

GENERAL ASSEMBLY Surplus Stopgap Budget 2024-2025
05/06/2025

Agenda:

- Opening of the GA
 - Approval of Agenda
 - General announcements
 - New board members and IB members
 - Rules of the GA, presented by Independent Body
 - GA votes on previous minutes of the GA
 - Motions on policy manual
 - Surplus & Stopgap budget
 - Open floor questions
 - Closing the GA
-

Attendee:

1. Valérie
2. Ayra
3. Bernardo
4. Jente
5. Julie
6. Lucile
7. Delphine
8. Thije
9. Yael
10. Kate
11. Albert
12. Jasmijn
13. Giulia
14. Colette
15. Charlotte
16. Audrey
17. Lena
18. Pauline
19. Franek
20. Ares
21. Mirthe
22. Pascal
23. Elisa

24. Leonhard
 25. Raphaela
 26. Romane
 27. Maja
 28. Juul
 29. Iris
 30. Ella
 31. Misaki
 32. Kai
 33. Sebastian
 34. Mathilde
 35. Julian
 36. Sam
-

Opening of the GA

Timestamp: 19:00

- The location has changed
 - President Audrey introduces the the GA
 - wooclap set up
-

Approval of Agenda

- Yes: 30
- no:
- abstain:

-> the agenda has been approved

General Announcements

- New board member has been introduced
- Finance committee is coming to present themselves:

Bernardo, Albert and Julian:

- They like finance and economics world
- They noticed that there weren't any committees that met this particular interest
- Activities: workshop, quiz nights, invite people, weekly meetings

- Question: How would the finance committee collaborate with other committees?

- Answer: ask experts to join or PhD students
- Question; what about other committees like the film committee?
- Answer: (unanimous) Wolf of Wall Street
- Comment from Pascal: this committee handed in the proposal to be a committee, SB has already been approved as the trial committee

Votes on finance committee to be official committee

- yes: 25
- no: 3
- abstain: 2

-> Finance committee has been approved

Announcements from IB:

- About the Freiburg exchange event: budget on the car according to title 11 -> new transportation form. Current policy manual does not have proper rules on the alternative transportation option -> new motion to address the transportation methods and budgeting. This event was approved based on a very unexceptional case, and IB acknowledged in the policy manual stating about this. Please participate in the vote because we have motions on this issue.
- About the elections: past election GA and all the problems that arose from it. Elections are valid, any wrongdoing or errors did not invalid the results of the election. Errors were made but that did not impact the results of the GA. Also address rumors around the proxies, those are difficult to investigate and thus they will remain rumors. Second, the term is allowed by the statutes thus it is completely within the rules. Any changes to this rule must be made according to the policy about statutes reformed (costs 400€ so let's be mindful). There are motions put into place to reform the elections. (Anni): if you have any ideas of reforms please email the IB.
- One IB member has resigned.

Rules of the GA, presented by Independent Body

- The Independent Body presents and explains the rules of the GA.
- Explains the motions and rules

Votes on Previous GA Minutes

The GA votes on the previous minutes of the GA.

- Yes: 31
- no: 0

- Abstain: 0

->The minutes have been approved.

Motions

Everyone who presents the motion has one minute to present.

- motions on title 4.1 - election promotion responsibility

I was the one who submitted the motion, this is basically about the election promotion, Universalis positions. The reason behind why we thought this would be a good idea, is because this was not in it (policy manual) beforehand. It is not like there was a terrible advertisement job, but just to make sure that there is clear policy, like how advertisement for each position should go, the way should be advertised, alongside with IB, so someone who is independent, also the board who are leaving the position. So ensure more transparency.

- Question: Timeline of the advertisement?
- Answer: There is already a timeline in the policy manual when advertisement should be done before the GA, when to close the advertisement.
- But this is more about clarity.

Votes on the motion:

- Yes: 28
- no: 0
- Abstain: 1

-> The motion has been passed.

- motions on title 4.2.5 - IB presence on deciding preferred candidates for MoU

As usual of democratic action the whole idea is being fair. People who oversee how it is happening, in the name of transparency I would say. Currently in the meeting of Universalis to decide on preferred candidates, IB is not here, and thus we want IB to be here from now on.

Clarification: How it is right now, when there is this meeting and Universalis board members vote, there needs to be consensus. So with this, IB will just be there to prevent bias.

- Question: When does IB interfere or use veto?
- Answer: They will not join the discussion on preferred candidates because the discussion should be done among universalis (board) members.

- Question: It says in 'd' that the IB has a veto right, is it individually or as a whole of IB?
- Answer: As a whole. IB as an entity.

Amendment to add in 'd' that the IB can use veto right and they have to state when they use veto, in the following GA.

- Question: Do they have to explain the reason behind the veto?
- Question: Declare what makes bias? or declare that there was a bias.
- Comment: Needs to follow the privacy law etc., but there should be clarity.
- Answer: they (IB) have to declare what state, regardless of their use of veto or not. So like when the whole election process happens, It will then be that IB will state they were there, nothing happened, or they were there and they said we have one objection for position X, based on reason Y.
- Comment: there is already something in the policy manual, that says that IB will audit the process of this. And present their audit at GA.
- Comment from IB: this has to be done anyway for audit. Like, they should change it or not, and whether they did change or did not change it.
- Comment: Then let's make it: IB has a duty to declare the veto process in the audit.

Amendment has been seconded.

Votes on amendment (that IB has a duty to declare the veto process in the audit):

- yes: 29
- no: 1
- abstain: 1

-> The amendment on motion has been passed.

- Question: is title 4 the election procedure right? shouldn't this be also in the IB's responsibility?
- Answer: no.

Votes on motion with an amendment:

- Yes: 28
- No: 3
- abstain: 0

-> The motion with an amendment has been passed.

-
- motions on title 4.2.5 - consensus on preferred candidate of MoU election

We just want to make sure that it is a fair democratic process. At the moment, when we had a puzzle meeting, that's what we called it, there has to be consensus, everyone has to agree on preferred candidates, and we want to change this into broad consensus. Not everyone has to be on the same page, but $\frac{2}{3}$ of the board has to agree. So not if one person says that I don't agree then that would theoretically mean there are no preferred candidates, which we think is wrong. Because then, if one person has the power to make sure there would be no preferred

candidates. we want to change that to broad consensus to $\frac{2}{3}$. Then, we want board members who are standing for reelection, they can participate in the discussion, because we believe that they can have valid points, but we would like individuals with a conflict of interest to not vote, so this would, conflict of interest can mean a lot of things, but people who are running again should abstain from voting for a preferred candidate, and $\frac{2}{3}$ will be changed with the amount of people that are voting.

- Clarification: this says that they cannot vote for the position they are re-applying for, or conflict of interest. They can vote on other positions.
- Question: so for the a1, that would mean that if you say for example, if you are deciding the preferred candidate for treasurer, and the entire executive board disagree, the preferred candidate still be the one that others agree with?
- Answer: I would say that chances are very..., like how it always works that we always listen to the board, and then they have priority and we listen to what the board knows. For example, for the treasurer, I would not be able to make a decision, so also this time I based my decision on the opinions of the existing executive board we interviewed people. It is more of an idea that now we have one person, one board says I don't agree then we have no clue.
- Comment from the person who asked the question: don't you think you should add at least one person from the concerned board should agree with the preferred candidates?
- Comment from IB: remember that IB will be also presenting at the meeting.
- Comment from answerer: it would be really weird if 8/12 people would vote differently.

Amendment: $\frac{2}{3}$ of the board. 8/12. including at least one person from each board has to agree with preferred candidates.

- Question: but isn't this amendment giving the one board veto power to not to decide the preferred candidates?
- Answer: I don't think that...
- Question: what value does it add to have the amendment?
- Answer: it adds the value that you have people with different opinions and different uses. It is more like you can say one board is a friend group, what if two boards are against one board, and then all of the people that are selected from various boards cannot be voted in by the teams.
- Question: but what does add a group of one person from the board?
- Answer: it doesn't change anything to the $\frac{2}{3}$.
- Answer: but then why would we have that when we have IB there ?
- Answer: cause IB is more about rules, and if the rule says $\frac{2}{3}$, it is $\frac{2}{3}$.
- Comment from IB: but we also don't want it a bias, so...
- Answer: just because $\frac{2}{3}$ are agreeing, does not mean there is bias.
- Comment from IB: no, but it does mean that maybe IB will look into it to see if there is a bias.

- Answer: but this would put it clearly, so that it just, at least one person from each board, which is, not something that would be crazy to reach, and I think would bring more democratic transparency to the process because it is a broad consensus in the sense that I saw two entities that agree to one thing, and ones that adds, it is more of a consensus between everybody, it's against this idea of friend group, because at least one person from each board needs to approve it.
- Question: but doesn't that, if you have a particularly close board, doesn't that give them veto on the preferred candidate?
- Comment: yea, because then if one board says we don't agree then they can kinda veto by just saying no.
- Comment: in the same way, currently you only need one person to say no, if one board says no, it's the same thing I believe.
- Answer: but that means that whole board. it's four people saying no.
- Comment: those four people have like a whole year to bond, they have mutual interest or biases against specific people.
- Answer: bias is not like...
- Comment from IB: we are already going to debate, if we want to debate, it should be seconded before the debate.

The amendment has been seconded.

- Comment: but both ways, if the full board disagree, $\frac{1}{3}$ is missing so it is the same thing.
- Comment: so if $\frac{2}{3}$ is agreed, even though the whole board vetoes, it still is a win.
- Comment: I think, also not everyone is on the interviewing process, sometimes people are not involved in interviewing candidates, so making it harder than the board who did the interview, I don't see it as transparency.
- Answer: but you do have one board that has been at all interviews. and if 2 of the boards is not at all interviews
- Comment: It circles back to the same issue. Because if it is one board that is at the interview, it would be logical for this particular board opinion to be put forward because they've been at the interview, but if it is a friend group, it is a problem. and it is not a perfect solution, but it is still kind of giving a balance to have one member of each board agree.
- Comment: but if $\frac{2}{3}$ are already agreeing on something, and $\frac{1}{3}$ is totally not agreeing, then there must be some kind of conflict, and then it's IB's turn to decide if there is bias or not.
- Comment: I mean the only thing you are thinking about right now is a scenario where two boards, 8 people vote pro, and one entire vote con. And that is the only scenario that this thing would apply.
- Answer: it is just to make it easier.
- Comment: but that is the only thing that extra thing would solve.
- Comment: by adding this, in your eyes, it could be you trying to make democratic, but it could also give people a tool to make it undemocratic.
- Answer: but if IB is here anyway. what if we say $\frac{2}{3}$ or more.

- Comment: it is the same thing, you are just rephrasing. Why rephrasing?
- Comment: because it is clear.
- Comment: one of the main problems is that boards can be quite close with each other. So if there is a relation, you are obviously thinking of those groups, and may vote on these groups.
- Comment: I can give one scenario where for example, everyone would agree. Let's imagine the crazy social board, and all they do is partying. And academic board and executive board are reasonable people, right? They all agree that one person who is running for the next social board should not be preferred candidates who handle responsible things. And the social board says that they are like a friend group, we don't like this AB and EB have power to say. but we are $\frac{2}{3}$, and we can say we do not agree.
- Comment: if social boards push people like that, maybe they have a reason for that right?
- Comment: and yea that's why we shouldn't have one person from one each board.
- Comment: I think that is why we should have.
- Comment from IB: but that's why we have IB.
- Question: doesn't that just give a complicated situation? if they do not come into conclusion, they can just say there is no preferred candidate?
- Answer: because the role of this is to have a broad consensus. And consensus is everybody being included.
- Question: but if the only reason why the consensus in this case does not happen or fail is because the board is pissed off...
- Comment: maybe they are not one that are pissed off.
- Comment: can we move on?

The amendment has been dropped.

- Question: I have a question because now the motion is completely reformulated how I submitted the motion, because we just have the idea of first being re-elected cannot vote to any voting, that is what we discussed. I do want to know why. Was it like a misunderstanding?
- Comment from IB: I submitted the motion as they were submitted. We need to propose an amendment on that if you want to change that.
- Clarification: the person who is reelecting (re running) cannot vote on the preferred candidates of the new board of the universalis, but they can explain the reason why they think someone or they should be preferred candidates.
- Question from IB: why shouldn't they be able to vote, if they are re-elected to the same or different position as they are right now, why shouldn't they be able to vote on positions different than their own positions?
- Comment: okay now with $\frac{2}{3}$, it is less important, but with the broad consensus, that was a problem. But now with $\frac{2}{3}$, we can leave it like that.

The amendment from IB: matter related to the candidacy, but just their candidacy.

- Clarification: they cannot vote on their candidacy position they are going into.
- Comment: that was only there.
- Comment: this is only for clarification.
- Answer: no the idea was if someone stayed on the board, they cannot vote on the preferred candidates.
- Question from IB: for which position?
- Answer: all. That was the idea of the motion.
- Comment: This was the idea because we have other motions, and was not sure.

Clarification for b: that only means if the person they are going to new position, they cannot vote into the new position, which has already been applied but nowhere in the policy manual.

- Comment: we already have it in the motion, so no longer need the amendment then.
- Comment: yes.

The amendment has been dropped.

- Question: If then you are not voting for your position you are applying , is $\frac{2}{3}$ out of 12 or 11?
- Answer: out of 11.
- Comment from IB: IB is there, IB knows how to formally interpret the rule, also with the number of people who are voting.

Votes on motion:

- yes: 27
- no: 8
- abstain: 1

-> The motion has been passed.

-
- motions on title 3.11.7 - proxy votes procedure

Proxy votes for now are a mess, we propose that proxy votes should be sent by the absentee to the IB.

- No questions.

Votes:

- Yes: 32
- No: 0
- abstain: 1

-> The motion has been passed.

-
- motions on title 11.6 - travel expense

Budget motion. Rules on the reimbursement for travel, the policy manual was weirdly phrased. So any travel with a car was clear how much would be reimbursed, mainly fuel reimbursement set by Dutch law. It hasn't been set to any other transportation methods. Any type of transportation, the same calculation will be made. The number of kilometers times the legal set limit by the Dutch government of how much fuel will be reimbursed. It included the 15-30 euros that people would get for a trip. So whenever you travel for a day, 15 euros maximum will be reimbursed.

- Question: Some events can be super expensive?
- Answer: This is the limit, so we can prevent the over expense
- Question: could you explain how would that apply to freiburg exchange
- Answer: travel reimbursement from universalis will be 30 euros per person. divided by the people who are going.
- Question: now you cannot budget for a car extra?
- Answer: exactly. Cars should be also included in the travel cost and ticket as well. Any type of travel (realistic transportation) should fall into .
- Question: Is there a situation where green transportation could be realistic?
- Answer: yes at the GA we can discuss that.
- Question: will the km calculation not apply to trains then?
- Answer: if any tickets fall under 50 euros, it is totally fine. if any type of things included in travel.
- Question: 20 cents per km apply to trains as well?
- Answer: no. It just says for example, you are traveling further away, with the car you would spend 250 euros travel reimbursement. also for trains as well.

**the amendment - (the number change on title 11.6.2b <-11.4)
all transportation to be included in the part.**

- Question: so that means, the transportation exceeds the limit won't be covered?
- Answer: yes. The rest will be covered by tickets.
- Comment: which is, we have been doing in the practice.
- Comment: I understand the amendment, but 300 euros would not even cover probably $\frac{2}{3}$ of the transportations
- Comment: it would cover one car.
- Answer: calculate the number of people. So if you want 20 people you need 5 cars, that means, you get 1000 euros divided by 30, so you still have money left. If you go by train for example, tickets will be a bit more expensive.

**The procedural motion to extend the debate
-> has been seconded.**

votes on the procedural motion:

- yes: 16
- no: 15
- abstain: 1

-> the motion has NOT been passed.

votes on the amendment:

- yes: 24
- no: 8
- abstain: 4

-> the amendment has NOT been passed

[people confused on what they are voting on]

the votes are void.

- Question: what has been changed?
- Answer: clarity. It has been done practically, but differs by events and committees whether to include transportation to be in the reimbursement.

votes on the amendment: limit of reimbursement is set by 11.4 (vote 2.0)

- Yes: 26
- no: 7
- abstain: 3

-> the amendment has NOT been passed

- Question: because the amendment has not been passed, it is not included?
- Answer: still ambiguous.

- Comment: some events included the car to the travel reimbursement, while other events not, and there is an ambiguity. This amendment makes it clear.
- Comment: the purpose is to treat every event equally.

- Question: How expensive is the activity during Freiburg?
- Answer: national museum visit.
- Comment: we want to have transportation extra to the event.
- Comment: can we make an amendment for freiburg.

The amendment: we will consider the amendment that has not been passed, but make the exception on the event stated in the policy manual (Freiburg Exchange Event and UCSRN tournament)

-> second it.

votes:

- yes: 23
- no: 8
- abstain: 4

-> The amendment has NOT been passed.

the procedural motion to make this motion postpone

-> second it.

votes on procedural motion:

- yes: 28
- no: 2
- abstain: 1

-> the motion has been passed.

Surplus and Stopgap Budget

Current financials

Available Budgets: 21,813.15 euros

Budgeted Surplus; 426 euros

Budgeted Stopgap: 10,625.48 euros

Remaining amount: 10,761.68 euros

Executive Board

- Self explanatory. any questions. The mascot lost an ear during the UCSRN tournament, so we want to either buy or repair them.

-

stopgap 3.256.32 €

- Question: I have realized some board supplies are missing in Universalis Boardroom?
- Answer: That will fall under boardroom supplies. Also we can ask management.

complete budget

stopgap 3,256.32 €

Academic Board

- Both events probably are not going to happen, but just in case. We want to have a feedback session to ask what went wrong or what can be improved. We want to have extra drinks in case SB drinks did not happen.

surplus 220.00€

- Technical point: isn't there a rule on food?
- Comment: snacks or 20 euros except if the event is 30 people approx.
- Comment: under the sun, people will like to talk about academic matters. Hopefully.

- Question: Have you had an event like this before?
- Answer: We only had life after the bubble where we add 80 people
- Question: proposal, how about changing the event name to "picnic" instead of academic feedback session.
- Answer: the original idea was having a picnic but it didn't sound formal enough. we are also not going to spend 80 euros anyway

the motion on changing the academic event formal academic feedback session to picnic feedback session second it.

Votes:

- Yes: 28
- No: 4
- Abstain: 0

-> The motion has been passed.

stopgap 767.50 €

- pizza with dean
- board bonding according to the policy
- academic related event
- academic advising session - since we also have academic advising
- communication with the dean - we have a lot of communication

- Question: Do you think that's enough pizza?
- Answer: enough.
- Comment: no more february income students, so there might be less participants?

- Question: communication with the dean, you do not have to budget snacks because he always has it
- Answer: no he does not

- Question: why do you need snacks to talk to Wolfgang?

- Answer: it takes hours, you need

complete budget

surplus 220.00€

stopgap 767.50 €

Social Board

- Stopgap is the big one because it will have intro days. we will request the megaphone to speak up. Of course committees can use the megaphone if requested. board bonding. kaleido for open mic night. pub crawl - give enough opportunity to everyone after the scavenger hunt.
- Supplies for activities relating to the events
- Committee event: drinks, supplies for committees

stopgap 1555.00 €

- No questions

motion to have a speaker in the budget. waterproof, 200 euros -> second it.

- Question: doesn't the music committee have it?
- Answer: those are big speakers and immovable. we want something to be portable and something that every committee can use it

votes:

- yes: 32
- no: 1
- abstain: 1

-> the motion has been passed.

motion to have a condom budget for the sexual safety lecture 400 euros

- Comments: we are thinking to get the budget from sexual safety team
- Comments: budget just for safety
- Question: A lot of people said they will not use it because it is weird?
- Answer: i know a lot of people use it
- Question; so how much per one condom?
- Answer: 1.44 euro.

votes:

- yes: 25
- no: 10
- abstain: 0

-> The motion has been passed.

complete budget 1,755.00 €

Graduation

- We contacted all possible venues but this was the best we can do (lumiere), which we acknowledge the high cost.

stopgap 3.277.66 €

- Question: Is this 3000 euros more than previous?
- Answer: we are triple the amount of people graduating

- Question: What are the cheapest options other than lumiere?
- Answer; we do not have it right now, lumiere is the only option for now, though we are actively looking for the other options.
- Question: Have you done a survey to assess who can be there in November?
- Answer: we are quite confident that we can fill out the venue because half of the people are coming and you guys have class so it's fine

complete budget

stopgap 3.277.66 €

Party

- The summer gala would not be possible this year. They are motivated to do the welcome party instead of this summer gala. photographer, dj (tried to find cheaper dj than usual), tokens for free drinks, venues which have already been booked.

stopgap 450.00 €

complete budget

stopgap 450.00 €

Spiritual Enlightenment

- Wine tasting and beer tasting, but since the wine cost may be higher, the budget will be increased slightly.

stopgap 450.00 €

no questions.

complete budget stopgap 450.00 €

Sports

surplus 20.00 €

- Final training for football -> celebration for that, everyone is welcome. Court agreement.

stopgap 387.00 €

- Court agreement for the first weeks of the semester and make sure that our teams can practice
- Question: about volleyball, since a lot of them were cancelled, we made a lot of losses?
- Answer: thinking to do trials.
- Comment: suggest what to do after the fall GA?
- Comment: we really have to find someone we can train.
- Question: do we already have someone who can do it?
- Answer: (no clear answer)

complete budget

surplus 20.00 €

stopgap 387.00 €

Exco

surplus 69.00€

- Dead poet society <- this has been already budgeted in previous GA. It has been budgeted differently from the last GA
- St pieter picnic - for new board, super popular event.
- Concert - classical music pleaser, a certain amount of people would always join.

stopgap 200.00 €

- Question: we have already budgeted the dead poet society in the previous GA, so are we going to remove it from this budget or ask for more money?
- Question: how much did they budget last time and for what?
- Comment: total request was 25 euros and it was for food and drinks.

**The motion to match the dead poet society budget (take the previous budget 25 euros from the current budget)
second it.**

votes on motion:

- Yes: 25
- no: 0
- Abstain: 0

-> The motion has been passed.

- Question: what are the props for and why are they 35€?
- Answer: I think it was for cakes.

complete budget

surplus 44.00€

stopgap 200.00 €

Radio

- Same expenses as every other month. subscription, licence cost

surplus 117.00 €

stopgap 117.00 €

- Question: what about the months of July and August?
- Answer: we can't make an argument that people will be listening if there are no show going on so we are discontinuing it during the summer but have uploaded everything unto a massive drive

complete budget

surplus 117.00 €

stopgap 117.00 €

Art

- Basic supplies because we have lost some pens and ink dried up.

stopgap 55.00 €

- Question: what's the art exhibition
- Answer: we noticed an influx of student in the beginning but can't retain their attention and the exhibition is to keep the interest going

complete budget

stopgap 55.00 €

Games & Chess

- Controllers - taken out by the executive board because Universalis does not own the switch and we cannot be sure if they will be used.

The motion: to have three game controllers for 75 euros second it.

votes:

- yes: 26
- no: 5
- abstain: 4

-> the motion has NOT been passed.

stopgap 47.50 €

complete budget

stopgap 47.50 €

Gay Agenda

- Questions on budget?

stopgap 32.50 €

- No questions.

complete budget

stopgap 32.50 €

Music

stopgap 30.00 €

- Want snack for open mic night
- Question: when is it happening?
- Answer: we want to have it happen in the first week of September, but realistically in the second week.

complete budget

stopgap 30.00 €

Completed Budget

Available Budgets: € 21,813.15

Budgeted Surplus; € 401

Budgeted Stopgap: €10,685,48

Remaining amount: €10,726.68

votes:

- yes: 23
- no: 0
- abstain:0

-> the budget plan has been passed.

Open Floor Questions

- no questions.
-

Closing the GA

→ President Audrey closes the GA

closing timestamp: 21:15