

**General Assembly Minutes
Of the International Association for Political Science Students
Held Online on December 28, 2019, at 19:00 CET**

Attendance (11)

6 participants in the beginning

Tobias Scholz (TS)
Justin Patrick (JP) (Chair)
Jan Behrens (JB)
Max Steuer (M)
Pete Flintrop (PF)
Joaquim Botelho (JA)

Participants who arrived later (5)

Paola Navarro Villa (PNV)
Noor Saris (N)
Silvia Carolina Ruiz Rodríguez (S)
Michael Gyekye (MG)
Spyridon Parthenis (SP)

Minutes (taken from recording after the GA)

Georgia Aimilia Voulgari

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the Agenda and General Assembly Committee
3. Approval of the minutes of the May 2019 General Assembly in Madrid, Spain
4. Report of the IAPSS President
5. Report of the IAPSS Treasurer
6. Legal Framework Amendments
 - a. General amendments proposed by the Executive Committee
7. By-Election of Advisory Committee Members (2)
8. By-Election of Vice President for Public Relations
9. Other Business
10. Adjournment

Minutes

1. Call to Order

Before addressing the items of the Agenda, JP takes the floor describing how the GA will be conducted. It will take place online with votes posted on the IAPSS web page for the GA with options that participants can click to vote. Each time a new poll is posted, participants need to refresh their page in order to be able to see the new poll. The full Agenda is posted on the IAPSS web page.

2. Vote on General Assembly Board and Agenda

2.1 JP, as the Secretary General, puts himself forward as the Chair of the GA Board and nominates Deputy Secretary General Georgia Aimilia Voulgari as the minute taker, who is not present and will create the minutes from a recording of the GA.

2.1.1. JP moves the motion of approving the GA Board and the Agenda and TS seconds it.

2.1.2. Vote on GA Board and Agenda (6 members present)

2.1.2.1. In favour 4

2.1.2.2. Against 0

2.1.2.3. Abstain 2

2.1.2.4. The motion passes.

3. Vote on approval of the Minutes of the GA of May 2019 held in Madrid, Spain

3.1 JP informs those present that there is a link on the website page, also shared by TS in the chat, with a PDF of the Minutes of the last GA. By voting to approve the minutes, the GA verifies that they are in order, there are no misspellings, misrepresentations, or other concerns that the minutes do not reflect what happened. The Appendix, which constitutes the Statutes of IAPSS, has been placed before the Minutes.

3.2 TS moves the motion of approving the Minutes of the last GA of May 2019, held in Madrid, Spain and JP seconds it.

3.3 JP shares that a Max Steuer has indicated in the chat that they were not able to participate in the GA in Madrid and do not find it appropriate to vote for approving the minutes. JP recommends that the participant abstains from voting and observes that for the future it is best to amend the legal framework to account for that; he also shares that this has been an issue in other student organizations, especially because students generations change every year, since it results in those who did not participate in a previous meeting voting on the minutes.

3.4 Vote to approve the Minutes of the GA of May 2019 (6 members present)

3.4.1. In favour 5

3.4.2. Against 0

3.4.3. Abstain 1

3.4.4. The motion passes.

4. Report by the IAPSS President Tobias Scholz

4.1. TS expresses his satisfaction for the IAPSS holding the first online GA with a livestream in order to reach a larger audience, to have transparency and to give access, since participation and voting is difficult since the organization has members from different time-zones. The Report is a summary of what the association has accomplished this year. The Mandate Report will be signed by every single member of the executive committee and will be presented when we will have elections for the Executive committees. (1) The Organization, in order to be more available to every member and to bridge the disconnect between administration and the global organization, has established branches in 6 regions, in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, Oceania and USA & Canada, with regional regulations and regional boards in the making. This will make IAPSS a global organization not governed centrally but something coming from the regional entities that pitch their ideas and vote on matter pertaining to their respective jurisdictions. The year 2019 has been a first step in this process and next mandate must continue this project. (2) IAPSS has Statutes and Regulations that have been established;

the Code of Conduct is in place in order to monitor the Organization's diversity. 2019 brought us the World Congress in Madrid in May. (3) The Organization has been able to further advance its academic portfolio and the project to re-establish its blog, A Different View. It has successfully further advanced its Federica partnership project, which has been a major effort in order to bring in IAPSS as a stakeholder and as an Organization that actively moves forward on education initiatives. (4) The Organization was not only able to maintain relations with the established partners, but also to acquire new partners; JP was able to raise in UNESCO a point of view on how student voices matter on what we want to achieve in education and this is something that we want to proceed and establish further in 2020; the partnership with UNESCO and also the cooperation with the Asia Europe Foundation. One goal for 2020 is to establish more cooperation with stakeholders and other foundations; with the establishment of the regions, this should take place in other parts of the world as well.

4.2 N asks who the existing partners are, if they are also students' associations and what the Organization is at in this regard.

4.3. TS explains that by associations he means that there are former association members of IAPSS who are currently looking at becoming association partners with IAPSS. There is a Partners Framework in the process of being established, by which students' associations will have more opportunities to liaise with IAPSS. It is not justifiable for IAPSS as a global organization to organize events just in Europe and just have association members in Europe. In order to address this issue a way had to be found to bridge the gap and make IAPSS a global organization; this will be possible by using the structure of IAPSS and the best way is that the Students Associations shall be directly linked to the Regions and individual members become active in IAPSS Europe or Asia, which will permit an active presence of IAPSS in all Regions as a global organization.

4.4. N poses the question what the other current partnerships are besides UNESCO.

4.5. TS explains that the idea is of IAPSS working together with other global associations such as UNESCO, and the Regions may initiate partnerships at a regional level. Currently the Organization is working very closely with UNESCO, with the International Political Science Association (IPSA) to bring together political science together from all over the world, then the Organization works together with the International Studies Association (ISA), which has a biannual conference and works together with IAPSS' public relations department. These are the partnerships based on academic representation; IAPSS sends panels, based on academic merits, to different conferences of these organizations. Then IAPSS has the partnership with POLITICO's Europe Studies Fair, we work on projects, and there are partnerships for promotion. Our capacities will extend as soon as the regions start to work. There is also the Europe – Asia Foundation which has programs for young professionals and students and different projects. For example this year they had a

project in Madrid, in Malta, and in Myanmar; these are projects that IAPSS students can participate in.

4.6. JP takes the floor to observe that a few more people joined in and urges them to fill in the GA attendance form.

4.7. M wants to stress two highlights on IAPSS' journal operations from the perspective of Politikon. Besides publishing the fall issue, which is mentioned in the Report, there are things to be achieved every year and there have been some changes in the management and some progressive developments. The structure of the Journal has changed. The philosophy of the IAPSS Politikon, if anyone wants to understand the background, how Politikon works, can be consulted through the pilot webinar, available through the IAPSS Youtube channel. A new open journal system platform has been introduced, which makes all past issues publicly accessible. These are important steps since it professionalizes the journal, besides the publication of new issues.

4.8. Vote to approve the Annual Report of the IAPSS President¹

4.8.1. In favour 6

4.8.2. Against 0

4.8.3. Abstain 0

5. Annual Report by the Treasurer

5.1 PF takes the floor and states that the Report will be an issue on the next General Assembly, since the legal framework and statutes of IAPSS have been changed at the last General Assembly in a way that alters the financial year, in order to be aligned to the Association Year. In the past the Association Year ran from spring to spring and the financial year ran from the 1st of January to the 31st of December. As this caused some troubles, especially since different people are in charge each year, this has been changed and the financial year runs from spring to spring. There is a link on the webpage, which opens the budget for these 5 months. Consequently the budget is for 5 months and shows the work that has been done in the course of the year; in the next General Assembly there will be the next budget running for the entire financial year 2020 – 2021. However, the link opens the budget for these 5 months, income, estimations, and the World Congress which is the only event we had so far, in this time-frame. The budget shows a total income of 16.390,00 € and how this income is planned to be spent; there are some individual items which cannot be seen but anyone can ask individually. The expenses are 16.390,00 € so it matches.

5.2. JB took the floor and poses a question regarding the analysis of the events budget.

¹ There were other members present than those who voted, but they did not indicate formal abstentions by clicking the respective abstention option on the voting web page.

5.3. PF answers that the budget for the events is general and is not included in the budget linked; it contains financial data that has to be protected under the data protection law; if JB is interested in them PF offered to send them over but they are not to share with all.

5.4. JB poses a second question regarding the income from memberships.

5.5. PF answers that the amount in the budget is for the first 5 months basically, then it is broken down to the individual members and broken down to reflect the membership period of 2 years, so the membership fee would be 25 €.

5.6. JB asks how these memberships are being counted.

5.7. PF answers that if there are some irregularities they are due to all the different programs IAPSS uses and tries to put together; basically the membership fee is reduced to the amount of memberships purchased in the 5 – month period, as it is normally done in a company.

5.8. JB poses a question regarding what expenses there are and what the plans for extending infrastructure are.

5.9. PF answers that point 1.3 of the budget covers the website running included in the role of the checkout process, and point 1.1 is about improving the website, the normal running, for improving the current status of the website, since there had been some issues with the website and it needed some improvements; so this includes money that has been set aside for improving the website, to provide more services, to provide more options on the website. There is money for an advance and then in the next budget we will have money for payment.

5.10. JB asks if there are any other items that are on an annual basis.

5.11. PF answers that “annually” means this part of 2020. They are included on this budget but they cover the entire year, so they will be included in the budget of 2020 – 2021, which will include the expenses that begin 2020 -2021. They will cover the whole year but this is a budget term.

5.12. JB asks how the budget works in terms of savings

5.13. PF asks if the term “savings” refers to how much cash flow IAPSS has.

5.14. JB confirms that was what was referred to.

5.15. PF replied that the current sum of all accounts is 8.680,33 €, which is as of December and does not include the latest data, which is mainly distributed to the Organization’s checking account.

5.16. Vote to approve the Report of the Treasurer

5.16.1. The motion is moved by TS and is seconded by JP. 11 people are present

5.16.1.1. In favour 6

5.16.1.2. Against 0

5.16.1.3. Abstain 5

6. General Amendments, proposed by the Executive Committee

6.1 JP takes the floor to say that there is again a document linked on the web page to the motion. If the motion passes, it will approve all amendments proposed, since May 2019, to comply with the Statutes. There were some comments and some amendments made, which will be postponed for after December 14th, for the next General Assembly. And there are some motions that have been withdrawn, including a motion for the Student Research Committees; the motion is marked as Regulation 9 in the document and JP has already made a comment in the document stating it is withdrawn. JP states that they are still working on it and will probably propose it in a future General Assembly. The present motion is proposed by the Executive Committee, however a mover and a seconder will be needed to put it forward so that it can be discussed in an open discussion.

6.2 JB comments that it is a very long document and it is not possible to identify the amendments and asks for some explanations for the changes.

6.3 JP replies that he checked the Google Document and it says that anyone with the link can access the document. He urges everyone to refresh their page. There are currently 7 people viewing the document, 7 of the 11 people at Google hangout. In terms of these amendments, what is different from the ones currently on the website, is that we have put the statutes, the legal framework and our policies in one document, to have one legal framework document, so that anyone can easily see all the legal framework instead of having 4 or 5 different documents in individual files; it is a little bit more easy to use. We have added different Regulations and Policies, the numbering is different. In terms of the amendments and numbering we will sort that out after the General Assembly, depending on what is passed here. So this is why things look a little bit different from the old documents. In the text there are comments in different colours in track changes; if it is in track changes it is an amendment. In this General Assembly the vote will be on all amendments being proposed as of December 14th, 2019. Any comment or amendment after that date will be postponed for the next General Assembly. There is also Regulation 9 regarding Students' Research Committee, which has been withdrawn, there is a comment on the document and will not be discussed, because the Students' Research Committee is still constructing it and wants to propose it in a future General Assembly, when it will be ready. JP iterates that it is best to walk through the significant amendments. Most of them consist of minor wording amendments. In terms of the Statutes, the official version of the Statutes is Dutch, since IAPSS is registered in the Netherlands; this English version that we got from the notary has been used and we are going to make it fit better, as well as some minor amendments in terms of numbering. This brings us to kind of our main Regulations, which have some wording amendments and some structural ones. We put everything in one document and there are some name changes, so what was previously called the Supervisory Committee now is called the Advisory Board, to fit with the

Statutes, and there is also a proposal to merge some Committees and also account for the new IAPSS Regions, which will be different than before. Now they will have leadership committees and staff, they will have their own teams and work in each continent as TS has outlined previously here. In terms of things that are completely new, there is a Policy on our advocacy framework, something that gives IAPSS the mandate to advocate for political science students and actively try to improve the quality of education for political science students around the world. And in terms of finances, there are some things proposed here, to make sure the Treasurer has some foothold in favour of financial decisions and also things that allow the Advisory Board to ask for Reports from the Treasurer. In the previous General Assembly, it had been agreed to follow Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised, plus house rules outlined in the IAPSS Legal Framework. In terms of redundancies, some rules did not fit with Roberts Rules of Order or some things that are stated in Roberts Rules do not have to be restated in here as well. Also the IAPSS Board Regulation has been extended, as has the General Assembly Regulation, and there is the Code of Conduct as well, which was already in existence in a separate document and is brought in here and is made a Regulation to put it in our legal framework. There is also a Regulation on the Regions which outlines their responsibilities as a team and the different positions in each team, and then different processes, for example one for Recruitment, we will probably keep tweaking in future General Assemblies depending on how it is implemented in practice and figure out what works and what does not, because some of the stuff might not be feasible. The proposed Regulation 8 is one about Partnerships, which is completely new; this is about our relations with other student associations, organizations like UNESCO, IPSA, etc., which will probably be tweaked at future General Assemblies. I think the biggest thing to look at here is that it would prevent IAPSS from entering into agreements that involve a transfer of funds, so instead it would have to be a resource thing or be on promotion or communication basis, as opposed to exchanging funds with other student organizations. Regulation 9 has been withdrawn as you can see here. So, we have the Advocacy framework, which would be Policy 1. Statutes are the most binding document; they supersede everything else, then there are the Regulations, and then the Policies are the least strong, since they are more broad and related to the mandate of IAPSS. In other words, a policy is like what IAPSS wants to do, what it takes into consideration, or its stance on a certain issue. There are 2 Policies currently proposed: the Advocacy framework which includes our draft declaration of the political science students, which is a product of consultation with members, and also a Declaration on Plagiarism that IAPSS already had but it was in a separate document which essentially condemns plagiarism. At this point in order to start the discussion there needs to be a mover and a seconder. As JP had been required to monitor and organize the Executive Committee's proposals, he moves and requests a seconder.

6.4 PF states that he saw the document, it has changes and comments on the English version of the Statutes and proposes that the discussion is postponed because we are not ready to decide if changes can be made to the English version because it is a transcript of the Dutch version. The changes must be officially conducted in Dutch and this is not available. He proposes that the item of the changes in the Statutes be postponed for the next General Assembly.

6.5 JP replies that the comment is interpreted as PF raising a point of order, to say that there cannot be any vote on the Statutes. As the Chair, JP acknowledges that the point of order is valid,

which means that the changes to the Statutes will be postponed for a future General Assembly. JP urges anyone who has questions about that, to pose them. He added that a seconder is still needed to support the motion to adopt the remaining amendments.

6.6 TS seconds this motion.

6.7 JP announces that discussion has opened on the amendments. Motions can be submitted to break things apart, in order to have separate votes for certain things, but care has to be taken when raising the motion because this can take a significant amount of time and can go on forever. If there are questions, something does not make sense, someone wants to comment something, or if someone wants to propose an amendment to the amendment, please do so, but care has to be taken when proposing amendments to the amendments, as well, because it can bring an endless loop and take a significant amount of time. JP asked if there is anyone who wants to speak on the amendments or a vote shall take place.

6.8 Max says that if he has understood correctly, a vote for the Statutes is not going to take place in this General Assembly. He points out a technical issue: he checked it himself on the browser without being logged in to the IAPSS e-mail account, and it is possible to see the document but it is not possible to see the amendments; it looks like a clear document. And there are many issues in the other parts of the document. The Statutes have not so many issues from what he sees, but for the other materials, they have many issues, although many are more on wording, or of symbolic rather than substantial importance; for instance, with approving the internal Regulations it looks like the Diversity and Equality Committee is being abolished, which he thinks sends a wrong message, even though all the tasks of this Committee are transferred to the Human Resources Committee; but he thinks it is not something that looks very well. Again, at this point he stresses that he is not proposing something specific, just asking the Chair that due to the amount of amendments in this other material, it is more reasonable to postpone voting on the rest of the amendments as well, to the next General Assembly, because basically the other materials derive their validity from the Statutes. And of course, there are Statutes already in place for IAPSS, in this point, the previous version, and it would make more sense that everyone be able to make a more systematic review before the vote and have some discussion on the document. Especially if there is not a clear damage that would arise from the postponement, it would be reasonable.

6.9 JP replies that in terms of wording changes, and minor changes that are more like symbolic, he would recommend that we work on these after the current GA, because as long as the basic structure is down, then we can move forward from there. If everything is postponed until the next General Assembly, it can be a bit challenging in here, just in terms of the amount of the amendments that would also be added since then, it could stall the development of the Organization; there are a number of things that IAPSS can benefit from, that could move the Organization forward if passed here. And we can also talk about how this can be made more accessible to people; as previously said in the beginning, this is a learning experience, trying to bridge continents and bring people from all over the world to participate. Most other students' organizations have collapsed because they didn't have these kind of resources and didn't pioneer

new approaches as we do with some stuff here. On merging the 2 Committees into 1, this is done on the basis that Human Resources incorporates the aspects of diversity and equality. This is the practice in other organizations as well. It is also a matter of finding the people to fulfil these Committees to a sufficient degree here and ensure that there are not 2 Committees doing the same or similar things, so that we can make processes more expedient. So he recommends that if it is a wording issue, or if it is a subtle thing that would not affect the functioning of the organization, he would propose it as an amendment for the next General Assembly in May 2020. JP invites TS to reply, as well.

6.10 TS declares his concern that Max raised this issue, something that had been discussed over a long period of time and that he personally was most of the time the one arguing the exact same thing that Max said; because, in the first place, it looks as if we are withdrawing, like we are dropping a mandate, this definitely is the message that we could have sent. However, he thinks there is a certain trade-off if you look at the exact missions of these Committees; because the Diversity and Equality Committee, or which he was a member for the last 2 years and with the team established the Code of Conduct, these rules and how we want to conduct operations are not only for people who would be reacting when there is an issue but for the people who are responsible for recruitment policy, who are responsible for diversity; by merging these Committees, now that these rules have been established, we basically don't say Ok these are the people who basically do recruitment, monitoring, etc. and then the same people react once there is a complaint; we have one committee who acts proactively, that fights against discrimination and control basically within every part of the organization and he thinks this would be helpful. He personally thinks that the term "resources" makes the character of the committee a bit blurry, this was his concern at the end, however, from what JP said, this is how other organizations are handling the issue. If there is a certain point that we want to send a stronger signal than the wording "HR Committee", TS claims he does not have much experience, if that includes all these issues.

6.11 JP asks if there are any other questions regarding the amendments or discussion.

6.12 Max thinks in terms of wording issues, there are a number of issues, but they could be resolved by interpretation; however there are some things that change substantially some of the previous regulations, for example some instruments are entirely disappearing from the framework, such as the honorary memberships basically being eliminated; because it is not in the Statutes proposal, it basically disappears, which affects all existing honorary members, so there is a question of neglect and there are a number of other issues that he raised as comments in the document. He says he understands that it is rather challenging to go through the entire document; of course it is possible to bring these proposals forward more formally and within the deadlines but it is a time consuming process that few if anyone can have time to be fully invested in, and maybe on the next occasion, we can try to make it more accessible and hence inclusive for those who have limited time. He said he understands this is a long effort to this point but it is very difficult at this point to make these changes and recommendations formally and give a reasonable time frame; and he also suggested to give more time to the Regulations which basically stipulate

terms that, up to now, do not exist in a number of provisions. He clarifies that this is a suggestion and observes that he does not raise all specific comments to individual provisions now.

6.13 JP thanks Max for that explanation. He then recommends, if someone wants to break part of these amendments off as a separate item, to say so, but that he also would recommend only doing this if someone thinks it is a matter of structure, if it is an operational thing, or if it affects IAPSS ability to function. If it is a more cosmetic thing or a wording thing, this could be developed in the future. After checking the poll he announces that people are voting, there are 2 positive votes and 1 against. Then, he invited, if there are any other issues for discussion, for members to go ahead, and if not, to vote.

6.14 TS raises another issue. Probably because it is the first time this amendment is brought at the General Assembly, it is the first time some changes are being discussed. He observes that he is not sure if we are able to vote on these amendments before we discuss on these amendments.

6.15 JP observes that this is a valid point. He proposes to reset the vote or make a new one so everybody may recast their ballots. So, the web page will be amended and everyone will be informed when it is good to refresh. In the meantime, he invites anyone who wants to discuss anything regarding these amendments to go ahead.

6.16 JB took the floor and poses a question for a clarification, if the vote can be postponed.

6.17 JP replies that this is a point of information; this is the part of the Statutes, the 1st part of the Document. There are three parts in the legal document, the Statutes, the Regulations and the Policies. This is about postponing the voting on the Statutes. But the rest is still on the table here. The point has been updated so that it reflects the point of order.

6.18 JB repeats his question on whether the voting is being postponed.

6.19 JP ask JB if he is making a motion to postpone everything, because if he wants a motion to postpone all the amendments, then this can be discussed as well.

6.20 JB states that he cannot understand, the connection is bad.

6.21 JP said that it is JB's connection and he recommends typing in the chat. If there is a motion to postpone everything, this can be discussed as well. He then asks if anyone else has any discussion points or any motions they want to move, to vote separately or to postpone.

6.22 TS takes the floor and says that he thinks that the general proposal to vote for the amendments should remain and if there are other changes that JB might have concerns or someone else might have, these changes can be proposed at the next General Assembly, which is going to be held during the World Congress. Also, it could be reinforcing to have the Diversity and Equality Committee solved now and not to be unsolved at the end of the mandate; he stresses

the importance and value for IAPSS to have clarity on the changes, to move forward with these changes.

6.23 JP announces that JB has placed a motion to postpone any vote on the amendments until next year, to the next General Assembly. He then asked if there is a seconder; if there is not a seconder the motion cannot be debated. It is seconded by N, so a discussion can open up. He poses the question to JB and N if they want to speak for this motion or type their comments; or if there is someone who wants to speak against.

6.24 JB observes that there was not enough time to read the amendments and he thinks that at least 10% of all members at the General Assembly have to have present. It is a very long document and it is not clear which points have changed and which have not.

6.25 JP replies that the document has been certified by a notary, the amendments have not and that if they pass, they will be certified by a notary.

6.26 JP observes that on YouTube live stream N has stated "I want to send this: I would like to go through the whole document again and I also want to see the Dutch version". So, JP invites anyone else who has any points to raise or to speak for or against this motion to postpone.

6.27 TS addresses N saying that what we want is that everyone has time to go through the changes and not to rush them; we want that they make their mind up and more important they should have the right to go through the entire list of changes.

6.28 N argues that she did not see this document with the changes, however it has already gone to the notary and has been notarized. She concludes that she didn't see the point in postponing the vote, since nothing could be done anymore; or, instead, she proposes that those present can just read it.

6.29 TS takes the floor to say that there is some misunderstanding. Addressing JB, he said that first, it has been agreed to postpone voting for the Statutes. Second, the notary is usually the one working on the Dutch version and then on the English version; the changes that we will be voting, have not been signed by any notary and every vote that has been made here is the vote of the members. Basically, to sum that up, the changes are not been signed by a notary and they would go to the notary after the amendments have been voted, but also considering the Dutch version. The changes of the Statutes should be at least confirmed by a notary to be on the safe side and everything be registered under Dutch law; however, he continues, only the Statutes have to be in Dutch; the rest, all the rest of the legal framework has more flexibility to a certain extent, because they need to comply with the Statutes, which in their turn have to comply with Dutch law, since the seat of the Organization is in the Netherlands. This has been said in order to clarify some of the confusion.

6.30 N answers that what has been said clarifies a little. However, she stresses that the legal framework document is not only the Statutes, but also internal Regulations and Policies and the amendments to those. She then poses the question if these are going to be postponed as well.

6.31 JP answers that the current motion on the table, moved by JB and seconded by N, is to postpone everything, including the Statutes, Internal Regulations, and Policies. He then asks if the participants want to keep discussing the motion or to proceed with the vote.

6.32 Max takes the floor to say that he had some time to have a better look at the Document. First of all, a remark on procedure: the first motion has to be voted first and then the second one, since they are conflicting; if the first motion is approved the second one is irrelevant. He then raises a second point, that Internal Regulation is in the file, it is called Regulation 1; it says in the last sentence that it comes into effect on 1st June 2019, that is, if approved it has a retroactive effect. Furthermore, in relation to the other Regulations, it is not clear when they will come into effect. He said he appreciates that for some of these the ambition is for them to come into effect at the beginning of the next mandate, which is 1st June 2020, but in the way they are drafted it is not so clear; basically there is no provision on that. He said that in his understanding, all these Regulations if approved, except for the Statutes, which have been postponed, come into effect immediately after the voting takes place and maybe after some recordings are done for the Minutes of the General Assembly; he admits he is not aware of what is written in the rules in terms of the effect. He repeats that he raises this for discussion, since postponing is not always good in terms of motivation; and also, there is some interest to have some advancement; so, for the sake of discussion, he repeats he is not making a motion but he is interested in the views of the ones who have made these changes and of the others of course. He proposes an option to add in these Regulations a provision explicitly stating that they will come into effect on June 1st 2020, and therefore if there are some issues with it, these issues could be rectified in the next General Assembly, in April 2020; those amendments will become part of the legal framework at the next General Assembly. The issue is a bit complicated and the provision 63 in the Structure Regulation is really not correct.

6.33 JP clarifies that this is the original text that was passed at the last General Assembly, which was voted to go into effect on June 1, 2019. This is the original text, not an amendment; this is what has been voted, so they are already in effect. In his view this is not a point of concern, the clause is not an amendment, because they are not being amended to make them active retroactively, since they are already active. The other point is that according to Robert's Rules, if there is a vote on the internal Regulations and Policies and their amendments now, they come into effect immediately. He then asks if there are any other points of discussion.

6.34 TS ask for a clarification by JP, as the main person drafting the amendments, whether he would be okay in terms of postponing voting for the amendments.

6.35 JP answers that he thinks it is his duty to act in the best interests of the organization, so he will be voting against the motion to postpone. But he said that this is his personal position, the

rest of the participants are welcome to vote whatever they like. He then asks if there are any other points of discussion or if they may proceed to the vote.

6.36 JP concludes that there are no more points of discussion. He then urges to proceed to the vote and to make sure it is the correct one; the vote is on the motion moved by JB and seconded by N to postpone the amendments for the next General Assembly. He invited the participants to cast their ballots.

6.37 Vote on the motion to postpone the amendments for the next General Assembly. 10 members are present.

6.37.1. In favour 5

6.37.2. Against 3

6.37.3. Abstain 2

6.37.4. The motion passes.

7. Election of Board Positions

7.1 Presentation of applicants and vote for members of the Advisory Committee

7.1.1 JP presents the item and acknowledges that there is only one candidate for this position, Joaquim Botelho, whom he invites him to speak while the participants can view his CV and cover letter to have a look at his credentials.

7.1.2 Joaquim Botelho thanks the Chair. He says that as everyone one can see from his cover letter that he had shared with everyone, he feels that it is a privilege to be part of this Association and that there are still some gaps to be bridged, both in Portugal and across local Universities, regarding political science matters. That this is one of the topics that motivates his involvement with the association and that he would like to make part of his candidacy: his wish to work closely with this Association for the vision shared for 2020-2022; he strongly feels that the Association has to commit to it, after solving this issue of the Statutes which has been postponed. He further states that he feels that the postponement of the amendments was a missed step forward. He then addresses the General Assembly by stating that it is his commitment to support the Board and make the necessary observations to the Assembly in what is required for the execution of the measures to be taken by the Board to fulfill this issue.

7.1.3 JP thanks the candidate and invites the participants to pose questions.

7.1.4 JB asks if the Advisory Board is just the same as the Supervisory Board was before.

7.1.5 JP replies that this is the case.

7.1.6 TS thanks the applicant for applying for this position and for making it through the first 2 and a half hours. He observes that the applicant seems to be

highly motivated and that he would like to ask him, in view of what he said regarding the Agenda and the Statutes, how he considers the role of the Advisory Board member, including what kind of tasks and what kind of mission he sees for himself in that capacity.

7.1.7 Joaquim Botelho replies that the time spent in the General Assembly, is a pleasure. He said that he feels strongly about the fact that the members of IAPSS are the future political scientists, or at least the ones to stand for the students who are trying to become this, to have this global approach, a more holistic approach to the thing. Regarding these Regulations, he added, the fact that the association has not moved forward, makes him feel somehow intending to emphasize the bureaucracy itself instead of emphasizing what is being brought to the table; the regionalization is a project in itself and needs statutory support to be effectively operational. He added that where he sees himself engaging is to focus clearly on the vision and make sure that he makes it clear to the Board, to offer some type of external view, some more pragmatic view, as he has a professional history of working at a multinational level. He observes that from what he has seen, in the Board's vision, it clearly stands out to him that there is a project to make this organization a more well-equipped company, a model of work. This is the type of approach that he can bring in, making sure that he pushes for visibility. He states that he is very much engaged with the way it has been formulated, putting it at very high demand, giving him the analytics to track future members to foster in the association. If it is within those lines, he will be more than happy to contribute and make sure that the word is spread globally.

7.1.8 JP asks if there are any other questions for the candidate. He then ascertains that there are no further questions and he initiates the vote. He asks for the participants to stand by and refresh their page. He explains that the way this works, as it is an election, is different: there is a list of candidates, or in this case one candidate, so there is an option to choose the candidate, an option to choose none of the above or to abstain. He declares the vote to be online and invites everyone to cast their ballot.

7.1.9 Voting on electing Joaquim Botelho as a member of the Advisory Board

7.1.9.1. In favour 9

7.1.9.2. Against 0

7.1.9.3. Abstain 1

7.1.10 Joaquim Botelho is elected as a member of the Advisory Board.

7.2 Presentation of applicants and vote for the position of the Vice-President for Public Relations

7.2.1 JP declares that this brings the Assembly to the next point, the election for the Vice-President for Public Relations. He briefly introduces the item, saying that the Vice-President for Public Relations resigned, an interim had been appointed

and then a call for candidates had been launched and the only candidate to present themselves was Paola Navarro Villa, who is serving in the position of Interim Vice-President for Public Relations. He then invites Paola Navarro Villa to speak.

7.2.2 Paola Navarro Villa states that basically it is her 2nd year at the IAPSS. What she appreciates the most is the team that has been created from political science students. Her whole IAPSS experience has been in the PR department; she started as a social media coordinator, and as just already said, she has become Interim Vice-President for Public Relations. The coordination and projects that she has been part of, as she states in her cover letter, are projects inside IAPSS. Basically she would like to formally occupy this role, not only because of the position, but because she sees the benefit of an Association such as IAPSS and also because of the team that has been created in the department; this particular team is a joy to work with, and they are all very excited at what is ahead. She then refers to the information in her CV.

7.2.3 JP asks if there are any questions for the candidate. He then ascertains that there are no questions and he initiates the vote. He declares the vote to be online and invites everyone to cast their ballot, as has been done in the previous by-election.

7.2.4 JP states that Paola Navarro Villa posed a question in the chat asking if she may vote or if she has to abstain for voting. He replies that she can vote, since she is a paying member of IAPSS, even if she is the candidate, but she could also abstain if she wants if she doesn't feel comfortable.

7.2.5 Vote on electing Paola Navarro Villa as the Vice-President for Public Relations

7.2.5.1. In favour 9

7.2.5.2. Against 0

7.2.5.3. Abstain 0

7.2.6 Paola Navarro Villa is elected as the Vice-President for Public Relations

8. Other Business

8.1 JP announces that this brings up the next item of the Agenda, "other business" and invites anyone to raise a question.

8.2 N takes the floor to pose a couple of questions; first one she observes that 8 members are present at the moment and asks if this is an accurate representation of the all IAPSS Members and how is this represented in the Policies.

8.3 JP asks to whom the questions are directed.

8.4 N answers that they are directed to the General Board, the President, the Secretary, whoever.

8.5 JB interrupts to take the floor and make a point, that for whatever reasons, he had not gotten any announcement for this General Assembly and wants to know why.

8.6 JP replies that the email had been sent to all IAPSS members on the membership list with 30 days' notice as per the Statutes; maybe it went to the member's spam folder, he does not know. He observes that members have individual settings on the website so they may be able to indicate if they want to receive emails; he urges JB to double-check that. Regarding the initial question of N, as to whether this is an accurate representation of IAPSS members, he says no. However he adds that this has been a challenge the association had faced in the past and efforts are being made to improve the situation; he points out that this is a time when student governments around the world are either collapsing at a global level or are barely hanging on, judging from those who are consultative members with UNESCO and also with the fall of the International Union of Students and struggles faced by regional and national student governments. These are all critical different factors to be taken into consideration; maybe this method of decision-making, online, where everyone can participate individually, is not the ideal; he expresses his wish to think about other ways to structure this, be it a referendum or perhaps some other method instead. He expresses his opinion that this online General Assembly is not necessarily doing the trick and in-person General Assemblies like the IAPSS World Congress, which has been a thing in the past, is probably not ideal either, because every member cannot afford to go to the location of the conference and be there in person. He acknowledges that this online general assembly has been an experiment to see if it can be feasibly done. However, he stresses the importance of making a note that in the Statutes there is no minimum requirement for a quorum. He expresses concern that while the proposals had been circulated internally for about 6 months and had been communicated within the notice requirements to the general membership, the fact that only the Dutch version of the statutes can be amended was not communicated until it was raised as a point of order at the general assembly by an IAPSS volunteer who had access to the proposed motions for months. He repeats that this is a learning experience and efforts should continue to make it work. He also invites TS to reply as well.

8.7 TS takes the floor to add to the points raised, as well as provide some smaller side-remarks and side-comments. He says that the participation at General Assemblies has been something that is continuously in our minds, that the online General Assembly has been tried and that the online General Assemblies are not something to be understood as the main Assembly, but the online General Assembly will be complementary to the in-person General Assembly that will take place when the World Congress takes place; he added that usually 180 – 200 individuals join the World Congress and then when the General Assembly takes place, on the day after the World Congress, still less than 10% of are present, because unfortunately, most of the members sign up for IAPSS not because they want also to participate in the democratic structure, functions, and processes. The right question is how this can be done more attractive, how can it be more interesting to participate in such actions? This question has been voiced every single time there is a General Assembly, so he repeats the question for the participants, because it is ultimately the people in this chat, what they think in terms of how this is improved, the process, what do they

think the steps that should directly be taken for the next General Assembly, or if they think there are more structural concerns perhaps to this process.

8.8 N states there are problems for people to attend the General Assembly but she suggests reaching out to a lot of students' associations; in the Netherlands there are already 4, and to be all in contact with each other, so members can easily show up with more people online; and if it is online she proposed to just send messages not 3 days before, like it is in the Statutes, but at least 2 weeks before and also to have the documents ready earlier and accessible; those are the main things. Regarding the World Congress, she says she did not know there would be a General Assembly afterwards, so maybe it would be a good idea to make this very clear in the program and maybe add an extra day, and then make that day the General Assembly, so it can be optional, but still put it out there, put it in the program.

8.9 JP clarifies that notice had been given 30 days in advance, not 3 days.

8.10 TS responds that the invitation had been sent 30 days ahead, as this is exactly what it is usually done in the World Congress as well. So the conference program always includes the General Assembly day; he refers to what was previously said by himself and by JP in the beginning, that this is kind of a test; now a lesson has been taken from this, in terms of Statutes changes, in terms of Regulation changes, to postpone much of the agenda for the present General Assembly, it is a lesson to say that the experience showed that they have to pass reforms in an in-person General Assembly, supplemented by a simultaneous online General Assembly, because the audience is larger and also these changes, discussions and decisions are larger; maybe some people are more able to handle important discussions when they are in a room with each other. He concludes by saying that this is one thing he will take from this General Assembly. He then adds that there is one advantage, messaging some people some days in advance, and there are disadvantages as well, in terms of structure building; he said that something the board can be proud of this year and last year, is that it has advanced with a very transparent and open communication, there are not any sort of lines between the association, people working together with each other, people coming together only to vote for something or against something. His belief is that this works very well at the moment in the association; finally the reason that someone attends a General Assembly is because he/she wants to attend and not because someone is asking him/her, for a favour, for example. This is always what the association wants to reach: people who argue for themselves, who vote for themselves; he then stressed the importance of that point.

8.11 JP asks if there are any other points to be raised under "other business" for any further discussion.

8.12 JB takes the floor to pose a few questions. He first observes that maybe this is not the best way to raise it as a side-note, that maybe he is not the only one who did not get the announcement for the General Assembly; he urges to have an investigation on this, because he had already received the newsletter until November 12th and since then there was no change in the settings from him; he then deducted that this is a problem on the side of IAPSS and that it should be solved

for a future time. Second question, it addressed personally to JP; he states that he had applied for the position of the IT coordinator a few months ago and he did not even get an answer from JP on that.

8.13 JP replies that his application had been received, but there were some other applicants; his application unfortunately had not been selected, it had been evaluated with the other applications and had not been selected.

8.14 JB answers that this did not answer why he did not get any answer; he says that JP is not obliged to answer the question, but it would be nice to. He adds that he had not joined the rest of the ExCom; he says that he talked to TS and that he was not quite sure TS was happy with what was going on.

8.15 JP replies that only applicants who were selected for an interview had been contacted.

8.16 JB asks if his application had been presented to the rest of the ExCom.

8.17 JP replies that it has not because the current hiring practices is that the applications go to the hiring head of the Department, the hiring manager, so they are not presented to the entire ExCom; only the ones who are successful in an interview are recommended to the ExCom. This is how the process works.

8.18 JB thanks him for the answer. He says that it would be nice to present his application to the rest of the ExCom, because of what had happened in the past, and because of what had been talked about during the General Assembly in Madrid. Then he poses another question, if it is right that the IT coordinator has never studied political science.

8.19 JP answers that under the current legal framework, the association allows students who are interested in political science to join IAPSS, so that includes people from countries who cannot afford to do that or who have an interest to study political science.

8.20 JB, unable to hear the answer due to a bad connection, poses again the question if the IT coordinator has studied political science.

8.21 JP replies that he does not believe she did; he adds that such people are allowed to apply under the legal framework; it is still allowed to apply for an IAPSS position and be selected and occupy that position. It is perfectly permissible under the legal framework of IAPSS.

8.22 TS takes the floor to point out, addressing JB, that this had already been discussed in the General Assembly held in Madrid; the Statutes have been changed in a way that IAPSS is an association for political science, where there are various study programs which are directly related to political science. He says that it is the belief of the association that it is not necessary for someone to be enrolled in a very specific program in order to be volunteering with IAPSS, so whether someone is studying economics or gender studies or human rights law or whether is

about to study and is not a student yet or whether someone has taken a different career path and decides at a later stage to study political science or something related, it does not matter; what counts for the association is the expertise and the spirit to volunteer, that is important and this is what had been talked in Madrid as well. He expresses his wish to have clarified what JP had already said.

8.23 JB thanks TS for his clarification. However, he observes that in the current Statutes it says that someone is only allowed to become a member in the association if he/she is studying or has some experience in studying political science or a related field; and in his opinion, computer science is not a related field to political science.

8.24 JP answers that there is no list of related fields and it is up to the organization to determine what is a related field and what is not.

8.25 JB argues that this is not right; in the application it was written down that the applicant has to become a member of IAPSS and one can only become a member of IAPSS if he/she studies political science or a related field. So, if there is only experience in studying computer science, then one cannot become a member of IAPSS. He then says that he is not saying this because he is the bad guy. He ended up in a psychiatric hospital because of the behavior of the association and it is in this respect that he said this. He repeats that it was impolite and disrespectful to not to even give him a negative response when he applied for the position; the behavior was not okay, it was disrespectful, it is not the best way.

8.26 JP thanks JB for making his point. He then observes that the organization operates under a different interpretation.

8.27 JB argues that it is not a different interpretation; studying chemistry is not a related field to political science and regarding competencies, he had also studied computer science, but he is also enrolled in political science. He repeats that he feels deeply offended for not getting a response, that it is so disrespectful, that he was crying at the General Assembly, and the fact that he did not receive an announcement for the General Assembly. He expresses that it is not a good atmosphere. He accuses the Board of infringing the Statutes. He then adds that in this respect he would like to have a statement from IAPSS and a statement is not something about the association having a different opinion. Then he adds that it is a pity former IAPSS President Anna-Lisa Wirth is not present and that he cannot contact her because she blocked him on Facebook. He states that he has no idea on how someone from Kenya, from Africa, applied for the position, behind his back.

8.28 JP gives the floor to Paola Navarro Villa who has a point to make.

8.29 Paola Navarro Villa states that she had been wondering if this is the best way and the best time to have this conversation.

8.30 JB replies that this is what General Assemblies should be for. He says that he had talked to JP and he had not given him a response, not once, to his application. He said he had voted for JP, that he had given him credit, that he tried to send a message and there was no answer, so this is the problem.

8.31 JP clarifies that the IAPSS elected terms change every year, and also that it might be good to think about improving these practices to let applicants know they have not been selected. He adds that it would be best to try to move forward and foster an environment which is conducive to continuous improvement and good mental health; even if Dutch law, which IAPSS is bound to, does not necessarily require certain things, it might be a good gesture to develop additional practices.

8.32 JB replies that he is not sure what JP meant exactly; moving on might mean nothing happened probably.

8.33 TS takes the floor to observe that there are several different issues that are put together in the discussion. As raised by Paola Navarro Villa, he is not of the opinion that any personal issues should become subject of a General Assembly, in regards to the fact that the solutions to these problems cannot and should not be solved in a General Assembly. Whatever the different aspects that are raised, it is also a matter of internal regulations. He argues that JP acted in the IAPSS Executive Committee since this year and JB brought different points, relating to a couple of years ago. He adds that this is not the place to speak of these issues had been discussed at the past General Assembly, as they had been discussed before. The only issue that could be dealt with and that he sees as internal criticism is the policy towards applications. Policy towards applications is made by individual decision-making; any ExCom member has to say how they want to deal with applications; they send out emails for example to people who have not been chosen, either invited to an interview or not. He adds that it is his challenge to see how the members want to move forward; there are issues that are unfair, unjust, various things; however, what cannot be argued about is that this had been something personal; this is something that comes from over a year; TS had been working with JP for over a year now and he can assure everyone that JP had not excluded anyone on a personal basis. The message has been received, it is a point to talk about but it really is not something that came out of the blue. The practice that people in organizations or companies demonstrate according to which applications are not answered is a developed practice and does not mean that everyone has to find it a positive thing or a good thing. JP is not to be blamed for following this practice, it had been his personal decision and a very normal one; there is no obligation under the Regulations and Policies to respond to everyone; the message was clear. Lastly, he remarks that there have been also some sub-issues which have already been discussed in a past meeting.

8.34 JB argues that it had not been his aim to say that JP had done so intentionally. However his feeling should be understood that he tried three times to apply for a position and there had been no answer, and JP indeed had not been in charge before. He repeats that he had no idea how to handle the situation, and that he admits that the General Assembly is not the best place to try to find solutions. He adds that he is willing to find solutions just to solve this issue. He suggests that

since Paola Navarro Villa is present, to apply to her department. He then invites Paola Navarro Villa to say something on that.

8.35 Paola Navarro Villa replies that if JB is interested in her department, to go through the normal procedure, to apply as any other candidate and the procedure will be followed as with any other candidate who would have applied.

8.36 JP observes that this effectively closes this point. He then asks if there are any other points or business.

8.37 Max takes the floor to thank JP and anyone else who had been involved in preparing the online General Assembly. He observes that it might look, due to the results of certain votes, that it had not been a success. However, he asks everyone to be careful with such an interpretation. He states that in many ways there had been several achievements in this General Assembly that had been long overdue, because of some formalistic interpretations regarding the changes to the legal framework and also because of some formal representatives of IAPSS who had not been interested in democratization and open governance, in open discussion without constraints, all of which are characteristics of an online General Assembly. He urges everyone present not to be discouraged by certain outcomes. He adds that he would have a number of proposals in terms of the procedure for the next General Assembly. He finds this experience to be very valuable to correct some defects; that it was sort of an experiment in some ways, though legally it was correct, to have such major reforms approved in a more experimental forum; this can even be seen as an advantage from such a perspective. In terms of the previous point that had been raised, that the present General Assembly was an opportunity lost, he replies that this is not the case in his view, although certain compromises took place. He suggests that next time some compromise motions be prepared in advance, in case there would be some disagreement in the next General Assembly. With that said, he concludes by thanking the participants and urging them not to be discouraged. He observes that there was progress towards democracy, because the particular provision which says that IAPSS is based on democracy was part of the document which was not approved. However, the practice that took place was one that manifested democracy in reality and that this was more important than having specific documents approved. He concludes by stating that this was not an opportunity lost; it was an achievement in several regards.

8.38 JP thanks him and asks if there are any other points or other business.

8.39 Joaquim Botelho takes the floor for a last word, following what Max had said. The type of assembly that has been inaugurated is what drives the association to the future; all things can be improved, but this is a good example, showing how with low attendance, things can get out of hand. The last point raised by JB is undoubtedly in his perspective out of order; if everyone had read the minutes from Madrid, which he did when preparing for this General Assembly, it was quite clear that this point had been raised before. For him, coming to this association and being for the first time in the General Assembly, he wanted to remark that the rules have to be followed, that everyone should stick to the agenda and those points to be discussed; it has left in the air something of a bad taste and it was not pleasant to hear that type of personal accusations that

have been heard. With this said, trying to make sure that the association evolves, this environment has to be improved. He adds that he would suggest for another alert, going out to all members asking for their participation, that the ultimate decision is for people to engage themselves; the association is looking for participants who are willing to participate, not someone who is coming out of an invitation made by someone out of other interests. He concludes by recognizing that there were few present but still there had been some improvement and thanks everyone.

8.40 JP thanks Joaquim Botelho and asks if there are any other points or other business.

8.41 JB states that handling the issues of the Statutes was not the best way; it was on the Agenda on December 5, quite late. The second point is that this should have been done in a more transparent way.

8.42 JP asks if there are any other points or other business. Hearing none, JP declares the General Assembly adjourned at 10:45pm CET. He thanks all participants.