuing, any questions or amendments to 8.4.3 and 8.4.4?

Anna UCR: 8.4.3 (read aloud)- I'm concerned that this should be longer because it's hard to find a date for all parties involved so I think it should be 6 weeks.

Helene: Anyone who would like to respond or has further questions? I think in this regard, Aram made a point before on efficiency in decision taking; it is indeed difficult to organize anything within three weeks. However, it should be considered that if a decision is objected to, you make the decision because you need something to happen. Waiting six more weeks to reject a decision or not

Anna UCR: Well saying that it must take place within 6 weeks. It can take place within 2 weeks. By making it 6 weeks you give yourself more time and flexibility to get a hearing earlier than 6 weeks.

Stefanie: Changed the rule to "at least within six weeks" rather than "within three weeks."

Anna UCR: I think so this works for me

Helene: Any objections to this change?

Aram AUC: I would like to. The efficiency of the UCSRN is a big deal and I get the feeling UCR doesn't want this to be here at all. I really fail to see the problem here- 3 weeks come on. I really think this is ridiculous.

Helene: Can we not make assumptions about commitments of other UC's to the UCSRN.

Tine UCU: I argue against what UCR said. If you think about 6 weeks- this is half a semester and a very long time. If this were to happen in January only in April or something could you bring his to a GA. There might be a new board and many things can happen. I think that 6 weeks is too long and we need to focus on efficiency

Helene: Note that we are talking about a hearing, not a GA. This has not been identified as a GA with all UC's present; it is a hearing between the IB.

Tine UCU: Even more so then because even if it is decided that this should go to the GA then you're speaking about the new year.

Anna UCR: I don't understand the problem that much because I don't understand why you would want to limit yourself and give yourself more flexibility. I do agree it should be as soon as possible. That's my point.

Helene: Okay, would anyone like to add anything? Then I would like to call a vote on this point.

Helene: In favour means changing the wording to "as soon as possible, at least within six weeks", against means keeping the wording "within three weeks".

In favour: 7

Against: 27

Abstain: 8

Helene: By simple majority, the rule will stay as it is.

Helene: Any other questions on 8.4.3 and 8.4.4?

Helene: Any questions on 8.4.5 and 8.4.6?

Mark UCR: I would like to change 8.4.5 to include the committees.

Helene: Any objections to the change? Please repeat.

Mark UCR: Just include the board, the social and academic committee.

Minutes Summit 24-04-16

Stefanie: The UCSRN also refers to the Members.

Helene: Any objections to this change?

Akelei UCG: Why are we redefining it here. It's just a waste of space.

Helene: As we explained before, there is a misunderstanding between us as to what that rule means. The rule does not explicitly include the committees but includes everyone that is elected by the delegates by the UCSRN.

Mark UCR: We would like to change it to the board and the committees.

Helene: Vote on adding "as well as the AC and SC" within 8.4.5.

In favour: 26

Against: 8

Abstain: 6

Helene: Any other questions on 8.4.5 and 8.4.6?

Daan UCR: I have a general comment. According to Tessa Van Hoorn the board does not include the committees.

Small timeout to talk amongst the executive board.

Helene: For now we will stick to the definition of the board such as Mark has explained, which is the five people. We will check with the notary as there seems to be some communication issues. As well as checking the decisions made previously, when the statutes were approved. To make sure the clauses adhere to the statutes as well.

Helene: Anything else on 8.4.4 and 8.4.5? No. Moving on.

Helene: Any questions or amendments to 8.4.6, 8.4.7, and 8.4.8?

Mark UCR: 8.4.7, I'm wondering how confidentiality ties into this. Because some people will not want their complaint and information to be shared with the whole GA.

Helene: Of course it says, the IBs decision will be presented, not the person who complained.

Daan UCU: I agree that it should be added that it's the IB's decision within the GA but confidentiality should be upheld

Mark UCR: maybe to have the clause- upholding the confidentiality that the complainant requests

Daan UCU: Perhaps it would be good to change it into- taking personal confidentiality into account, ...

Helene: any objections to this change. Any other questions or additions?

Anna UCR: In 8.4.8 I was wondering- doesn't this clause go against clause 8.1.3 as the IB is independent Does this not clash? Since the IB is independent, I was wondering if it contradicts whether it can be

Arlet UCR: According to the statues the highest body of the UCSRN is the GA so the GA should be able to overthrow any body that contradicts it and can therefore overthrow decisions made by the IB.

Helene: Any additions or questions about section 8 as a whole?

Helene: Moving on to a vote on section 8.

In favour: 42

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Section 9: Advisory Body

Helene: We would like to go over the definition section, after the discussion on section 9. No objections.

Helene: This section is on the AB, any questions or additions to 9.1 and 9.2?

Josephine UCG: maybe it's a good idea to say that it needs an old treasurer. For 9.2 maybe something like the AB exits of at least three members, of at least one that has previous experience treasuring.

Helene: Amendment proposed for one member of the AB to require "experience with treasuring."

Mark UCR: I don't see what is sufficient experience then. You can be part of a committee or you can do it personally, but how do we define experience

Helene: "Experience with treasuring" means treasurer of an association or the UCSRN.

Josephine UCG: in our association we didn't have anyone with any experience and it was great to talk to others who did have the experience, so I think that having been the treasurer of one type of association was helpful.

Stefanie: You can run into practical problems, if there are no willing treasurers to take up this position.

Josephine UCG: I think it's of great value

Arlet UCR: you have at least 7 associations, all of which have a treasurer. Not only our social associations but also associations that aren't the study associations so then you have quite a large pool

Tine UCU: I thought we were also talking about being a former board member or is it any other board member.

Stefanie: I think this is more of an issue to deal with in transition, not the AB.

Helene: As it is now, anyone with treasurer experience in an association.

Tine UCU: I agree with Stefanie, I think yes its good for the experiencing, but what you want is people who are there to put in time and commitment. And I would favour those people who do have the time and the UCSRN could always find help outside of the UCSRN

Daan UCR: To negate this problem you could always recommend it but not make it mandatory.

Helene: Okay, we will address this in the board book. Any other questions or additions 9.1 or 9,2?

Josephine UCG: I do agree that it's better to have as a recommendation

Helene: Any questions or additions on 9.3 or 9.4? Okay, moving on.

Helene: Any questions or additions on 9.5 or 9.6?

Tine UCU: Maybe I'm mistaken but I have the feeling that we don't know how the people of the advisory body are chosen; how are they decided upon? Does the GA or the board decide this? Maybe we should add that?

Helene: Okay, what is your proposal?

Tine UCU: I would say that the advisory body can step down and that its up to the board to select them, it shouldn't be brought to the GA.

Stefanie: We interpreted this as the board together with the current AB being responsible. Any changes to this will be presented to the GA.

Tine UCU: Oh yea

Felice: It is also mentioned in 9.4. Indeed the articles together make, the board proposes AB members to the GA and the GA votes on them being approved.

Helene: Any other questions on 9.3 and 9.4?

Helene: Any other questions on 9.5 and 9.6?

Minutes Summit 24-04-16

Helene: Any questions or additions on 9.7, 9.8 and 9.9? No.

Helene: Any additions to Section 9 as a whole? No.

Helene: Vote for section 9 as a whole.

In Favour: 42

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Helene: Then this part is also finalised. Although the definition section has been shown in the past GA, we would like to show you again, but I don't know if there are any questions. Would anyone object to showing you the definition section again?

Helene: What is most important today is to show the definition on motions and resolutions. Motions shall be put forward during a GA, resolutions are written motions and include anything that can be introduced as a motion. This is taken from a dictionary with the addition that motions are introduced during a GA.

Daan UCR: Does it state somewhere what representative is? If it's referred to then we should probably add it. It's not in the statutes.

Josephine UCG: it does say so in the structure of the UCSRN.

Helene: We can include "representative" in the definitions section. Would anyone like to propose an addition?

Daan UCR: I am fine with it not being defined now; I would just like the board to think about it

Emma UCG: In 14: It should be delegates.

Helene: Any other questions on the Definitions section? No. Continue to Open Floor.

Josephine UCG: We as the SC have gift bags for the UCSA board and for the tournament team. If you come up here we can give this to you guys! We want to thank you for all the hard work you did and the rest of the UCSA board. We only had positive feedback so thank you very much. This is the bag for the tournament team

Stefanie: It's from all UC's! And this is for the UCSA board!

Stefanie: One last point from the tournament, we have medals to give out for the UC's to take home.

Helene: Any other points for the open floor? No, Then I would like to remind you to send in when your next GA is so we can make sure everything works out so we can discuss it. We have to wait for the medals, but I would like to close our meeting for today and thank you all for being here today.

