

**Notes Extraordinary General Members
Assembly 13-07-2023**



ABC

ASIAN BORREL CLUB

1. Opening: welcome!

Meeting start: 16:41

2. Announcements

Lin: welcomes everyone to the Extraordinary GMA, announces that Jonli has been invited to present the Extraordinary GMA and serve as Chairman for this GMA.

Jonli: introduces himself, talks briefly about his position at ESN, what ESN is and who he is.

Jonli elaborates that there was some confusion regarding Article 21 and Article 18

Jonli elaborates further stating the confusion about article 21

Kay Djoehari: to leave the interpretation of article 21 to the chair of this meeting.

Lin: the confusion was regarding nominating persons and boards, but in th RoP it is stated that a board shall be chosen as a whole, it only states board, so does it also concern Board, supervisory board, advisory board etc?

Jonli: By definition of article i would say all the boards (supervisory board, advisory board and executive board). Since board is plural.

Lin: Is the Audit committee part of this?

Jonli: Audit committee would be separate since it's not a board. Since it is named as a committee, not a board.

Jade: boards are boards, committees are committees. As article 21 concerns only board, it should only concern boards and no committees.

Lin: last meeting, people wanted to vote person per person and people wanted to vote as a whole.

Kay: regarding the voting there were quite some problems, so I agree that it would be beneficial that there are individual votes. Last time it caused problems to vote upon an entire board. I suggest we continue just voting individually and amend it later. Cause last time it caused problems when voting on an entire board. This should be changed

Jonli; don't think it's possible since no amendment has been made regarding voting on individual nominees. How it's stated now is that boards will be voted in as a whole board.

Lin: i think Kay is right, i think the question is more is board only means executive board or if it is regarding all the boards (supervisory board, advisory board etc)

Lin: if we vote David out the whole executive board needs to be voted in again since the executive board can only be voted in as a whole.

Kevin: During the last GMA we made an exception to vote individually.

Lin: Now back to the first question, voting on what boards mean.

Kay: You can also decide what it means for now.

Jonli: That's gonna be difficult since 21.1 states that the GMA decides on this.

Jonli: We can vote on the following:

Point A: article 18 is regarding all the boards (supervisory board, advisory board etc)

Point B: article 18 means executive board only

Jonli Explains: blanco means you vote blanco

Abstain means you don't vote

Point C is blanco

Point D is abstain

Jonli explains: In a simple majority, the one with the most vote wins. For an absolute majority at least 50% needs to vote for a solution.

Voting regarding article 18

19 for point A

9 for point B

2 for point C

4 for point D

Point A follows through: article 18 is regarding all the boards (supervisory board, advisory board etc)

3. Agenda GMA

Jonli states that the Agenda is gonna take 5 hours and 5 minutes and that he is gonna try to run through it faster. Mentions that the agenda was sent by email so he will go straight into voting.

GMA Agenda approved or not?

27 for point A

1 for point B

0 for point C

0 for point D

GMA Agenda has been approved

4. GMA For Beginners

Jonli: runs through GMA for beginners

Explains what ABC is, it is an association. A association has members. The board does everything for their members

Non-profit, no shares. Each member of ABC is a stakeholder. So they have a say in everything

The GMA decides what board wil do.

Explains the important documents such as the Articles of Association, House Rules, Policy Plan, (semi) Annual Report, (semi) Annual Realisation.

Mentions that the House Rules are the most important for members to have a general knowledge on.

Jonli explains the voting process. 1 hand for a vote, 2 hands if you have a vote and a proxy. If you have a proxy, this has to be known before the GMA

5. ABC Wellbeing Point

Quynh: explains the ABC Wellbeing Point, explains that there were trust persons for ABC actives, but that didn't work well since it wasn't being promoted. So the wellbeing came into fruition after discussions with active members. The well being point consists of at least 2 members. Those members should be preferably a member of the supervisory board, advisory board or audit committee. Can't consist of executive board members since they are too actively involved day to day and stand too close with general members. Well being point is for people seeking support, guidance, or assistance. Incidences, complaints regarding events and work environment can be pointed out to the wellbeing point. Well being officers are obliged to keep all the information they receive confidential unless all parties come to an agreement to do otherwise.

Tawny: you mention party, but can it be expected that there is gonna be a wellbeing officer always sober at a party?

Quynh: no, it's more for after a party. During the party you should be able to approach someone of the party committee directly.

Quynh: further explains that the wellbeing point can give advice to the executive board, the board can ask for advice from the wellbeing point. If the wellbeing point gives advice the whole organization should take it seriously. The wellbeing point will be promoted on the website, where there can submit their stories, unanimous as well. Officers are in place for 1 year with can be extended for the same term if necessary. At the end of the GMA we will decide who is gonna be part of the Wellbeing committee and people can nominate themselves as well.

Jonathan: i had 2 points of concern but now 3. The structure of the slides are different from the agenda. I have a concern regarding the website, since IT committee members can see submissions through the website. There is no rules regarding the distribution of male and female members within the well-being point. Which I find important.

Quynh: regarding gender distribution, we haven't written it down, but we have taken it into consideration. This can be added. Preferably we would want 2 of each gender. So that you have a choice who to talk to within each gender.

Lin: i think there needs to be a place within ABC to talk about their stories. We have the supervisory board now so i don't see the need for an addition of a wellbeing point. Why don't we include these tasks under the supervisory board. Isn't it bureaucracy? What is the addition to separating them?

Quynh: with the separation, i wanted to have the most prominent members to be part of the wellbeing point. But also have the skills to talk to these people and to be trusted by these people. This year's supervisory board was mainly focused on policies and most people weren't aware of the existence and presence of the supervisory board.

Jade: how do we assess if someone is suitable for the wellbeing point? Like in ventures into psychologist territory. You might actually need help from a professional from outside of the association.

Quynh: the vibe is important, people need to feel safe with that person, if they read people well, if they listen well and if they act upon if needed. They should be proactive.

Lin: back to your response, you said that people didn't know that there was a supervisory board, why not promote the existence of the supervisory board. I find it important that people within the supervisory board also have the same skills and character at the wellbeing point.

Quynh: i don't agree, supervisory board are mainly focussed on their tasks of rules and regulation.

Kenny: can i jump in on quynh's answer to lin. I agree with Quynh but would like to add that if you separate it, it also highlights the importance of a wellbeing point within ABC. Not making well-being a side job for someone

Jorine: i agree with the wellbeing point but how are you planning to test the people?

Quynh: Setting up the structures. Questions to ask, guidelines for writing a report. During that we can assess if someone is suitable for the wellbeing point or not. I worked with the current nominees and think they are qualified

Lisa: how would you measure if someone is a good listener, caused it is subjective. Everyone may think different on what it is being a good listener. Their soft skills and hard to measure.

Quynh: i think when we are recruiting people, the people recruiting need to be good at reading people.

Lisa: how would you make it more subjective?

Kevin: have multiple people interview, have multiple people talk about their feelings to the applicant to see how they respond.

Timothy: i agree with Lisa and Lin, within the wellbeing point is to have some that is distant to the daily activities. Supervisory board or advisory board.

Quynh: current nominees are distant, they are from the supervisory board, advisory board and the audit committee.

Timothy: The wellbeing point might be too powerful since point 9 and 10 states that their advice should be taken seriously. Can the Executive Board still disagree?

Quynh: Board can still disagree and others as well.

Vanessa: It's stated that GM can nominate themselves as well, but they have to have at least

2 other general members supporting you. How can you make sure that potential general members that nominate themselves can be objective?

Quynh: With that rule we wanted to offer the room for other people to nominate themselves but in the end the GMA decides who gets appointed and not

Vanessa: Is the rule regarding being nominated to have at least 2 other general members supporting you also regarding board members?

Quynh: If you're part of any board of the audit committee you're automatically already considered if put forward as a nomination.

Chilok: On here for example i don't see that a wellbeing member needs to sign a NDA, will that be the case?

Quynh: Yes that will always be the case

Voting Wellbeing Point:

29 for point A (in favor)

0 for point B (against)

5 for point C (blanco)

0 for point D (abstain)

Therefore the ABC Wellbeing Point will be established.

6. Nomination Wellbeing Officers 2023/2024

Jonli: everyone will be voted individually, the 4 nominees are invited to come in front and introduce themselves

Quynh: I am this years treasurer and head of sports. I believe I am well suited because I came up with this idea while discussing with active members. I really put their needs high on the priority list. Since this was a need from the active members. I think it's a very good thing to implement. Good to sustain and for the future of ABC

Dion: head of external and gaming: I find wellbeing is very important within the association is the most important thing for all members. During events and networking to feel safe. For this reason I want to stand for the wellbeing of everyone at the association and I am a great listener.

Yenly: ABC is a place where everyone can feel safe at home and feel comfortable, if that's not the case please feel free to contact one of the wellbeing officers, we are there to listen and to find a solution together, either anonymously or in person so that everyone can feel safe at ABC events.

Matthijs: Hello everyone, I am a supervisory member, I thought why not join the wellbeing point, i see it as a very important thing to have within ABC , since I am a very sociable person and able to see a lot of different perspectives as a whole i think that the position of me being part of the wellbeing point will be a perfect match, hence the reason why i made myself available for this position.

Lisa: How can Yenly defend herself?

Jonli: One of the nominees can answer in name of her.

Christine: A lot of people will come to you with all sorts of different issues, how do you decide if you can solve it or not, if officials need to be contacted?

Dion: That is really up to the situation. If he or she only wants to just let her story known or if she wants to undertake actions.

Ying: I see that 2 nominees are current board members, are they going to the supervisory board and advisory board.

Dion: Yes, I am a nominee of the advisory board.

Lin: Can we discuss the nominations anonymously?

Jonli: Yes, if there is a request.

A request has been made to discuss this topic anonymously

There is a proposal for everyone on discord to turn on their cameras to verify if people on discord are indeed members and can partake in this meeting/discussion

Xiu: can anyone join the wellbeing point later throughout the year.

Jonli: technically people can still apply now but once the wellbeing point has been fully filled with members no one can nominate them anymore

Kenny: We should allow every a fair chance to apply for the wellbeing point. This has been very last minute .

Timothy: I don't think there was any campaign on this and now the wellbeing point is "full"

Kevin: people were sent the documents a week ago, so people were able to think if they wanted to be nominated or not.

Lin: I don't think it's fair cause at that moment people didn't know if the wellbeing point was gonna be a new entity or not plus the fact that you need 2 people to nominate you makes it very difficult to do so in such a short period of time.

Xiu: All in all, 1 week was a very short period.

Kevin: i agree that one week was very short

Timothy: I suggest marketing this position to its fullest by social media now that it's known that the wellbeing point is becoming an entity.

Lin: I suggest to postpone this agenda point.

Kenny: I believe that there would be more nominees if it was marketed some more.

Jorine: In my opinion, someone needs to be at least a member for 1 year. So we can determine better if someone is suitable or not. A first impression is not sufficient in my opinion since a first impression can vary a lot and having people that know the nominees can help to make a better judgement

Kenny: suggest to invite the nominees back to the room again since the GMA is not discussing anymore if they are suitable for the position or not.

Kenny explains the reasoning for the nominees to be called back to the room toward the nominees. Stating that voting will be postponed because of the fact that there was not enough marketing or time for general members to nominate themselves.

Jonli: the nominations for the wellbeing point will be postponed to the next GMA probably.

Current or next board will decide how to promote and apply to be a nominee for this position.

Voting for cancelling this agenda point (agenda point 6, nomination of wellbeing officers):

Point A is yes cancelling the agenda point, 22 votes.

Point B is against cancelling the agenda point, 2 votes

Point C, 6 votes. (blanco)

Point D, 1 vote. (abstain)

Nomination of wellbeing officers has been cancelled.

5 minute toilet break, back at 18:21

GMA continues at 18:30

7. Nomination President 2023/2024

David Law is gonna introduce himself, explains that he is thrilled to be nominated about ABC, has passion for the association, wants to create memorable experiences, hopes to make ABC the cosiest and most open community around where everyone feels at home, he promises to hear everyone out to make sure everyone's voices are heard, wants to make it an open and inclusive organisation, believes to have what it takes to manage the president position, thinks rational and thinks and sees before acting. He thinks he is mature enough to take this position despite his young age and able to overcome its challenges. Has been working in an environment where he needs to coach and lead his colleagues, he approaches his colleagues very gently and especially in a good way. Wants to actively engage all members and also to have more collaborations with external parties to tap into more resources and expand. Is very stoked to serve as a next president and thinks to be able to take ABC to a higher limit.

Speakerslist:

Kay Djoehari: Thanks to the nominee for nominating himself, applauds him for that. Mentions that David was an intro group member of Kay Djoehari. Mentioned that David had ideas on how to better the gaming committee. Are you (David) willing to take over the gaming committee?

Timothy: the gaming committee has already been assigned. It can still be discussed.

David: Like Timothy said the gaming committee has been taken, I am up for a discussion.

Moriel: What is your vision for ABC gaming, what do you want to do with it. It's been a lot of valorant for example?

David: I had a conversation before regarding the gaming committee. Some less competitive games. Such as mario kart or tetris games. Games such as valorent are really ment for true gamers.

Kenny: I have a question regarding your vision of ABC, have you spoken to the previous president?

David: haven't talked to lin yet, Operations can be streamlined, internal operations can be streamlined. The number of external collaborations, like partnerships, can be improved and increase in number. This can be improved upon with disregard to plans from previous boards.

Jorine: I have a question regarding active involvement, sometimes it feels like a slow process to speak up regarding our thoughts (cause it has to go through committee heads). Outside of the GMA is there a plan to make the actives involvement better?

David: like i mentioned before i am planning to actively engage our members even more, also active members. There are no plans yet but i am planning to discuss this with my board

Yaslin: I think that's a great idea, maybe an ideabox, something online, will be a great

addition for ABC next year.

Matthijs: you applied for the IT position for the first round, why are you applying for president now, what is your motivation?

David: I received this question before, even during the toilet break. Yenly contacted me and then i started to think of if it's suitable for me or not. I carefully thought this out , what my vision was and I thought about some plans that I have planned out for now.

President votes (anonymously voted):

24 votes in favor

1 vote against

1 vote blanco

2 votes abstain

David has been accepted for the president position.

8. Nomination Advisory Board 2023/2024

Chilok: mentions that he nominated himself for next years advisory board, mentions that probably most people at the GMA already know him. He nominated himself because of his passion for ABC and hope to be very suitable with his insight gained as secretary of ABC, as Head of Internal and his experience gained by helping during a lot of various events at ABC. Hopes to use this knowledge to advice the upcoming board on whatever needs advising on

Dion: mentions that he is the current head of external affairs and head of gaming. He nominated himself because this year there were a lot of challenges and with his experiences gained with these challenges he hopes to help the upcoming advisory board.

Yenly on video: mentions her experience as executive board and supervisory board. She mentions that the nominations are a good combination of all previous board years and wishes the new board a lot of fun and the best of luck. Mentions that she can't wait to help the upcoming board with whatever then need help with

Christine: Do you guys have any concrete plans already how to help the new board

Dion: by keeping a good communication with the AB and executive board is the most important thing, to help immediately when help is needed.

Lisa: I have a question regarding the nominee Yenly, since I have had her as an advisory mentor since I am her successor. I am curious what her qualities are that make her fit for this position. So I am curious what the supervisory board thinks upon this matter.

Ryan: she's is a great listener i would say, she is great at looking from multiple perspectives. She is neutral in her stance. She helps whenever possible.

I was wondering what Lisa's opinion is regarding Yenly?

Lisa: I oppose Ryan's opinion of Yenly being able to see things from different perspectives. My experience with Yenly is that she doesn't see things from different perspective, we think differently from each other. But i always received at party events for example that i wasn't doing a proper job and that she would have done it differently. I don't think i had a great experience with my supervisory board member

Jorine: As her past committee member she was really open to hearing me out and I had a positive experience working with her.

Lin: I think Yenly is a very empathic person, so if you talk to her she is nice and likeable. But I do agree with Lisa, business wise, she can be hard, especially if it's not her way of thinking. I am in the middle of it. We need people to guide the new board but i want to warn the new board a little bit if she doesn't agree with you she can be harsh. Personally she is a very nice person to talk to.

Moriel: from my experience, as my head of marketing, she was very open, she had her ideas but was open to hear my ideas out.

I think Yenly this year has been one of the more involved with her successor than others in the supervisory board, for example with helping to take pictures at ABC events. So I think that speaks for her willingness to help people.

Advisory Board nominees voting:

19 votes in favour

5 voted against

4 votes blanco

2 votes abstaining

The Advisory Board Nominees have been accepted.

9. Nomination Supervisory Board 2023/2024

Supervisory Board

Christine: has been part of the supervisory board and was a board member, has been involved from the start of ABC. last year she was in the first supervisory board ever. She thinks that by her staying in the supervisory board she can stay and continue her journey and keep going in her position

Matthijs: mentions his age and studies. Is current supervisory board member, throughout this year has been a bumpy road, he has been in a lot of difficult situations where his knowledge and interpersonal skills had been tested. He's confident that throughout these trials he has become a more stronger and resilient person of himself. Knowing this he is confident to be well suited for this next chapter. With a deeper understanding of the supervisory board responsibilities and the determination to make a significant impact.

Ryan: full time IT consultant, he likes to present his nomination. Mentions the growth of ABC in the Dutch student community. This has inspired him to continue working within the supervisory board to continue working towards the further development of the association, and wants to offer his insight and dedication to help to sustain the positive figure of this association.

Kay: mentions his age, his studies in law, experiences as being president, marketing, treasurer, supervisory and statutes commission in a different student association. Had a interview with the current sitting supervisory board. Asked them about the state of ABC, how that we have come to our heritage, how the GMA's and procedures are set up. It became clear to him that there was a need for more experience. In the coming year he wants to take this heritage on him and leaves something else for coming boards and GMA's

Yaslin: question toward current supervisory board. What are some things that you want to do differently compared to this year next year?

Ryan: We have a lot of things that could have gone better. Such as how we take care of complaints. We want to make it more efficient and transparent.

Matthijs: In the first year when ABC started we didn't have a supervisory board. So the supervisory board was new for us and unclear. It was challenging for us all. We didn't know what our responsibilities were. Current board didn't know what to expect from us and we didn't know what we were able to offer them. There are still a lot of things to do better, that's why i want to continue to make a better foundation for future generations of supervisory board members.

Christine: Next year we are gonna focus more about the procedures and policies. Clear up any uncertainties and remove any grey areas.

Supervisory Board nominees votes:

23 votes in favour

2 votes against

3 votes blanco

0 votes abstaining

The Supervisory Board Nominees have been accepted.

10. Nomination Audit Committee 2023/2024

Audit Committee

Kevin: introduces himself by mentioning his age and studies. Was the first treasurer of ABC and current audit member. Created the financial backbone, one of the co-founders of ABC, created the financial policy, approached budgeting on 3 levels, a booking system all it being manually. co-created secretarial financial reports. This year overlooked if the financial health of the organisation was stable. Aside from that I also created together with Quynh integrated E-boekhouden, which ensures 100% financial accountability. Wants to create audit reports for next year, that are readable for general members. So that general members have a better global understanding on financial matters with regards to ABC.

Quynh: introduces herself by mentioning her position as treasurer and head of trip, her studies and her work as financial risk analyst. She has done the bookkeeping of some small firms as a bookkeeping assistant. That's why she supposed to implement an online bookkeeping system, together with Kevin. Making bookkeeping way more efficient and creating less room for mistake. While also providing valuable and improved quality of data for ABC. having a clearer understanding if future investments are feasible.

Tien: introduces himself being part of the current external committee and his studies. Mentions that this committee will help him to get him out of his comfort zone to tackle a new challenge and improve his skills in Excel. Aims to ensure ABC will be financially healthy and will exist for years to come.

Timothy: What do you want to put in the audit report?

Kevin: just how ABC has been going for the last year financially. Answer questions where the money is going to. Try to ensure that members can be confident to approve budgeting and realisation created by treasurers.

Kevin: if there are any notable deviations from past estimation we will look into why this has happened and mention it in our report.

Timothy: i think you should rename the report since i am of the opinion that this isn't enough to be called a audit report

Kenny: What would you (timothy) call the report?

Timothy: I would call it ... just something else cause auditory assurance can be tricky, with law and such.

Jonli: I suggest these technicalities be discussed another time.

Voting regarding Audit Committee Nominees

25 votes in favour

1 votes against

0 votes blanco

1 vote abstain

The Audit Committee Nominees have been accepted.

Break 15 min

Back at 20:00

11. Board Compensation

Kevin explains the general information regarding the topic “Board Compensation”

General Information

1. ABC is a non-profit organization;
2. Doing a Board year is primarily voluntary;
3. Board Members want to be appreciated for the work they do;
4. The Board appears to be divided in the distribution of financial matters;
5. Each Board Member contributes significantly to the success of the organization;
6. By providing equal compensation, it is acknowledged that all Board Members are equally valuable and invest the same amount of effort and time into their duties.

Kevin explains Proposal 1, in addition explains what ASVA is.

Proposal 1

1. (ASVA) When a Board Member is not eligible for a (full) board compensation, this Board Member is entitled to a financial compensation from the association.
2. (ASVA) The financial compensation is a reimbursement for voluntary activities.
3. The financial compensation is only for students, who simultaneously study full time (MBO, HBO, UNI) and are Board Members at ABC.
4. Board Members who are taking a gap year or are not currently studying are not eligible for the compensation from the association, as it is assumed that they can work full-time and are not experiencing study delays.
5. (ASVA) The financial compensation must be determined in the annual budget. The financial compensation never exceeds a board compensation from an educational institution for the same time investment.
6. (ASVA) In the event that a Board Member does not complete the term, the compensation will be calculated pro rata based on the number of months that the board member has served.
7. An individual Board Member sends a request to the Audit Committee for the compensation, which the Audit Committee approves/declines. The request proves that the individual Board Member studies full time and pays tuition fee in the concerned academic year.
8. Total budget is capped at €3.000/academic year and is capped per person at €100/month
9. Assuming that ABC continues to realise surpluses in its exploitation results, it is indeed feasible to allocate a budget for the mentioned purposes. If it is demonstrated that the volunteer budget from ABC poses a significant financial risk, there is the possibility of not allocating that Budget.

In layman's terms: some board members are currently compensated by ABC through the university cause they happen to be students at HvA, Uva and Vu. Other board members who are not students at HvA, Uva and Vu get nothing while they do the same work and also

endure study delays. As such this feels unfair, unequal and causes the board to work ineffectively. Therefore we believe that it's in the associations best interest to provide compensation from the association for those who are not entitled. We have to validate and recognize the study delays non entitled board members incur while they have the same responsibilities like the ones that do get study delays.

Lisa explains Proposal 2

Proposal 2

1. Each Board Member will receive compensation for their performed duties in kind. The compensation for Board Members will be provided in the form of a paid bonding activity or a dinner.
2. Every Board Member, regardless of their background, is entitled to be compensated.
3. The budget for compensation has a maximum limit of €120 per person, with a maximum total of €960 per board per year.
4. Board Members are not allowed to receive the compensation in cash.
5. The budget is intended to facilitate a joint bonding activity for Board Members and promote team bonding.
6. The budget can be distributed throughout the entire period of Board Members' active involvement. This means that multiple bonding activities are possible as long as the budget limit is not exceeded.
7. It is assumed that ABC is not operating at a loss, and the budget will not be disbursed if the organization is experiencing financial risk.

Jade: for both proposal the question is, if people are non entitled to be reimbursed by the university or by the school should they submit a certified document that they are not entitled to that compensation?

Kevin: Proposal 2 doesn't look at it specifically. Proposal 1 is focussing on people who also should be compensated for their study delays. If you pay tuition, it is assumed that you're a full time student and this will be verified by the audit committee.

Lin: reaction to jade and kevin, short question you can not verify if someone did or did not get their board compensation. There was someone within the board who was too late with applying for the board compensation, so that person is not getting anything from the university or association.

Jade: so my question was about if you're not entitled by your school, should you get a document from your school to ABC to prove that?

Quynh: the case mentioned by Lin, i think that it's different. Cause the person in question was eligible, then it's the persons responsibility to make sure that you receive it. Proposal 1 is in regard to people who would not receive it.

Jorine: I had a question for Kevin's proposal, I see that it meant to treat people fairly. I understand that board members in a gap year, work, so they don't need the extra money.

But is there anything that you are gonna do to make them feel appreciated too?

Kevin: As for those people it is very unfortunate. The whole discussion of this issue was about first place validating and acknowledging study delays, so we didn't think about the other part. We are trying to mirror what universities are doing.

Lin: You try to mirror what universities are doing to provide for their students but we as ABC are a student association. It is not up to ABC to do this. The money in ABC's bank account is the members money. You talk about ASVA, they are not a association. They don't have members, they don't have events. They are a students association representative. CSA-EUR is not doing it, ESN is not doing it, Het koor is not doing it, i think for students really in need of financial stability, they can go to their own university for compensation, not for a bestuursbeurs, to cover daily costs. How does that make sense?

Kevin: Do you agree that under current circumstances, part of your board, does not have a feeling of validation for their study delays?

Lin: Yes

Kevin: Do you agree that the board somewhat worked ineffectively because it spent hours upon hours on this topic.

Lin: yes

Kevin: shouldn't we agree that we provide guidelines for those who are not entitled to resolve this issue for once and for all? Because if we were to do nothing, we are basically saying it is your responsibility.

Lin: Even with this proposal a lot of board members are still not eligible for this. There is gonna be a bigger inequality created by this. You will not always get board compensation.

Kevin: Board members who are eligible for a board compensation are compensated by ABC through the fact that we managed to get recognition at those universities and therefore allow them to apply for a board compensation.

Lin: But not all the students will get it because you will have to meet certain criteria. First you need to be a student at a university, you need to do it fulltime, you need to have real study delays, if you can't prove that you won't receive compensation. It is about equality and appreciation to board members then this is for a very small amount of people and not fair to committee members.

Dion: Do you think what happened this year was equal for all board members?

Lin: What happened was at the beginning of the year some board members were misinformed about what the board compensation entailed. Instead of fixing the misinformation. You're making a bigger gap, because even when this proposal is approved there are still board members non eligible for this proposal.

Jonathan: Maybe I missed it but what is the current situation? What is going wrong now? Cause i am supposed to vote in a couple minutes.

Kevin: current situation 3 people are non entitled, 4 are entitled. There was a discussion about the possibility of sharing. So the discussion kind of became “ongemakkelijk” (uncomfortable) because it was regarding someone’s personal money. At first we tried to divide everything, then Lin said justified that we cannot divide everything that we receive from the Uni’s and hogeschool. But given our current situation and financial means. We have a surplus of cash of 30 thousand euros, so the suggestion was to use part of it to help those who are non-entitled basically. But do the same amount of work, spend the same amount of time and incur study delays.

Dion: it’s clear to me now

Yaslin: What if you’re not eligible because of non acceptance of your application while attending a university that is recognized?

Kevin: The thing in such cases, we could amend the proposal for “Uitzonderlijke situaties”, if you had already done board year, and you’re doing one again at ABC, and if that’s the reason why the university won’t grant you a compensation, you can explain that to ABC and in that fairness you can be eligible for compensation from ABC. Because you will still incur study delays cause you’re a full time student

Lin: In my situation for example, I already had a board year with my university, but I am fine with it. Because doing board is primarily voluntary as the first slide said. Second of all , We are a non profit organisation. Like handing out board grants to only board members means that you have to keep making profit. Like i have been saying this whole year, it’s not necessary for our association to make a profit. We don’t need a profit anymore, and now if we accept this proposal, we need to make a profit for these kind of things, well that’s not the reason why ABC exists. You always talking about making profit, making more money, but we are a non profit organization. We should give the money back to the members.

Jonathan: point number 6 says. The compensation will be calculated pro rata based on the number of months that the board member has served. Has served is in passed tense. Which makes me believe that the calculation is done after the fact. Is there a possibility to be compensated monthly or only at the end of the term?

Kevin: It will be first monthly, if you do stop and you did get more money you will have to give the excess back.

Timothy: As one of the upcoming board members, I don't really care about the board compensation. I think it's a good proposal, it just has to be rephrased a little bit. For example, i live in rotterdam, i have to go to Amsterdam for board which is okay, i have a car from work, but for example i have to pay RAI 1 euro for the P&R, it would be nice to get it compensated, but it's alright because eventually you guys said (...). I think also for point 9, I think this kinda incentivises working for profit. For example if you have a budget cap at 3 thousand and that allows us more incentives theoretically to make more revenue, more profit to meet this cap. So I do think point 9 isn't fit for this association.

Lisa: I still have a question about this proposal regarding equal treatment of board members. In this proposal it still leaves one group out that I emphasise in proposal 2. I do think that it is a good proposal. But on the other hand the main goal in trying to get there is equal treatment and how i see it is there is still no equal treatment in a way and what i also see is, i feel like that there is not enough recognition how hard it can be when you're not a student. Cause when i was a student i got like student grants, i could lend money. So even if I didn't work, I would have an income. But now if i don't work, there is no income. And I realise this year looking for a job with ABC is harder than I thought. Like in my mind i was like, alright i'll do ABC next to a fulltime job. I did that and I realised I am doing 70 hours a week for barely any money. So that was not worth it. But then like if you do a part time you still don't get enough income to like maintain yourself in a sense. So like I do agree with this proposal but i don't really agree with the fact you still leave out one group that is still a board member at the end of the day.

Kevin: So in our proposal there is a big assumption. As it is assumed that one can work full time and not experience study delay. That's a big assumption.

Lisa: and that's a big assumption that i can uhm...

Kevin: I think to make this proposal to make it all equal then we should amend it in some ways.

Chilok: I have a question. If someone has to give money back to the association. How is ABC able to do that?

Kevin: We assume that people are honest of course about these things. That they don't misuse these things. But in a case where someone does or for bad reasons. We will "inschakel een deurwaarder".

Kenny: Is there an option for people to sign a contract who agree to this board compensation. For, in order to, if they have to return money, they are tied to the contract that they have signed.

Kevin: yes that is definitely a solution, at the end of the day we have to write that on "zwart op wit"

Lisa: You mentioned that this proposal needs changes but it's not fully clear to me if these changes are being made and what the changes are.

Kevin: So as of now we are attacking multiple problems. For instance, whenever someone has already done a board year and isn't eligible, okay. That's one. Second, if someone is assumed to be working but isn't working and isn't a student is something we can add.

Lin: It's about future boards, why don't give something to all the board members instead off...

Kevin: Because you're double compensating some people.

Lin: But that's not true.

Kevin: That's the idea of proposal 1, you don't want to double compensate people who already get something. So that's why we compensate through ABC, We already compensate people through HvA, UvA and VU. If you give everyone more money than basically you did nothing.

Jonli: I think mostly of the arguments have already been said. I think it's quite clear what the arguments are and the thought are. I think that it now to ask the members if we want 3000 euros to compensate board members or 920 ish for the whole board. But is also see and feel like both parties have a common ground and they want to adjust the amendment here. More of a question for the members. Do you think maybe it's better for both parties to discuss it between them and come with a new proposal. Either for later today or the next GMA or would you like to continue the discussion to eventually vote upon it. on proposal 1 or 2.

Kay: I think we already have these proposal because both parties were not able to find common ground with each other. So it seems pointless to negotiate again.

Jonathan: I kind of do agree with what Kay just said, but honestly, i am seeing both proposals now, i am still confused, i am not confident in voting personally. For me it would be better if there was one proposal that would just quickly explain what the situation is.

Kay: Then a question to Lin and Kevin then, if you were to speak with each other for the coming months, until the next GMA, realistically except for completely giving in to each other's demands, what could change? Could you guys meet in the middle?

Kevin: The thing that is common ground it could perhaps misunderstanding, but something that we said, we kinda ment this to more Lisa's thought on this cause the other proposals were primarily Lin's, so i am not moving to Lins proposals, i am more moving to Lisa's thoughts

Jorine: I see both proposals, I see both pro's and con's in both. I see that Lisa's proposal is more in the sense of fairness for everyone in a different way. This is more to compensate for the ones that don't have it. Isn't there a way to combine the both? When you don't have a compensation, you can formulate something where you can have activities. You could incorporate committee members as well where they can have activities on ABC's budget. That you can in a way combine them, a possibility for both parties to agree in a more fair way for both.

Kevin: I think problem of the 2 proposal lays, are not the problem in the 2 proposals. It's that they define the problem differently, How i see the problem and how most of the supervisors see it is that because some receive something while others don't, it causes a feeling of lack of validation and acknowledgement for the study delays. Which is the main problem, which caused the board to work ineffectively. That's what we tried to tackle. Their solution, some board members don't feel treated equally. So they want to give a budget to all the board members. My question is then: do you solve the core of the problems or not?

Jonli asks everyone if they know the context, what they are voting for and the impact that it might have.

Jorine: I think because there have been a lot of things said about the proposals that need changing. I don't know if i say, okay these changes is what we should do and i vote now, is it gonna happen that way or executed that way? Or can we give suggestion, have consensus about it, so we should just postpone it and have the changes made and vote on it. I think that is the better way than just voting now.

Jonli: If you vote now then it goes into effect immediately. If you want to postpone, that's also a possibility.

Jorine: If we do it the next GMA or another time, i could make a better comparison and a better decision cause now i feel like i don't know exactly what the better decision is.

Jonli: Okay, so we have already 2 people who are saying that they don't really understand the bigger picture and need a better understanding. Who feels the same, raise their hands. Do we know enough context on this matter? If you don't feel confident enough raise your hands. If you feel uncomfortable the board can take the upcoming 2 months to discuss this go through it again to make it more clearer. Result: almost 50/50

Mystery person: I want to make a comment instead of... As the board right now, I think it's kind of unfair to vote for or against. And thus I am not against voting right now or against.

Kevin: Blanco and Against are options.

Jonli: We are gonna scrap the voting on this matter for today. That means you will have the chance on the next GMA. Cause i feel like a lot of people feel uncomfortable voting it now because of lack of context. So I would like to propose a vote on whether we want to scrap this or not.

Kay: I want to ask if Kevin and Lin know what needs to be done/clarified?

Kevin: We need to create a report on what the whole situation is, what the facts are, what happened and why these proposals are here in the first place. Also make amendments on the existing proposals, to provide a better understanding on what you are voting about.

Jonli: If there are still questions regarding the proposals you can still ask them now, otherwise we continue on voting.

Kenny: How I see it today, there are 2 proposals. For some people there are cracks in one proposal and for some in others. If there would be one proposal where people could look at and then judge whether that proposal needs adjusting. If it were to be 2 proposals i think for a lot of people it is difficult to differentiate the struggle that each proposal has to make a decision on. It would be easier to just have one proposal.

Quynh: I understand the thoughts behind that, but I hope everyone can understand that the reason why there are 2 proposals is because we tried to come up with 1 solution. Time to

time, again and again. But we couldn't. To be honest I don't think that giving us another month or 2 months will result in us being able to propose one proposal where everyone is content.

Mystery person: I have a question, just so i understand it clearly. So proposal one is just basically, people will get compensated from the board and some people don't. Proposal 2, everyone will get some kind of compensation.

Kevin: There is a small nuance to it, in proposal 1 part of the board is already compensated through ABC, by UvA.

Lin: No no no, don't say that

Kevin: Yes, because we fixed the recognition, did we?

Lin: it's not from ABC

Jonli: From what i understand. In current board, some people are compensated while some aren't. In proposal one, those who aren't will receive a small compensation of around a 100 euros from ABC. In the second proposal, the whole board gets money for board bonding activities.

Lin: To clarify to the whole GMA, there are 3 questions. First of all, do we want to compensate board members. Second of all, how much do we want to compensate and last of all, who do we want to compensate. That 's what makes this matter so complex. Cause it's 3 big questions in one. Maybe we can vote on that next time. Like maybe that will make it easier.

Jorine: I understand that if we postpone to the next GMA there will not be a lot of change probably. But I heard a lot of adjustments suggested. I feel like if we give them some time to put these down on paper, so that we can actually see them on paper and then vote on them later today, with the correct adjustment that we discussed here. Maybe that is a solution instead of postponing to another time.

Kevin: I can do that.

Mystery person: I agree with Jorine and don't think that giving more time will enable both proposals to merge into one.

Jonli: Okay so Lin and Kevin have the time to adjust the proposals and we will go back on it later tonight.

Kevin: from personal experience, how was it in ESN in past years about board compensation.

Jonli: we have a board of 8, with 6 non eligible for board compensation. We would receive the money monthly, deposited on the ESN bank account and divided by 8. That's how we did it.

Lin: I think it was a good solution within your board itself, but i think this matter will return like in ABC and in upcoming boards. I don't want them to fight about it, what rules does ESN have about it cause you have solved it yourself.

Jonli: we don't have any rules regarding board compensation, nothing is written in statutes and House Rules. We felt like it's common sense, one team, one board. So we splitted it into 8.

Lisa: So today we have established that board includes supervisory board, advisory board and now here it says board members, so what understood, that it was regarding executive board. But now that i look, it says board. So if you make any changes please change that as well.

Kevin: I would need to amend that as well.

Yaslin: So you guys did it voluntarily, but for HvA for example, the compensation is attached to a person. Can you force someone to share the compensation?

Jonli: Good question, so UvA and ... gives 300 euros, HvA gives 250 euros, so there is already a difference there. Is it possible? I don't know, we didn't have any issues. But technically now if you think about it, yes, because it is your own responsibility for the money.

Yaslin: I get that it's your own responsibility but can you make it a rule within the organisation to say like you need to split it?

Kevin: No you can't, because you're claiming something that it's theirs. So the moment they get the money they can spend it on whatever they want.

Jonli: I feel like we still feel like we need to make some changes to proposal 1 and 2. Come back to it late and hopefully finish it off later.

Mystery person: Following Lin's question. Shouldn't we vote if the board should be compensated at all or not?

Jonli: I get that, but there is no proposal for that. For not having any compensation. Technically not, but there should be an option to vote for none of the above.

Lin: Could you explain the possibility of voting?

Jonli: It should be proposal 1, proposal 2, none of the above, blanco, abstain.

Lin: If you vote none of the above you won't be able to vote next time. Because the GMA decided we don't want them

Jonli: Technically if I understand your statutes and house rules. You can always pop off the topic, even if it has been talked about. It doesn't say specifically what the content was/is about.

Jonli: Now we are gonna vote on if we want to do the change later on the agenda. Hopefully we will have a better proposal by then.

Lin: I do think we have to think about the question that I mentioned. We can't talk about them right now because it wasn't proposed 1 week in advance, so I propose to postpone this topic to the next GMA.

Jonli: that would be none of the above options during the voting.

Chilok: Can we just make amendments during the GMA?

Kevin: That is what the current proposal is about right now. Make amendments and vote on it later today.

Jonli: Voting starts now (voting to postpone this topic till later tonight) (informal voting ((putting hands up in the air))

Jonli: The majority agrees to postpone this topic till later today.

12. ABC Borrel Locations

Jonli: ABC borrel location is the next topic. I would like to invite the supervisory board on behalf of ...

Kevin: Actually we want to make a change, I understood that the submitter wants to present this agenda point.

- Intermediate break because people left the room and a counting had to be done to make sure we met quorum.

Jonli: We are just gonna continue, while people are coming back in. Since this is not regarding a change in the statutes or house rules. So technically we can continue this conversation. Since we are not voting. Either way it's not gonna be in the house rules

Cecilia introduces herself by mentioning her name and that she is speaking on behalf of the introduction committee that she was part of last year. On behalf of the introduction committee, she believes that it would be more fun for association members to vary in locations. This would mean to host borrels at non-partner and partner locations. Diversify the locations for borrels. She wants opinions on 3 topics. What is the rule of an intro committee member in the future? Second is, should it be mandatory to host all ABC borrels at partner locations when all provided facilities are equal between partner and non-partner locations? Third topic, Do you believe that all ABC borrels should be hosted at only at a "stamkroeg" such as Bar-B and what are the advantages and disadvantages?

Jonli: opens speakers list

Yaslin: As board, i don't think there is a rule that we have to host one of our borrels at one of our partners. Do you think that's the case or what is happening?

Cecilia: Well I was in discussion with Lin on this topic for quite a long time and what I have heard was that it was mandatory or that it was an ongoing discussion to have it mandatory at partner locations.

Lin: To clarify this year we discussed this matter within the board. Firstly, since we had a lot of trouble last year with partners and them saying we were going to other places that were not partners, this year we were trying to make contracts with solid locations. Preferably we would go to a partner, unless there was something which made it impossible to host one of our partners. We also discussed for introduction that it is possible to host borrels at other locations but then the location has to have something that our current partners don't have.

Yaslin: I remember that when we were talking about that one in so many events we would go to a non partner location?

Lin: Yes so we were talking about the borrels specifically, that if necessary, we can have up

to 3 other locations that are not partners.

Cecilia: I haven't heard of that. Introduction doesn't know about that.

Lin: That's not true, i told you about that.

Kenny: I have a question for Lin, cause we are talking about borrel locations. What are the troubles that we have had from current and past partners regarding the borrels.

Lin: So i have been an intro committee member from day 1, the struggle was that we had to find a new location for borrels every month. With every location we had a lot of troubles. Either we had to pay a fee or we didn't have a room for ourselves or the music was the dutch kind of music or we got screwed over by an invoice of 2000 euros. So we had a lot of problems back then. Then also we had partners telling us that they were going to leave cause we were going to non-partner locations while partners are supporting us and we are not going to them.

Jorine: I understand the point of diversifying locations. But on the other hand maybe that can be solved by having more partners and maybe diverse the activities within the borrels. Because in my opinion those are often still the same. The same issue can be solved that way while still maintaining a good relationship with the partners where you have some financial security where you don't have that other location.

Lin: Good points, we as a board have been trying to do that. For next year we have 4-5 clubs/bars that are willing to work with us. So we can have borrels at different locations.

Kenny: Has it ever been considered by Intro to have monthly borrels at a "stamkroeg", but you also have special barrels once every 2 to 3 months at partnerships at other places.

Chilok: I think we discussed this matter with the board.

Cecilia: If I remember correctly I think I proposed that. Every month a borrel at Bar-B and a borrel a month at a different location.

Lin: Yeah we discussed some things over the phone and I always had a long term vision for ABC to have weekly borrels. It's a good idea for you. We are not able to have that right now. We don't have enough people and locations. For now it is important to find some solid locations now, which we did and expand that in the future.

Yaslin: I wanted to say that what Lin said we were focussing this year on a good foundation. Because all the troubles introduced. This year we were quite lucky with Bar-B, being available for us. I do get the need for variation in locations. Going to locations outside of partners next year. I don't know if that helps you understand?

Cecilia: So 3 borrels at different locations for borrels next year.

Lin: Maximum, so think about for example a ping pong borrel, that you can not host at one of our partners, then we go to a non-partner. Also if the new intro wants to do it or has the time to do it, cause it is time consuming to find new places.

Jonli: this discussion is mainly for the policy plan of next year, so more discussion, insight and policy plan.

Kenny: I really understand the vision of Lin, but how has that been projected upon current Intro Committee? Cause it looks like there is a wedge between the two. Cause you see things like this and they see things like this. I think for future committees, it should be clear what the long term vision is and how the committee can contribute to that vision. In order to be in one line and achieve that.

Lin: Yes, for sure. I think the nuance is that we didn't have a solid Head of Introduction. Sofia helped out, I tried to look at it. They didn't have the Head of Intro that they deserved. Also introduction committee members were burnt out or abroad, so we were understaffed. But you're totally right to get people on board with your plan.

Jorine: I think in that case if there is progress in finding new partners. I think Intro can work closer with External to actively look at new partners and in the meantime diversify in the borrels themselves to create a more diverse feeling with the partners that we already have.

Jonli asks cecilia if she has some more insights now and if Intro committee is satisfied with what has been achieved.

Cecilia: I there can be more discussion regarding this topic with new board when they are about to make the policy plan, maybe that would be more fruitful.

Jonli: Are you okay with today's topic? Perfect!

Cecilia: What is the rule of an intro committee member in the future? I would like your opinion (Lin) about it.

Lin: I don't want to push my vision on the next one, because next year they can do whatever they want. Right now intro looks like party committee, they have a contract with Bitterzoet right now, so all parties will be held there, because of financial reasons. But intro committee members would help out, talk to members who aren't familiar with ABC, helping out with scanning and have a big impact on intro groups. That was about it for this year, description of a Intro committee member.

Cecilia: This year, i thought we would also be more involved into the organisation of the borrels, teams, locations. Which wasn't really the case. I feel like that needs to be more clarified.

Jonli: I think to be fruitful in this conversation is that the intro committee will talk to the next board about what their role actually is.

Jonli: Then we move on to the next topic.

David: Just a little remark, towards cecilia and the rest of the intro committee. We as a board (new board) are open for a discussion with the members of the intro committee to discuss all

of these questions before making the policy plan. If that answers your question more. We are open for it.

Jonli: Nice, wise words from the new president.

13. Addition to Agenda: Candidate Transparency

Jonli: Next up we have a proposal. Candidate transparency, a HR proposal by Kay, to make house rule changes. We have reached quorum. So we can make decisions and vote on this now.

Kay Djoehari: So i have submitted 2 proposals, as of right now i think that these GMA's take too long and are inefficient. You would be quick to ask questions that are more basic such as what do you study. These are questions that don't have to be asked if (moves on to introducing the topic)

Kay introduces the topic:

Proposal 1. Job interview with the GMA: Expresses her opinion as that CV and motivation letter of each candidate should be published to the GMA while protecting their privacy by anonymizing their personal information down to their name and proceeds to the order of the day.

Kay introduces the topic:

Proposal 2. Displayed board choices regarding candidates: Expresses as her opinion that board members should document the results of the candidates that they interview and publish this to the GMA and proceed to the order of the day.

Kay emphasises that proposal 2 focuses on the results. Not about what the interviewees found of them. So they should write down the answer not what the findings are of the answers.

Tawny: With the results do you mean the minutes?

Kay: Yes, I mean the minutes with that.

Chilok: Would you like to make an amendment to that right now?

Kay: Depends on what the amendment is.

Chilok: that the term results are changed into minutes.

Kay: I would be fine in clearing up some semantics if that helps you vote for the proposal.

Yaslin: for the first proposal i kind of feel like when you show the CV and motivation letter it is not representative. They might look good on paper but after the interview might not be as compatible. I feel like it would suck if you see the motivation of someone and it's less good than the one you sent in. like why am i not chosen for that position while my motivation was much better.

Kay: You are allowed to nominate yourself. I believe you're allowed to be a counter candidate and apply anyways. If you feel strong about your own case

Yaslin: This is about people who already applied but got rejected. But they can think that theirs was much better than one from the chosen candidate.

Kay: Personally I think you should just be an adult about it. You can always come to the GMA if you strongly about it to express your opinion. Publishing these documents would set a better ground to what the GMA is supposed to. The board is not chosen by the sitting board but by the GMA. The GMA should have access to the information that the board gets.

Lin: Why not the whole interview? The whole process is not only a CV and motivation letter. Some have very good motivation letters but make you change your mind during the interview.

Kay: I suggest you vote for both proposals then.

Lin: i suggest to make a amendment to proposal 1.
(Expresses her opinion as that CV, motivation letter and interview of each candidate should be published to the GMA while protecting their privacy by anonymizing their personal information down to their name and proceeds to the order of the day.)

Kay: So to merge the 2 as one? I would be fine to merge them together and vote on it once.

Xiu: privacy by anonymizing their personal information, i mean you already know who it is gonna be about so what is that about?

Kay: I meant more personal details such as phone numbers and email addresses. To leave that out.

Tawny: With each candidate do you mean every nominee candidate or every candidate that has applied for the position?

Kay: Every candidate that you can vote on.

Yaslin: Is it for the sitting board or for the supervisory and advisory board and such?

Kay: I would leave this up to the upcoming executive board to decide this.

David: i haven't thought about this yet

Kay: I would suggest to run with the definition that we have decided upon tonight and that would be boards. But I will leave this to the coming board to decide.

Yaslin: I think we should define it right now so we don't have to talk about it later. Like for the advisory board we don't really send in CV or motivation letters. Some are just old board members who apply. So there will be documentation for some and not for everyone, so that would not be very consistent and weird.

Kay: I would leave it to the upcoming board. There will always be grey areas and definitely in the application of the proposal. As long as it is written down in a board enough view to the people who dictate whether they have been trespassed or not is enough.

Yaslin: I get that, but i think , at the beginning of the GMA we had concluded it was all the boards. Is this description going to continue on. That we don't have to decide upon it later again. I get what you're going for, being very broad, but that can also lead to more uncertainty later one. For the next time nomination wise, for example. What if the board thinks it is not discussed but only the executive board. But what for the Advisory board? Where are their documents?

Jorine: I would say, in this case, we have established one definition for another point. I feel like we should differentiate what it means in one sentence in what it means in other sentences in the same document. For CV and minutes. We should add a sentence, like if there is no Cv then only minutes will be provided or something like that. I think with changes the wording we can fix this quite easily.

Jonli: Sounds like quite a good suggestion. Maybe some amendments are needed before voting.

Kay: I would like to rock one vote on one proposal, and if you care so much on the wording you can vote against it, i am fine with that..

Technically what happened is that there is a voting to the following proposal:

Proposal 1. Expresses her opinion as that CV, motivation letter and interview of each candidate should be published to the GMA while protecting their privacy by anonymizing their personal information down to their name and proceeds to the order of the day.)

Sidenote: documentation is in both Dutch and English so those have to be translated presumably.

Voting regarding Candidate transparency

Point A: 18 in Favour

Point B: 0 against

Point C: 6 blanco

Point D: 2 abstation

The proposal has been hereby accepted

14. Addition to Agenda: Personal Relationships with Candidates

Jonathan: i want to explain my idea in 3 steps, first the general idea behind my proposal, second why i created this proposal and explain the 2 variations of my proposal. The reason why I came up with this proposal was because of the previous GMA. There were quite a lot of questions between a board member and general member. I want to implement this to protect the trust in the general members in their ability to judge how fair the process has been. I feel like having strict rules clears up any confusion and ambiguity. If people find it too strict, since i have heard people say that, I am willing to make amendments. I want to provide one amendment of my own, suggested by Yaslin and Ting, the latter was not able to make it here today. The amendment was if a board member is in a relationship with a general member, then this general member can't be interviewed by this particular board member, this board member can't have the say in accepting and declining the application.

Proposal 1: When a board member is in a romantic relationship with a regular member, this regular member is automatically ineligible for a board position.

Proposal 2: When a board member is in a romantic relationship with a regular member, this regular member can still apply for a board position, but cannot be interviewed by the board member and this board member must not have any influence on the acceptance/rejection of this regular member.

Lin: I get the thought about it and the reason why this has been brought up, I want to get an amendment on both proposals, to not only include romantic relationships but also family relationships.

Jorine: does the relationship have to be official or does dating also count?

Jonathan: i do not have an answer, i have not defined it yet.

Lin: maybe it is nice to have this gray area, when in doubt about someone this can just be enforced then.

Timothy: i think this is a good proposal, i still don't see a necessity to include it in the House Rules. I think nomination in the GMA can also prevent this instead of defining just romantic relationships or family relationship. It is up to the GMA to decide if someone gets accepted or not.

Jonathan: this could be because you weren't there last GMA? We spent way too much time on this topic, I want to implement this to prevent that.

Yaslin: For us as board, we are more in favor of proposal 2, with the change to include family relationships. I get what you mean with leave the GMA decide, the romantic relationship with overshadow their competence, if this rule will be implemented it will give the nominee a fairer chance.

Timothy: In the end it is up to the GMA after all.

Mystery person: What happens if a relationship is kept secret?

Jonathan: At that point, I am not a policy maker, so I need to ask help to define that. I think it is more a problem of breaking the house rules by then.

Lin: If someone has been chosen and it turns out they have such a relationship then you can ask that during a GMA and revert the decision.

Timothy: what if you have a long time friend, that person can be as biased as a relationship or family member.

Kay: I have written an amendment to make it more broader and inclusive to other sorts of personal relationships. To keep the neutrality of the interviewee. That was rejected because Jonathan wanted to focus on romantic relationships. Why specifically romantic relationships?

Jonathan: Why only romantic relationships? I am not trying to make a comment on how strong family or friendship relationships are. We have all been in love, either now or a long time ago, i think we know the difference between being in love and being friends or family with someone. Point being, being in love blinds, at least in decision making ability. Maybe not, but i want to make sure that it isn't the case so that's why.

Kay: I would still suggest that you broaden this a little bit, and cite it to the HR.

Jonathan: I am open to amendments.

Kay: if it was cited into HR right now it would be exempt, relationships who have ended will be exempt from the rule. While i can/am still be blinded by love but in a different way.

Jonathan: I have thought about Kay's proposal and it has some nuance in it. I will let the GMA decide.

Jonathan: I still have my amendment, I think with my amendment you can still get technically speaking exactly what you want. I will offer my amendment to the GMA. Amendment: A mandate to candidate can't be interviewed when there is reasonable doubt of someone's neutrality.

Jonathan: It is vague, i am not against it, but i am against vagueness.

Kay: There is ambiguity in both proposals. Every question that has been asked here is because of unclarity.

Lin: They need to solve it, i think we can use Kay's amendment and add: such as romantic relationships, family relationships and friendships.

Jonathan: Does the GMA prefer Kay's amendment? I am willing to accept the amendment if the such as part, that was mentioned, is added.

Kay: i am willing to accept that amendment.

There is only one proposal now instead of 2.

Jonli: then the voting will be regarding: Candidates can't be interviewed by someone when there is reasonable doubt of someone's neutrality. I.E. romantic relationships, family relationships and very close friendships.

Voting proposal Kay's amendment of Personal Relationships with Candidates.

Point A: 30 in favor

Point B: 1 against

Point C: 0 blanco

Point D: 0 abstain

The proposal has been accepted.

15. House Rule Changes: Sanctions on Persons

There are several changes that we as a board want to make in the current House Rules. Quynh runs through all the House Rule changes on the presentation slides. Questions are asked at the end of the presentation.

Lin: all these rules apply to the current situation. Any objection to vote everything at once instead of separate?

No objections. So every change will be voted in at once.

Voting General House Rules Changes at once

Point A: 29 in favor

Point B: 0 against

Point C: 1 blanco

Point D: 0 abstain

House Rule changes has been accepted.

15. House Rule Changes: Sanctions on Persons

There are several changes that we as a board want to make in the current House Rules. Quynh runs through all the House Rule changes and additions regarding sanctions on persons on the presentation slides. Questions are asked at the end of the presentation.

Jonathan: So banning someone is quite a definitive action, in this case if someone has acted indecently, of course they should be punished. But have you taken into account checking proof.

Quynh: Proof is always necessary before giving someone a sanction. There needs to be talks and discussion with multiple parties and people who may have seen or have seen things.

Timothy: What I understand from HR 4.2 is that the ban starts from the date the incident has occurred but if the decision is made 2 months later then that means that the ban will only last 10 months right? And not a year.

Lin: You're right from what is written here.

Chilok: Then we need to amend this, cause Timothy is right and we mean to ban someone for 12 months.

Quynh: I think we can accept that amendment.

Jonathan: I want to make an amendment to add one word. Making 4.1 being: A member shall at all times refrain from abusive, humiliating, intimidating, **discriminating**, and sexually transgressive conduct that could damage ABC's members and name.

Quynh: I can all think we can agree with that amendment

Amendment regarding 4.1 has been approved. No objections

Amendment regarding 4.2 has been approved. No objections

Every amendment and changes will be voted in at once

Voting regarding House Rule changes and additions regarding sanctions on persons

Point A: 31 in favour

Point B: 0 against

Point C: 0 blanco

Point D: 0 abstain

House Rule changes and additions regarding sanctions on persons have been accepted.

15. Rules of Procedure Addition

Amendment has been made regarding Article 15.10: general members has been taken out the rule.

New Rule change: Proposers (board, audit committee or advisory- and supervisory bodies) should not be able to vote on proposals they have submitted themselves.

Kay: As a nominee can you vote part of the nominee. If you are part of the board can you vote on the upcoming board. If you are part of the board can you vote on your own board members?

Lin: They are able to do it since they are still general members. And not part of the board.

Kevin: What do you believe is fair? I have a suggestion to amend this.

Lin: What is the thought process about this?

Proposal has been revoked by the submitters

11. Board Compensation (continued)

Proposal 2 has been revoked by the board.

Proposal 1 has been amended.

A small recap of the changes has been requested.

Kevin: Changes have been made. We have widened the conditions to be eligible for compensation to: You're full time studying, you do not work full time or you aren't eligible anymore at one of the institutions that recognise ABC. In point 7 we have added that people needed to prove that. Board member is not obliged to send a request. In point 9 we have removed that ABC continues to realise surpluses.

Lin: GMA has a thing about whether we want to reward board members this amount of money, since we are a non-profit organisation. This is a voluntary board. Committee members don't receive anything. There will still be inequality. It won't be fair because 3 people will still not be compensated.

Xiu: I get that ABC is a non profit organisation, but we are still a student organisation. Shouldn't we, like ESN, still compensate our board members?

Lin: I want to clarify, no other student association is doing such a thing. ASVA is the only one that does it. They are a student union. Not a student association. UvA and VU give them money to be independent. All other associations in Amsterdam don't give board grants. You need to acknowledge that.

Kevin: You also need to acknowledge the lack of validation of board members under current circumstances.

Xiu: I want to come back to what Xiu said. She said that ESN provides a board compensation but what i heard previously during this meeting is that ESN does not provide a board compensation. But divides the board compensation that board members receive.

Jonli: I want to add to that statement. Board do get a board budget to do stuff together as a board from ESN.

Timothy: You stated that it is a recognition for the board. In ABC it is also stated that ABC is for students and young professionals and i hope to represent young professionals, but i don't see anything with regards to young professionals?

Kevin: I have to get back to the work table and start writing again. I hope to have included everyone by writing do not work fulltime, study full time. Aren't eligible anymore.

Kay: I think the only reason why other student associations don't struggle with this is, is because we accept students from other universities. All the top 5 student associations in Amsterdam you have to study at VU, UvA and some allow HvA. So they don't cope with this

problem. We can consider that when it comes to the reimbursement we give out of our own pocket. We should think about if we accept people from other universities. This is something fundamentally different about ABC. As you can join ABC while you don't study at an Amsterdam university.

Lisa: I want to clarify some things. If I read this proposal I assume that this will start from the next board meeting. But it is not written there. I would like you to make an amendment from when this starts.

Kevin: Can you trust me on that?

Lisa: I can trust you on that.

Jonli: Are you trusting him on it or are you requesting an amendment.

Lisa: I am requesting an amendment.

Jonli: We don't have to write it down right now. Because we have Chilok from the minute.

Jonli: You can vote!

Chilok: I want to verify that we are in quorum because discord is a bit empty now.

Jonli: ohh ohh, everyone stay still so Chilok can count the votes now

Jonli: We can't continue with the voting cause we need 35 for the quorum and we are around 20 ish.

17. Closing

Jonli: We have to close it off, cause we need to go now.

GMA has been closed by Jonli.