

Minutes of the General Meeting held on 2 December 2021

Location: Online (Zoom)
Time: 6 pm – 10 pm
Present: 60 participants
Minutes: Patricia Eiche

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Election of vote counters and approval of the agenda
3. Activity report for the co-presidium 2021 including the organization of avuba and reasons for the decision not to sign the “Petition Academia”
4. Outlook 2022 including discussion of items 3 and 4 of max. 60 minutes
5. Approval of the minutes from the General Meeting on 27 November 2020 and the minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting on 20 January 2021
6. Approval of the annual report 2020 and the auditors’ report
7. Discharging of the executive board, co-presidium, general manager and auditors
8. Approval of the projection for 2021 (advisory) and the budget 2022
9. Motion to increase the current membership fee of CHF 15 per semester to CHF 20 per semester to boost personnel resources
10. Bylaw amendments (various)
11. Elections for 2022: Additional executive board member, co-presidium and auditors
12. Miscellaneous

Appendix 1 from page 21: Zoom chat record from General Meeting

Item 1: Welcome

Tizian Troxler welcomes everyone present and thanks them for their patience; the meeting was delayed for two reasons.

First, an advance check was required to ensure all attendees were avuba members. If people who are not entitled to vote were to take part in today’s votes, avuba members could retrospectively declare the vote results to be invalid. If the meeting were taking place in person, voting cards could be distributed solely to attendees who are entitled to vote. This is not an option in a virtual meeting with 80 registered participants.

In addition, various people were unable to answer the first electronic question in this Zoom meeting because they first had to download the latest version of Zoom. Those still unable to take part in the electronic vote are asked to send their votes to Camila Plaza or Patricia Eiche via the private chat function so that their votes can be counted.

Tizian Troxler will lead the meeting for as long as his voice allows. Camila Plaza is responsible for technical moderation, including the chat function and electronic voting. Patricia Eiche will write the minutes.

Item 2: Election of vote counters and approval of the agenda

Tizian Troxler explains the process for voting on resolutions: Unless otherwise stipulated in the Bylaws, resolutions are passed with a simple majority of those present, i.e. the majority of voting members must agree to pass a motion. Bylaw amendments are decided upon at the General Meeting with a 2/3 majority of the members present who are entitled to vote.

- To determine the number of people entitled to vote, the first question to the General Meeting is whether those present are members of Group III.
://: -> Everyone apart from Patricia Eiche is a member of Group III. This means that 57 people present are entitled to vote. (Question: Are you an avuba member and therefore taking part with the right to vote? Result: 59 Yes, 1 No, total responses: 60)

Camila Plaza, acting co-president of avuba, puts herself forward as a vote counter. Votes are submitted via the electronic voting form in Zoom. After every vote, Camila will share the result on the screen. She will save the vote results and the Zoom chat text at the end of the meeting to create a written record of the results and all questions and comments in the chat.

- The General Meeting votes on whether Camila is permitted to count the votes for today's meeting.
://: -> The majority agrees. Camila Plaza is elected vote counter for today's meeting. (Question: Do you elect Camila as today's vote counter? Responses: 58 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 58)

The agenda approved by the avuba executive board was sent to avuba members on 28 October 2021. The executive board received a request from a group of assistants at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences to expand the agenda. The avuba executive board discussed the options at its meeting on 23 November 2021 and decided that all avuba members should be informed of the following alterations:

- Original item 4 ("Activity report for the co-presidium 2021") will be changed to item 3.
- Original item 11 ("Outlook 2022") will be changed to item 4.
- Three items will be elaborated as follows:
 - The item "Activity report for the co-presidium 2021" will be changed to "Activity report for the co-presidium 2021, including the organization of avuba and reasons for the decision not to sign the 'Petition Academia'".
 - The item entitled "Outlook 2022" will be supplemented with the following text: "including discussion of items 3 and 4 of max. 60 minutes".
 - The item "Election of executive board" will be changed to "Election of additional executive board member" because the ex-officio executive board members are elected by the assistants in the seven faculties and not by the General Meeting.

An email was sent to all avuba members on 24 November 2021 containing the amended agenda. It also explained that the General Meeting can only elect additional avuba executive board members because the Group III Senate representatives for the seven faculties (who are also ex-officio members of the avuba executive board) are elected by the assistants in their respective faculties.

This email also stated that

- due to the aforementioned amendments, the meeting is expected to last until at least 8.30 pm;
- Tizian Troxler will not stand as co-president for 2022 because he has acquired external funding and would like to concentrate fully on completing his habilitation. Both co-presidium positions are therefore vacant for 2022;
- Patricia Eiche, the avuba general manager, has been working for avuba since 2013. Following Tizian Troxler's resignation, she has realized that after 8 1/2 years with avuba, the time has come for a change. She has therefore notified avuba that she is resigning as of the end of November 2021 and will leave at the end of February 2022. Her notice period is 3 months.

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Approve the existing agenda approved at the executive board meeting on 23 November 2021 (for details, see page 1 of these minutes) for today's General Meeting:
://: -> The majority agrees. The agenda is approved. (Question: Do you agree with today's agenda? Responses: 56 Yes, 2 No, total responses: 58)

Item 3: Activity report for the co-presidium 2021 including the organization of avuba and reasons for the decision not to sign the "Petition Academia"

Tizian Troxler says that he would like to begin this item by discussing avuba's legal bases and organization before explaining why the "Petition Academia" was not signed. The co-presidium's activity report will be presented at the end of this item.

3. a) Legal bases

The following documents form the legal framework of avuba:

- [Statute of the University of Basel \(University Statute\) – German only](#)
Paragraph 22 "Assistants' Association (avuba)" states that:
 - It is organized in accordance with the law of associations as set out in the Swiss Civil Code (ZGB).
 - "avuba" represents the interests of its members and early career researchers in the Senate and, in accordance with their regulations, on faculty, department and university committees, as well as in public and when dealing with public authorities.
 - Other tasks are defined in a performance agreement with the President's Office.
 - "avuba" provides services for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers.

Tizian Troxler emphasizes that it is avuba's duty to represent not only the interests of current members, but also those of future assistants (early career researchers).

- [avuba Bylaws](#)
For an association to be valid in law, it must have bylaws set down in writing. Alongside the legal provisions of the Swiss Civil Code (ZGB), these are the only laws with which members and the executive board must comply. Section 3 “Purpose” states that:
 - avuba is a non-profit association, politically neutral and non-denominational.
 - avuba provides services for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers.
 - Within the purpose of the association, avuba performs tasks for the University of Basel that are defined in a performance agreement with the President’s Office.

- [Performance agreement with the President's Office](#)
This document regulates the mutual rights and duties of avuba and the University of Basel. Point 2 “Responsibilities of avuba” states that:
 - Accordingly, avuba represents the interests of assistants relating to university and educational policy matters within the university and to official authorities and the public at cantonal, regional, national and international level.
 - avuba shall ensure, coordinate and regulate the participation of assistants at the university.
 - In accordance with Section 22 (4) of the University Statute, avuba shall provide information to assistants at the University of Basel on university and higher education policy matters.
 - For this purpose, avuba shall operate a secretariat as a central point of contact for assistants’ concerns.
 Point 4 “avuba services” states that in addition to the tasks specified in point 2, avuba can, within the framework of the agreement, use funds for the following activities:
 - Subsidizing academic and non-academic projects via the executive board.
 - Organizing academic and social events to support teaching and research assistants at the university.
 - Making its infrastructure available for academic and non-academic initiatives and projects.
 - Running a common room shared with skuba with a reading room and newspapers and journals for assistants.
 - Offering courses for the support and promotion of careers both at and outside universities for teaching and research assistants in collaboration with the university.

3. b) Organization

In accordance with the Bylaws, the main bodies of the association are the General Meeting, the auditors and the avuba executive board, which also encompasses the co-presidium.

The General Meeting is the highest body of avuba.

- Composition:
 - The General Meeting is made up of avuba members.
 - Members of Group III, i.e. doctoral students and postdocs at the University of Basel, can join avuba, leave avuba or be excluded from avuba on objective grounds.
- Responsibilities:
 - Electing the non-ex officio members of the executive board, the co-presidium and the auditors;
 - setting the membership fee;

- approving the annual financial report and the auditors' report;
- discharging the executive board, the auditors and the general manager;
- amending the Bylaws;
- dissolving the Association;
- excluding avuba members from avuba or avuba bodies on objective grounds;
- the General Meeting may also pass non-binding resolutions, i.e. advisory resolutions.
- Resolutions
 - Resolutions are passed with a simple majority of members present who are entitled to vote (exceptions: Bylaw amendments, dissolving avuba)
 - Matters for which resolutions are to be passed must be properly listed on the agenda in the invitation to the General Meeting.
 - The invitation is sent at least 30 days prior to the meeting via email or publication on the avuba homepage.
 - Motions from members regarding agenda items are to be submitted to the executive board in writing at least seven days before the General Meeting. These include:
 - Motions to approve agenda items
 - Motions to reject agenda items
 - Motions aiming to amend the content of a specific agenda item, provided the original topic of the agenda item is preserved
- Tizian Troxler explains the reasons for these formal rules:
 - All important topics and votes must be properly listed on the agenda beforehand so that members can decide whether they want to take part in the General Meeting.
 - This is not about taking away members' rights, but about protecting the large membership cohort – currently around 3,200 members – from “hostile takeovers” or misuse by individual interest groups.
 - If the formal rules were not complied with, all decisions could be contested and declared to be invalid.

Auditors:

- Responsibilities:
 - The annual financial report is checked each year by two members of avuba.
 - The annual financial report must comply with the law, the Bylaws and the avuba financial regulations.
- Composition:
 - Two avuba members serve as auditors.
 - They may not comprise members of the executive board and must be impartial.
- Tizian Troxler explains the reasons for these formal rules:
 - Division of powers and ensuring impartiality
 - Accountability
 - The people who have access to avuba's funds should be monitored by an independent body on behalf of the General Meeting.

Executive board:

- Composition:
 - Two co-presidents (elected by the General Meeting for one year)
 - Senate representatives who represent faculty assistants in the Senate (elected by the relevant faculty)

- Senate representatives' deputies (elected by the relevant faculty)
- Additional executive board members (elected by the General Meeting for one year)
- The executive board is committed to ensuring that its composition reflects the diversity of the avuba members.
- Responsibilities: The executive board is responsible for all tasks and has all powers that are not transferred to another association body by law or the Bylaws. These include:
 - determining avuba's strategy within the purpose of avuba;
 - deciding on and prioritizing avuba's activities;
 - managing finances;
 - deciding on expenditure based on the budget or within avuba's own financial jurisdiction;
 - preparing the annual financial report and the budget proposal for the General Meeting;
 - carrying out day-to-day business;
 - convening and organizing the ordinary and extraordinary General Meetings.
- Tizian Troxler explains the reasons for these formal rules:
 - It is necessary to delegate general management in organizations with a large number of members.
 - Reducing coordination costs, improving organizational efficiency
- Decision-making powers/voting rights on the avuba executive board:
 - The presidium is to convene an executive board meeting at least three times per year, during which resolutions may be passed with a simple majority of members present.
 - Each co-president has one vote. In addition, each faculty has one vote even if more than one executive board member from the same faculty is present.
 - Other executive board members, deputies and the general manager (invited to executive board meetings as a guest) do not have the right to vote.
- Tizian Troxler explains the reasons for these formal rules:
 - The voting rights structure ensures that the interests of all seven faculties are respected and treated equally.
 - Protecting avuba against "hostile takeovers"/misuse by individual interest groups
 - Similar to the concept behind the Swiss Council of States (Schweizer Ständerat), in which cantons with fewer residents have the same number of votes as larger cantons.
- avuba executive board resolutions:
 - Resolutions must align with the statutory purpose of avuba;
 - where possible, they should be in the interest of all members and early career researchers;
 - resolutions may be in the interest of individual groups and/or support just one specific group of members provided there are no negative consequences for other members such as early career researchers.
- Limited personnel available to complete all tasks, i.e. avuba may avail itself of the equivalent of just one full-time employee, divided up as follows:
 - 40% workload for the general manager
 - 40% co-presidium (two co-presidents, each with a 20% workload)
 - Approx. 20% total workload performed by various people such as other executive board members, external service providers (e.g. translation services) and services covered by the university free of charge (such as accounting, HR, member administration and collection of membership fees, and IT services).

- Due to limited resources, priorities must be set (criteria: necessity, efficiency and effectiveness)
 1. Focus on internal university matters – if avuba doesn't do this, nobody will.
 2. Performing services/organizing social and networking events for members
 3. Administration of avuba
 4. Point of contact for individual avuba members with questions/problems
 5. Representing the interests of its members not only within the university, but also in public and when dealing with public authorities

Co-presidium:

- Composition:
 - Two co-presidents (elected by the General Meeting for one year)
 - The presidium is part of the executive board and ideally comprises one doctoral student and one postdoc from different faculties and of different genders.
 - The co-presidents are elected by the General Meeting for one year and can then be reelected.
- Responsibilities in agreement/consultation with the executive board:
 - Representing avuba's interests within and outside the university
 - Responsible for all avuba publications
 - Preparing the activity report for the General Meeting
 - Lodging complaints and releasing statements
 - Negotiating performance agreements with the university
 - Implementing executive board resolutions
- In practice, the co-presidium and the general manager make up avuba's "workforce".

General manager:

- Recruited by avuba (not elected by members)
- Appointed by the co-presidium in consultation with the executive board
- Has supporting and executive functions
- Runs avuba's general management
- Initial point of contact and information for members and third parties
- Has no decision-making powers (not an executive board member)
- Permitted to sign documents only together with a member of the co-presidium

3. c) Reasons for the decision not to sign the "Petition Academia"

Petition text taken from [The Petition - Campaign Website Petition Academia \(petition-academia.ch\)](https://petition-academia.ch) (28/11/2021)

- We call on the Federal Assembly to improve the working conditions of researchers, protect their health and family life, and thereby ensure the excellence of scientific research in Switzerland through the creation of a significant number of permanent positions **for postdoctoral researchers**.
- Academic positions should be diversified through the creation or expansion of permanent mid-level positions between research assistantships and professorships. As the Swiss Academy of the Humanities and Social Sciences points out in its 2018 report, this means "converting employment categories that were previously fixed-term into permanent positions and **limiting resources channeled to research projects in favor of a higher basic funding**" [1]. The Federal Assembly must send a clear message to higher education institutions, their representative bodies, and the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) and compel them to review hiring and promotion policies for junior researchers in order to create a significant number of permanent academic positions available as early as possible after obtaining a doctorate.

- [1] “Umwandlung von bislang befristeten Stellenkategorien in unbefristete Stellen sowie (...) eine Reduktion der projektformig vergebenen Forschungsmittel zugunsten einer höheren Grundfinanzierung der Hochschulen”. Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences (Schweizerische Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften) (2018), Next Generation: Für eine wirksame Nachwuchsförderung, Swiss Academies Reports, 13 (1), p. 46.

Key objections:

- Uncertainties regarding compatibility with the statutory purpose of avuba
- The petition claims to improve the situation for all researchers, but in fact only improves things for one group of our members (postdocs and advanced-stage doctoral students)
- Potential disadvantage for early-stage doctoral students and researchers by restricting project funding options (“limiting resources channeled to research projects in favor of a higher basic funding”)

Further objections:

- One-off impact, i.e. limited effect on one generation because the newly created permanent positions will probably be occupied for a long time, leading to a low fluctuation rate.
- The rhetorical style of the campaign and website and the insufficient data on which statements are based do not fit with avuba’s style.
 - “The resulting precarity takes a toll both on the individual and the collective: renunciation of family life and/or parenthood, financial strain, mental health issues (stress, anxiety, burnout), vulnerability in terms of mobbing and sexual harassment, and a decline in research quality.” (Source: [Launch of the petition - Campaign Website Petition Academia \(petition-academia.ch\)](#) (28/11/2021))
- The petition is unsuitable as a political instrument because, unlike an initiative, a petition only has symbolic value:
 - “Art. 33 Right of petition: Every person has the right, without prejudice, to petition the authorities. The authorities must acknowledge receipt of such petitions.” (Source: [Art. 33 Swiss Federal Constitution \(Bundesverfassung der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft, BV - 2020\)](#) (swissrights.ch) (28/11/2021))
- Anonymous committee – who is behind the petition and what is their (true) political agenda?
- Potentially harmful to avuba’s image

Pros and cons of signing the petition:

- Arguments in favor:
 - May support some members
 - Sends a message
- Arguments against:
 - Risk of worsening the situation for some avuba members because a reduction in project funding cannot benefit avuba members whose academic career prospects are boosted by measures such as external funding
 - Damage to future generations of early career researchers
 - Risk of harming avuba’s purpose

- Risk of damaging the reputation of avuba as an organization, which argues with facts and proposes feasible solutions
- Jeopardizes other future improvements at the University of Basel
- Loss of control over communication and further steps by the petition team; by signing the petition, avuba would have declared itself to be in agreement with all other communication media and content from Petition Academia.

Pros and cons of NOT signing the petition:

- Arguments in favor:
 - Does not harm members/future generations
 - No harm to avuba's purpose
 - avuba retains its successful communication and working style
 - No risk of loss of control
 - Improves starting position for future negotiations with the university
 - If the petition does achieve something, this would also benefit assistants at the University of Basel.
- Arguments against:
 - Does not send a message.

Why, after the member survey, did the executive board stick to its original decision not to sign the Petition Academia?

- In accordance with the avuba Bylaws, only the executive board has the right to sign the petition (or not).
- The survey was non-binding and advisory.
- The executive board wanted to explain its decision and find out whether the avuba members wanted it to maintain its present course.
- The response rate of 7% left room for various interpretations.
- The survey results conveyed just three facts:
 - Only a very small number of members actually voted for the petition (5%).
 - An even smaller number of members actually voted against the petition (2%).
 - Based on the sample size and structure (not randomized), the sample does not allow conclusions to be drawn about the membership as a whole.
- The survey did not provide any important new information that would have prompted the avuba executive board to change course; the majority opinion within avuba cannot be determined from the survey results.

What avuba could have done better:

- A better time could have been chosen – some assistants probably did not check their emails at the end of the summer.
- One (or two) reminder emails should have been sent.
- The executive board should have explained the reasons for not signing more precisely when conducting the survey.
- The communication and statistical validity of the surveys could have been improved (for example, by creating a representative sample for future surveys).

3. d) Activity report for the co-presidium 2021

Tizian Troxler presents avuba's activities in 2021:

- January – March: Evaluating and publishing the avuba Postdoc Survey 2020. The President's Office has offered some measures since then (expanding child care and extending Academic Editing to include postdocs). The President's Office has promised to clarify further measures and to provide avuba with an overview by the end of 2021.
- May – June: Writing a memorandum entitled "Restructing avuba's finances: Fixed amount instead of deficit guarantee" and discussing this with the President's Office – this has been approved and comes into effect as of 1 January 2022.
- May: Participating in two workshops on the topic of family-friendliness and writing a paper "More flexible employment contracts for assistants with family responsibilities". The feasibility is currently being discussed in a working group with GRACE, HR and some professors.
- June – September: "Petition Academia" (*Bajour* article, meetings, discussions, survey)
- August – October: Developing a social media concept and setting up avuba LinkedIn and Twitter accounts to increase visibility and share the latest information with assistants. These accounts went live in October.
- August – September: Drawing up the avuba financial regulations
- September: Revising the performance agreement – due to the changes in financing – for the attention of the President's Office (the document is currently with Legal Services).
- September – November: Writing a memorandum entitled "Explaining committee confidentiality" so that avuba, which is not directly represented on committees, is permitted to discuss all business openly and share information with assistants who represent Group III on the various cross-faculty committees. This matter is being clarified with the Data Protection Officers at the University of Basel.
- October: Qualitative survey on "Working conditions at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences" including reporting
- November: Drawing up and submitting a paper entitled "What measures could boost family-friendliness for assistants" for the attention of the "Family-friendliness" working group (GRACE, HR and professors). avuba is to receive a paper from the working group in December containing proposed measures and will be able to give feedback.
- November – December: Drafting a paper entitled "Setting up fixed positions under the professorship", which needs to be completed by the new avuba executive board
- Feedback was also provided on the following topics:
 - April: Core questions in the university doctoral student survey (GRACE)
 - April and August: Documents on the process of recruiting and supervising assistants (GRACE)
 - September: Evaluating the university's HR and personnel/organizational development services
 - October: University of Basel self-evaluation report (accreditation)
- Participating in the University Welcome Days in March and September
- September: avuba BBQ in the Schützenmattpark
- October: Participating in the actionuni general meeting
- November – December: Organizing, preparing, conducting and following up on the avuba General Meeting held on 2 December 2021
- Organizing seven avuba lunchtime meetings throughout the year
- Organizing three finance seminars
- Approving the (co-)funding of 6 academic and non-academic projects for which avuba received applications in 2021

Item 4: Outlook 2022 including discussion of items 3 and 4 of max. 60 minutes

Tizian Troxler explains that on 23 November 2021, due to lack of resources, the avuba executive board set the following priorities to the end of 2021:

- Appointing the co-presidium and seeking a new general manager
- Following up on the General Meeting 2021
- Postponing/canceling all non-urgent activities in December, such as organizing the mulled wine reception

4. a) Outlook 2022

The following activities are planned for 2022:

- Recruit additional administrative personnel to support the general manager and co-presidium and allow them to spend more time expanding political activities. Tizian Troxler points out that in order to do this, the membership fee will be increased to cover the additional salary costs and the Bylaws have to be amended.
- Submit a proposal to the President's Office: "Problems and potential measures for improving assistants' working and research conditions, with a request to review the status quo in each faculty and suggest improvements" (including the creation of third-space positions)
- Improve the avuba website and social media channels (Twitter & LinkedIn)
- Intensify exchange with the Group III representatives on the university's cross-faculty committees
- Continue existing commitments (lunchtime meetings via Zoom, funding academic and non-academic projects, managing social media accounts)

4. b) Discussion of items 3 and 4 lasting max. 60 minutes

Tizian Troxler points out that with so many participants, it will not be possible to hold a discussion via Zoom. He therefore says that anyone wishing to speak should write in the chat so that Camila Plaza can give them the floor. Camila Plaza will save the entire chat. This can be found in Appendix 1 from page 21 in this document.

Audience questions to the avuba executive board are indicated in italics below.

Question: Why was it so difficult to add an extra item to the agenda?

Answer: According to the avuba Bylaws, once the General Meeting invitation has been sent – at least 30 days before the meeting date – it is no longer possible to change the agenda. It is also not possible to add content retrospectively for which resolutions must be passed. It is possible to add motions to the existing agenda items. The avuba executive board approved these additions on 23 November 2021 and the extended agenda was then sent to all avuba members via email.

Question: It seemed as though the avuba executive board wanted to restrict the participation of some members.

Answer: There was never any intention to exclude anyone. In the future, it would be useful if the avuba executive board were to send out an email 60 days before the General Meeting stating that members have 20 days to submit agenda items for the upcoming General Meeting. The executive board could then discuss them while still ensuring that the final agenda is distributed in plenty of time.

Question: What are the chances that working conditions will improve for everyone?

Answer: The chances are good because the university relies on assistants. The President's Office sees our problems and respects our suggestions, so the avuba executive board should be able to make something happen next year. However, the university's processes are very slow and certain changes have to be approved by the University Council itself. This requires patience.

Question: Hasn't avuba harmed some of its members by deciding not to sign the Petition Academia?

Answer: avuba has definitely not harmed any of its members by deciding not to sign. Furthermore, avuba has not blocked the Petition Academia processes. Plus, the avuba executive board knew that the petition would continue regardless of whether they signed, and if this were to lead to improvements on a national level, then assistants at the University of Basel would also benefit. "Freeloading" isn't exactly an admirable strategy, but it is a fact.

Question: Why didn't avuba make contact with the petition team?

Answer: avuba made contact several times, initially in summer 2020, when it gave feedback on the first draft of the petition text. Among other things, avuba recommended reconsidering the content and form. The petition team responded that they wouldn't adjust the text and that avuba could either sign it as it is or not sign at all. In September 2020, the avuba executive board decided not to sign.

Question: Other associations of non-professorial academic staff had no problem with the text and signed the petition. Does avuba know why?

Answer: avuba was in contact with actionuni and some associations of non-professorial academic staff, some of whom held internal discussions on whether they should actually sign the petition. avuba doesn't know why almost all of Switzerland's associations of non-professorial academic staff decided to sign the Petition Academia.

Question: The demands made by the Petition Academia are nothing new. Why do we always look for causes and problems rather than improvements? We don't need any more data or avuba surveys.

Answer: In recent years, avuba has found that every time we draw attention to grievances, university departments say that they are isolated cases. We have to conduct surveys to prove that there are structural problems.

Question: We feel that avuba is not giving us sufficient support. What do you have to say?

Answer: avuba is an organization that represents the interests of assistants in all seven faculties. Since they experience different problems – for example, assistants in scientific fields have no problems with protected time – certain problems have to be addressed with the relevant faculty. Fixed assistant positions are not desirable in the Faculty of Science because transfers, mobility and internationality are important for research and career prospects. It is already tricky to find solutions within our university for problems that affect everyone, so at a national level it's almost impossible.

Question: Would it not make sense to improve working conditions for at least some assistants?

Answer: It is unclear whether/when basic funding for universities could be increased. Therefore, the demand made by the Petition Academia would have led to project funding being reduced for all other assistants, impeding career opportunities for other assistants.

Question: Instead of emphasizing the differences between the faculties, would it not make more sense to organize a meeting, say twice a year, in which assistants could talk and exchange ideas to promote internal networking and communication?

Answer: That's a great idea! But we can't force people to take part. It's already difficult to fill all the Group III positions on cross-faculty committees. In the past, avuba organized twice-yearly "Talk to the executive board" lunchtime meetings. These meetings were stopped because they only ever attracted 2 or 3 people. It was probably a mistake to stop them.

Question: Perhaps the assistants who sit on the faculty committees and assemblies could meet regularly?

Answer: Yes, the new co-presidium could organize that.

Question: Of avuba's 3,200 members, 160 wanted avuba to sign the Petition Academia. And now we're at a meeting of just 60 people who are voting on everything? It doesn't add up. It seems like avuba isn't reaching its members.

Answer: The aim of the advisory survey was to help the avuba executive board find out what avuba members wanted. For the board to change course, more responses would have been required/more people would have had to be in favor of signing. In September 2020, the avuba executive board voted not to sign the petition. To change the board's decision, the individual board members would have had to change their votes. That didn't happen.

Christina Lamers, a postdoc representative on the doctoral committee, adds that she has attended every avuba General Meeting for four years and that avuba has definitely reached her. The avuba executive board or the general manager must be informed of important issues so that avuba can take action.

Ulrike Unterhofer, avuba executive board member, comments that the situation in the various faculties is sometimes very different, and that changes within the faculties must be initiated by the relevant assistant assemblies. It's great that there are more people at today's General Meeting than have attended in the past. However, it is important to move forward rather than discussing just one past topic.

Eva Schnider, avuba executive board member, states that she was in favor of avuba concentrating on topics and opportunities for change at the University of Basel. This was not compatible with signing the Petition Academia.

Tizian Troxler adds that too few people took part in the survey. It's possible that those who took part were primarily in favor of avuba signing the Petition Academia. In this respect, the survey results were not representative.

Camila Plaza points out that it is now 8.55 pm, so the discussion time is over. Since various questions and information entered in the chat could not be addressed, the chat will be saved and attached at the end of these minutes. It is up to the new avuba co-presidium and the executive board to decide how they wish to deal with these comments.

Item 5: Approval of the minutes from the General Meeting on 27 November 2020 and the minutes from the Extraordinary General Meeting on 20 January 2021

5. a) Approval of the minutes from last year's General Meeting

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Approve the minutes from the General Meeting on 27 November 2020.
://: -> The majority agrees. The minutes are approved. (Question: Do you approve the minutes from the General Meeting on 27 November 2020? Result: 32 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 32)

5. b) Approval of the minutes from the last Extraordinary General Meeting

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Approve the minutes from the Extraordinary General Meeting on 20 January 2021.
://: -> The majority agrees. The minutes are approved. (Question: Do you approve the minutes from the Extraordinary General Meeting on 20 January 2021? Result: 32 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 32)

Item 6: Approve the annual report 2020 and the auditors' report

6. a) Annual report 2020

For 2020, avuba's expenses totalled CHF 105,326. Internal income amounted to CHF 83,010. This equals a deficit of CHF 22,316, which is covered by the University of Basel's deficit guarantee. Therefore, as in previous years, avuba's annual result for 2020 is CHF 0.

avuba's annual reports are publicly available at avuba.unibas.ch/en/about-us/minutes-and-annual-reports/annual-reports/.

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Approve the annual report 2020.
://: -> The majority agrees. The annual report 2020 is approved. (Question: Do you approve the annual report 2020? Result: 34 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 34)

6. b) Auditors' report

At the avuba Extraordinary General Meeting on 20 January 2021, Margaux Depaermentier and Joelle Loew, both doctoral students at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, were elected as auditors for the avuba annual report 2020 in 2021.

Margaux Depaermentier and Joelle Loew audited the avuba annual report 2020 on 27 May 2021 and 3 June 2021 respectively and had no further comments.

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Approve the auditors' report on the annual report 2020.

://: -> The majority agrees. The auditors' report on the annual report 2020 is approved.
(Question: Do you approve the auditors' report, which can be found on page 4 of the annual report 2020? Result: 34 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 34)

Item 7: Discharging of the executive board, co-presidium, general manager and auditors

Explanation of the discharge resolutions:

The bodies within the association are liable to the association and its members for any damage caused due to intentional or negligent breach of their legal or statutory obligations. The association can discharge individual members of these bodies from this liability by passing a resolution at the General Meeting.

Only association members who are not serving on the executive board are permitted to vote on discharge resolutions. The auditors of the avuba annual report are not permitted to discharge themselves.

Results of the executive board discharge motions to the General Meeting:

- Discharge the executive board.
://: -> This motion is carried. The avuba executive board is discharged by the members who are not part of the executive board. (Question: Do you discharge the executive board? Result: 18 Yes, 3 No, total responses: 21)
- Discharge the co-presidium.
://: -> This motion is carried. The avuba co-presidium is discharged by the members who are not part of the executive board. (Question: Do you discharge the co-presidium? Result: 17 Yes, 4 No, total responses: 21)
- Discharge the general manager.
://: -> This motion is carried. The avuba general manager is discharged by the members who are not part of the executive board. (Question: Do you discharge the general manager? Result: 23 Yes, 1 No, total responses: 24)
- Discharge the auditors.
://: -> This motion is carried. The avuba auditors are discharged by the members who are not serving on the executive board or as auditors. (Question: Do you discharge the auditors? Result: 25 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 25)

Item 8: Approval of the projection for 2021 (advisory) and the budget 2022

8. a) Projection for 2021

In accordance with the currently valid performance agreement with the President's Office, avuba may avail itself of a maximum annual cost/revenue deficit of CHF 50,000 from the university. avuba endeavors to use its money responsibly.

Since avuba was founded, the university has covered an average annual deficit of around CHF 32,000.

avuba expects to make use of the University of Basel's deficit guarantee to the order of CHF 34,800 for 2021.

- Advisory question to the General Meeting on behalf of the avuba executive board: Who approves, on an advisory basis, the projection for 2021 with an expected claim on the University of Basel's deficit guarantee of CHF 34,800?
://: -> The majority agrees. The projection for 2021 is approved. (Question: Do you approve the projection for 2021 (advisory)? Result: 39 Yes, 1 No, total responses: 40)

8. b) Budget 2022

Patricia Eiche has drawn up two budgets for 2022.

Budget A assumes that the membership fee will remain unchanged at CHF 15.

Budget B assumes that today's General Meeting will increase the membership fee from CHF 15 to CHF 20. In this case, avuba will aim to recruit additional personnel resources, meaning that income from membership fees and personnel expenditure will both increase.

As of 1 January 2022, the university will pay avuba a fixed amount of CHF 50,000.

in CHF	Annual report 2020	Budget 2021	As at 1/12/21	Proj 2021	Budget A 2022	Budget B 2022
Personnel costs	85,405	95,000	75,127	95,000	95,000	110,000
Third-party services	5,865	5,000	4,865	9,000	7,000	7,000
Office supplies and postage	347	400	58	200	400	400
Catering, representation, advertising	3,358	15,200	3,259	4,000	15,000	15,000
Courses / Transferable Skills courses	5,400	3,600	0	0	0	0
Memberships (actionuni)	600	600	0	600	600	600
Funding projects	4,351	8,000	2,828	6,000	6,000	6,000
Operating costs	19,921	32,800	11,010	19,800	29,000	29,000
Total costs	105,326	127,800	86,137	114,800	124,000	139,000
Income from membership fees	83,010	80,000	71,745	80,000	80,000	92,500
University contribution (deficit guarantee)	22,316	47,800	14,392	34,800	50,000	50,000
Total revenue	105,326	127,800	86,137	114,800	130,000	142,500
Annual result	0	0	0	0	6'000	3,500

Executive board motions to the General Meeting:

- Approve budget A, assuming that the membership fee remains unchanged at CHF 15.
://: -> The majority agrees. Budget A is approved. (Question: Do you approve budget A for 2022, assuming that the membership fee remains unchanged at CHF 15 per semester? Result: 37 Yes, 2 No, total responses: 39)
- Approve budget B, assuming that the membership fee is increased to CHF 20.
://: -> The majority agrees. Budget B is approved. (Question: Do you approve budget B for 2022, assuming that the membership fee is increased to CHF 20 per semester? Result: 37 Yes, 3 No, total responses: 40)

Item 9: Motion to increase the current membership fee of CHF 15 per semester to CHF 20 per semester to boost personnel resources

Since avuba was founded in 2013, the membership fee has remained unchanged at CHF 15 per semester. Tizian Troxler explains that it would not have made sense to increase the membership fee before now because the additional internal income would have only reduced the University of Basel's contribution to avuba's expenditure – i.e. the deficit guarantee.

At avuba's request, the President's Office has passed the following resolution ([President's Office resolution no. 21.07.174 dated 6 July 2021](#)):

In accordance with the University Statute, in addition to contributions from its members and other forms of income, avuba may avail itself of funds from the university's global budget (Section 22 (6)). The latter is currently provided as an annual deficit guarantee in the amount of CHF 50,000. avuba has now, however, requested that the President's Office replace the deficit guarantee with a fixed annual amount. In contrast to the deficit guarantee, a fixed amount means that unused funds may be carried over to the following year. There are no further financial implications compared with the current budget. The President's Office resolves the following:

://: 1. As of 2022, the avuba funding model will be altered from a deficit guarantee to a fixed annual amount of CHF 50,000. avuba may apply to adjust the fixed amount during its periodic discussions on the performance agreement with the President's Office. 2. The President's Office reserves the right to make potential reductions to the fixed annual amount, should avuba build up reserves exceeding CHF 50,000 having carried over unused funds. 3. The "Performance agreement between the University of Basel and the Assistants' Association of the University of Basel" (point 5) will be adjusted accordingly.

Tizian Troxler explains that avuba currently avails of approximately 100 percent of its personnel resources. These are made up as follows:

- 40% workload for the general manager
- 40% workload for the two co-presidents, each with a 20% workload
- Approx. 20% work performed by others such as the avuba executive board members, external service providers (e.g. translation services) and services covered by the university free of charge (such as accounting, HR, collection of avuba membership fees by HR and Student Services, and IT services)

It should be possible for additional funds to be spent on personnel resources so that the avuba co-presidium and the general manager can spend less time on administrative matters and focus instead on representing the interests of assistants. The avuba executive board would therefore like to propose to the General Meeting that the avuba membership fee be increased.

According to information from HR and Student Services, which collect the membership fees for avuba, it would be possible to increase the avuba membership fee in summer 2022, i.e. for one semester in 2022.

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Increase the membership fee from CHF 15 to CHF 20 per semester in order to build up personnel resources.
- ://: -> The majority agrees. The avuba membership fee will be increased to CHF 20 per semester. (Question: Are you in favor of increasing the membership fee to CHF 20 per semester, coming into effect for just one semester in 2022? Result: 33 Yes, 7 No, total responses: 40)

Item 10: Bylaw amendments (various)

Tizian Troxler explains that it was primarily necessary to revise the Bylaws due to the new university funding that comes into effect on 1 January 2022. Amendments were also required so that the avuba executive board is permitted to employ more people in addition to the general manager. Additional adjustments are also proposed that set down common practices in writing.

The Q&A session is hereby opened on the requested Bylaw amendments that were communicated to the registered avuba members on 24 November 2021 in electronic format.

One avuba member asks whether the proposed sentence in “9. Presidium” (“Further tasks performed by the Co-Presidium are defined by the Executive Board in regulations”) might extend the co-presidium’s responsibilities unnecessarily and whether it would not be possible for all regulations to be approved by the General Meeting.

Tizian Troxler explains that this sentence does not mean that the executive board can assign more responsibilities to the co-presidium than are set out in the Bylaws. Furthermore, approving regulations does not fall within the remit of the General Meeting. Only the executive board can do this. In addition, Bylaw amendments cannot be agreed at this General Meeting if the avuba members have not been informed.

The following decision is therefore taken:

- The avuba executive board will compose an additional sentence for the Bylaws, for the attention of the next General Meeting, stating that all regulations enacted by the avuba executive board are to be presented to the General Meeting for consultation.

There are no further questions on the proposed Bylaw amendments.

In total, 49 people are still present in the Zoom meeting when the vote is taken on the Bylaw amendments. Only Patricia Eiche is not entitled to vote, which means that there are 48 people present who are able to vote. For the proposed Bylaw amendments to be approved, at least 32 people must vote “Yes” for a 2/3 majority of those present.

Executive board motion to the General Meeting:

- Approve the existing revisions to the avuba Bylaws.
://: -> More than 2/3 of avuba members present who are entitled to vote approve the revision of the Bylaws, that is all proposed Bylaw amendments.
The Bylaws are available at: <https://avuba.unibas.ch/en/about-us/bylaws-and-performance-agreement/> (Question: Do you agree with the revision of the Bylaws, that is do you approve all proposed and/or discussed Bylaw amendments? Result: 34 Yes, 5 No, total responses: 39)

Item 11: Elections for 2022: Additional executive board member, co-presidium and auditors

11 a) Additional executive board member

Ex-officio executive board members 2022 (as at 2 December 2021):

- Faculty of Theology: Esther Maria Meyer, deputy Nesina Grütter
- Faculty of Law: Representative and deputy positions vacant
- Faculty of Medicine: Eva Schnider (until February 2022), deputy position vacant
- Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences: Séveric Yersin, deputy position vacant
- Faculty of Science: Butrint Aliu, deputy position vacant
- Faculty of Business and Economics: Ali Darudi, deputy Ulrike Unterhofer
- Faculty of Psychology: Representative and deputy positions vacant

The vacancies will be advertised and filled within the relevant faculties.

Thomas Messerli, a postdoc at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, would like to be an additional avuba executive board member in 2022.

- Elect Thomas Messerli to the avuba executive board for 2022.
://: -> Thomas Messerli is elected for one year. (Question: Do you elect Thomas Messerli, a postdoc at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, as an additional avuba executive board member for 2022? Result: 40 Yes, 1 No, total responses: 41)

11 b) Co-presidium

Lars Fluri, a doctoral student at the Faculty of Business and Economics since 2021, puts himself forward for the position of avuba co-president for 2022.

- Election of Lars Fluri as co-president for 2022.
://: -> Lars Fluri is elected for one year. (Question: Do you elect Lars Fluri as avuba co-president for 2022? Result: 29 Yes, 12 No, total responses: 41)

Sven Kraus, a doctoral student at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences since 2019, puts himself forward for the position of avuba co-president for 2022.

- Election of Sven Kraus as co-president for 2022.
://: -> Sven Kraus is elected for one year. (Question: Do you elect Sven Kraus as avuba co-president for 2022? Result: 40 Ja, 5 No, total responses: 45)

As Tizian Troxler is withdrawing from his role as of 2 December 2021, Sven Kraus could serve as co-president from 3 December 2021 to 31 December 2021. This would mean that he would run the co-presidium together with Camila Plaza, co-president for 2021, until the end of 2021.

- Question to the avuba General Meeting: May Sven Kraus begin his term as avuba co-president on 3 December 2021?
://: -> Sven Kraus is elected, which means he may serve as avuba co-president from 3 December 2021. (Question: Are you in favor of Sven beginning his term as avuba co-president on 3 December 2021? Result: 41 Yes, 1 No, total responses: 42)

11. c) Auditors

The following people put themselves forward for election as auditors:

- Lea Marie Nienhof, doctoral student at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
- Alena Schmidt, postdoc at the Faculty of Science
- Agnes Hoffmann, a postdoc at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, declares that she would be prepared to step in should either person be prevented from serving.

Motion to the General Meeting to elect the persons named above so that they may audit the avuba annual report 2021 in spring 2022.

- Election of Lea Maria Nienhof, Alena Schmidt and (deputy) Agnes Hoffman as auditors.
://: -> Lea Maria Nienhof, Alena Schmidt and Agnes Hoffman are elected. (Question: Do you elect the two/three assistants who have put themselves forward to audit the avuba annual report 2021? Result: 35 Yes, 0 No, total responses: 35)

Item 12: Miscellaneous

The avuba members and executive board express their heartfelt thanks to Patricia Eiche for her valuable work for avuba over the last 8 ½ years.

The avuba executive board 2022 will hold an informal meeting in December to gain an overview of the process and determine a timetable for advertising Patricia Eiche's position and recruiting a replacement.

Basel, 14 December 2021



Camila Plaza
avuba co-president



Sven Kraus
avuba co-president

Appendix 1: Zoom chat record from General Meeting

18:22:29 From U. U. to Everyone:
I didnt get a popu

18:22:32 From U. U. to Everyone:
Popup

18:22:41 From S. Y. to Everyone:
Me neither

18:22:42 From M. K. K. to Everyone:
I did not get a poll either

18:22:43 From M. B. to Everyone:
me neither

18:22:44 From w. to Everyone:
Me neither

18:22:46 From P. B. to Everyone:
Me

18:22:47 From L. M. N. to Everyone:
me neither

18:22:48 From A. K. to Everyone:
me neither

18:22:53 From T. M to Everyone:
I got it

18:22:53 From A. S. to Everyone:
You need the newest Version of zoom

18:22:58 From S. K. to Everyone:
I got it

18:23:18 From M. K. to Everyone:
Can we update and log in again?

18:23:24 From A. T. to Everyone:
we could use an etherpad instead?

18:23:43 From V. S. to Everyone:
In the faculty assembly they collect votes that do not work by mail

18:23:51 From W. A. to Everyone:
What is the newest version?

18:24:31 From F. E. to Everyone:
raise hands instead?

18:24:43 From T. M. to Everyone:
raise hands is not anonymous

18:25:12 From A. T. to Everyone:
chat to one person could work?

18:25:12 From S. Y. to Everyone:
Maybe vote on this matter (voting system) per a show of hand.

18:25:32 From M. H. to Everyone:
can't we just let people update their zoom and then reconvene?

18:26:07 From Y. W. to Everyone:
yes

18:26:07 From E. S. to Everyone:
10 minutes should be enough

18:26:11 From M. F. to Everyone:
yes

18:26:13 From A. D. to Everyone:
5 to 10 minutes should be enough

18:26:14 From P. B. to Everyone:
ok

18:26:14 From S. Y. to Everyone:
10 min max

18:26:15 From N. S. to Everyone:
yes

18:26:28 From S. K. to Everyone:
Suggestion: Everyone who got the poll stays in the Meeting, so we don't have to ID-check everyone again

18:26:30 From W. A. to Everyone:
What is the latest version? 5.8.1?

18:26:36 From S. Y. to Everyone:
yes

18:26:43 From T. M. to Everyone:
agreed

18:26:51 From E. N. to Everyone:
5.8.4

18:26:52 From S. F. to Everyone:
i have 5.8.6

18:26:57 From E. N. to Everyone:

oh...

18:27:09 From A. D. to Everyone:
ok

18:27:11 From Y. W. to Everyone:
ok

18:27:12 From T. M. to Everyone:
I have 5.8.4

18:27:15 From S. S. to Everyone:
apparently there are some People who have the newest Version and it still doesnt work?

18:27:16 From T. M. to Everyone:
and it worked fine

18:40:57 From A. H. to Everyone:
Wow! Das ist wirklich unangenehm.

18:47:20 From V. S. to Everyone:
Just a little remark - there are no postdoctoral students, just postdocs

19:09:39 From V. S. to Everyone:
Question: you have explained the rules for the Mitgliedsversammlung and that you are trying to protect avuba from unfriendly takeovers. As a matter of fact, I had handed in a topic for the agenda that a number of members wish to discuss within the time frame that was announced in the avuba-email. We applied to the rules, but it was still a long discussioern if the aspect we wished to discuss can be on the agenda or not: why is that - what was the specific problem? I would like to discuss the communication strategies of avuba with their members - and possible improvements

19:14:50 From R. B. to Everyone:
Can the co-president explain how likely he supposes it to be that there will ever be any change to present university working conditions that will benefit each and every member of his organisation?

19:17:44 From R. B. to Everyone:
And could he also disclose the empirical basis on which probable harm for part of avuba's members through Petition Academia was diagnosed?

19:18:06 From J. S. to Everyone:
And now, no member's interests have been harmed?

19:19:29 From S. S. to Everyone:
the reputational Damage caused by not standing up for the avuba members and their Problems which have been demonstrated in many Surveys and by thousands of signatures seems to be much higher to me than the hypethetical Damage that is assumed here

19:20:30 From V. S. to Everyone:
Why did you not try to get in contact with the committee? And how do you explain that almost each and every other assistants representation of Swiss university (including the ETH) has signed the petition?

19:21:27 From T. M. to Everyone:

I think all of this is beside the point, quite frankly. I think the board should recognise when faced with a question like this, that it is absolutely crucial to get a mandate by the groups it represents to be either for or against such a petition. Whether or not it is bound to ask for the opinion of the members is one question, what seems to be quite clear is that it was not in touch with the opinions of its members.

19:22:53 From T. M. to Everyone:
Was enough done to actually reach avuba members?

19:23:19 From E. N. to Everyone:
Please also show the outcome of the survey

19:23:27 From M. L. to Everyone:
By how many is the board elected?

19:23:32 From V. S. to Everyone:
Wouldn't it be a good moment now to think of better strategies to get in contact with your members?

19:23:47 From T. M. to Everyone:
That is a very biased representation.

19:25:35 From Y. W. to Everyone:
wouldn't your representation of the problem, that only a fraction of avuba members participated in the poll also apply to our setting here?

19:27:12 From C. P. to Everyone:
We will return to the questions and comments regarding the petition during the discussion

19:28:34 From S. K. to Everyone:
There is Always going to be a selection bias in these kinds of Settings/statistics. Participating in avuba is voluntary and most likely directly tied to general political interest and willingness to engage in university politics.

19:28:42 From S. S. to Everyone:
the Major Problem of the Survey was that it was biased from the beginning: it started with deligitimizing one of the positions that was to be voted on. No one could seriously Claim that this was an attempt to neutrally evaluate what the members Position is. rather the function seems purely to be legitimizing the presidiums Position.

19:29:15 From M. L. to Everyone:
Is the petition not signed because it is seen as not statutory (and then why to have a vote in the first place) or based on political reasons? The argumentation here is contradictory

19:29:49 From L. N. to Everyone:
Further, making a non-binding survey does not respect the opinion of the members. It questions the legitimacy of your decision-making process.

19:30:00 From A. V. to Everyone:
I would like to point out that the demand for more permanent positions after the doctorate already has a broad support. Especially, it is supported by the feminist movement. As the political very broad participation at the women's strike 2019 showed, there is a broad political basis for this demand, which is not coming only from one political side, but is supposed to make the university more

inclusive in general, especially for women, which make a big part of Avuba's members. The point here is not about the supposedly disadvantage of some members, but about equal chances for all members, regardless of their gender (and private life, family etc.) in the first place. See for instance demand 4 of the Academic Manifesto of the feminist strike: <https://campaign.petition-academia.ch/text-de-fr-it-en/>

19:34:22 From A. V. to Everyone:

I appreciate your engagement, but the time argument is exactly why we need to support additional demands from outside, like the Petition..

19:35:05 From A. V. to Everyone:

Also, wrong link above, sorry: <https://www.feminist-academic-manifesto.org/>

19:40:56 From L. N. to Everyone:

Could you please share the memorandum "commission confidentiality statement"? It would be great to discuss this directly with the representatives of Group 3. To my knowledge, you have not yet reached out directly to representatives of Group 3 to discuss this matter.

19:56:01 From L. N. to Everyone:

From your statutes: "Anträge von Mitgliedern zu den Traktanden müssen dem Vorstand mindestens sieben Tage vor der Mitgliederversammlung schriftlich eingereicht werden." Nothing is stated in the document about the 30 days rule.

19:57:55 From S. K. to Everyone:

It actually is in the following paragraph. However, I feel, that this particular point can be improved to make it easier for members to put something on the agenda.

19:58:21 From S. K. to Everyone:

Sorry, I meant the paragraph above

20:00:11 From L. N. to Everyone:

Could you copy the corresponding line into the chat? Maybe we are having different versions? I do not see a paragraph on this.

20:02:29 From S. Y. to Everyone:

« Geschäfte, über die Beschluss gefasst werden soll, müssen in der Einladung zur Mitgliederversammlung gehörig traktandiert werden. » + « Die Einladung erfolgt mindestens 30 Tage vor der Versammlung per E-Mail oder durch Publikation auf der Homepage der avuba. »

20:02:34 From S. K. to Everyone:

Geschäfte, über die Beschluss gefasst werden soll, müssen in der Einladung zur Mitgliederversammlung gehörig traktandiert werden. Anträge von Mitgliedern zu den Traktanden müssen dem Vorstand mindestens sieben Tage vor der Mitgliederversammlung schriftlich eingereicht werden. However, this leaves some room for debate and this formulation could be made more clear in the future.

20:02:38 From S. Y. to Everyone:

(Concerning Beschlüsse)

20:03:03 From S. K. to Everyone:

Thanks, @Séveric!

20:06:00 From J. M. to Everyone:

Since the sheer number of questions and comments in this chat cannot possibly be fully discussed in the remaining time, would you kindly ascertain that they be documented (verbatim and in full) in this meeting's minutes? Thank you.

20:06:19 From J. M. to Everyone:

Also, could you explain – in short and at an appropriate time – why the bylaws have to be amended specifically in § 8 „Dem Vorstand obliegt insbesondere [... der] Erlass der Reglemente der avuba“ in conjunction with § 9 „Die weiteren Aufgaben des Co-Präsidiiums können in einem Reglement durch den Vorstand geregelt werden“? These two additions seem to allow for the Vorstand to authorize the Co-Präsidium quite extensively without any need to consult the members of avuba?

20:10:18 From M. H. to Everyone:

This is not a discussion. This is a Q&A.

20:11:11 From M. B.M. B. to Everyone:

More like a lecture

20:11:45 From M. L. to Everyone:

There are a lot of people want to speak. I think there has to be another way that people can express themselves. This kind of discussion is not approved.

20:11:46 From Y. W. to Everyone:

I strongly urge camila de plaza laifer to consider J. M.s contribution and end the lecture

20:11:49 From S. S. to Everyone:

I agree and would like to suggest that we switch from answering "Questions" to the promised discussion

20:13:54 From A. P. to Everyone:

I also agree with Jan's proposal

20:14:03 From V. S. to Everyone:

Me, too

20:14:03 From J. S. to Everyone:

agreed

20:14:06 From R. B. to Everyone:

Concur.

20:14:52 From J. S. to Everyone:

jan?

20:15:21 From S. Y. to Everyone:

Maybe stop sharing your screen Tizian please

20:16:17 From M. I. to Everyone:

I also agree with Jan's suggestion

20:16:28 From Y. W. to Everyone:

agree

20:16:51 From M. F. to Everyone:

concur

20:17:44 From C. P. to Everyone:

Hi Jan - yes we will document these in the minutes

20:18:24 From Y. W. to Everyone:

frankly this is outrageous, those are structural problems, stop individualizing them

20:18:50 From A. V. to Everyone:

Some research is mentioned here: <https://bajour.ch/a/GR4ck8vFsm21zpUL/basler-forscherinnen-am-anschlag>

20:19:00 From U. U. to Everyone:

Yes, but you need an empirical basis @Yan

20:19:49 From U. U. to Everyone:

This research is in part based on the data Aruba collected

20:20:00 From U. U. to Everyone:

avuba

20:21:42 From Y. W. to Everyone:

how would options on permanent positions hurt mobility?

20:23:58 From H. T. to Everyone:

I need to leave - bye.

20:24:12 From Y. W. to Everyone:

this is just bluntly false, the petition doesn't have definitive demands

20:24:37 From Y. W. to Everyone:

it is an attempt to network mid-level staff and bargain for better working conditions

20:24:40 From M. I. to Everyone:

Could you please write where exactly it is written in the petition that permanent position are to be financed by project financing?

20:25:42 From Y. W. to Everyone:

this was contradictory, does the petition now have no clue how to finance it or with project funding?

20:26:19 From A. T. to Everyone:

The division between docs and postdocs seems a bit artificial to me. Current docs will benefit once they are postdocs from these positions. They would give them a perspective, which is important also for equality and diversity issues, as mentioned by Aline

20:27:22 From J. S. to Everyone:

how can you be interested in increasing "family friendliness" and hold a meeting like this from 6-8.30?

20:31:23 From T. M. to Everyone:

at least one "avuba town hall" every term?

20:31:55 From T. M. to Everyone:

I used to come to those lunch meetings, they were great But so few people, I agree.

20:32:13 From K. G. to Everyone:
Dito - same experience

20:32:55 From B. A. to Everyone:
I have to leave unfortunately. Happy to respond to any questions in chat via mail later..

20:33:07 From A. T. to Everyone:
It is because of this diverse group with little participation that I find the participation in the poll on the petition exceptionally high. Therefore it seems a sign of little respect to those members who voted in favor of signing to disqualify the results.

20:33:26 From J. M. to Everyone:
openly discussing controversial topics or taking an unpopular stance might engender more engagement of the members – as manifest in this meeting?

20:36:25 From Y. W. to Everyone:
7% of all members is still twenty times as much people as have been involved in avubas decision in the past years

20:38:57 From S. S. to Everyone:
agree with max

20:39:44 From Y. W. to Everyone:
it's a matter of disregarding a poll, not of your convincing

20:40:30 From M. I. to Everyone:
Completely agree with Max!

20:41:09 From E. N. to Everyone:
Agree too with Max

20:41:13 From M. F. to Everyone:
same

20:41:14 From Y. W. to Everyone:
thanks for the statement

20:41:28 From C. P. to Everyone:
Thank you very much Max!!!!

20:41:39 From Y. W. to Everyone:
how many people have participated in the last meetings?

20:41:47 From Y. W. to Everyone:
more than 60?

20:42:29 From P. B. to Everyone:
Yes!!

20:43:08 From V. Z. to Everyone:
I agree with Christina, thank you

20:43:16 From V. S. to Everyone:
But that's what many people did

20:43:23 From M. H. to Everyone:
but we are here now. we are the ones taking part

20:43:31 From V. S. to Everyone:
(Emailing to Patricia)

20:45:37 From M. G. to Everyone:
Unfortunately, I have to leave now. Thank you and have a nice evening.

20:48:46 From M. L. to Everyone:
voting is not surveying

20:48:58 From J. K. to Everyone:
But by not signing, you have made a conclusion

20:50:57 From A. S. to Everyone:
In municipal assembly are only 4% of the voters present, but their vote is valid.

20:50:58 From L. N. to Everyone:
I agree that a better communication between members and the Avuba representatives is at the core. And of course, this is in the responsibility of both the members and the Avuba. An important question to discuss now is how to rebuild trust between the members and the organization.
In your statement about non-signing the petition, I gained the feeling that you constantly prioritize the Avuba statutes in your argumentation while lessening the power of the members to decide on how they would like to be represented. It is the members who can decide and vote on changing the statutes. How can we start a productive conversation?

20:52:37 From S. S. to Everyone:
Maybe that's because the Option "Enthaltung" is missing

20:53:10 From P. B. to Everyone:
Sorry - I can't vote .. probably my update did not work ..

20:54:04 From C. P. to Everyone:
To all those who want to vote but cannot, you can write Patricia or me with your votes

20:54:24 From P. B. to Everyone:
Thanks.

21:01:58 From T. M. to Everyone:
One note about the ending of the discussion: The issue is certainly not about randomised samples. The issue is that you didn't ask the members initially. You first decided on your own, and then – pressured – you made a feeble attempt at getting everyone's opinion. You interpreted this like a referee who uses VAR: We need irrefutable evidence in order to overturn the decision already made. The question is whether the avuba board should act like a football referee, or whether a better, more democratic way of deciding on key issues should be found in the first place. I agree with what Severic said, you created a situation where it was difficult to overturn the decision on the petition already made. The solution is not some statistical trick, but simply to not create that situation. I thought we had agreed to that or come to that consensus,

but I found the return to that argumentation (that this is a problem of statistics) as the last point made in the discussion quite concerning.

21:02:59 From V. Z. to Everyone:
Thank you Patricia for all your engagement over the years

21:08:14 From A. T. to Everyone:
Yes, thank you very much Patricia!

21:12:16 From K. E. to Everyone:
The increase of the fee is something we should have probably better discussed before.

21:19:50 From A. T. to Everyone:
I agree with Jan

21:20:02 From E. R. to Everyone:
Me too

21:21:07 From V. S. to Everyone:
I agree, too

21:21:14 From A. H. to Everyone:
me too

21:21:26 From A. P. to Everyone:
I agree with Jan too

21:21:33 From Y. W. to Everyone:
i agree

21:21:41 From E. N. to Everyone:
Me too

21:24:02 From S. K. to Everyone:
I think also we should create a way for members to make motions for ammendments to the statutes before the next general assembly, which then in turn can be voted on.

21:24:45 From S. Y. to Everyone:
I agree

21:25:13 From C. P. to Everyone:
33 votes for yes for the ammendments, 5 for no. 48 voting members

21:25:25 From S. Y. to Everyone:
But maybe this is solved by a simple call 60 days before the GA ?

21:25:44 From P. B. to Everyone:
+my vote because I vote via e-mail

21:25:45 From E. N. to Everyone:
Good idea

21:25:54 From S. K. to Everyone:

Something like that, and then proposals for ammendments can be made public along with the agenda

21:27:57 From S. Y. to Everyone:
I confirm that I've had this discussion with Thomas.

21:29:36 From D. K. to Everyone:
Thank you Thomas!

21:29:40 From V. S. to Everyone:
Thank you, Thomas, for your engagement!

21:30:14 From S. Y. to Everyone:
Thank you Thomas, we start Tomorrow 8:00. ;)

21:31:51 From E. N. to Everyone:
Do you support the petition academia?

21:34:05 From P. B. to Everyone:
Ich muss leider gehen. Bis bald und danke für die Organisation!

21:36:18 From A. S. to Everyone:
For a next time, would it be possible to send infos about the candidates in beforehand?

21:42:05 From S. Y. to Everyone:
Congrats to both of you

21:42:18 From Y. W. to Everyone:
congratulations

21:42:41 From A. D. to Everyone:
Congrats!

21:42:44 From E. N. to Everyone:
Congratulations!

21:42:55 From T. M. to Everyone:
Congrats to both of you!

21:43:08 From M. L. to Everyone:
congratulations and thank you!

21:43:11 From E. S. to Everyone:
congrats and thank you for future efforts :)

21:43:43 From J. M. to Everyone:
congratulations, and thanks for your service.

21:45:15 From J. S. to Everyone:
i need to leave, thanks everyone

21:45:30 From K. G. to Everyone:
I did that before and offer it again

21:45:35 From Y. W. to Everyone:
there are three hands

21:45:51 From V. V. to Everyone:
I need to leave too, thanks

21:45:58 From A. S. to Everyone:
I don't need, but I would

21:49:58 From A. T. to Everyone:
Thank you!

21:50:06 From S. K. to Everyone:
Thank you!

21:50:14 From A. D. to Everyone:
Thank you all three!

21:50:19 From E. M. to Everyone:
Thank you!

21:50:21 From V. S. to Everyone:
Thank you!

21:50:21 From E. S. to Everyone:
thank you!

21:50:26 From S. Y. to Everyone:
Thank you !

21:50:29 From E. N. to Everyone:
Thank you

21:50:30 From V. Z. to Everyone:
thank you

21:50:44 From L. N. to Everyone:
Thank you to all of you as well and the work you are doing.

21:51:35 From M. F. to Everyone:
Same here, gotta go as well

21:52:03 From M. B.M. B. to Everyone:
Thank you very much to everyone involved tonight! It was tough but fruitful. I guess.

21:52:29 From S. S. to Everyone:
thank you for your Engagement, Patrizia!

21:52:47 From A. T. to Everyone:
Thank you again very much Patricia, yes!

21:53:06 From V. S. to Everyone:

Thanks for your work, Patricia!

21:53:12 From N. S. to Everyone:
thank you Patricia

21:53:14 From E. R. to Everyone:
Thank you Patricia!

21:53:21 From U. U. to Everyone:
Thank you Patricia

21:53:22 From C. L. to Everyone:
Thank you Patricia!!!!

21:53:26 From D. K. to Everyone:
Thank you Patricia!

21:53:32 From A. D. to Everyone:
Thanks a lot Patricia!

21:53:41 From S. S. to Everyone:
good night everybody

21:53:41 From J. M. to Everyone:
thanks Patricia!

21:53:43 From A. S. to Everyone:
Thank you everyone

21:53:43 From C. L. to Everyone:
Thanks to all

21:53:45 From M. L. to Everyone:

Hi, thanks for all the work over the last year. Just to clarify again, in case it sounded otherwise, it was not my goal to create sentiment against Avuba or the Board. My point was to emphasize that good decision and development comes from broad controversial discussion. My expectation is that the general meeting could be the place for such discussions, especially when so many show up because they want a different representation of interests. And also that these concerns are taken seriously. But thank you as well for all the important work is done in a lot of extra hours.