

## **Minutes Additional Semi-Annual General Member Meeting**

---

**Date:** 10-03-2021

**Time:** 7 pm

**Location:** Zoom

**Speaker:** Maud Weijers

**Minute taker:** Lieke Verhoofstad

**Present:** Quirijn Somers, Niek van de Minkelis, Dylan Zeevaart, Max Ploemen, Job Coehorst, Tessa Stolte, Susanne Luijff, Klaas Kant, Rianne Zwarts, Govend Salih, Dominique Paulissen + 32nd board

---

### **Agenda**

1. Opening
2. Setting the agenda
3. Proposal change of House Regulations
4. Vote on House Regulations
5. W.C.T.M.
6. Question Round
7. Closure

### **Opening**

Maud welcomes everyone to the meeting and opens the meeting at 7.02 pm. This GMM is an additional meeting, on the occasion of last GMM. There, we proposed to change the House Regulations. Now, we thought about the proposal more thoroughly and came up with a new proposal to change the House Regulations.

### **Setting the agenda**

The agenda is approved.

### **Proposal change of House Regulations**

In the House Regulations, there is a clause about the Advisory Board (article 2, clause 1d). Now it is stated that only active Babylon members can have a spot in the Advisory Board. Our proposal is to change this to the following sentence: "There is room for one external member who is or has been a board member of another study association. All other members must have played an active role within Babylon". The formulation of the sentence is the same as we proposed last GMM. Previous GMM, we got the question if this means that there are more spots in the Advisory Board now. We decided that the maximum amount of spots in the Advisory Board is still six. We believe seven spots is simply too much. If you have seven members, there will probably a lot of overlap in the feedback and there is not enough to give feedback to for all members. This year, only five members are in the Advisory Board and it already occurs that there is nothing left to give feedback on or that a lot of things are said multiple times. If there are seven members in the Advisory Board, this will only occur more often.

We find that it can be helpful to have an external member in the Advisory Board, because an external member has a fresh look on topics and sees things differently. The external member has to have played an active role within another study association. An external

member is unbiased and can advise the board on things their association do differently. This way, we can learn from each other better.

We think an external member will just be as motivated to put effort in the Advisory Board as Babylon members do. We will personally contact someone we think would be suitable for the Advisory Board. If someone does not feel like doing so, that person probably also will not apply. Therefore, if someone applies, he/she is interested in helping us and joining or Advisory board, hence will put effort in this. Therefore, we would give an external member the change to apply. There will still also be voted on this person, so it not necessarily means that the external applicant gets a spot in the Advisory Board.

*Quirijn:* Do you want to contact board members personally or do you want to send them an email in which you say you are looking for an external member?

*Maud:* We want to contact them personally, so we know that person somewhere has a connection with Babylon. This way, we know what kind of person someone is and what their position in the board was. If you personally know someone, it is more likely that someone is willing to do this. If someone says not to be interested, we will ask someone else.

*Quirijn:* Did you know there is a spellingmistake in that sentence?

*Maud:* No. Where is it?

*Quirijn:* It says 'alle' instead of 'all'.

*Maud:* Thank you. We will adjust it.

*Quirijn:* I saw that clause 4 has changed. Could that be? In the current document, there are four bullet points and in the new document there are only three. I think something has moved, because there is an extra bullet point (e).

*Maud:* I see. That is a mistake. Nothing has changed there, but the enumeration is wrong. We will adjust it.

*Max:* In clause 1a and 1d, there is a double space after the comma.

*Maud:* We will also adjust that. Thank you.

*Dylan:* How are you going to do it with the votings? Do you think more people are going to vote for an external member instead for a Babylon member. Would it not be better to have a separate spot for an external member?

*Maud:* I get what you mean, but we think this would not really be the case. During the GMM in which the Advisory Board is voted for, we will explain that it is possible to vote for an external member and what the additional value of an external member is. Every applicant for the Advisory Board is able to explain their motivation. We think in that case that people do vote for an external member

Dylan: I understand, but I think that for a lot of people that will not be enough to vote for that person and that not everyone reads the application letters.

Maud: In previous years, not all former board members were voted in the Advisory Board, so we do not necessarily that an external members will not be voted in. We can only find out if we try it out.

Govend: I was wondering if there is enough interest from external members to be in our Advisory Board. They do not have the same bond with Babylon as our own members have.

Maud: Yes, we think so. A lot of other associations already have an external member in their Advisory Board and there are a lot of associations we have a good bond with for years. We know a couple of people who would be interested in joining our Advisory Board.

Max: If you are going to approach this external member personally, how fair is that? Then you just contact someone you think is suitable for a spot in the Advisory Board, so you propose someone. All the other applicants really have to do everything themselves.

Maud: I think the others are also to some extent proposed, because they are all former board members, so it is not that that comes out of nowhere.

Max: I am more talking about the critical look they have. Normally, in the Advisory Board are people you know very well, so you might receive more critical feedback from Babylon members, simply because you know them better and you already like them.

Maud: I think, on the other hand, that an external member who knows us and likes us, is willing to help us. If that person is not willing to help us, he/she will not take place in our Advisory Board. If an external member applies, he/she will just give critical feedback.

Dominique: I do not agree with Max. If you approach someone, he/she gives advice to the next board, so it does not really matter if he/she likes us. The Advisory Board is an intensive function, so if you want to do that voluntarily, I do think you will give critical feedback. Therefore, I also think it is best to approach someone. If you put a vacancy on the website, you will not receive a lot of responses.

Dylan: I am doubting how motivated an external member is, when you just ask someone who likes Babylon, but does not know the new board. You could also send the vacancy to whole boards. Then it would be more fair and they not necessarily do it for the bond with Babylon.

Maud: Then it might be the case that multiple external members are going to apply. In that case you first have to vote for an external member, which becomes very complicated.

Dylan: That way, you do know who is most suitable, rather than just voting for someone you like.

*Niek:* I find it hard to imagine that someone who does not know Babylon has the motivation to give feedback for a whole year. Is it not possible to have an external member in the Advisory Board but to obligate him/her to give feedback every week. This way, they might stay more motivated.

*Maud:* I get what you mean. There are multiple other associations that already have an external member in their Advisory Board. That works very well and they really benefit from it. So we do not think someone will lose his/her motivation.

*Niek:* Which other associations do you mean?

*Maud:* We have the idea from Postelein. Someone of them said to be interested in joining our Advisory Board.

*Niek:* What is the relationship between them and their external member?

*Lieke:* Their external member is from SPiN and they have a good bond with them.

*Dominique:* For the Application Committee we also personally approach people. The Advisory Board of course is more intensive, but if it works for the Application Committee, it will also work for the Advisory Board.

*Dylan:* Last year, we asked whole boards for a spot in the Application Committee.

*Maud:* Yes, we did so too.

*Dominique:* I think everyone has a lot of assumptions and think that others find it too much work. Maybe it is good to think about people who are willing to join the Advisory Board and talk to them about what the Advisory Board entails. People who do or did a board year know what an Advisory Board is and how intensive that is. If they say yes, they just want to do that for you.

*Maud:* Indeed. We think so too. If there are no other questions, we will move on to the voting.

### **Vote on House Regulations**

Total number of voters: 15

Vote in favour: 7

Vote against: 2

Blanc vote: 0

Withhold: 6 (board)

The House Regulations are hereby approved.

### **W.C.T.M.**

Nothing came to mind during the meeting.

### **Question Round**

There are no questions left.

**Closing**

Maud thanks everyone for their attendance and hopes to see everyone soon next time.  
Maud closes the meeting at 7.42 pm.