

Dear OSb, SU, ABC and Chair(wo)men of the Associations,

I am writing this document as a discussion piece for the GMA on the 28th of January. In this document I want to share my insights regarding the response letter of the OSb and my current viewing on the situation. I want to make clear that this is not only a response to the letter of the OSb but most importantly a discussion piece during the next GMA and is therefore directed to all involved parties and the GMA itself.

A decision was made during the GMA on the 18th of December considering the inclusion of a 6th board member in the division of activism grants. In this document I will give several arguments why I think the current distribution is unfair and far from ideal. I would like to stress to all chairs to carefully read this document and reconsider their position on this division. Next to that I will address the process that led to this decision. Mistakes were made by all parties, but it is important to reflect on this to prevent similar future situations and re-address if the current solution is optimal.

During the GMA on the 18th of December the argument was made by the Student Union that the 6th board member can't be included in category 2 as not enough grants would remain for more "important" committees and boards in category 3. I would like to ask the Students Union why they think this is the case as it undermines the whole concept of the current FOBOS grants system. At some point a decision was made that category 2 is more important than category 3. And therefore category 2 should receive grants first. Saying that some committees or boards in category 3 are more "important" directly contradicts this system and suggests that this is wrong. And if this is not the case then the current solution shouldn't be allowed. Next to this, I learned that the Student Union has changed the regulations to allow the current solution. I think this is a really strange approach to solving this situation. At some point the decision was made that the current regulations are acceptable and most fair for everyone. Changing them again suggests that the board of the Student Union thinks that the current system is flawed. I would therefore like to hear from the Student Union why these decisions were made and why the chairs of the associations weren't informed earlier that the regulations were changed on the coming GMA. And maybe more importantly why the OSb and the ABC didn't try to contradict this decision.

Next to that a big problem of the current solution is that an unaffiliated party, committees of the associations, are disadvantaged for a problem of the boards of the associations and the Student Union. The committees shouldn't be involved in this. I absolutely believe that the ABC has tried their best to get the most ideal solution in their eyes. However, I think the approach to reach this "ideal" situation is wrong. Currently the goal of the ABC was to get the most amount of grants to divide under the associations. It should be, how can the ABC reward the activism of the committees of the associations the most? This is the main goal of the grants that the OS receives to divide as is stated in the FOBOS regulations of 2019. Currently, some committees only receive 9 grants for 2 full years of work which means less than 1,3 grants per person. I think this is unfair. And therefore I would like to stress to all chairs to really consider if the

current distribution is the most fair. Yes, your association receives more grants in total, yes you get personal financial benefit from the current solution, but is it fair to punish other unaffiliated parties to get more money for yourself and take this money from a party who worked really hard to earn it?

I understand that removing the 6th board member from the division will probably lead to a decreased amount of total grants to divide. But as I stated before I think getting the most amount of grants shouldn't be the goal of the OSb and the ABC. Rewarding the committees of the associations should be and is the goal of the ABC.

In addition to that, in the process towards the current solution some weird decisions and mistakes were made. I still think that the review period of 18 hours that the boards of the associations got was too short. It is correct that most of us do full time boards but this does not mean that we are not busy with other manners. The fact that board years are fulltime is for a reason. But as I now understand this was not the fault of the ABC. I also want to say now that I am highly grateful to the ABC for laying down all work and creating a new proposal in just 6 hours, but I think it's ludicrous that the ABC only got 26 hours before the GMA to change their proposal. This is why I want to direct myself towards the Student Union again. How was it possible that this decision only came through at this very last moment? As I understand the division of the FOBOS grants is one of the more important tasks of the Student Union. Giving umbrella associations only 26 hours to revise their proposal in my eyes shows high negligence on behalf of the Student Union. Something I find really strange is that the OSb and the ABC "agreed" to follow this decision. I think the OSb and the ABC should not have accepted the 26 hours they got from the Student Union and should have protested against it.

In the letters previously sent by me and the OSb some attention was directed towards the definition of an Erratum and if the voting during the GMA went correctly. I think that these should be discussed during the coming GMA, but are less important than the discussion around the current division. If the sent document was an erratum and if the GMA was undemocratic are unimportant in my opinion and will probably end in a yes-no discussion which is futile. However, we should discuss how we can prevent similar complaints in the future. Some chairs felt that the voting was rushed and unfair and this shouldn't be allowed to happen, even if it's not true. In addition to this, new by-laws should be created and also include deadlines for the OSb, the Student Union, the ABC or other parties for delivering documents or errata to the GMA. By clearly defining the definition of an erratum and defining these deadlines in new by-laws or including them in the HR or statutes future discussions can be averted.

And then I come to the sentence which surprised me the most in the response of the OSb and the ABC (last Alinea on page 2): *"However, if this change is not possible, the OS should be prepared to change their current model for activism grants to also include a category for 6th board member grants."* No, this should absolutely not be considered. Yes, the OSb should still try to get the 6th board member included in category 2, but the grants that are divided by the ABC are, and should remain, for the committees of the associations and not for board members. In the letter of the OSb and the ABC they state that they agree with the fact that voting to get financial benefit for yourself should be averted. But in the last alinea of the second page they

state that if the 6th board member would be included in the grants model they of course have the right to vote on this model which directly contradicts the statement that voting for personal financial benefit should be averted. I would like to stress to the ABC and the OSb that the current solution should not and cannot be a precedent for future attempts to include 6th board members in receiving grants. As I stated before punishing unaffiliated committee members to get more grants for boards members is unfair and should not be allowed now or in the future.

I hope that this document clearly shows my insights on the current situation and allows for an open discussion at the next GMA. To give structure to this discussion I propose that we discuss the following points in this order:

- What is the logic behind the decision to grant 5 out of six board members out of category 2 from the SU and one out of the OS grants?
- Why did the Student Union decide that some boards or committees in category 3 are more important than category 2? And why didn't the OSb and the ABC contradict this?
- How was it possible that the ABC got this small amount of time to create a new proposal?
- Do we think the current distribution is still fair and why?
- Should we include the 6th board member in future divisions?
- How can we create by-laws that prevent similar problems/discussions in the future and what has to be done to achieve this?

Lastly I want to stress towards the Student Union to wait with finalising the current division until after the GMA on the 28th January. If you have any questions about this document, please feel free to contact me.

Kind regards,

Maarten Smit

Chairman of the 19th board of S.G. Daedalus