OBESSU General Assembly

Brussels, 13th and 14th June 2015

1. Opening of the General Assembly

Board Member Luke Shore opens and introduces the 41st General Assembly (GA) of OBESSU.

The roll call is made, and voting cards are distributed in alphabetical order to the organisations present. Yellow cards are given to the Member Organisations (MOs) with the right to vote and blue cards to the Candidate Organisations (COs) with the right to speak, according to the payment of the Annual Financial Contribution.

First Roll Call:

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNSS, USO, VSK, CNE, CSU, UNEL, BSSU.

In addition, KYC and SVB are present as Affiliate Organisation. These are not included in lists of roll calls.

19 MOs present, 4 COs

2. Election of the Chairperson

The Board proposes Viviana Galli, former Secretary General of OBESSU to be the Chairperson of the GA.

The General Assembly approves the Chairperson by acclamation.

The Chairperson welcomes the delegates and she briefly shares her experience in OBESSU.

3. Election of the minute-taker

The Board proposes Estel Buch, OBESSU Project Officer, and Giorgio Tessadri, OBESSU Membership and Communications Officer (as substitute) to be the minute-takers of the General Assembly.

The General Assembly approves the minute-takers by acclamation.

4. Election of the Ballot Committee

The Chairperson explains the role and function of Ballot Committee.

The Chairperson explains that the General Assembly has to decide on the composition of the Ballot Committee. She suggests a Ballot Committee of 3 people.

There are no questions or comments.
Proceed to vote:
In favour: 15
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Ballot Committee will be composed of 3 people.

Three people are needed for the Ballot Committee. EEO proposes Simon Dall, SVB proposes Lukas Wolf and UNEL proposes Flore Friden.

The General assembly elects the ballot committee by acclamation.

5. **Legality of General Assembly and adoption of the Agenda**

For the General Assembly to be legal, 50% plus 1 of the total number of OBESSU members has to be present.

At this GA 24 Organisations are present, which satisfies the legality criterion. Furthermore, all deadlines leading up to the GA were kept. No protests are made known and therefore the Chairperson confirms the legality of the General Assembly.

The Chairperson explains the agenda and no comments are made Agenda.

Proceed to vote the approval of the agenda
In favour: 15
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Agenda of the General Assembly is approved.

The Chairperson announces that the deadline for urgent motions and resolutions is on Sunday 14th at 8:00h via email to Rasmus Aberg and the Chairperson.

6. **Voting right for Member Organisations failing to pay the Annual Financial Contribution**

The Chairperson explains that according to the Statutes, only Member Organisations which have paid the Annual Financial Contribution (AFC) have the right to vote. There are 4 MOs and 1 CO present that have failed to pay the AFC. These are: CNE, DGS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, UDS.

One delegate from each organisation has the chance to explain why their organisation has failed to pay the AFC on time. The General Assembly will vote on whether to grant the right to vote/speak. To pass, a simple majority is needed.

A secret ballot is requested for this.

The organisations concerned make a brief explanation and the Chairperson opens the floor for questions or comments:
CNE explains the reasons why they failed to pay.

DGS explains the reasons why they failed to pay.

MAKOSZ explains the reasons why they failed to pay.

SAKKI explains the reasons why they failed to pay.

UDS explains the reasons why they failed to pay.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions but there are not comments.

Roll Call to hand out the ballot papers

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LMS, SIF, SLL, SUS, UNSS, USO, VSK.

Now we have 15 organisations with the right to vote in the room. A simple majority will be enough to grant the right to vote to each organisation.

The ballot committee leaves the room with the Secretary General to count the votes.

The Ballot Committee comes back with the results:

- CNE: 12 votes in favour
- DGS: 12 votes in favour
- MAKOSZ: 15 votes in favour
- SAKKI: 15 votes in favour
- UdS: 11 votes in favour

All the organisations have been granted the right to vote.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNSS, USO, VSK, CNE, CSU, UNEL, BSSU

Now we have 19 MOs with the right to vote. The new quorum for simple majority is 10.

7. Internal Regulations

The Chairperson introduces the Internal Regulations of Statutory Meetings and explains that there are some proposed amendments and how the discussions will work.

Amendment #1 (DGS)

Article 1, paragraph 1, b

Delete: The General Assembly decides how many delegates per member organisation have the right to speak

DGS: We believe this is unnecessary and that everyone should have the right to speak and contribute to the debate.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion but there are no comments.
Proceed to vote:
In favour: 17
Against: 1
Abstentions: 1
Carried

**Amendment #2 (DGS)**

*Article 3 insert new paragraph 6*

**Add:** It is not allowed to show any expression of opinion during the debate, except if you are the current speaker or a vote has begun.

**DGS:** it can be very uncomfortable to see people expressing their opinions with their non verbal language.

We want to create a safe space to discuss without feeling uncomfortable.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

**UNEL:** Thinks we do not have any regulations now and with the amendment we will be going from one extreme to the other. They feel we should be free to express our opinion during discussions.

**USO:** Remembers the debate in Bratislava about the same topic, and they feel that people should be allowed to express opinions. He believes that we know how to act.

**DOS:** Feels it is too strict.

**UNEL:** Suggests being more specific on what is allowed and what not.

**DGS:** Believes that we express our opinions by voting and that the internal regulations are to protect ourselves. Now it would be allowed to boo at someone.

**EEO:** Thinks that you might feel bad if you intervene in the debate and no one claps and your idea.

**SIF:** Sees potential in the amendment. They think this could be developed so we do not show emotions. Maybe we should research in more detail, so we do not forbid every expression of emotions. We are very different and we use different ways to communicate.

The Board does not have a particular opinion on this amendment.

There are no more comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 2
Against: 16
Abstentions: 1
Not carried

**Amendment #3 (DGS)**

*Article 7, paragraph 20, e*

**Replace:** the name/-s of the candidate/-s with the least number of votes obtained up to the name of the candidates with the most votes

**With:** The name/-s of the candidate/-s who have been elected
DGS: We do not see the benefit of everyone knowing how many votes the Board members individually have obtained. Because then everyone is equal. We all have to be in the same Board, so it is unnecessary to know how many votes you got.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

UNEL: Asks about the impact on the transparency of the results.

The Board clarifies that the total amount of votes will still be found in the minutes, because they have to be there. Also, each of the candidates can ask how many votes they got.

DOS: Expresses that for them transparency is one of the most important things.

USO: Asks if the amendment will change the order of the reading of the names of the people that have been elected.

The Chairperson clarifies that only the people that have been elected will be mentioned; the non-elected will not be mentioned. Right now, everyone is mentioned with the number of votes.

UNEL: Asks if now the possibility is given to candidates to decide whether they want their names to be read.

The Chairperson clarifies the procedure.

SLL: Expresses that this amendment does not say anything about the votes.

DGS: We want the name of the people to be read in a random order.

There are no more comments.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 8
Against: 8
Abstentions: 3
Not carried

Amendment #4 (DGS)

Article 7, insert new paragraph 21

Add: All candidates can ask the ballot committee for their own votes obtained

DGS withdraws the amendment.

Amendment #5 (OBESSU Board)

Insert new article: Article 9

Add: Any delegate can propose General Assemblies and Councils of Members to be live-streamed online. This will then be done as long as none of the delegates opposes this, and as long as tools and technology is available. During voting procedures the live-stream will be shut down. All delegates can also request the live-stream to stop when they speak.
Board: At the General Assembly in Vienna 2014 there was a proposal to live-stream part of the meeting, but a discussion arose about whether or not this was in line with OBESSU’s Internal Regulations. Since there was no rule in place, it was suggested that someone should propose to include it in future amendments of the Internal Regulations.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

LMS: Explains that in the GA in Vienna we had some issues, but they still value the possibility to live stream the GAs to connect OBESSU with their home organisations.

UNSS: Asks some technical details.

The Board clarifies that they have not thought about the different possibilities. Everything will depend on the technology available.

EEO: Thinks it is a good idea. They ask how it worked in Vienna, because we vote a lot, and we feel it will slow everything down.

USO: Feels that it could be easy to shut it down. Regarding the saving, live stream means that you cannot access it later. We feel that the minutes are much more readable than 10h video, in any case.

LMS: Thinks that the only thing that should not be seen is people raising the cards, because we all have the minutes to see how many votes.

The Board clarifies that the amendment will mean that in case the statutory meeting is live streamed, these will be the rules applied.

UNSS: Asks if this will be applied also in Study Sessions or it is just for statutory meetings.

The Chairperson clarifies.

FSS: Asks why we cannot live stream voting.

The Board things it is a precondition to let everyone be comfortable in a room.

There are no more comments.

Proceed to vote:

Agree: 19
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

Carried

The Chairperson invites the GA to adopt the Internal Regulations with the carried amendments:

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 19
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Internal regulations for the GA of OBESSU are adopted unanimously.
The Chairperson explains the procedure to speak during the GA and the signals for direct reply and technical points.

CANAE: Wants to thank the OBESSU Secretariat for the document explaining the rules for the GA that was send in advance.

The Chairperson explains that Affiliate Organisations do not have speaking rights and proposes to vote to grant them the speaking rights during the point about guest people in the GA.

8. **Presentation of the report on the Extraordinary General Assembly and Council of Members**

The rapporteur Zvezdelina (Lina) from VSK reports on the ExGA and COMEM 2014.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions and there are no questions or comments.

9. **Adoption of minutes from the Extraordinary General Assembly and Council of Members 2014**

The Chairperson explains that the minutes were sent out in time and they are available online and opens the floor for questions:

CANAE: Suggests splitting the document of the minutes in two different documents, one from the ExGA and on for the COMEM because they are two different meetings.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 19
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The minutes for the ExGA and COMEM are adopted

10. **Guests present at the General Assembly**

The Chairperson explains that there are no guests in the room, but in case they come, we will allow them when the time comes.

Nevertheless, we will vote to allow the Affiliate organisations SVB and KYC to have the right to speak during the GA.

There are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 19
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
KYC and SVB have been granted the right to speak in the GA.

11. Presentation Board Report

The Board presents the Board Report (August 2014 - June 2015) that was sent out to all organisations.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

LMS: Asks how the new Board is feeling after the first year.

The Board explains that in their internal evaluation they talked a lot about communication issues. There is a time lack, they have personal priorities, and they need to structure their time and work better. Also, they need to increase communication between MOs and Board. They feel it would have been helpful spending more time doing teambuilding at the beginning of the mandate. The first year was about getting to know OBESSU and each other.

There are no more questions.

Roll Call
AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNSS, USO, VSK, CNE, CSU, UNEL, BSSU

Now we have 19 MOs with the right to vote and 4 COs and 2 AOs with the right to speak.

12. Membership issues

a. Applications for Member Organisation of CNE

A representative from CNE presents the organisation and its activities.

• The Board explains the reasons why it was decided to prolong the candidacy. The Board investigated the situation and spoke to various people, alumni and current members of CNE. The Board has the perception that the Ministry does not have an influence in the decision-making of the organisation. Therefore, OBESSU does not focus a lot in the structure, because there are a lot of differences between countries. The Board feels CNE fulfils the criteria to become a full member, and they now advise the GA to approve the membership of CNE.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

FSS: You get most of the funding from the Ministry, how can you ensure you will be able to pay the AFC?

• CNE: yes, they have the obligation to fund them, but they usually do not do it unless it is one of their activities. They pay activities, by law. If you want to go somewhere, we have to pay it by our own. Now they will be able to have a bank account and get money from other sources.
DGS: Asks for clarification on the membership system in CNE

- CNE explains the structure of the councils at local and county level.

FSS: If you would not get the money from the ministry, would you be able to pay the AFC?

- CNE clarifies that the money they receive from the Ministry is never to pay the AFC and that they fundraise to be able to pay it.

DOS: Asks if the also represent VET students

- CNE explains that students up to 16 can come to their GAs but do not have the right to vote.

MAKOSZ: Expresses their disagreement regarding the student council system in Romania. They feel that school students participate there because they are obliged and not for their motivation.

- CNE thinks that the ones that participate are the ones that are motivated, and explains that the councils are also organising many other activities not only related to the structure.

There are no more questions.

b. Application for Member Organisation of CSU

A representative from CSU presents the organisation and their activities.

- The Board advises the GA to approve the membership of CSU.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

FSS: Asks the level of dependency to the funding from the Ministry.

- CSU explains that they are a non-profit organisation, and have an open transparent account. They explain they are financially stable and that they are receiving some donations.

DGS: Asks about the structure of the membership.

- CSU explains that the student councils in Czech Republic are not working. They are trying to be as legitimate as they can. They explain that in Czech Republic, the student council can exist unless the principal agrees to it. CSU developed a manual to help students to create their school councils. Furthermore, they explain that the membership can be done online, but people can come to their events even if they are not members. They do not want to have individual members, rather delegates that legitimately represent the students’ councils.

SUS: Asks what happens when a student that does not belong to any student council want to participate in CSU.

- CSU explains that the school council can be established but the principle has to commit to it. They also clarify that there can be individual students participating directly to CSU.
LMS: Explains that they face the same situation with representation in Lithuania.

DOS: Asks if they include VET

- CSU explains that most of their members are from general secondary schools, but they are now getting some inputs from the VET schools and they are working with and NGO that works in VET schools and are planning to cooperate with them.

SLL: Asks if the student card they developed is linked to the registration to be a member of CSU.

- CSU explains that it is a very new project. The plan is that every Czech student will be able to register and order the card.

There are no more questions.

c. Application for Member Organisation of UNEL

A representative from UNEL presents the organisation and their activities.

- The Board advises the GA to approve the membership of UNEL.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

USO: Asks for their working language.

- UNEL explains that they work in Luxembourgish, French and German. They try to keep it as open as possible.

DGS: Asks for their representation and the number of engaged people in their activities.

- UNEL explains that they act as a platform. There is a students’ council organisation and they work with them but and also with other organisations. Luxembourg is very small, so there are few students.

SLL: Asks for the working system of the Board.

- UNEL explains that the Board is a coordination group that meets once a month and does administrative work. Once a month they meet with the Working Group responsible people. Currently the Board consists of 5 people, and the WGs depend on the interests.

There are no more questions.

The Chairperson invites CNE, CSU and UNEL to leave the room with the MC and opens the floor for questions:

UNSS: Asks the Board if there is something the MOs should worry about.

- The Board explains that there is nothing that might affect the platform itself. The statutes are very clear to give them the tool in case there is any issue, to interrupt membership.
DGS: Explains that they were wondering that UNEL is a platform rather than a representative organisation.

- The Board explains that, as far as they understand the documents, when speaking about the platform, it is an organisation. They have members and member organisations.

EEO: Explains that UNEL split with the other student organisation because of disagreements on the approach to school student activism.

- The Board explains that they are a small organisation because of the split, and because it is a small country.

UNSS: Asks about the sustainability of the candidate organisations in terms of financial capacity.

- The Board explains that all MOs have struggles with finances, and they feel this should not be taken into account to grant them the membership or not.

MAKOSZ: Asks why CNE’s membership was not voted upon last year already.

- The Board explains that before the GA2014, the Board was informed about some issues concerning CNE and some conflicts happening at a county level. They explain that the case was closed, but the group kept on bringing up this issue.

CANAE: Asks MAKOSZ about the work of CNE, how representatives they are and how are they working.

MAKOSZ explains that they are not convinced with the system in place in Romania, because the participation to student councils is mandatory and not voluntary. Nevertheless they explain that the team leading CNE right now is very motivated and willing to be active. They do not want to speak against them, because they feel they can change.

LMS: Clarifies that UNEL explained they are an umbrella organisations and this might be the reason to have less members. They are working on serious issues, for example on the Youth Guarantee.

Regarding CNE, for LMS, they also have the issue that in some places people meet because it is mandatory but they feel one have to look at the passion and motivation of people. There might be problems in the regions, but they need to have the opportunity to be part of OBESSU.

MAKOSZ: Clarifies that they are not representing students but student councils at County level.

SIF: Stresses that the important point of OBESSU is to learn from each other, and to be better. For them, OBESSU is about representing school student unions, but at the end we are representing the students. They think that if they have problems, then OBESSU can play a role to help them.

USO: Asks if the allegations that were raised in the last ExGA have been turn out to be untrue.

- The Board explains that the cases brought to court, have dropped out.

MAKOSZ: Clarifies that they totally support the full membership of CNE in OBESSU.
SLL and DGS ask for a secret ballot.

The Chairperson welcomes CNE, UNEL and CSU back to the room.

**Roll Call to hand out the ballots.**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNSS, USO, VSK.

The Chairperson calls for the vote on the membership of CNE.

**Proceed to vote:**

In favour: 17
Against: 1
Abstentions: 1

The GA approves the full membership of CNE to OBESSU.

The Chairperson calls for the vote on the membership of CSU.

**Roll Call to hand out the ballot.**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNSS, USO, VSK.

**Proceed to vote:**

In favour: 18
Against: 1
Abstentions: 0

The GA approves the full membership of CSU to OBESSU.

The Chairperson calls for the vote on the membership of UNEL.

**Roll Call to hand out the ballot.**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNSS, USO, VSK.

**Proceed to vote:**

In favour: 18
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1

The GA approves the full membership of UNEL to OBESSU.

**Roll Call.**
Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 AOs with the right to speak.

d. Ratification of Candidate Organisation BSSU

- BSSU delegate takes the floor and presents the organisation.

The Chairperson explains the procedure to accept new Candidate Organisations.

- The Board explains the reasons why they gave the status of candidate organisation to BSSU. The candidacy has been the result of a long process of cooperation with OBESSU.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

- FSS: Asks how old is the organisation and the reasons for not applying before.
  - BSSU explains that they are 2 years old and that they have been working to fulfil the criteria to become members of OBESSU.

- UNEL: Asks about the structure of the organisation.
  - BSSU explains there is an overlapping structure. Their main idea is that student councils decide what happens in the school. We want the student councils to be in the decision-making of the schools.
  - Regarding the structure, every region has a delegate (coordinator) that represents the region, they have a secretary. BSSU explains that they are still in the making of the organisation.

- VSK: Asks for the regularity of meetings.
  - BSSU explains the different kinds of meetings they organise.

- VSK: Asks if they have working groups.
  - BSSU: explains he is not so aware of working groups.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson confirms that, if there is not opposition, the General Assembly will not vote on the candidacy and will accept the decision of the Board.

There is no opposition; therefore, the OBESSU General Assembly ratifies the Candidate status of BSSU.

Roll Call.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 COs and 2 AOs with the right to speak.
e. **Ratification of Affiliate Organisations SVB and KYC**

The Chairperson explains that OBESSU received the application from SVB and KYC to become Affiliate Organisations and, after studying the proposals, the Board decided to accept them. Now the General Assembly will ratify their status as Affiliate Organisations.

- SVB delegate takes the floor and presents their organisation.
- The Board explains the reasons why they granted the status of affiliate to SVB. They feel it is a great opportunity to get in contact with Germany and the school student councils at state level.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

ISSU: Thinks the bottom-up approach SVB is taking to build a school student union at federal level is great. They also ask why the age limit is 27.

- SVB explains that is because they want to have a truly youth organisation and they want to ensure that the people in the Boards are young people. He explains that they also have the network of coaches (peer educators) that are much younger.

There are no more questions and no opposition, therefore the Chairperson confirms the Board decision to give SVB the status of Affiliate Organisation of OBESSU.

- KYC delegate takes the floor and presents their organisation.
- The Board explains the reasons why they gave the status of affiliate to KYC.

There are no more questions and no opposition, therefore the Chairperson confirms the Board decision to give KYC the status of Affiliate Organisation of OBESSU.

6. **Report of the Secretary General**

The Secretary General, Rasmus Aberg, gives the report about the Secretariat, its different roles and the main updates.

There are no questions or comments.

7. **Financial report 2014 and budget 2015**

Financial report on 2014

The Secretary General, Rasmus Aberg, explains the structure of the financial report 2014 and makes the summary of the year.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

SLL: Asks how the deficit is going to affect the financial situation of OBESSU.
Rasmus: explains that it will not affect the finances for 2015, but it does affect the reserves of OBESSU. He explains we will have to be very careful when spending money during 2015.

CANAE: Asks for the reasons of the financial problem with the Summer School 2013.

Rasmus explains that there were some problems with the participants list, participants leaving earlier, or missing mandate letters. OBESSU declared information that was not accurate and the European Commission decided not to cover some of the costs and asked for the money back. The report was not very well done at that time. Now the Secretariat is very strict with participation lists and travel reimbursements.

FSS: Has some questions on the travel of non staff.

There are no more questions or comments so the Chairperson calls for the vote to adopt the Financial Report 2014.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
The Financial Report 2014 is approved.

Budget 2015
Rasmus explains the Budget 2015 and explains that it is very difficult to make a prediction for a full year.

The Chair opens the floor for questions:
CNE: Asks to which national agency OBESSU applied in Romania for the Convention.

Rasmus: Explains that is the Erasmus+.

UNEL: Asks for a prediction on the debt for 2015.

Rasmus clarifies that in 2015 we are not going to have any debt. We are aiming at increasing the reserves of OBESSU in the following 3 years.

MAKOSZ: Insists in having the Convention in Romania.

Rasmus clarifies that we will have to be very strict with the costs.

ISSU: Asks if there might be any problem with the Operating Grant of the European Commission if we make surplus in the following years.

Rasmus explains that the new grant is based by unit cost and that it is ok to make a surplus by the end of the year.

CSU: Asks clarification about the “subcontracting”.

Rasmus explains that this includes Paolo’s consultancy and the auditor.

CSU: Thinks it is a lot of money

Rasmus explains the money is totally worth it, and clarifies that the fee Paolo is getting is much lower than it could have been.

EEO: Asks for the amount of hours Paolo does for OBESSU.

Rasmus explains the working hours of Paolo.

EEO: Does not think the fee is a lot.

Rasmus explains Paolo is very valuable for OBESSU.

UNEL: Thanks Rasmus for the background document for the financial documents.

There are no more questions or comments so the Chairperson calls for the vote to adopt the budget 2015.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The budget 2015 is adopted.

8. Vote on Annual Financial Contributions 2016

Rasmus explains how the system of the AFCs is working, and that at the end of 2015 the current system will be over and we have to take a decision on the following year. Rasmus stresses the importance of the AFCs in the OBESSU budget:

- Because the income is unconditional from external funders.
- Because the income is regular and it comes at the beginning of the year.

He continues explaining that when it was discussed with the Board they launched a consultation with all MOs, but it was a very inconclusive consultation.

Rasmus explains that the proposal is to keep the AFCs at the same level as for 2015.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SAKKI: Asks for the difference between the organisations paying the smallest amount and the highest amount.

- Rasmus explains that the difference is big. Some organisations pay 0€ and some 4000€. Most of the organisations pay somewhere in between.
- The Board explains that in a study done in 2012, most of the organisations were placed in the middle of the chart.

CSU: Asks where is the idea to exclude grants from the turnover that was suggested in the last statutory meeting.
• Rasmus explains that in the consultation there were only two organisations in favour of the proposal. He sees some difficulties to identify what a project is in the different contexts.

VSK: Asks why not all organisations pay the same amount.

• Rasmus explains that in OBESSU there are many different organisations with different capacities and there have to be some kind of acknowledgement of these differences. He thinks it would be unfair if everyone would pay the same amount.

• The Board points out at the diversity of organisations and situations when it comes to financial management in the organisations, as well as the cost of living in the different countries.

UNSS: Agrees with the Board. They point out how expensive would be for them to pay 1000€ as AFC.

CSU: Explains that looking at the system, it can be compared to regressive way of taxes. If an organisation has a bigger turnover, they pay less. For organisations with smaller turnover, they have more problems to pay the AFC that the ones having bigger turnovers. They ask what is the coefficient used.

• Rasmus explains that he does not know exactly how the numbers were calculated. He explains that the coefficient would bring difficulties for some organisations. He still thinks it is a quite good system.

ISSU: Asks if OBESSU investigated what system would be much better.

• Rasmus thinks that the proposed is a better alternative and it is more predictable.

SAKKI: Explains that the biggest problem is that big MOs do not feel they get as much from OBESSU as other organisations. The countries that have better systems help the smaller ones. They love to help but they would like to get something from OBESSU as well.

• Rasmus points out that what you get out of OBESSU also depends a lot on how much do you engage.

USO: Explains that their general turnover changed with the exchange rate and asks if there is a standard procedure with countries not having Euro.

• Rasmus explains that in 2012, this was probably not discussed.

SVB: Points out that the output is because you want to do politics and change something, but they understand there is an issue for some organisations that might have big turnovers, but not money on their own.

CSU: Explains that their annual turnover was 2101€ and that they paid 5% of this turnover as AFC but if one looked at bigger organisations, they pay 1.3% of their turnover. They want to exemplify the effort that they are doing to pay the AFC, as well as the feeling that this is neither a fair nor a solidarity system.

• Rasmus acknowledges the effort but explains that if there would be the big percentage for everyone, some organisations would pay 5%, it would be very complicated for the bigger organisations.
CANAE: Points out that they also think it is not fair in terms of percentage, but they want to remind that everyone also pay fees for every activity that are the same for everybody without taking into account the background for each of the activities. They propose to merge the system of the AFCs to the participation fees and try to find more fair systems for the participation fees for some organisations.

- Rasmus explains that, since we do not really have other income, this could be a possibility and he opens the door to receive alternative proposals.

FSS: Explains that as a big organisation they do not have money lying around the office. If their turnover is big is because they have a lot of projects.

ISSU: Reflects that the current system rewards the bigger organisations to put more money. They think that offering the same rate for every organisation, would not be fair. The think that fees should not be increased.

DGS: Asks to close the speaking list.

The Chairperson closes the speaking list.

VSK: Thinks that it is not fair if everybody pays the same. They suggest that flexibility in the payment is given to organisations.

The Chairperson clarifies that this is already a possibility in the statutes.

EEO: Thinks that the issue raised by CSU is very relevant and suggests establishing a maximum percentage, a rectifying rate. It would make a big difference for small organisations and would not be a problem for the OBESSU budget.

- Rasmus explains that if we did it by percentage, whatever is gained from one way, would be lost from another.

USO: Thinks that the percentage would be very equal but it would either mean that the poorer organisations had to pay more, or the bigger organisations would have to pay much more. They think that if we impose such high payments to big organisations we risk that big organisations will leave OBESSU. They point out that, in any case, we will not find a fair solution for everyone.

SAKKI: Explains that, even though we are a big organisation, they have to pay the participation fees by themselves. They do not think that connecting participation fees and AFCs would be correct, as proposed by CANAE.

CSU: Clarifies that they are not proposing a percentage from the turnover to calculate the AFCs. They wanted to put an example. They propose that we could move the different slot of money. Maybe the small amounts of money could be divided in smaller parts.

- The Board explains that at this stage, we are in circles, but it is important that this discussion is going on. They think that we will not reach a full agreement, but points out that, for example, participants coming from Finland cost a lot of money. They think there is value being members of OBESSU.
There are no more questions or comments so the Chairperson calls for the vote on the AFC 2016.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 20
Against: 1
Abstentions: 1
The AFCs 2016 are adopted.

9. Policy Corners I

The Chairperson and the Board explain how the policy corners work.

- Statues amendments
- Political Platform amendments I
- Political Platform amendments II
- Workplan and Development Strategy amendments

Roll Call.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 Affiliate Organisations.

10. Monitoring Committee report

Nora Kleibel, member of the MC presents the MC report that was sent out to the members.

The Board and the secretariat leave the room.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

ISSU: Thinks it is very interesting the role of the Board discussion and they ask the MC if they have planned how to facilitate this discussion.

SIF: Asks how they would describe the group dynamics within the Board.

CANAE: Congratulates the MC for the report. They express their worry for the situation of the Board and ask of the Secretariat and the Board have met to speak about the communication problems.

CSU: Asks how does the MC asses the expenditures of accommodation of Board and staff

Nora, as a representative of the MC explains:

- To ISSU: They do not see the role of the MC to facilitate the debate. They give a few thoughts, so MOs can use them as they consider.
• To SIF: Explains that they work really well as a team. They had difficulties, but every single one of them evaluates the overlapping mandate very positively.

• To CANAE: The communication problems have been tackled; also the ones within the Board have been addressed. Nora is not sure if they did it in a bigger context. She explains Rasmus is in the Board meetings and brings it to the Secretariat.

• To CSU: Basically they looked at the budget in 2014 and the actual spending. They saw that all the estimated costs were always bigger than the actual expenditure. Regarding the Board meeting costs, they are very cheap. They always look for possibilities to save a lot of money. So she does not see a lot of room to save a lot of money.

UNEL: Points out that the MC thinks a Board of 4 is having trouble to do more and asks if they can share a bit the experience of having a bigger Board as well as what they would recommend in terms of numbers.

• The MC thinks that a bigger number of people do not mean doing better work. It might mean going to more external representations, but does not necessarily mean having better work.

CANAE: Asks if they think that the lack of initiative of the Board can be because of their first year of mandate or if they think it could continue next year. They ask if it has changed from the beginning. They also ask if the MC thinks that the Secretary General can really take the political competences of the Board if ratified.

• The MC thinks it is a bit difficult to say. From their perspective, it takes time to get comfortable in the position. They also think that a clear mandate from the GA is a way to enhance the initiative. She is not able to answer if it changed since the beginning.

• About the SG, they think the political role should be for the politically elected.

ISSU: Asks if she can further explain the lack of initiative from the Board.

• The MC explains they did the interviews and checked the minutes. They felt the things were talked about in the meetings but not followed up afterwards. They feel there is room for improvement in the policy work of the Board.

There are not more questions and the Chairperson invites the Board and the Secretariat back in the room.

SLL: Asks the Board if they recognise themselves in the report from the MC, and asks how the communication with the MC was.

➢ Board explains that a lot of the things mentioned, they could recognise. These are topics that they discuss as well in their evaluation.

➢ They also explain that the communication with the MC was very good. Very frequent and the interviews were really approachable.

FSS: Asks what the Board things about the Secretariat

➢ Board explains that they overall value the communication with the Secretariat very good. Mostly their communication is with Rasmus as he comes to the Board meetings and observes, then he passes the info to the rest of the team.
Rasmus communicates regularly what is needed and they recognise they might not have been so fast.

SAKKI: Asks the Board what would be the concrete things that they would do differently, a part from communication.

- The Board explain they could have been more proactive to engage in institutional processes, especially on the second half of their mandate. Sometimes they were too reactive and waiting for others to come to them.

CANAE: Shares that in the next statutory meeting, they would like to see the MC report before the Board report, in order to be able to contrast them. They also want to point out the PoT selection process that the MC mentioned. CANAE also recommends in the next years that a nomination letter is needed from the MOs, because they had an issue with this.

- The Board really values the MC feedback, but also the feedback from the MOs. They ask the organisations to write to the Board and give constructive criticism, and tell them all the things that go through their head.

MC: Explains that they did an evaluation of the Development Strategy that MOs can read in the written report.

There are no more comments or questions.

11. Discussion and voting on proposals and amendments I

**POLITICAL PLATFORM**

The Chairperson explains that amendments are adopted by simple majority. She explains the rules of the debates.

CSU: Explains that they had a lot of amendments and that they had supporting organisations to propose them and want to thank these organisations and the Chairperson.

**Amendment #1 (DGS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | Replace: can be  
With: should be |
| Rationale | Education should be considered a lifelong process. The problem is that some do not consider it this way, and we need to change that. |

DGS: Education should be considered a lifelong process. The problem is that some do not consider it this way, and we need to change that.

There are no comments or questions and the Chairperson call the vote.
Proceed to vote:
In favour: 21
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1
Carried

Amendment #2 (DGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>69-71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Replace: Every school community resembles, in itself, a miniature of civil society and reflects the hierarchical structures of power and values found in civil society. The ways in which democracy and participation are perceived and experienced...&lt;br&gt;With: Every school community reflects a lot of the same problems as we see in the civil society. It reflects the hierarchical structures of power and values found in civil society, it reflects discrimination on behalf of sex, gender, ethnicity etc. The ways in which democracy, participation and discrimination are perceived and experienced...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DGS: There has been a lot of debate about it. They do not think that the school community is a miniature of civil society, but instead they think it reflects a lot of the same problems. Society has impact on education. They thought of adding discrimination because it is something that is present in civil society.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:
UNEL: Does not agree on listing values as problems.
DGS: Thinks that values can also be negative some of them.

➢ The Board proposes an editorial change with “on behalf” for “on grounds of”.

DGS: They found the business dictionary and reads “Values are...”. From their perspective, the definition includes positive and negative values.
CNE: Asks DGS why they want to add the problems. In the initial text, it means that there are good problems and good things. In the new amendment we only speak about problems and negative aspects. They think that the issue with listing problems is that you might forget some.
DGS: They understand it but they think it could be added something.
CNE: Explains that initially he saw the form as a neutral one and with the proposal, he sees only the negative and pessimistic aspect.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 9
Against: 11
Abstentions: 2

**Not carried**

**Amendment # 3 (SLL, SUS, UNSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>86-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | Replace: only by de-constructing the hierarchies of power  
           | With: by modifying the school structures |

**SLL:** We feel that such phrase is overly anti-systematic and should be mitigated into constructive proclamation which can be achieved. It can be more easily understood.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

**DGS:** Thinks the proposal is completely different. They agree with changing the verb but the hierarchies of power and not the school structures.

**SAKKI:** Points out that in a previous paragraph, hierarchies are also mentioned.

**SLL:** Accepts it is true that hierarchies of power are not mentioned directly, but they feel the proposed formulation gives more space.

**CNE:** Thinks the initial formulation is more about changing mentality. They want to modify substantially the article, and it is not the point of the agenda. It is not what they want to do.

**CSU:** Believes that when asking to deconstruct hierarchies' structures of power, we say that we do not accept the system of school, teachers, etc. Those structures should be modified to include democratic ones.

**DGS:** Does not believe that teachers should have more power than students. They want to be at the same level as teachers and the only way is to deconstruct hierarchies.

**CNE:** They agree with DGS. Modify the structures is only the structures and not the mentality and the perception.

**SLL:** Points out that later it states the change of mentality. By modifying the school structures, all components are included.

**EEO:** Proposes to close the speaking list.

**LMS:** Thinks it is a good point to add because when we talk about hierarchies, but when talking about school structures are school councils, and particular bodies that can be changed, where the school is living.

There are no more comments.

**Proceed to vote:**

- In favour: 11
- Against: 8
- Abstentions: 3

Carried

**Amendment # 4 (FSS, SLL, SUS)**

| Line(s) | 101 |
Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 126 | Add: politics and Not just civil society but also in political processes.

SUS: We want to emphasize the role of students in politics. Students should be recognized as equal partners, not just at civil society but also in political processes.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

ISSU: Wants to speak in favour of this. They encourage the engagement in political debates.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 21
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1
Carried

Amendment #5 (FSS, SUS, UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Replace: the abolishment of any kind of fees linked to education and training With: the abolishment of school fees linked to public secondary education and training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSU: From their perspective, OBESSU should precise its demands. The political platform should not provide so much space for interpretations. They feel it is very general and would like to specify it with “secondary” (higher education is tackled later) and “public” (Government is in charge). We have to bear in mind that there also exist private schools. They feel the initial wording, would mean to abolish private schools. They want free public education, but not restrict private education.

DGS: Proposes to limit the interventions to two minutes.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SIF: Thinks that the point about private schools is valid. They want to ask about hidden costs for education because they feel this is a very important issue.

AKS: There is not only those two words added, but also takes away “any kind” and they feel it is important that hidden costs should also be abolished. Also, they think that our main goal should be that no one had to pay for education. Therefore, private schools should also be for free.

FSS: Explains that there has been a misunderstanding and they do not support this amendment.

CNE: In the initial wording, when speaking “education and training” is speaking much more in general, so they think we should be more specific to secondary education.
SAKKI: They had two problems with the amendment, one is mentioned. For public, they understand that we cannot influence the private system. Asks why only limit it to secondary education. From their perspective, OBESSU does much more. They want free education because it would help us in the long run.

CSU: What is very important is the interpretation of all the demands. If we speak about hidden costs, we could interpret it too broadly. There is education as a global and “any kind of education” is a too broad term. It could go almost everything under this idea.

USO: Would like to close the speaking list.

SAKKI: For the future, we have to acknowledge the ideological ideas. In their perspective, the political platform should include the utopia perspective and the work plan, we might not reach it, but we want to reach it.

CSU: Asks if they could modify the amendment.

MC: explains it has to be hand it written to the Chairperson.

The Chairperson explains that from now on, the organisation presenting the amendment will have 2 minutes and the interventions 1 minute.

Note to the Chairperson from CSU: “The abolishment of any school fees linked to public secondary education and training.”

The Chairperson explains the procedure to change and amendment on the spot: first to give it written to the chair and this amendment needs to be approved by consensus, if approved, and then we vote on the amendment

Proceed to vote to vote on changing the amendment:
In favour: 10
Against: 6
Abstentions: 6
Not accepted.

Proceed to vote the original amendment:
In favour: 2
Against: 18
Abstentions: 2
Not carried

Amendment #6 (UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Replace: to all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU: It is connected to amendment 5. They think that it is illusive to think that we can dictate private schools free access to their schools denying the system of school fees. Instead, OBESSU should influence the public institutions that are run by the state and where we can really stand for a change (in countries having paid public higher education). Demanding abolishing fees and dictating the private sector, it is not possible by law.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SIF: The private sector is dictating the education systems in some countries. We cannot control, but we should aim at regulating the private sector when they go into education. Equal access means equal access to quality education. We need to control private sector.

SAKKI: They think OBESSU should ask to the private sector, what we ask to the public sector. OBESSU should give our opinion and guidelines as the same.

ISSU: Think OBESSU should send the message that everyone should have equal access to education. From their perspective, this amendment goes against the OBESSU values.

FSS: Think the political platform does not need to go according to the laws in all the countries. It is supposed to be our ideological position. Laws can be changed.

EEO: Proposes to close the speaking list.

The chairperson closes the speaking list.

CSU: Agrees about the control on the private sector. From their perspective, though, equal access to education is not equal access to institutions. For them it does not make sense at all. In their opinion, the Political Platform should be according to the law, because otherwise loses credibility.

There are no more comments.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 4
Against: 16
Abstentions: 2

Not carried

Amendment #7 (SLL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>132-134</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Remove: Therefore, potential financial challenges within educational systems cannot be faced through reforms involving privatized management and cost cutting strategies from the private sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSU: The sentence makes no sense as the complete privatization of education department would never succeed (it would always be counterproductive for the government to give the whole department into hands of private sector). In the intention to keep the content light, they recommend crossing it out.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:
DGS: Thinks this is very bad idea to remove because of the financial challenges in the systems. As they see it, it does not benefit the educational systems. From their perspective, OBESSU should advocate to not allow the private sector influence in educational system.

ISSU: Supports DGS. No matter what the situation is education should not be cut.

UDS: Explains that in Italy, the government tried to privatise schools. Therefore, it is very important to keep the initial wording.

EEO: Proposes to close the speaking list. He really appreciates the work put in the amendments from CSU, and suggests keeping the speaking list very short.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 1
Against: 20
Abstentions: 1
Not carried

Amendment #8 (SLL, SUS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Remove: and not those of private contractors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUS: Is strongly convinced that education as a whole must always be in hands of the government and its content should not be negatively affected by third parties. But the formulation in subordinate clause could be perceived even as pejorative because the text repeatedly puts private education and institutions in positions of the educational system enemies, even though they can create healthy competition and contribute to the improvement of the school methods.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SIF: Asks for clarification, since they understood the sentence saying that the interest should reflect the interest of society and not of private contractors.

CSU: Thinks we are demonising private sector and contractors, but they believe it can make a healthy competition. They believe the Political Platform goes against the private sector. The responsibility should be in the hands of government but they feel OBESSU is going against the private sector.

SLL: Explains that in Finland there are private schools and clarifies that if one reads the following sentence, it is not limiting anything, only stressing that educational systems should reflect interests of society.

ISSU: Does not think we are demonising any sector. From their perspective, OBESSU is stressing that education is the right of everyone and should be accessible to everyone.

SIF: Proposes to close the speaking list.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 4
Against: 13
Abstentions: 5
Not carried

Amendment #9 (UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>136-137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | Replace: Non-profit institutions providing alternative education can still be a good alternative.  
With: Non-public institutions providing alternative education can still be a good alternative.” |

CSU: The formulation connotes that only non-profit institutions are a valuable alternative. They feel that for-profit schools are not made for being a bad alternative and often make a good one, hence the wording should be changed accordingly.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SIF: Supports this amendment, because in Iceland they have some good examples and alternatives.

DGS: Believes that for-profit schools are interested in making money and not educating people. From their perspective, non-profit institutions can be interested in educating.

ISSU: Thinks not-profit should be kept. It is essential that we should not promote privatisation of education.

UNSS: Supports this amendment. They have some good examples.

EEO: Clarifies that non-profit does not mean public but that they do not want to get enriched. They also propose to close the speaking list.

CNE: Supports this amendment. They also have good examples in Romania.

CSU: Does not think that interests of private contractors have to be necessarily against education values. They invite everyone to think that low-profit schools are good alternative. They do not agree with this ideological stand that everything private is bad.

ISSU: Thinks profit education is bad, private is not bad. It is vital that we say that people should not make profit of education.

There are no more questions or comments.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 6
Against: 15
Abstentions: 1
Not carried

Amendment #10 (SUS, UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>142-144</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Remove: It is the responsibility of the government to fund institutions with alternative approaches to education, to ensure that these alternatives are accessible for everyone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSU: This clause indirectly says that government should pay school fees at private schools (because “institutions with alternative approaches to education” are in the text labelled as private schools) for
students which completely reshapes the idea of scholarships and puts a great (unreal) burden for the state budget. Furthermore, there is no reason why state should pay the school fees at private schools bearing in mind the distinction between public and private schools.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

UNEL: Clarifies that it does not necessarily mean private schools. For instance those schools using non-formal education, they think they should be still be helped and supported. It is not about private schools.

DGS: Thinks public schools should always be the best. That is the reason governments should support this alternative approaches to education.

LMS: They think that it should be in the Political Platform and that it is the responsibility of the government to support these initiatives and to ensure equal access.

CSU: Thinks there is a huge problem with accuracy with the sentence. The sentence says that it should fund institutions to ensure that they are accessible to everyone, and that it should be free. They think that is the reason why it should be removed.

SIF: Proposes to close the speaking list.

LMS: Makes a suggestion of change.

There are no more questions or comments.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 1
Against: 14
Abstentions: 7
Not carried

Amendment #11 (SLL, SUS, UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>155-162</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment</strong></td>
<td>Replace: All students must have the right to access further and higher education after the completion of secondary school. Furthermore, there should be no financial, social, cultural or any other kind of barrier preventing students from accessing higher education. Therefore higher education should not be linked to any fees or entrance restriction. Nowadays lots of universities in Europe raise entrance fees and set limits of students in the university courses, selecting them by entrance tests, graduation vote, exams outcomes or personal background. This presents a barrier for many students, especially for the less privileged.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With: All students must have the right to access further and higher education after the completion of secondary school. Furthermore, there should be no financial, social, cultural or any other kind of barrier preventing students from accessing higher education. Therefore higher education should not be linked to any fees. This presents a barrier for many students, especially for the less privileged. Citizen should be able to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study accordingly to one’s abilities and society’s prospects.

CSU: They think that there are several types of universities. Their aim is to produce excellent scientists, and if we want excellent institutions, there should be some kind of selection to access these institutions. They think there should be the opportunity to select by entrance exams. Universities cannot be accessible to everyone.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: They do not think that Cambridge is better and should be better. They believe that the more heterogeneous students you have, the better. Prestige should not be the main aim. There should be no entrances whatsoever.

ISSU: Speaks in favour of the amendment. Education should be free, but there is no way governments will fund higher education for everyone.

CNE: Is in favour of the amendment. There are different universities in the world: popular ones and prestige ones. They think there should be entrance exams in some cases.

AKS: Believes entrance tests are also another barrier to access higher education. They think that one might also need a lot of money to pay for materials and books for the entrance test. They feel it is also another kind of social selection. From their perspective, OBESSU should be against entrance tests.

UDS: They disagree with the last sentence.

SUS: From their perspective, it is really important to implement the entrance exams in university studies.

ISSU: Thinks that what is needed is to make the entrance exams more relevant. Everyone has the right to access higher education and they want everyone to have opportunities.

SAKKI: Does not want people not have any qualification. There are examples to keep the motivated people in the system without the need of entrance tests.

VSK: Requests to close the speaking list.

CSU: Explains that in the Czech Republic the most expensive students are the film schools, but if we would allow everyone to get into the cinema school the government would not be able to pay for their education.

If we would allow everyone, we would not have enough resources. It would not be sustainable.

ISSU: Asks for clarification on Luxemburg.

UNEL: Explains the Luxembourgish system.

CANAE: Thinks that the tests are not necessary when we are being evaluated during secondary school education.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 14
Against: 7
Abstentions: 1
Carried

Roll Call.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK
Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 COs and 2 affiliate organisations.

The chairperson welcomes everyone back in the meeting and explains that there has been a request from CANAE to change the agenda of the GA.

Statement to the minutes from CANAE: On behalf of CANAE I propose to change the order of the points of the Agenda. Therefore, the proposal is to address the points 26 (composition of the Board), 27 (election of new Board), 28 (election of MC) and 21 (WorkPlan) (in this order) before points 19.

CANAE: The reason is that CANAE’s representation leaves tomorrow at around midday and would like to attend those points if possible.

The chair opens the floor for questions and there are no comments.

The chair explains that the proposal has to be adopted by simple majority.

Proceed to vote on the proposal of CANAE to change the Agenda:

In favour: 21
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1

The change has been accepted. Once the point of Political platform is finished, the elections will start.

DGS: Asks if there will be a policy corner or not.

The Board explains that this policy corners are space for discussions and are not linked to decisions by the GA.

The Chairperson explains that the organisations that proposed amendment #28, proposed a modification of the amendment. She explains that the change of amendment needs to be agreed by consensus. The decision will be taken tomorrow and the amendment will be sent to all delegates tonight.

Amendment #12 (SUS, UNSS)

**Amendment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Remove: and never be given into hands of private companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CSU: It is counterproductive to close the doors before healthy competition and more choices for students.

Yet again, the educational system as a whole must be in hands of the government but the involvement of the private sector is not unfavourable.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: They do not think there should be competition in the educational system. Private companies have interests for themselves and in the educational systems there should not be private interests.

SIF: The think we need to have a control of the private sector in the educational system. It is healthy to have competition, but the responsibility of higher education should not be in hands of private companies.

CSU: Believes this is a matter of interpretation. It is not bad that private companies open universities.

EEO: Proposes to close the speaking list.

There are no more comments or questions.
Proceed to vote:
In favour: 4
Against: 14
Abstentions: 4
Not carried

Amendment #13 (UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Replace: owned</th>
<th>With: guaranteed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CSU: It is not the work of OBESSU to prevent private universities. They think private universities are the best. There should be place for private universities but strictly regulated but the mainstream of students should go to private universities.

There are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 14
Against: 5
Abstentions: 3
Carried

Amendment #14 (SLL, SUS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Remove: free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SLL: It is linked to the previous discussion.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SIF: They support variety in school systems, and they would like to have access to free education economically and also educationally. Ensuring free education for all does not mean that we would abolish fees. It is important that we ensure free entrance exams.

The Board clarifies that by saying free in this case, does not mean about not having entrance exams but that there should be no financial barriers, taking into account the previous discussion.

UNEL: It is about having the same opportunities. It does not mean the diploma devaluates and the people do not pass the exams.

ISSU: If you have a situation where there are no standards to enter higher education, you would not be able to pay higher education.

CSU: Thinks that equal access and free access are different. The sentence could be interpreted as there should be no barrier - nor entrance exams.

DGS: Reminds everyone that MOs just past the amendment about entrance. They think that if it says free here, it is not contradicting. It means that there are no barriers. If it is free, it’s for everyone.
There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 4
Against: 10
Abstentions: 8

Not carried

The chair explains this amendment is connected to amendment 16. If #15 passes, amendment #16 will not be voted upon.

**Amendment #15 (UNSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>193-203</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Remove</strong>: OBESSU believes that every European school student must be guaranteed a basic financial safety in the shape of a student income, granted by the national government. A student income is to be granted to everyone who holds the status of a school student, based on personal need. In order to respect the various social and economical backgrounds of the school students of Europe, OBESSU believes the student income must be granted according to general standards determined by the financial situation of the school student in question. These standards are to be set with respect to the income of the student’s parents and number of persons provided for by the student’s parents. A student with parents with no or low payment is naturally to be granted a higher income than a student with high-income parents providing only for one child. The income system must also see to the needs of children with no parents or custodians. In addition to a student income,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSU: It does not cover the social situation of the students, but it covers all. We might also need other better elements. This proposal would work only with countries with strong welfare systems, and we could discuss if we want it. Our effort is to make the Political Platform more pragmatic and easily to put in place. This part could never work in the full Europe.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: Explains this is one of the things that matter most for DGS. This system works in Denmark, and this system creates equality, and no one is influenced by any social negative heritages. In Denmark, students can take education without worrying about their financial situation.

FSS: Explains they have the system in place since 1959. They do not have to worry about having part time jobs. It works and it is sustainable. They believe we should strive to have it all over Europe and the world.

UNEL: Recalls the discussion in the corner. From their perspective, a Political Platform has to aim high. In some countries it is applicable. We need to work for the possibilities. It is nice to invest in teachers you could have good teachers, but what if students cannot access education because they have to work.
CSU: Scandinavian economic situation might be good but post-soviet is not. The teacher is crucial for the student and they have to be awarded, and those countries that are part of Europe and have to be taken into consideration also.

SLL: It would be very good if each EU country could have it. I do not understand what can help to take it out of the political platform.

UNSS: Agrees against the amendment. In Serbia teachers can also get better incomes, but they do not see how removing the amendment could help on this.

SIF: The student income creates social economic stability and allows students to be more independent and prevent early school leaving.

ISSU: They think we need to aim high and need to be idealistic on this. Even if we are not going to manage to get it, it does not mean we do not have to aim at it.

LMS: Thinks the political platform says what we can advocate for. It is needed to keep it for those that would like to continue advocating for it.

CNE: Explains that, in Romania, they have a similar income of 19€. There are millions of children that are happy to get it. They also propose to close the speaking list.

EEO: Thinks that even if we get the student income from the government, it does not mean that they have to cut on teachers and materials. Students have to be able to survive.

CSU: Recalls that someone mentioned that we are working for this income. CSU works to have the political platform thinner. They aim at focusing on fewer topics. To promote student incomes at European level, there must be a lot of force work to work on it.

SIF: In an organisation that is so large, some MOs might reach their goals easily and some of them will not be able to do it.

There are no more comments and questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 2
Against: 18
Abstentions: 2
Not carried

Sunday 14th June 2015

The Chairperson welcomes everyone back to the General Assembly.

Roll Call

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK, BSSU

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 COs and 2 affiliate organisations.
The Chairperson explains Vicky from UNEL is leaving in the middle of the day and asks for another volunteer to be in the ballot committee. Horia from CNE volunteers to be in the ballot committee. No one disagrees.

We also have a guest present in the room, Alvaro Ferrer former CANAE and MC member, and the chairperson asks if everyone agrees that he stays. He is allowed to stay by acclamation.

**Amendment #16 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Add: With the exception of this when a student, who is over 18 years old, lives independently of their parents. In such a case, the income level of the student’s parents must not affect the student’s grants. After: …providing only for one child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>A school student should be able to focus on school full time whether or not they live at home. If the income of the students parents affect their grants when they live independently of their parents, they might have to work after school, which is a great disadvantage compared to those who live at home with their parents or receive bigger grants due to lower incomes of their parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLL: It is an addition to amendment 15. They feel that it is really important that if a student lives independently, the parents’ income should not affect the student grant.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions and there are no comments or questions.

**Proceed to vote:**

In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
**Carried**

**Amendment #17 (SLL, SUS, UNSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Remove: and visions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUS: Explains this is an indefinite formulation making the document lose objectivity and credibility. The process of granting scholarships for people with “visions” is not applicable at any wider level (*in this document we focus on the state level*) and should therefore be reduced to skills.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: Opposes the amendment. They agree “visions” might not be the best wording, but think that if one person only has skills, they feel that this person also needs visions, why do you want to study somewhere.

CSU: Asks how they would define vision. In their opinion it is an arbitrary formulation.

DGS: Thinks it is difficult to have objectivity of special skills. Vision is something one believes and fights for.
SAKKI: Explains that visions are a very big part of entrepreneurship. She asks the supports of the amendment to explain this part of it. How this affect entrepreneurship education.

UNSS: They agree that visions are relative. But they are more supporters of motivation and skills and would like to have something measurable.

There no other questions or comments.

** Proceed to vote:**

In favour: 8
Against: 9
Abstentions: 5
Not carried

**Amendment #18 (SLL, SUS, UNSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>211-212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Replace: Public services must provide public transport free of charge and free or reduced admission to cultural institutions such as museums, cinemas and theatres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With: Public cultural institutions as well as public transportation must be provided with reduced admission or free of charge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLL: Thinks it is not necessary to list single places. Additionally, the demand for having reduced admission in public transportation is more feasible than stating only request for having it free completely.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SAKKI: Thinks is the same line of discussions from yesterday. Of course they want free transport, because we aim for the utopia in the Political Platform.

ISSU: Thinks it is important that we fight for young people to access culture. Therefore, for them it is important to keep it as it is. It protects access to non-formal education like museums.

SIF: Asks if the amendment can be amended.

The chairperson clarifies the procedure.

UNSS: Clarifies they do not want to change the meaning, but rather simplify the sentence. In their opinion, there are many more cultural institutions.

CNE: Clarifies that the initial line says the need of public transport to be free. Public transport is about going to school. In their opinion, the original wording is clearer than the proposed one.

UNEL: Proposes to close the speaking list.

The Chairperson explains there is a new formulation proposed by SIF and SAKKI on the spot:

“Public transportation must be free of charge, and public cultural institutions must be provided with reduced admission or free of charge”

SIF: Explains it is important that people get free public transport and cultural institutions reduced.

UNSS: Agrees completely. Now it is defined that public transport should be free and we do not name all cultural institutions.
The chairperson explains that the first vote will be to accept the amendment of the amendment and afterwards, about the amendment itself.

Proceed to vote on accepting the amendment to the amendment:

In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The proposed amendment to the amendment is accepted unanimously

Proceed to vote on the amended amendment:

In favour: 20
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2

Carried

Amendment #19 (SLL, UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>212-214</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Amendment** | Replace: School students must be relieved from paying taxes on material needed for studies, such as literature and audio-visual material and must not be charged of public service functioning as educational aid, such as television  
With: Materials needed for studies should fall under reduced VAT rate in order to be more affordable |
| **Rationale** | This is factual amendment making the actual formulation more usable. We believe that this concrete action could be put into practice and it is advisable to have in our document. |

CSU: Wants to generalise the initial sentence. They have been trying to make the Political Platform more usable at national level, and more easily pushed to government.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

ISSU: Thinks the initial wording should be kept as it is.

CSU: Agrees that the Political Platform might have a higher aim and proposes to combine the amendment to include both options to give more ideas.

SAKKI: Does not think it is a good idea. The Political Platform is the ideal scenario this is what we strive for. We strive for no taxes, instead of reduced.

CSU: Thinks that politics is not about utopia and no compromises.

SAKKI: Thinks this is a Political Platform and not about politics. From their perspective, the objective of having a work plan is to have more concrete ideas, and those are better in the work plan than in the political platform.

ISSU: Thinks this is our Political Platform, and we need to aim high.

CSU: Thinks that the Board cannot support ideas that are not in the Political Platform but having another approach will give another possibility.

CNE: Thinks that in the Political Platform we have to have some ideological perspective, because after that we can be legitimate to aim higher. They also propose to close the speaking list.
UNEL: Understands the point of CSU but still believes that we should aim high, and it is a bit less credible.

The Board clarifies that when they advocate, the demands are based on the Political Platform but if something is not explicitly stated, but implied, even if it is not written in the document, they can still advocate for it.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 2
Against: 17
Abstentions: 3
Not carried

Amendment #20 (SUS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | Replace: ideas of student income and scholarships  
With: ideas of student scholarships |

SUS: Explains it is connected with amendment for removing the “student incomes” (#15). SUS still believes that student income is not relevant for our countries from Eastern Europe. Therefore, they believe the Political Platform should be able to apply to all national states.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:
SIF: Explains the Political Platform does not necessary reflect each and every state is right now. These are our goals. It is suitable that we demand things that are in place in the Political Platform. It is relevant in some states now, and hopefully it will be relevant for other states in the future. It is a demand for the future, for a better life of students.
ISSU: Explains that one of the reasons we come together is to learn together. They will never see it happen in Ireland, but that does not mean that we do not want it and aim at it.
CSU: Proposes to close the speaking list.
SLL: Thinks this makes it flexible enough to all European countries and that it is possible to somehow use in all countries.
UNEL: Thinks that we are speaking about a logical and coherent Political Platform, therefore, it makes sense to keep it there.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 2
Against: 18
Abstentions: 2
Not carried

Amendment #21 (SLL, UNSS)

| Line(s) | 222 |
Amendment | Add: reduced fare or  
Before: free of charge

SLL: Explains it is connected with amendment for adding request to the price of public transportation.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions but there are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 4
Against: 18
Abstentions: 0
Not carried

Amendment #22 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>228-229</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | Replace: safety in regard to on one hand physical, on the other hand mental health.  
With: safety in regard to physical, meaning absolute impunity from physical violence in all situations and safety in regard to mental health. |

SLL: They feel it is necessary to define physical safety.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:
SIF: Would like to echo what the Board said before. They feel the violence is already implied and we feel it is unnecessary to change.
FSS: Thinks this is important to clarify even more, since this is very important in schools.
   ➢ The Board thinks this is a nice idea and suggests to change “meaning” for “including”
SIF: Supports the amendment, and thinks it is important.

There are no more comments or questions

Final formulation with the change proposed by the board: “safety in regard to physical, including absolute impunity from physical violence in all situations and safety in regard to mental health.”

The Chairperson calls the vote to accept or not the modifications to the amendment proposed by the Board.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
The amendment to the amendment is accepted unanimously

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 21
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1

**Carried**

**Amendment #23 (SLL, FSS, SUS, UNSS)**

| Line(s) | Replace: racism, homophobia, transphobia, misogyny and class discrimination and offer no place for anti-human rights movements, neofascist ideologies or supremacist mindset  
With: any kinds of discrimination and offer no place for extremist political ideologies |

SUS: Would like to replace this kind of discrimination, with a more general wording.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: They see three problems. They think we should treat differently racism and homophobia. They believe it is really important that to say anti-human rights.

CSU: Thinks that with the initial wording, there is no space for anti-semitism and other -isms. They propose a more general formulation of the Political Platform, to have bigger space for demands. They demand, taking into consideration their country political evolution, to include other ideologies.

UNEL: Thinks that what is there now is something we can work on. They think we have a lot of other discrimination. They believe we show that we are inclusive, and we can actually grow up.

SIF: Agrees with UNEL, but also with CSU. They think it does exclude other forms of discrimination but it is necessary that we define what is discriminated. They think both are needed and propose to add “among other”.

LMS: They think that would be fairest that someone makes an amendment and includes the “any kind of discrimination”. They ask for volunteer organisations to submit it.

SAKKI: They do not agree because they feel that we cared about something, more than to other issues. They think the Workplan of OBESSU is the document that shows where OBESSU puts the focus in its daily work. They are all very important, even if we do not mention them.

ISSU: Agrees with SAKKI. The place to explain concretely is not necessarily in the Political Platform.

CSU: Thinks the Political Platform should be for all of the Member Organisations, then they do not understand why there is no mention of Stalinism. They believe there are extremist movements on both sides of the ideological spectrum. They feel that, by saying this, we are excluding these extremist movements form our Political Platform.

EEO: Proposes to close the speaking list.

The Board explains that it is true that generalising is helpful, but points out line 357, where we are already explaining about discrimination in general.

SIF: Understands the points but stresses the need of stating types of discrimination in order to protect human rights.

CSU: Clarifies that line 357 is only about social statues. They propose to make an amendment to the amendment but keeping the wording.

ISSU: Thinks that by saying we are against discrimination, we are saying we are for equality.
SAKKI: They agree with SIF, but when you state certain type of discrimination, you should list them all.

The Board reminds of the deadline before the GA to amendment the amendments.

The chairperson explains that there are two amendments to the amendment and that the GA will vote one by one.

ISSU proposes “Any kinds of discrimination and offer no place for anti-human rights movements, neo-fascists ideologies or supremacist mindsets.”

CSU proposes “Any kinds of discrimination and offer no place for anti-human rights movements, neo-fascists ideologies or supremacist mindsets or extremist political ideologies”

ISSU: Thinks that we can all be considered extremist sometime, and they think it is too broad. In some interpretations our stands can be considered too extremist.

CSU: Stresses that we are talking about school community. School community should be free of any kind extremism of political ideologies, because children are endangered by influence by someone forcing their extremist opinion to younger ones.

ISSU: Understands CSU position, but they also believe in the freedom of speech. They do not think we should restrict people’s freedom of speech.

SAKKI: Suggests changing the amendment.

The chairperson does not accept another amendment to the amendment to the amendment and reminds the Member Organisations of the procedure for amendments before the General Assembly.

EEO: suggests a 3-step process to vote on the amendments to the amendments.

We first vote on the two proposals, one against each other:

In favour of ISSU’s amendment to the amendment: 11
In favour of CSU’s amendment to the amendment: 2
Abstentions: 9

The proposal from ISSU is the one that will be voted upon by the GA.

We then vote on accepting the amendment to the amendment from ISSU:

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 19
Against:
Abstentions: 3

The amendment to the amendment is not accepted.

Proceed to vote on the original amendment #23:
In favour: 9
Against: 12
Abstentions: 1

Not carried

Amendment #24 (UNSS)
Unfortunately, the European community has become a ground for different modes of fascism such as xenophobia and racism. OBESSU believes that a democratic school fostering mutual understanding, respect and solidarity is one of the most prominent ways of combating intolerance. With: Unfortunately, the European community has become a grow-ground for extremist ideologies and political movements deprecating liberal democratic values and different modes of fascism such as xenophobia and racism. OBESSU believes that a democratic school fostering understanding of European values, mutual respect, and solidarity is one of the most prominent ways of combating intolerance.

CSU: They are proposing a basis for liberal democratic values as well as European identity that is fundamental for developing a responsible and hate-free Europe society.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: They think that again, “extremist ideologies” is too open. On the other hand, they do not understand so much the “European values”, and they think the original wording is much clearer.

CSU: They think the Political Platform is not about just only political formulation. They explain that by European values they mean freedom, democracy, and human rights, and the ones we have as European community.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 4
Against: 13
Abstentions: 5
Not carried

Amendment #25 (SLL, SUS, UNSS)

CSU: Thinks that gender identity is definitely one of the topics that should be discussed at schools to prevent discrimination and social exclusion of pupils not matching the stereotypes but since there are many other problems that are important at least at the same level as the gender identity, such as religion diversity and its habits or lack of civic education (leading to rise of anti-system movements) associated with active leading pupils for democratic values, they are convinced that none of such topics should be favoured in spite of others.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:
The Board makes a linguistic point by clarifying that a focal point is not “the fundamental” but an important one.

CSU: Thinks that if you say something is in the center, you are saying that it is the core.

ISSU: Thinks it is not the main goal, but it is at the heard, were the values are. It means a lot to them. It is one of the goals and a strong one.

SAKKI: Agrees with ISSU, but if focal is used on one topic, CSU is right.

CNE: They agree with SAKKI and think there are more focal points. They also suggest to close the speaking list.

SIF: They support the amendment.

DGS: They do not understand what greater understanding means while saying focal point is quite understandable.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 8  
Against: 5 
Abstentions: 9  
Carried

Amendment #26 (SLL, SUS, UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>403</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | Replace: crucial  
With: important |

CSU: Thinks that gender identity is definitely one of the topics that should be discussed at schools to prevent discrimination and social exclusion of pupils not matching the stereotypes. But since there are many other problems that are important at least at the same level as the gender identity, such as religion diversity and its habits or lack of civic education (leading to rise of anti-system movements) associated with active leading pupils for democratic values, we are convinced that none of such topics should be favoured in spite of others. They do not want to prioritise one against each other.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: Explains that we are all experiencing trans-phobia, homophobia and bi-phobia in our contexts. They see those topics as a crucial point in our educational systems.

SAKKI: Sees where DGS is coming from, but thinks it is the same problem with the different kinds of discrimination. They agree it is a very crucial point of education, but not on top of other topics.

CSU: They agree with DGS, but if you say it is crucial only to this, you are not developing the rest of problems.

ISSU: They do not think we would reduce our impact, but raise it. They think we are sending a clear message.

EEO: Proposes to close the speaking list.

CSU: Thinks this is a Political Platform of 30 pages. We are not saying it is not important, but there are also other important problems, for example with civic education.

SAKKI: They totally agree with CSU. In their opinion, the Political Platform should include everything.
The Board clarifies that the word “crucial” appears on many different topics: education as Human Right, when talking about gender based education, lifelong learning, vote @16, etc. It appears many times, and the board uses different adjectives in different moments. They clarify they do not give a preference to a topic or another one.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 8
Against: 13
Abstentions: 1
Not carried

Amendment #27 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Add: Pedagogical methods should involve use of modern technology. Schools should support students to use their laptops, tablets and mobile devices in taking notes, looking for information etc. The use of technology in education helps the students to learn skills needed in the modern world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before:</td>
<td>High quality continuous...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLL: They are strong supporters of technology in education. The matriculation examination in Finland is electronic by the year 2020 and we believe computers, tablets and mobile phones should be utilized more in education as they offer infinite possibilities. We acknowledge the different situations in all of the countries, but they believe this to be the ideal.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:
- The Board feels that in the future we will open the discussion within OBESSU and it is a deeper issue than an amendment of the Political Platform, but something to be developed in a resolution.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #28 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>420-426</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Delete: High-quality continuous professional development must be an integral part of professional life for all teachers. During teachers’ careers, views concerning the nature and purpose of learning and education; the value systems of schools and of society; and the interests, capabilities...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and ambitions of students will all evolve greatly. As professionals, teachers must adapt to changed circumstances and demands with varying degrees of sensitivity and adequacy, but reliance on this alone are unreasonable. Schools and teachers themselves must recognise their responsibility for ensuring that, throughout their careers, they are able to adapt and update their professional skills.

FSS: There is a new amendment in this line.

The Chairperson explains there is an amendment to this amendment proposed by UNEL and FSS that replaces the paragraph by “Therefore, adaptation and updating professional skills are responsibilities teachers and schools need to recognise and also apply to ensure, that the quality of teaching is not affected”.

UNEL: Feels it is very important to mention this, and it would be incoherent with the lines 445. They think we cannot have it as a demand if it is not explained before.

The Chairperson calls the vote to accept the amendment to the amendment:

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

The amendment to the amendment proposed by UNEL and FSS is accepted unanimously.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions but there are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote on the updated amendment:
In favour: 17
Against: 1
Abstentions: 4

Carried

Amendment #29 (SLL, SAKKI, FSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Add: - digital teaching methods to be used in schools and schools to provide the equipment needed to use those methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLL: Explains this demand would be based on the chapter they propose to add into the political platform about the use of technology in education.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions but there are no comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

Carried

For the amendments #30-#33, the Board proposes that we have a general discussion and then to vote on them one by one since they are strongly linked.

Amendment #30 (UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Remove: such as the PISA surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CSU: Thinks PISA is also based in qualitative tests. Last PISA tests were done in 2012. They believe PISA surveys are essential and good to compare the educational systems and they find them useful.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

DGS: The delegate explains that she remembers being very frightened when doing the PISA tests. In their perspective, it becomes a competition between all the education system to create A and B schools. They believe that the changes in education should not be based on PISA tests.

USO: Explains PISA test is the one everybody knows and proposes to keep it in the first one, and in amendment #31 and remove it amendment #33.

The Board clarifies that:

- Quantitative vs. qualitative analysis is completely different. The PISA report is only the analysis of the quantitative data, but not qualitative reports. And PISA is NOT based on qualitative data.
- Here is where our relation with OECD started, and when we started the relation with them even though we criticised PISA tests and we were taken into account.
- Student-centered education is not the same as test-centered education. From their perspective, putting the test at the center of education would be completely wrong.
- Also, they think that if you take the “PISA” word out of the sentence, you change the meaning of the sentence completely.

CSU: Complains the Board had more time than one minute intervention. They also explain in Czech Republic they are not scared of it. They believe PISA makes a set of recommendation that are useful and that’s why they do not want to oppose PISA tests in the Political Platform.

ISSU: Explains that OBESSU has been working a lot in this testing system. While mentioning PISA, we are saying that we do not want to put the tests in the center of education. We need to focus on an education that puts learning in the center.

SAKKI: They agree with everyone. They are against the amendment and we support all kind of research. They think PISA can be used as a great tool, but it can also be used as a weapon.

UNEL: Thinks PISA is not representative. She explains that in Luxemburg they all have to take it, but in some countries, the results are not representative. There are problems with PISA that need to be changed to be valued.

Roll Call.
Now there are 21 MOs with the right to vote, 1 COs and 2 affiliate organisations.

Proceed to vote amendment #30:
In favour: 2
Against: 17
Abstentions: 2
Not carried

Roll Call.

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 COs and 2 affiliate organisations.

Amendment #31 (UNSS)

Line(s) | 691
---|---
Amendment | Replace the PISA
With: | such
Rationale | It is a common misconception that OECD through its PISA programme measures just quantitative outcomes. The researchers also publish various reports and data that go deeply into problematics. We recommend anyone interested to visit the PISA website and get familiar with its extent.

Withdrawn by UNSS.

Amendment #32 (SUS, UNSS)

Line(s) | 695-697
---|---
Amendment | Replace: OBESSU claims that the key to a high-quality education is, in the first place, a good social learning environment where every student feels safe and empowered in his or her studies.
With: | OBESSU claims that one of the keys to a high-quality education is a good social learning environment where every student feels safe and empowered in his or her studies.
SUS: | Explains there are many different views on what creates a high-quality educational system (well-paid/good-quality teachers, experts involvement, good curriculum, appropriate use of technologies, mobility etc.) and therefore it is not accurate to set only one approach as the best and label it as the key to
success. Instead, we emphasize the social learning environment as one of those elements helping to create the mentioned high-quality education.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

FSS: Thinks there are no schools that would work without any of these elements. If those are not in place, you cannot have quality education.

ISSU: Thinks that, by putting in place the social environment, we are saying it is basic and super important.

SLL: Thinks we still are stating that the social environment, it is only saying that there are also other things.

CSU: Agrees with SLL and reminds the discussion on gender identity. They do not agree that social environment is the most important for all of us.

LMS: Clarifies that the only thing that is changed in the sentence is that they added “one of the keys”. They think that for one of us it can be the main key, and this just leaves space for us to use it how you prefer.

CNE: Proposes to close the speaking list.

SAKKI: Asks CSU what is more important than the social environment. They think that for one of us it can be the main key, and this just leaves space for us to use it how you prefer.

ISSU: Asks the GA what is more important than a good social learning environment. They think it is a basic need.

SLL: They agree that this is the most important one, but if you only have a good social environment, it does not mean you have a high-quality education. There are other factors in place.

EEO: Proposes to permanently to close the speaking list.

There are no other questions or comments.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 8
Against: 10
Abstentions: 4

Not carried

Amendment #33 (UNSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>699</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Amendment** | Replace: PISA surveys  
With: surveys mentioned above |
| **Rationale** | It is a common misconception that OECD through its PISA programme measures just quantitative outcomes. The researchers also publish various reports and data that go deeply into problematics. We recommend anyone interested to visit the PISA website and get familiar with its extent. |

Withdrawn by UNSS.
12. **Vote on composition of the Board**

**Roll Call**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI (not present), SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK, BSSU

Now there are 21 MOs with the right to vote, 1 COs and 2 affiliate organisations.

The Chairperson introduces the Statutes that determine that the General Assembly have to decide on having a Board of 5 or 7 members (by simple majority). She explains that we currently have an overlapping mandate and the Board currently is of 4 people and Luke is finishing his mandate and opens the floor for discussion to decide on the composition of the Board:

MAKOSZ: Asks for the opinion of the current Board.

ISSU: Asks for the financial implications of taking a Board of 7.

SIF: Would like to hear the opinion of MC.

FSS: Asks for secret ballot

- The Board explains that having a Board of 7 would be more representative and have more expertise and less work for individual members. But they find more pros for a Board of 5. They feel it is a good working system, communication works better, and it makes it easier for teambuilding.
- About the overlapping mandate, if the GA decides now for 7 members and in the next for a Board of 5, it would mess up the overlapping mandate.
- A Board of 5 increases the responsibility of individual members and financially would be more feasible.
- Rasmus explains that it would cost more, that would have to cut down somewhere else, but it could still be done.
- The MC thinks it has to be taken into account that it is a financial burden. The Board of 5 is feasible.

The Chairperson explains that we can proceed to vote.

**Roll Call to handout the ballots.**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK, BSSU

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 affiliate organisations.

The ballot committee leaves the room with the Secretary General.

A Board of 5 had: 13 votes

A Board of 7 had: 8 votes

Blanks: 1 vote.
The GA decides on having a Board of 5 members. There are 2 spots open for the elections. The Chairperson explains that as there are two candidates from the same country, according to Internal Regulations (Art. 7.23 and 24) there is going to be a vote on whether the GA is going to vote on having 1 or 2 candidates from the same country. The Board asks the MC about the interpretation of these articles of the internal regulations and the MC interprets these two points in the context as also if someone is already in the Board. Since Oona Heiska is also in the Board from SLL, and Anna running from FSS, the GA has to decide whether or not Anna can run for the election of the Board.

The Chairperson gives the floor to Anna to explain herself.

Anna: SLL and FSS are different organisations and we also represent lower secondary school and VET. I represent a very different point of view from Finland. I could be able to look at the work from a completely objective.

The Chairperson explains that it will be a secret ballot and the decision will be taken by a 2/3 majority.

Roll Call to handout the ballots.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK, BSSU

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 affiliate organisations.

The ballot committee leaves the room.

In favour: 11
Against: 10
Blank: 1

The General Assembly did not vote for 2/3 to allow Anna Hanson to run for the Elections. Therefore there will only be 5 candidates.

Roll Call.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK, BSSU

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 affiliate organisations.

The Chairperson explains that we have a new guest, Ferre Windey, the senior international officer of VSK.
The GA welcomes Ferre Windey to the GA by acclamation.

- The Board wants to thank Anna for standing for the Board, and encourage her to continue involved in OBESSU.

13. **Election of new Board members**

The Chairperson explains that usually Board candidates leave the room but as there are candidates that are the only delegate of their organisations the proposal is that all candidates stay in the room for the candidates speech but that all candidates leave the room only for the questions and answers.

There is no organisation against it.

There are 5 candidates:

- Dragan Bunjevac from ASuBiH
- Laufey María Jóhannsdóttir from SIF
- Matic Matjašič from UNSS
- Rūta Meškauskaitė from LMS
- Sophie Worral from DGS

The Chairperson proposes that we do the presentations by alphabetical order:

- **Dragan Bunjevac from ASuBiH presents himself**

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

**UNSS:** Why would you like to be a Board member of OBESSU?

- Dragan: In Bosnia we have 13 school systems. My goal is to make them a unique in one. We can still learn a lot from other countries and other systems. If I’m a Board member, I will be able to collect all your knowledge.

**ISSU:** What do you think should be the priority of OBESSU in the next two years?

- Dragan: We need more communication among each other. We have different systems and the main goal is to rise up every educational system at the same level.

**MAKOSZ:** Why do you have to be a Board member to communicate with other MOS and not only do it as international officer?

- Dragan: From OBESSU it would be much easier to collect the knowledge.

**CNE:** How are you going to cope with the western and the eastern educational systems? How are you going to put them in balance?

- Dragan: Every country has a different school system. Eastern Europe can invest more money in education. In Eastern Europe, it is hard to put money for something else in education.

- We need more communication, and after listening to other countries we can manage in some way to get closer on the vision on where is the goal for the organisations.
CANAE: You said you want to be a Board member to get to know about the other educational system. But I think this is what we do in the events and activities, and from our point of view, you should get involved a little bit in OBESSU activities. What do you think about it? Have you been involved in teams managing staff?

- Dragan: I was coordinator for 3 years, where I learned a lot of skills. And ASuBiH called me to run different seminars and I told them my knowledge on what should be better in higher education. The team was composed by 33. I was working with two people that get paid.

EEO: How will you represent the whole of Europe and not only your country and region?

- Dragan: I learned a lot from the OBESSU Board, and the meeting in Bratislava. We have a very good Board. They are representing their countries and OBESSU in a very good way. I do not know how to answer.

EEO: What would be your main focus from the Political Platform?

- Dragan: Communication. You can learn a lot from different aspects. It will be my first priority.

SIF: What kind of knowledge have you learnt in ASuBiH that could be applicable to OBESSU?

- Dragan: All the knowledge that I have in ASuBiH that you also have. Mainly competences and soft skills.

ISSU: What do you find most exciting that you want to see developed in the Workplan for the next years?

- Dragan: In OBESSU there have been nice projects, and in ASuBiH we also have very nice projects. Again, communication is the most important thing. To learn from each other.

CSU: What experience do you hold in lobbying?

- Dragan: In the past three years as a coordinator, I was good at lobbying and I can use it at the same level as in Bosnia.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson welcomes back the candidates

- Laufey Maria Jóhannsdóttir from SIF presents herself

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

EEO: You say you are doing a lot of things, and how are you going to manage the work and time for your things and the time for OBESSU?

- Laufey: My organisation is my number 1 priority. The job as a waitress is only part-time. I will not be able to be the President of SIF and the Board of OBESSU, so I will resign as SIF President.

ISSU: What are you most excited about for the OBESSU Workplan?

- Laufey: Student Welfare, since I’m in the working group. Also the work with IGLYO and the work on diversity.

FSS: How are you going to maintain the contact with MOs?

- Laufey: Oona is the one responsible with our organisation. I think that is the point: being visible and asking. For the Board to be visible, is very important to be present and that all Board members are aware of the work of the rest of the team.

CSU: What is your experience in lobbying?

- Laufey: I am super-creative and positive, and I’m so very good at lobbying and gathering facts and statistics and make very good Prezis.

CNE: How are you going to cope with the Eastern and Western European system? How are you going to represent us?
• Laufey: I will be investigating and talking to the Boards. You have to be aware of this and have direct connection with MOs and Google things.

ISSU: About internal visibility: What should be done to increase visibility to external?
• Laufey: It is important that OBESSU should react at national issues, and also outside of Europe. But also becoming more political, also engaging more organisations. Being in contact with Ministries of Education.

SAKKI: What are some weaknesses you have?
• Laufey: I forget a lot of things and have to write them down. I’m very impulsive and not very organised.

CANAE: How big was your team in SIF? Have you ever worked with paid staff and what was your role?
• Laufey: we are a group of 7. I’m the president of SIF, and I deal with the Secretary General and she is 50% working. There is a very close cooperation with the Board and the Secretary General.

CSU: Shouldn’t it be an OBESSU priority some other of the priorities of OBESSU that are also included in the Political Platform?
• Laufey: Yes, there are a lot of things we have to deal with, but my passions are these ones.

CSU: What particular issue OBESSU should do concerning these issues?
• Laufey: We should aim at widening the work and work on the “normal” term.

SLL: We’ve been talking about skills and visions: Do you have bigger visions for OBESSU in a couple of years?
• Laufey: OBESSU are the ones to be contacted when it comes to consulting topics related to student welfare.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson welcomes back the candidates.

• Matic Matjašič nominated by UNSS presents himself

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

VSK: Can you give a negative thing about OBESSU that you would like to improve as a Board member?
• Matic: I would like to see more advocacy at European level, more direct cooperation between MOs, and improved implementation of documents.

SUS: How would you improve the advocacy in OBESSU?
• Matic: I see OBESSU as stakeholder in education and we should be invited to every roundtable or event tackling topics related to school student activism.

• We should improve cooperation with the European Commission, and I hope we could prepare a document that the European Commission would implement.

FSS: How much time would you be able to dedicate to OBESSU?
• Matic: I will start to study in October on European Studies. These studies give a lot of space for NGO work. You can not only go to school and have fun.

SIF: Can you please list your strengths and your weaknesses?
• Matic: Weknesses: I’m very emotional, I have ups and downs. Strenghts: I like challenges, I’m willing to learn a lot, and my life goal is to stay in politics.

CANAE: It is shocking that your nomination letter comes from UNSS. Why is that?
Matic: I’ve been in DOS from many years, but this year DOS changed the Secretary General (advisor) and this person is not interested in participating in OBESSU. That is why I asked UNSS to help me with this formal thing but I do not think it is really relevant.

UNSS: Explains they were familiar with the situation in DOS, and decided to support him.

CSU: What is your experience in Lobbying? How are you going to use it at European level?

• Matic: I have a similar experience at national level, for example with the case of public transport in Slovenia. I’ve been to many meetings with the Prime Minister and Ministers about the topic. Also in the regular work in DOS, we had many meetings with stakeholders in education. Also I’m in the WG on Welfare, and I had the incredible chance to meet the European Commissioner on Transport and we are now in contact with the Commissioner and also with the Education Commissioner.

ISSU: You have been in OBESSU for a long time. What is motivating you to stay in OBESSU? If you are elected, what are you looking forward to from the Workplan?

• Matic: The special energy in OBESSU events, that you can use this for our own organisations. It is useful amazing, and fun, and there are 100% things that are cool. I am addicted to OBESSU. I am really interested in the VET, and also Welfare.

SAKKI: What makes you special? What would you bring to the Board?

• Matic: The fresh air and motivation, and the positive energy, and the experience at the national level, and I really like to cooperate in this democracy things.

AKS: I would like to hear the point of view of DOS in the nomination from UNSS.

The Chairperson invites Matic to leave the room.

DOS: Lovro explains Matic is a good friend to him. In his opinion Matic is the critical eye that helped him. DOS does not support Matic, and they feel he is not a suitable candidate.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson welcomes the candidates back to the room.

• Rūta Meškauskaitė from LMS presents herself.

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

EEO: You were working close with Poland and Latvia. How do you feel you could incorporate the work you do with Latvia and Poland? What motivates you to do the work that you do?

• Rūta: Since there is still nobody in OBESSU from these countries, we should go to Poland to help them develop, and be strong enough to join us! We need the help from OBESSU to develop the educational systems. In the region the representation does not work that well.

• I like representing students, and I think about my future and working in the same field, getting experience to do some real change and to continue working in European level.

CSU: OBESSU has a broad spectrum of activities and topics. What do you think should be the priority of OBESSU?

• Rūta: I believe I think it has to be quality of Education, and that it has to be about educating individuals. Also the methodology.

FSS: How would you prioritise OBESSU in your life time management?

• Rūta: I will be starting university from September but I was also considering a gap year. I would be doing only university and my home organisation.
SIF: Where do you think OBESSU needs improvement?

- Rūta: Cooperation has been mentioned a lot. I would like to see the MOs to visit each other to their events. There would be some kind of a dialogue within MOs. Maybe in regions, etc.
- Sometimes OBESSU is only representative outside, but not inside. Cooperation within could strengthened.

ISSU: What are the activities you find most interesting from the Workplan?

- Rūta: I'm mostly interested in the quality of education and those parts and I have more experience in that field.

CANAE: How big was the team you were working with? Have you ever worked with a secretariat or paid staff?

- Rūta: In LMS we do not have any paid staff, so I do not have experience. Usually I work in groups of 24 council members and 12 people in the Board.

VSK: How do you connect the European sphere with the ground level?

- Rūta: OBESSU should be known all around. We are as strong as the weakest. It depends on you as organisations and how you transfer the information at the national level. You have the responsibility to explain how students are represented.

EEO: What are some of your weaknesses?

- Rūta: I think I do not have so much knowledge, and would have to learn a lot in different spheres, for example on Welfare. For example I do not have experience in VET, and would need help on this. Also the pressure on myself because I always want to be the best.

CSU: What are your skills in lobbying? How are you going to use them? Also, everyone mentioned communication, and how would you improve it?

- Rūta: I am a part of the Structured Dialogue team in Lithuania, and it includes a lot of decision-makers and officials and I have got the chance to develop on this. I try to do my best, and I am a person of consensus.
- Regarding communication: I appreciate the online chats with Board members and it is not only about work stuff, but also personally related. I really like about talking about what organisations have been doing.

EEO: Is there someone in your life that inspires you?

- Rūta: It is my mother, I can tell you about it in the lunch break.

There are no more questions and the Chairperson welcomes the candidates back to the room.

Sophie Worrall from DGS presents herself

The Chairperson invites the other candidates to leave the room and opens the floor for questions:

CSU: What are your skills in lobbying? How are you going to use them? Also, everyone mentioned communication, and how would you improve it?

- Sophie: I had experience talking with politicians and was in UNICEF Denmark. In DGS we usually speak with ministries and ministers. We are all advocating and lobbying.
- The priorities: financial barriers and hidden costs, but also the social economical background of students.

MAKOSZ: What are your future plans?
Sophie: I want to study political science and international relations in UK. I would like to be involved in UN and UNICEF. I work as a receptionist, and I want to work in something I really like.

MAKOSZ: Is OBESSU a goal or a tool?

Sophie: it is a goal, but at the same time it is a tool.

SIF: Where do you think OBESSU should be improved?

Sophie: We need to do more study sessions and activities and political discussions. Understanding why are we passionate. In future study sessions to give time to reflect what makes OBESSU special.

Why OBESSU makes sense.

VSK: Can you precise your political engagement?

Sophie: I am involved in UNICEF and I have gotten a lot of press coverage for a post about my mother. I am quite engaged in the upcoming elections in Denmark.

VSK: How about political neutrality?

Sophie: You represent OBESSU and its Political Platform. I see the Board as a facilitator. Your own personal opinion does not count very much, but is easy to remain politically neutral.

SAKKI: Why OBESSU? Why do not you go to ESU?

Sophie: Because I see secondary school as the point where you still have everybody with you. We are still a team, and not an A and B team. I see people getting on Board. University people are very much specialised. It is really about the solidarity about and having everyone on Board.

SAKKI: But secondary education has VET.

Sophie: Of course VET or the business schools. Typically entrance tests to are much different than in universities. In DGS we have had close cooperation with EEO and I have experience to represent VET students.

FSS: How are you going to manage your time? How will you keep in touch with MOs in Europe?

Sophie: For me it will be either university and OBESSU or only university. I have talked with Board members and they said they could manage, and I think I could manage. And I will have an airport nearby. I am a to-do list person. I do not really feel frightened about being busy. I am pro-Skype and speaking with people. I do not see many barriers. I think Skype could be easy.

ISSU: Are you a team player? Are you affiliated to a political party? What is the activity you prefer for the Workplan?

Sophie: I am a team player, and also like to know what people are doing.

Yes, I am affiliated in a political party and will step down from that. I have been active for a long time.

I am very excited about the TCIOs and having the IOs there it is the way to spread the network.

ISSU: Which campaign?

Sophie: all the campaigns are good, but especially those related to social inclusion.

CSU: OBESSU is essentially about politics. Are you able to distinguish between your own opinions and the opinion of organisation you represent?

Sophie: I do not think the party is relevant. OBESSU is about representing the Political Platform. I do have strong opinions. If you are concerned about us being strange people, DGS is engaged and the international committee has around 40 people and we all have different opinions and we represent the views of DGS.

EEO: Is “Vote@16” also your own opinion?

Sophie: It is also in the OBESSU Political Platform. It is about who you are representing
1962 CANAE: Are you continuing to be affiliated to the political party? Have you ever worked with staff members?

1963 • Sophie: I will not be affiliated when the campaign for the elections are over, because it makes no sense and also for OBESSU.

1964 • In OBESSU I have done a lot of work in social inclusion and in the Danish level I organised and coordinated a whole campaign for about 500 people.

1965 ➢ The Board clarifies that the Statutes leaves it open that people are affiliated to political parties as long as they do not hold any decision-making positions in political parties.

1966 ➢ The MC clarifies what is written in the Statutes regarding political affiliation.

1967 There are no more questions and the Chairperson welcomes all the candidates back to the room.

1968 The Chairperson explains the procedure to elect Board members according to the Statutes.

1969 CANAE: We have agreed to have a 5 Board, I would like to ask the organisations to be coherent and vote for two people to make sure there are two people elected.

1970 **Roll Call to hand out the ballots.**

1971 AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK.

1972 Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 affiliate organisations.

1973 EEO: Raises the question to know if any other candidates are affiliated to political parties:

1974 • Dragan: Yes

1975 • Laufey: Yes

1976 • Matic: No

1977 • Rūta: No

1978 • Sophie: Yes.

1979 The Ballot Committee has entered the room and we now have the results.

1980 The Chairperson explains that, according to the internal regulations, we will need to recast the vote because 3 candidates (Laufey, Sophie and Rūta) got exactly 50% of the votes.

1981 Matic asks to know the votes of all candidates.

1982 The Chairperson checks with all the candidates and everyone agrees to make public the results.

1983 There were 22 valid votes:

1984 • Dragan 2

1985 • Laufey 11

1986 • Matic 7
1998  •  Rūta 11
1999  •  Sophie 11
2000
2001  **Roll Call to hand out the ballots**
2002  AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE, CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK.
2003
2004
2005  Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 affiliate organisations.
2006
2007  **Statement to the minutes:** CANAE gave a proxy vote to AKS because they left the room.
2008
2009  The ballot committee comes back to the room.
2010  The names of the candidates are read out loud, not in order of votes.
2011
2012  There were 22 valid votes
2013  •  Dragan: 1
2014  •  Laufey 13
2015  •  Matic 5
2016  •  Rūta 12
2017  •  Sophie 10
2018  **Rūta and Laufey are elected as new Board members of OBESSU.**
2019  The Chairperson thanks all the candidates that run.
2020  The Chairperson asks the newly elected Board members if they accept the votes and they both do.
2021  **Roll Call.**
2022  AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE (proxy vote to AKS), CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK.
2023
2024
2025  Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote, 1 CO and 2 affiliate organisations.
2026
2027  **14. Election of Monitoring Committee**
2028  There are 4 candidates to the Monitoring Committee. As only one of the candidates is present, the Chairperson proposes to not have questions and answers, to make it fair for everyone. There are no objections from the GA.
2029
2030  •  Nora Kleibel from AKS presents herself.
2031  •  The video presentation of **Cia Lane** from FSS is played.
2032  •  The video presentation of **Sasa Pecic** from UNSS is played.
2033  •  The video presentation of **Elsa Lengeler** from USO is played.
EEO: Asks of the limit of people in the MC.

The Chairperson clarifies that you can vote up to three people to the MC.

**Roll Call to hand out the ballots**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE (proxy vote to AKS), CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL(not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK.

The Ballot Committee comes back to the room with the results.

There were 22 votes cast, 21 valid and 1 spoiled.

- Nora: 20
- Cia 5
- Sasa 16
- Elsa 15

**Nora, Sasa and Elsa are elected as Monitoring Committee members.**

The Chairperson thanks all candidates for running for this position.

15. **Development Strategy and Workplan amendments**

**Development Strategy**

**Amendment #1 (DGS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Line 46 after the word “bring”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Add: We see OBESSU as a strong and important platform for exchange of ideas, not only between organisations who are much alike, but also between organisations who are quite different and represent different educational systems. Only through cooperation between all of the European countries, will we get a stronger OBESSU and member organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DGS: explains that they have experience that some people want to make a division between Eastern and Western European countries. They believe OBESSU will be strong if we are all together and we learn from each other.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

CNE: Is in favour of the amendment.

There are no other comments or questions.

**Proceed to vote:**

In favour: 20
Amendment #2 (DGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Line 99-102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Delete: Ensure consistency of the Statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since their adoption, the OBESSU statutes have been amended at almost every General Assembly. To ensure stability and continuity, the provisions of the Statutes should be agreed by consensus and once agreed, changed only when necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DGS: They believe MOs should not be prevented to make changes to the Statutes.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

CSU: Disagrees with the amendment because they feel we should aim at being consistent and try to avoid contradictions. From their understanding, the aim is to ensure consistency.

UNSS: Thinks we should aim at only change them when necessary.

SAKKI: Thinks that the only difference is that this paragraph only says that the Statutes should be agreed by consensus.

- The Chairperson clarifies what the amendment and the document means.

SAKKI: Has a question about the rationale.

DGS: Clarifies their rationale.

- The Board explains that it is not that this is an undemocratic amendment. From their perspective, in order to ensure continuity it is not very good to change the Statutes continuously.

MC: Suggests to separate two Statutes, one with the stable structures and one as a working document that can be changed as many times as needed.

CSU: Agrees with the MC proposal.

There are no more comments or questions:

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 1
Against: 14
Abstentions: 7
Not carried

Amendment #3 (DGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Line 103-109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Delete: Strengthen the Monitoring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Monitoring Committee is the essential link between the governing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bodies and the member organisations. For the sake of accountability and transparency, the Monitoring Committee should carefully follow the work of the Board and the Secretariat and proactively engage member organisations in the continuous evaluation of their work. Where necessary, the Monitoring Committee should respond to concerns and catalyse action to improve the functioning and governance of the organisation.

DGS: Explain they have added this to the Statutes because they do not understand how this passage strengthens the Monitoring Committee, and therefore they do not understand why it should be part of the Development Strategy.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions but there are no questions or comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 2
Against: 2
Abstentions: 18
Not carried

Amendment #4 (DGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>After line 165</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Add: European dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBESSU must additionally work to participate more in a dialogue on a European level. This must be done by trying to get OBESSU more in the media. OBESSU should try to get press coverage for our different political activities, proposals and amendments, in the European Parliament and within our collaborators. This can be done in a number of ways; OBESSU can begin writing more and better press releases to a European audience; media coverage can also be gained through demonstrations in which a number of member organisations participate in either Brussels or in the different member states on the same date. Press releases must be issued in connection to these demonstrations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DGS: Thinks that a good media strategy would help make more people aware of OBESSU and this successful media coverage will give us more influence.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:
UNSS: Would like to be explained the part about the demonstrations.
DGS: Gives the example of the 17th November.

- The Board clarifies that there is no big European media as such. As long as MOs provide the Board and the Secretariat with the information of the activities they are doing at national level, they will be shared. They explain that our media coverage will depend on your media coverage.
There are no more comments or questions.
Proceed to vote:
In favour: 12
Against: 2
Abstentions: 8
Carried

**WORKPLAN**

**Amendment #1 (CANAE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Add:</strong> Advocacy at the global level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being our wish to expand the influence of European School Students in those issues related to their education, OBESSU will invest more efforts towards advocacy for school student rights at the global level. OBESSU, among other actions, will ask for Consultative Status in UNESCO, will get involved and advocate within UNESCO structure and decision making processes especially Education For All and will join the Global Campaign for Education.

The Chairperson reads the rationale of the amendment proposed by CANAE: Good improvements have been done last years in advocacy at the European level, for instance within OECD. However, there is at the moment a lack of school student organisations and voice in the global education agenda, and therefore, a lack of our core demands there. Hence, issues like student rights, participation, active citizenship are mostly absent in education policy debates at the global level. A first good step was taken with our membership in the UN Global Education First Initiative Youth Advocacy Group, but further steps are needed. OBESSU should further expand its influence and impact to promote student rights. There are very relevant policy discussion forums such as UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organisation) where OBESSU should be present in order to achieve its objective of defending school student rights.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions.

- The Board explains that we have applied for membership to UNESCO to get consultative status and are thinking of applying for ECOSOC. They promise to keep the MOs updated.

CSU: Wants to appreciate this initiative, and thinks it is a very good aim.

There are no more questions or comments.

Proceed to vote:
In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

**Amendment #2 (CANAE)**
Amendment #3 (DGS)

Line(s) | 73-75
---|---
Amendment | Change: Rights are the basis of democracy. Learning about rights in schools is never simple because there is never much space to discuss and reflect about their importance today and the historical reasons for their existence;
To: Rights are the basis of democracy. Learning about rights in schools is never simple because there is never much time to discuss and reflect about their existence.

DGS withdraws the amendment.

Amendment #4 (SAKKI, SLL)

Line(s) | 171
---|---
Amendment | Delete: 2016
After | Working Group on Vocational Education and Training

SAKKI: Explains that the need for a working group is rising as the Vocational Education and Training field is under major changes these following few years, so we feel that OBESSU must have a VET Working Group (WG) to ensure continuity in up-to-date information regarding European policies on VET as well as proper
amount of representation in OBESSU. Currently the working group is set up to last only to the year 2016.

SAKKI proposes the working group to become a permanent part of OBESSU’s Workplan.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:

EEO: asks for clarification about the Workplan.

- The Board clarifies that by this amendment, the WG will continue working until the end of 2017.

SIF: is in favour of this amendment and explains that from 2002 the Icelandic VET organisation left OBESSU because of lack of VET representatives, and they think this is a huge part of education. They think that a lot of the work will be lost if we do not continue with the WG.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0
Carried

Amendment #5 (FSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>176-177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment</strong></td>
<td>Replace: This working group will analyse the current OBESSU Political Platform to map the outdated parts and the identify relevant issues which are still missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With: This working group will rewrite the current OBESSU Political Platform, so that it is up to date and reflects the MO’s opinions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSS: Believes that the current Political Platform is outdated and needs rewriting. They also feel that it is crucial that the Political Platform reflects the MO’s opinions.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

UNEL: explains that they have a proposal to modify the amendment: “This working group will rewrite the current OBESSU Political Platform, so that it is up to date and reflects the MO’s positions”.

LMS: Thinks we would lose the mapping of the outdated part and identifying relevant issues.

EEO: Explain they re-write their work plan and Political Platform every year because it is important to have this place where education is today and not 10 years ago.

- The Board expresses their concern. The WG will work to update the Political Platform, but they have a concern that the WG members are elected by the Board and they do not have as similar political position as other bodies. They feel that they would be given a lot of political power. From their perspective, the plan for this WG would be to write amendments and not to re-write a new Political Platform.

FSS: They feel it would be very long to have thousands of amendments.

CSU: Explains this is the main reason why they want the Political Platform be re-written completely. From their perspective, it is responsibility of the Board to select an equilibrated and plural WG.

EEO: Sees the need to have a short and easier political document.
USO: Is not sure that they could accept the changes of the WG. They do not think it is good to have a full rewritten Political Platform.

LMS: Wants a clarification on the adoption of the Political Platform.

CSU: Thinks that if you want to make a Political Platform shorter and clearer, it needs to be shorter. By amending it, it would not be possible to make it shorter nor easier.

EEO: Wants a clarification on the adoption of the Political Platform and suggests the Board to approve the new Political Platform before sending it to the General Assembly.

- The Board clarifies that they are not a decision-making body. It has to be the General Assembly who approves it, and their role is to facilitate the process.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote on the amendment of the amendment proposed by UNEL:

In favour: 16

There is no unanimity, therefore the GA will vote on the original amendment.

Proceed to vote on the original amendment:

In favour: 5
Against: 9
Abstentions: 8
Not carried

16. Vote of trust to the Secretary General

The Board explains their proposal to extend the contract of Rasmus Aberg to be the OBESSU Secretary General and legal representative for the next two years.

The Board explains the reasons why they propose Rasmus again and explains they had a very long and thorough discussion last autumn and took the decision in January 2015. They evaluate his performance very good, he manages very well the relations with the funders and he has been very good to keep and adapt relations with the civil society in Brussels. He has a very good grasp of the organisation and a very good understanding of its structure. He manages very well the Secretariat, knows about the policies of the organisation, and he has a very good insight for the development and strategic development of OBESSU.

There has been some instability in previous years in the Secretariat and they feel that we can have some stability for the Secretariat if he stays.

They understand that he will be involved for 4 years, but a strong and informed Board will be able to maintain the division of political and technical work.

- Rasmus Aberg introduces himself

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

FSS: Do you have any plans after OBESSU? Do you have any vision?
Rasmus: After two years I will stop. I do not know what I am going to do after OBESSU. I recognise that the Secretariat can take a lot of power, but it will not happen that I get too much power.

SIF: Where do you think OBESSU need improvement and how would you approach the problem?

Rasmus: The lack of diversification of incomes of OBESSU. We are very dependent on the European Commission, and it can take us to bad situations. Being too dependent on one source of funding is not good. I would like to do better in looking at into different funding programmes. We have spent a lot of time looking at into different funding sources.

EEO: What is the most challenging thing for you in the Secretariat? What is the best?

Rasmus: Being so dependent on the ad hoc plans, it is very difficult to make long-term planning. It gives some stress. Also the legal situation is a stressful, because we still have to send letters to the Netherlands where we are legally based.

The best is being surrounded by topics that I really enjoy. We discuss things that are super interesting. But also going to events and meeting you!

The Chairperson invites Rasmus to leave the room and opens the floor for questions to the Board or the Secretariat:

➢ The Board explains they discussed the risk of him taking too much power and they think that with the overlapping mandate will also balance this risk. All the time there will be oldies in the Board and there will not be sudden changes of Boards.

FSS: Giorgio and Estel, how is it to work with Rasmus?

Giorgio: The communication and the atmosphere are really good. Rasmus knows how to collaborate and work with us, to give us responsibilities and to take the ones that belong to him. He has very clear idea on the division of roles between Secretary General and the Board.

Estel agrees.

There are no more questions or comments so the Chairperson calls for the vote of trust to the Secretary General.

Roll Call to hand out the ballots.

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE (proxy vote to AKS), CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS, USO, VSK (proxy vote to USO).

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 22
Against: 0
Abstentions: 0

Rasmus Aberg is trusted to continue being OBESSU Secretary General unanimously.
17. **Policy Corners II**

The Chairperson explains how the policy corners will work.

- Role of the Board
- Role of Member organisations

**Statement to the minutes from UNSS:** I, the representative of UNSS would like to give our proxy vote to FSS because we have to leave the GA.

**Roll Call.**

AKS, ASuBiH, CANAE (proxy vote to AKS), CNE, CSU, DGS, DOS, EEO, ESCU, FSS, ISSU, LH (not present), LMS, MAKOSZ, SAKKI, SIF, SLL, SUS, UDS, UNL (not present), UNEL, UNSS (proxy vote to FSS), USO, VSK (proxy vote to USO).

Now there are 22 MOs with the right to vote.

18. **Working Group reports**

The Chairperson explains that a member of the WGs will present their work.

- Working Group on the Manual:
  - Florian, from the WG explains the first meeting, and the general structure of the revised Manual.
- Working Group on Student Welfare:
  - Matic, Laufey and Amanda explain the mandate of the WG, future plans and ideas, as well as the process of the first meeting of the WG on welfare.

The Chairperson opens the floor for questions:

**ISSU:** Asks if it is a positive experience

- **WG:** Explain it is a really good experience and very interesting topic.

**FSS:** Asks for the outcomes of the Working Group.

- **WG:** Explain that it will be the case studies, the Convention, the Campaign and a long-term process.

19. **Statutes amendments**

The Chairperson explains the procedure of the amendments to the Statutes. The changes have to be agreed by 2/3 majority.

**Amendment #1 (FSS,SLL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>211-212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Add: The voting should always be a closed vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amendment #2 (FSS, SLL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amendment | J) Adoption of the budget for the previous and current year of OBESSU and the adoption of the Annual Financial Contribution.  
To:  
K) Adoption of the Annual Financial Contribution. |

FSS believes it is important for the MOs to separately debate and discuss any changes in the Annual Financial Contribution. They want to clarify it in the statues.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

USO: Asks what would happen if you adopt the budged and then the AFCs separately.  
The Chairperson clarifies that the adoption of the AFCs is for the next year and not the current year.

There are no more questions or comments.

**Proceed to vote:**

- In favour: 20
- Against: 0
- Abstentions: 2

Carried

**Amendment #3 (FSS, SLL)**

| Line(s) | Add: A written change to proposals and amendments can be submitted to the chairman of the meeting. Only the organisation proposing the original amendment can submit the change.  
After: ... sent out in time. |

FSS clarifies it is in the wrong line, but they aim is make it easier to make amendments to amendments on the spot.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

USO: Thinks that if you can change your proposal, it could mean that you include a “Trojan horse” in the discussions and change them on the spot.

SAKKI: Supports the amendment.
2353 CSU: Clarifies that this is only about the Statutes.
2354    The Board points out that in their explanation says that it would apply to all documents.
2355 ISSU: Asks if other organisations can amend other amendments.
2356 SLL: Yes.
2357
2358    The MC thinks that we are not here as individual people, but representing organisations. That is why
2359 we included the two deadlines for amendments before the General Assembly. They prefer people
2360 preparing the General Assembly in advance.
2361 CSU: Asks for clarification for what would it mean if this amendment passes.
2362 The Chairperson clarifies.
2363 SAKKI: Thinks it would not work for blocking amendments as it is feared by some organisations.
2364 FSS: Wants to make it easier to correct amendments before starting the discussions.
2365 EEO: We have a question about the changes on the amendments.
2366 The Chairperson clarifies how it works the process of accepting amendments to amendments.
2367 USO: Insist that this could be misused to introduce bigger changes on the spot and that would slow down
2368 the General Assembly. They still disagree with the amendment.
2369 SAKKI: Understands USO’s point, but thinks we should be able to include small changes on the spot.
2370
2371 FSS makes an amendment to their amendment:
2372 The proposal is to add the paragraph in line 255 point g) after point f) and a change of wording: “A written
2373 change to proposals and amendments can be submitted to the Chairperson of the meeting. Only the
2374 organisation proposing the original amendment can submit the change.”
2375
2376 The chair calls the vote on the amendment on the amendment proposed by FSS.
2377 Proceed to vote:
2378 In favour: 17
2379 There is no consensus therefore, the GA will vote on the original amendment.
2380
2381 Proceed to vote on the original version of the amendment:
2382 In favour: 5
2383 Against: 6
2384 Abstentions: 11
2385 Not carried
2386
2387 Amendment #4 (DGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>345-348</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>Rephrase: The Monitoring Committee acts as a monitoring, consultative and advisory body for all bodies in OBESSU. When a body of OBESSU requires, members of the committee can provide a guiding interpretation of the work-plan, the statutes, the political platform, internal regulations and formalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| With: The Monitoring Committee acts as a monitoring, consultative and |
The Monitoring Committee is an advisory body for all bodies in OBESSU and is an essential link between the governing bodies and the member organisations. When a body of OBESSU requires, members of the committee can provide a guiding interpretation of the work-plan, the statutes, the political platform, internal regulations and formalities. For the sake of accountability and transparency, the Monitoring Committee should carefully follow the work of the Board and the Secretariat and proactively engage member organisations in the continuous evaluation of their work. Where necessary, the Monitoring Committee should respond to concerns and catalyse action to improve the functioning and governance of the organisation.

DGS: They have added the description of the MC from the Development Strategy because they believe it makes more sense in the Statutes.

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SIF: They would like to request the opinion of the MC.

The MC explains they already spoke about it. They think it is fine to clear up the role a bit better.

CSU: They support the last sentence of the amendment but are not sure about the formulation of the sentence. They think it provides broad space for interpretation.

DGS: Explains they have not added anything, only copied from the Development Strategy to the Statues.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 17
Against: 2
Abstentions: 3
Carried

Amendment #5 (DGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>352-353</td>
<td>Delete: It should be recognized that the members of the Committee hold experience and this should be taken into account when decisions are made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNEL explains they spoke with DGS and agreed on changing the wording of the amendment. They propose the following sentence: “It should be recognized that the members of the Committee hold experience and this can considered when decisions are made.”

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussions:

SLL: Asks who can decide to use that option. Can organisations ask for the opinion, if one asks, do we have to hear it?

UNEL: Explains it is a tool that people can use.

SLL: If we want to hear the opinion of the MC every time.
CSU: Agrees on removing the sentence. In legally binding documents, there should be proper wording. Since this is a text without real impact, it should be deleted.

Proceeding to vote if we accept the amendment to the amendment proposed by UNEL and DGS:
In favour: 21

There is no consensus, therefore the GA will vote on the original amendment.
Proceed to vote the original amendment:
In favour: 2
Against: 8
Abstentions: 12
Not carried

Amendment #6 (FSS, SLL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Amendement</th>
<th>506</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add: f) The General Assembly annually adopts the Annual Financial Contribution. The Board and the Secretary General will propose a draft of the Annual Financial Contribution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSS and SLL withdraw the amendment.

New document proposal (from FSS, SLL and SAKKI)

The Chairperson explains that there is a proposal to have a new document in OBESSU. She invites the promoters to present it.

| Amendment | We propose making a shorter version of the Political Platform, which should basically be just the demands of the current Political Platform made into sentences. A working group of x members, coordinated by the Board, would be assigned to do this and the new political platform would be accepted in the next COMEM/Ex-GA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLL: The current Political Platform of OBESSU is very long and we think it should be shorter. However, there is a lot of good content in the current Political Platform and we do not want to dismiss it. However, a short and concrete Political Platform of less than 10 pages is needed and easy to execute by only formulating the demands of the current political platform into the new, shorter platform.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chairperson opens the floor for discussion:
FSS: Explains this could be a document that you can find in the web with some general information.
DGS: Sees some problems. To whom would it be too short? They think it would be weird. They feel everything in the Political Platform is important.

USO: Explains that if we change something in the big political platform, we will have to change the sense of the small Political Platform and it is going to be a very complicated process.

CSU: They do not agree with the proposal. They feel it will make statutory meetings longer and difficult to know which document to apply.

The Chairperson clarifies that all documents adopted are binding.

SL: Explains that the extended Political Platform would include the demands, so they do not see how it would be that difficult to change.

ISSU: Does not think OBESSU has a long Political Platform for fun. The reason why it is there is because we have a lot of messages to say. They would propose that we keep the document as it is, and list the main demands in the website.

EEO: Asks for clarification

DGS: They believe it would create a gap between people that read the full Political Platform and the people that have read only the small one.

CSU: Thinks that if you want to explain your political stances, you do not need to make a shorter version of the Political Platform but an article in the website.

SAKKI: Agrees with DGS and CSU but insist it would be useful for some people.

The Board explains we already have a WG on the Political Platform. If we create a new internal document, and if we want it to be shareable, then there are maybe other better ways to do it, maybe taking the current demands and stance and put them nicely and share them in our events.

There are no more comments or questions.

Proceed to vote:

In favour: 5
Against: 11
Abstentions: 6
Not carried

21. **Urgent resolutions and motions**

There are no urgent resolutions and motions.

22. **Any other business**

DOS: Asks what happened to the resolution that participants discussed in Right to Representation in Lithuania.

The Board explains they felt there was nothing new in this resolution that would add more things of other documents we already had in OBESSU, and they did not want to add a new document.

Sophie explains this is her last OBESSU event and wishes everyone good luck and a lot of good work.
Giuseppina on behalf of the Board wants to thank Luke Shore for his work in the Board of OBESSU for the last two years and gives presents to him.

23. **Closing of the General Assembly**

The Chairperson thanks all the delegates for all the civilised discussions. She is very happy to see OBESSU growing and that there are a lot of super active and motivated school student activists.

The Chairperson closes the 41st General Assembly of OBESSU 2015.