

Minutes GMA Organisation of Study Associations

Date, time: 28th of January 2021, 14:00

Location: Online



Present Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II)
 Patrick van Oerle (OSb 2020-II)
 Lars Essenstam (OSb 2020-II)
 Imke Nijenbanning (OSb 2020-II)
 Boudewijn Steenbreker (OSb 2020-II)
 Ruben Bos (OSb 2020-II)
 Ruben den Hertog (CB OSB 2021-I)
 Niels de Groot (Activism Grant Committee)
 Manouk Ramselaar (Student Union)
 Ruben Uineken (Supervisory Board Student Union)
 Daan Velthuis (W.S.G. Abacus)
 Gerard Groot Obbink (C.T.S.G. Alembic)
 Meltem Lampe (S.V. Arago)
 Jan den Uijl (S.A. Astatine)
 Alexander de Ranitz (S.A. Atlantis)
 Koen Rispens (S.A. Communiqué)
 Nick van Nijen (Concept)
 Maarten Smit (S.G. Daedalus)
 Christine Mulrane (S.V. Dimensie)
 Kristy Claassen (W.T.S. Ideefiks)
 Jelle Maas (I.C.T.S.V. Inter-Actief)
 Ryan Wakamiya (Komma)
 Jonne van Haastregt (W.S.G. Isaac Newton)
 Koen Geurtsen (CB W.S.G. Isaac Newton)
 Nikki Zandbergen (S.V. Onwijs)
 Lisette Masselink (S.V. Paradoks)
 Imke Verschuren (S.A. Proto)
 Wouter Nijenhuis (E.T.S.V. Scintilla)
 Brian Egberink (Sirius)
 Jeroen Assink (S.V. Stress)
 Thomas Goudsblom (Applicant Supervisory Board Student Union)
 Yorick Moleman (Applicant Supervisory Board Student Union)

Chair Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II)
Secretary Patrick van Oerle (OSb 2020-II)



1 Opening

Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II) opens this General Members Assembly.

14:02

2 Setting the agenda

The agenda is adopted without changes.

5 3 Notifications

3.1 OS Board

i ERO Courses

Lars (OSb): As already mentioned in the AnnOSments Group, no ERO courses are scheduled for January and February and maybe even March. This depends on the government regulations, since giving ERO courses is considered a contact profession. We are aware that this could cause problems for later on in the year, but Jelmer said he thinks it will be possible to give ERO courses earlier than activities are allowed to take place. They are also aware that a lot of courses need to be given, so they will probably schedule more than usual.

ii Voting

15 Patrick (OSb): For today's vote we would like to use Helios Voting, for which we need your e-mail addresses. This is indicated in the attendance list, so please fill in your personal e-mail address. This is for study associations only, since they are the ones allowed to vote.

3.2 OS Committees

20 Niels (ABC): On behalf of the ABC me and Bart are there to answer your questions regarding the grant division.

3.3 Study Associations

Jelle (Inter-Actief): There will be another chairmen outing this evening.

3.4 University Council Parties

25 Patrick (OSb): I got a notification from Kevin (UReka) that he is not there, and I don't think anyone from DAS is there either.

4 Minutes

4.1 Minutes GMA 17-12-2020 (Document 20210102)

30 Imke (Proto): On page 7, after the decision has been made about the errata, could a line be added indicating that the next discussion is about the actual division of the grants? That is not entirely clear now.

Wouter (Scintilla): On page 3, Manouk (SU) said that we will receive information on how to apply for grants. We haven't gotten that yet, why is that?

Imke (OSb): Since last GMA there was a lot of discussion about the grants so we just waited for a little while until all questions had been answered and therefore handed in our division



later than expected. You will get the information, just later than usual. 35

Manouk (SU): We didn't send the mail yet because the division wasn't totally set yet. During this GMA you will set the final division and then you will receive the mail in about one or two weeks.

Imke (Proto): On page 10 it states that we will discuss the provision of the activism grants for 2021. Why isn't it on the agenda? 40

Lieke (OSb): We would like to have a look at it again, since there are so many questions we want to further discuss this with the ABC. It's likely that there are a lot of changes to the current ABC model, so we chose not to send it right now and present it, hopefully, at February's GMA.

Decision *The minutes of the GMA of 17-12-2020 are approved with the proposed changes.*

5 To-do List 45

There are no ongoing action points.

6 Explanation Activism Grants Distribution procedure

6.1 Procedure ABC (Document 20210106)

Imke (OSb) gives a presentation about the procedure of the ABC and FOBOS in general.

Jonne (Newton): I think it's really important to ask how important these 6th board members are. The whole point that it was necessary to receive grants for 6th board members is that a lot of study associations have a 6th board member, and we think it is necessary to have one. If it is too much of a problem to include them in Category 2 of the FOBOS model and we don't want to include them in our ABC model, then I don't think we should include them. I think the 6th board member should either be in Category 2 or not there at all. 55

Imke (OSb): We know that a study association board can work with just 5 board members, but a 6th board member is just more fruitful. We have placed the 6th board member below the MUST category, so the study tours and symposia, in priority so these committees will still get their grants first.

Niels (ABC): Someone said that the 6th board member was important enough to take grants from the MUST category. If you look at the diagram, that is not the case. Before any grants flow through to the 6th board member, the MUST category must be filled. The reason that is not the case here is that we have our own model and redivide grants within OS and prioritize internally. The reason we included the 6th board member this year is that we should have given back our grants if we didn't award them to the 6th board member. We would not have more grants for committees, only less grants in total so there is no point in not including the 6th board member. 65

Jonne (Newton): If you look at the ABC model, study tours were given 29 grants with a reason. In that case, we say as OS: 'Study tours are that important to study associations, we award them 29 grants', while afterwards we say they aren't by cutting them nearly half. 70

Ruben (OSb): We also wondered why we award study tours with 29 grants, which is why we asked former OS board members. They all say it appears to be quite random, when transferring from the old grants system to the current one, and there was no clear reason why study tours get 29 grants instead of the 15 according to the SU.

Niels (ABC): If we change the amount of grants in our ABC model, we should first debate whether the 6th board member is more important or not than the MUST category (i.e. study tours and symposia). We will include this in our model and hopefully have this ready before 75

Minutes GMA Organisation of Study Associations

Date, time: 28th of January 2021, 14:00

Location: Online



the next GMA.

80 Jonne (Newton): Then I would also like to advise that OS board decides on the board grants and the ABC only divides the committee grants. Then associations would not have to vote on their own grants.

Ruben (OSb): That is not a way to get around it, since it would still have to be approved by the GMA before we can hand it in to the Student Union.

85 Lieke (OSb): Indeed, the only way to not vote on the board grants would be to include them in Category 2, which is exactly what we would like to see as well.

Niels (ABC): I just want to say that the whole thing of taking apart the 6th board member is something we have already looked at. The ABC has an idea of what we are going to work towards with the new model, but we still need to work out the details and hopefully present it next GMA. But we will take any advise given today into account.

90 Maarten (Daedalus): I agree with Jonne that the 6th board member should be seperated from the committees and I do think that the committees are more important than the 6th board member. Also, can you provide us some proof why 19 or 15 grants are enough for a study tours instead of 29?

95 Niels (ABC): We already explained this in the previous GMA and our letter; the 19 grants are simply because we needed to redistribute an amount of grants from the study tours to fill the 6th board member. It's not that we threw some dice and got to 19, we made a calculation of how many grants we were still missing and then got to the 19 grants for the study tours. Additionally, according to the Student Union model study tours should only receive 15 grants, based on their workload. This means that study tours now still receive more grants than they should according to the Student Union.

100 Maarten (Daedalus): So this time the approach was something like 'we need 50 grants, where are we going to take it from?' where I think the approach should be 'how many grants do study tours deserve and how much is left for the 6th board member?'

105 Ruben (OSb): As Niels already mentioned, study tours would only deserve 15 grants according to the Student Union, so we are already awarding them more with our ABC model.

Niels (ABC): Yes, and if we were to use that approach, study tours would receive less grants than they do now. Just keep that in mind.

110 Maarten (Daedalus): Remember we are not the Student Union. The SU has way less vision on what a study tour entails and how much work it is to organise one. We should really evaluate as OS, do an investigation and see how many grants each committee would deserve and give them those amount of grants.

115 Ruben (OSb): What you are suggesting right noow is what actually happened this year. 29 is the maximum amount of grants for study tours, which seems to be kind of a random number. We are looking at how many grants we have to divide, see what committees we have and look at their workload, and based on that we divide the grants.

Maarten (Daedalus): I think 15 grants is really little. You only get a little over 2 grants for 2 years of work.

120 Niels (ABC): I think we should not forget that the SU has little view on what happens. The 15 grants for study tours is decided by the EI meeting with the different umbrellas, amongst which is the SU. All umbrellas agreed that 15 grants is the correct number for study tours, also OS agreed on this. We can overwrite this decision, but since the SU is the one giving us the money they do kind of have a say on what we spend the money on. We can't just completely decide on our own model and ignore them.

125 Jeroen (Stress): Different question: I don't get why the SU decided our division isn't correct this year and I don't see the differences made this year compared to last years.



Imke (OSb): The main difference is that the 6th board member is included. If we leave it out, as it was previous years, the MUST, SHOULD and COULD would be filled amongst each umbrella evenly. This year the 6th board member is included, and fall between the MUST and SHOULD categories and would therefore receive grants before the SHOULD category. This would mean that the 6th board member would be about 60% filled, and there would be 0 grants left for the SHOULD category. The reason why the 6th board member is not in Category 2 is that a lot of grants would be taken from the EI Category to Category 2, leaving the other umbrellas with a really little amount of grants. This was considered unfair by the SU, which is why they decided not to implement it in that way.

Jeroen (Stress): Is this the first year that the ABC division is rejected by the SU? 135

Manouk (SU): The final decision is for the Student Union. What happened previous years is that the final division is established by all umbrellas during the EI meeting, and if all umbrellas agree, the SU does as well. This year we had about 10 EI meetings, also about the 6th board member. The conclusion is that the 6th board member was deemed important, also by other umbrellas, which is why OS received quite a lot this year. Other umbrellas kind of handed in their grants for the 6th board members of OS, which were redistributed over committees in the first erratum. That is why the other umbrellas would disagree with that division: those grants were meant for the 6th board member and not for committees. In previous years, the redistribution didn't make a significant difference after the ABC model, so it was fine. This year, there was a significant difference, being board grants redistributed over committees, which is why we intervened. 145

Jonne (Newton): There was one point that Maarten made that I think is important, and that was that should establish priority between board members and committees. The other umbrellas accept to receive less grants for our 6th board member. What we should be talking about is whether we should put effort in getting grants for board members, or put more effort in getting more grants for our committees. I think it is better to put effort in getting more grants for our committees rather than our boards. 150

Lieke (OSb): This discussion is more for the next GMA, but we will take it into account when making the model.

Niels (ABC): We haven't requested anything for 2021 as the deadline is still in quite a while. The ABC has a meeting next week to discuss 2020 as well as the requests for 2021. Our intention is to solve the problem first in whatever way possible, by adapting our model or something like that. Then we will be using that to file the requests for 2021 at the SU. 155

Alexander (Atlantis): So there is a lot of discussion about the OS grants model. Why do we have a different model than the SU and why is that not a problem for the SU? 160

Niels (ABC): I think I can say that is could be a problem to use our own model, as the SU or other umbrellas could tell us that our re-division is unfair and they don't accept it. We should indeed consider whether our redistribution model is a good thing, and removing it and using the SU model is one of the options we are going to talk about next week. 165

Imke (Proto): You could make a separate division for the 6th board members so we can vote on that. Then it would not affect the committee grants.

Jonne (Newton): In the request phase we will not chose between committees or boards, but it should be clear how many grants go to 6th board members and how many grants go to committees. Then it will kind of be separated. 170

Jeroen (Stress): So we are currently deciding upon a number of grants a committee should get. We could also decide upon a percentage each committee should get. If we value our study tours 50% of the grants, and our symposia and the rest 25% you stop the discussion about how many



grants is fair.

175 Niels (ABC): We already kind of do that, but then with the projected amount of grants. We already decide on who should get what proportion of the grants received, and in the end distribute the amount of grants we receive in the end evenly according to the proportions agreed upon in the beginning.

6.2 Letter Daedalus (Document 20210103)

180 Maarten (Daedalus): I still don't agree with the distribution within the study tours. I do agree that committees that actually had their study tour deserve a little bit more grants, but now Inter-Actief and Daedalus receive over 50% less grants than Newton and Stress while we might have already done 80% of the work. I think the first distribution, which was about 25% less, was more fair. Why didn't you keep in line with the earlier distribution, which would make it
185 12-16 grants instead of 9-19 grants?

Imke (OSb): When we had to take away grants for the 6th board member, we looked into what was most fair. We believed that 9 for the study tours that had not taken place and 19 for the study tours that had taken place was most fair. Going on a trip for 3 weeks, the committee puts a lot of work in those weeks and the study tours that didn't go didn't have
190 this workload. Besides, we rather award activities that have taken place rather than cancelled activities. Therefore we believe this is the fairest option.

Maarten (Daedalus): But we did all the preparations and I don't think the trip itself adds up to 50% of the work for a study tour. The trip itself is quite a lot of work, just not 50%.

Jonne (Newton): I would like to add that for the study tours that did take place, it is not only
195 the 3 weeks that you are on the trip that adds to the workload. You also have the months afterwards, where the financial settlement is made and reports have to be written. In my opinion, cancelling all the bookings takes less effort than rounding up a study tour, and I think 9-19 grants is not that bad of a division.

Lieke (OSb): Since I don't think we can easily get to a conclusion here, I think it is best to
200 quickly see who wants to change the current distribution, and who doesn't. If you want to see the division changing, please raise your hand.

Lieke (OSb): Since only 3 associations raised their hand, we will stick to the distribution as agreed upon during the previous GMA.

Maarten (Daedalus): The last thing I want to point out is that we really should create an
205 article in the Huishoudelijk Reglement (*English: Internal Rules and Regulations, IRR*) about a deadline to deliver documents before a GMA. This would prevent the situation that documents get sent 18 hours before a GMA.

Imke (Proto): Just a quick question: was the first erratum that was sent to the GMA checked by the SU before it was sent to us?

210 Niels (ABC): We sent the documents a week in advance, and the SU receives it together with you. From that moment on, Manouk could look at the documents and if she prepared the GMA later on, it was found out it could pose a problem. We were then informed and we fixed it as soon as possible with the second erratum. If your question is: 'Why didn't you send it to the SU beforehand?' then that doesn't help, since you would still have to approve the document.
215 We only officially send the document to the SU after it is approved by the GMA.

Imke (Proto): At least the SU would have noticed earlier that we were going to vote on a document that was not going to be approved by the SU, and you would have more time to prepare the second erratum.

220 Niels (ABC): I agree with that, this would have helped this time. However, if we do this with every document, this would give a lot of overhead since it rarely occurs that the SU doesn't



approve it.

Manouk (SU): I just want to make clear that it was no one's intention to bring up such a discussion as happened now. We are aware that this year's procedure was bad and we should improve this next year. We are going to do this and make sure it won't happen again in the future.

225

Imke (Proto): From my predecessors I was told that delivering proofs was a month earlier last year compared to this year, why is that?

Jonne (Newton): I don't think the ABC was set up earlier.

Lieke (OSb): We have shortly talked about a deadline for documents being sent before a GMA. We will discuss it with the OS board, and come up with a proposal to change our IRR and include a deadline for delivering documents.

230

Action point *OS Board Make a proposal to include a deadline for delivering documents for a GMA in the Internal Rules and Regulations. (deadline 18-02-2021)*

7 Position Supervisory Board Student Union

NOTE: Since I was trying to get Helios Voting to work, I didn't take notes of the questions asked to Thomas and Yorick.

235

7.1 Thomas Goudsblom (Document 20210104)

Thomas Goudsblom (Applicant Supervisory Board Student Union) introduces himself and answers the questions asked.

7.2 Yorick Moleman (Document 20210105)

240

Yorick Moleman (Applicant Supervisory Board Student Union) introduces himself and answers the questions asked.

Lieke (OSb): So we would like to use Helios Voting for the voting today, but since all e-mail addresses have to be entered manually, we need a little time to do this. There will be three voting options; either Thomas or Yorick, and the third option will be to abstain from voting. Voting blanc would make no sense, since you would suggest someone other than Thomas or Yorick, and probably doesn't even want to part of the Supervisory Board.

245

We take a small break of around 10 minutes to try and fix Helios. We failed.

Patrick (OSb): There is an error occurring when I enter the e-mail addresses, which seems to be a server-side issue which we unfortunately can't resolve. We will have to use a Google Forms for voting like last time. I have sent the link in the chat, and the e-mail address is to check whether everyone has voted once.

250

Decision *Yorick Moleman is nominated for the position in the Supervisory Board of the Student Union with 9 votes for Yorick, 4 votes for Thomas and 5 associations abstaining.*

8 Current COVID-situation

255

Lieke (OSb): Are there any questions or issues that you currently have, regarding COVID-19?

Gerard (Alembic): Mainly for the other associations, we want to organise online activities as a board ourselves since committees seem to have a lack of motivation. What kind of activities is



everyone organising?

260 Maarten (Daedalus): We use a website called Gather.Town, which has some nice features with interactions, a custom world and some mini-games.

Jeroen (Stress): We also used Gather.Town, but we also remade the MBasement and Abscint. We host drinks there, which is much nicer than using Discord. I would really recommend it.

265 Jan (Astatine): We have noticed that activities that are not a one-time thing, for example tournaments that take 2 or 3 weeks, people are more engaged in. We are also using Ommetje, an app from the *Hersenstichting* (Brain Foundation, a charity organisation) where everyone has to take a walk for 20 minutes a day, which people quite enjoy.

Alexander (Atlantis): MiBo is an online platform that can be used for drinks, similar to Gather.Town. It's a little bit more expensive, but it's 3D which is cool.

270 Jeroen (Stress): We are having difficulties with deciding upon a weekend which is planned for the last weekend of the academic year. We are unsure whether we want to support it with 1,5 meter restrictions, because we kind of figure that keeping distance is not going to happen. We struggle whether this is a good idea or to stop organising it. What are your thoughts on this, or do you have any advise?

275 Gerard (Alembic): We have 2 camps being organised, which have some go/nogo moments to see whether they can continue. We have some fixed criteria, and we hope it is still possible to go. We try to avoid making payments and stall them to the last moment, but we do encourage committees to organise those activities.

280 Jeroen (Stress): Thank, but the question is more; how would you guys handle the fact that 1,5 meter is not kept during such weekend?

Jonne (Newton): I would say it is nice to organise a weekend away, maybe with a little less partying than usual, but having physical activities, be it distanced, is highly valued.

285 Jeroen (Stress): We know that they won't keep 1,5 meter distance. We could arrange a huge location where it would theoretically be possible, but it still won't happen. We will probably bring around 30 people.

Lieke (OSb): You might go camping as well. You have your own personal space and keeping distance could be easier. It might be hard to organise, but it might be nice in the end.

Jonne (Newton): I know ConcepT organised a camping trip, you could ask Lieke (previous board) how they did that.

290 Gerard (Alembic): Do associations still organise trips abroad?

Jelle (Inter-Actief): We still have the voucher for the trip of last year, so we wait for things to clear up and otherwise postpone the trip. We don't think a trip will be doable with 1,5 meter distance, but we are thinking of ways to organise such events.

295 Meltem (Arago): We are thinking about it as well, but we will make a decision about whether activities can continue at March 1st, and postpone payments as much as possible.

Lisette (Paradoks): Our committee plans to go camping in the Netherlands as it might be allowed earlier than going abroad. We tried planning a trip to somewhere in Europe, but that probably won't happen, so we decided to stay in the Netherlands and hope for the best.

9 Upcoming Topics

300 9.1 Activism Grants Distribution 2021 Provision

Lieke (OSb): This will hopefully be discussed next GMA, and otherwise in March. We will discuss what the distribution will look like and what changes to the model we want to make.



9.2 FocOS Group: Motivation

Lieke (OSb): It is rather hard to find someone who can help us organise this FocOS Group, but we will try our best. 305

Jelle (Inter-Actief): Stress and Inter-Actief will have something like this as well, but we might have found a party who might be willing to organise it with OS as well. You can contact me or Jeroen for this.

9.3 Charging UTEA 2021

Lieke (OSb): As it looks, we will charge the next UTEA in February. 310

9.4 Documents ABC 2021

Lieke (OSb): This is kind of the same as the provision for the grants; we hope to have it ready next GMA and otherwise we postpone it to March.

Jonne (Newton): What is the deadline for these divisions, and will March be in time?

Lieke (OSb): The deadline is in May or June, so we will definitely be in time. 315

10 Any Other Business

Jeroen (Stress): A small reminder, I sent a message in the WhatsApp-group about a silent disco for Enschede. I haven't received many responses, but please do so and also if you are not interested.

Ruben (SB SU): As we have chosen my successor, this will likely be the last OS GMA I will be attending after 5 years of GMAs. I wish you all the best of luck, and thank you for all those years! 320

11 Resumé Action Points and Decisions

11.1 Resumé Action Points

Number	Action point	Deadline
GMA JAN.01	OS Board Make a proposal to include a deadline for delivering documents for a GMA in the Internal Rules and Regulations. (page 7)	18-02-2021

11.2 Resumé Decisions 325

- **GMA JAN.01** The minutes of the GMA of 17-12-2020 are approved with the proposed changes. (page 3)
- **GMA JAN.02** Yorick Moleman is nominated for the position in the Supervisory Board of the Student Union with 9 votes for Yorick, 4 votes for Thomas and 5 associations abstaining. (page 7) 330

12 Closing

16:13 *Lieke Pullen (OSb 2020-II) closes this General Members Assembly.*