

EFPSA
General Assembly
Part I | Minutes

Joint Executive Board & Member
Representatives Meeting, 2015
Sibiu, Romania

7th December 2015



efpsa

European Federation of
Psychology Students' Associations

General Assembly Session I Joint EB&MR Meeting 27th October 2015 Sibiu, Romania

Member Representatives and Delegates present: Austria, Azerbaijan, Leuven Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and Turkey.









Observer Representative present: Bosnia & Herzegovina

Executive Board teams present: Social Impact, EFPSA Office, Study & Travel Abroad team, Training Office, Finance Office, Marketing Office, Conference 2015 org com and Congress 2016 org com.

Board of Management present: Ana Odabašić (President), Jayne Hamilton (Vice President), Clara Chetcuti (Secretary General), Timo Rautavaara (Finance Officer), Blaž Podobnik (Marketing Officer), Ioanna Florou (Member Representatives Officer) and Benedikt Ričný (Events Officer).

Minutes by: Clara Chetcuti (CC) (Secretary General)

Topics/agenda:

-  **0. Introduction – Quorum & Voting**
-  **1. Approval of the External Training Officer**
-  **2. Approval of the Joint EB&MR Meeting Senior Coordinator change**
-  **3. Approval of the introduction of the EB position – Content Review Responsible**
-  **4. Approval of the change of ERO BM responsible**
-  **5. Approval of Calling the Internship Task Force**
-  **6. Approval of Restructuring the Finance Office – Senior Positions**
-  **7. Approval of Restructuring the Junior Researcher Programme**

Topic	Things discussed	Decision
0. Introduction; Ana Odabašić (AO) & Jayne Hamilton	- AO: Welcome to the General Assembly (GA) First Session at the Joint EB&MR Meeting, which is being led by myself, and Jayne.	

<p>(JH)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO presented the Agenda for the GA. - AO: the Agenda has been slightly changed and proposal 1.5 has been moved to the second GA since we will be having a presentation about this Task Force tomorrow. Then the MRs will have more information before they vote. - AO: Are there any objections to this? - No objections. - AO explained what the General Assembly is. - JH presented the Voting Rules. - IF: all countries are National so you will all have two votes, except Belgium which is local and will have one vote. - AO: Katja Decremer (Belgium) (KD) will be the adjudicator for the General Assembly to ensure that everything goes according to the Statutes and Domestic Regulations. We chose Katja because she was the Observer Coordinator last year and has worked with the MRs, and is also very familiar with the rules of the GA. Can I ask you to confirm quorum? - KD: We have Quorum. - CC: Before we start I would like to remind you all to state your name and country for the minutes before asking questions. Thank you. - AO: The Board of Management is one Executive Board team and all the proposals we give are as a whole team, according to the Statues and Domestic Regulations; however, the BM responsible will present that proposal individually, as it makes most sense. - AO: Any requests for anonymous voting? - Anonymous voting will take place. 	<p>Quorum has been met.</p> <p>Anonymous voting will take place.</p>
-------------	--	--

<p>1. Approval of the External Training Officer</p> <p>Jayne Hamilton (JH)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO introduced the proposal & JH. - JH: back in Czech Republic we approved the External Training Officer (ETO) to be Ieva Vainoritė (Lithuania) but due to unforeseen circumstances and personal choices she has stepped down from her position. We opened the call for applications to the Training Office for the position of ETO and we chose Monika Kolarova (Czech Republic) because she was a member of the TAT, she is active in the Training Community and understands what exactly happens there. She's been part of YTA, which is the equivalent of our TtT, but it is an external event and she has contacts with these individual in other organisations. - AO: Questions? Objections? Please write your decision. - None 	<p>45 In Favour 0 Against 0 Abstaining</p> <p>The proposal passes.</p>
<p>2. Approval of the Joint EB&MR Meeting Senior Coordinator Change</p> <p>Benedikt Ričný (BR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO introduced the proposal & BR. - BR: we are all at the Joint EB&MR Meeting right now and we propose to officially change the Senior Coordinator from Andra Valasutean who was approved at the e-Voting in June but due to unforeseen circumstances she had to step down and Mihaela Selescu (Romania), who was part of the team from the beginning, stepped in and we would like to appoint her formally. The reasons for choosing her were that she was part of the team from the very beginning, we had a meeting with the President of Cognosis and talked about it and came to a conclusion. She has experience in other events and she was part of the Org.Com in Romania, 2014 at the Congress. We would like to ensure a smooth conclusion of this whole event and all that is needed for it by approving her as the Senior Coordinator of the Joint Executive Board and Member Representatives Meeting 2015. - AO: Questions, Objections? - None. - 	<p>45 In Favour 0 Against 0 Abstaining</p> <p>The proposal</p>

		passes.
<p>3. Approval of the Introduction of the EB position – Content Review Responsible</p> <p>Clara Chetcuti (CC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO: Introduced the proposal & CC. - CC: we are proposing to add the position of Content Review Responsible to the Executive Board. This person will be in the EFPSA Office. At the moment, Jayne and I are the native speakers in the BM and have a lot of reading and proofreading to do – but we cannot guarantee each year that there will be a native speaker within the Board of Management or Executive Board. With the introduction of this position we would ensure that we have someone in the Executive Board every year who is a native or proficient speaker, who can proofread and check material before it is distributed externally. If accepted, we will make a role description, open a call and have this person voted upon in e-Voting in December. - Gabija Kisieliūtė (Lithuania): Does this include promotional material in EFPSA too? - CC: It means everything that is going out externally being proofread and checked, so the BM is still approving all the documentation afterwards. - AO: We mean the official materials etc. not emails, but everything we send externally, so we can be as professional as possible. - Parla Buyruk (Turkey): So if we approve, then you write a role description and send it to us to approve? - CC: When we write a role description we will send it to the MRs for feedback, and then we will open the call and nominate someone and this person will be voted upon during the e-Voting in December. If approved this person will hold the position for the remainder of the mandate. - AO: We'll send the Role Description as soon as possible for feedback, but it will not be voted upon, so we can have this person in position as soon as possible. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jolien Vandeneynde (Leuven, Belgium): is it necessary or preferable to be a native speaker? - CC: We're looking a native or proficient speaker. - AO: Any questions, objections? - None 	<p>44 In Favour 1 Against 0 Abstaining</p> <p>The proposal passes.</p>
<p>4. Approval of the change of ERO BM responsible</p> <p>Ana Odabašić (AO) & Clara Chetcuti (CC)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO: Introduced the proposal and herself and CC as the BM responsables. - AO: Currently the ERO falls under EFPSA Office but has 2 BM responsables – the President and Secretary General and we are proposing to change this to just one person. - CC: At the moment, Alex who is our External Relations Officer reports to 2 people, but we thought it would be better if he reported to just one. It makes sense for this person to be the President because they are also responsible for external collaboration as stated in the Role Description Document. - AO: Any questions, objections? - None 	<p>41 In Favour 2 Against 2 Abstaining</p> <p>The proposal passes.</p>
<p>5. Approval of Calling the Internship Task Force</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moved to the second session of the General Assembly. 	
<p>6. Approval of Restructuring the Finance Office</p> <p>Timo Rautavaara (TR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO: introduced the proposal and TR. - TR: we propose to change the position of Partnership Coordinator, Grants Coordinators and Accounts Administrator to Seniors because it makes more sense according to the roles which are in practice right now. In this way we will be making these more consistent 	

	<p>because each role includes the responsibilities. They have their subareas of their own in the Finance Office while the Finance Officer is overseeing the whole working compilation in the Finance Office. Any questions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None - Martin Helik (Slovakia): Before you put your vote make sure you vote for proposal 1.6 and not 1.5. 	<p>43 In Favour 0 Against 2 Abstaining</p> <p>The proposal passes.</p>
<p>7. Approval of Restructuring the JRP</p> <p>Jayne Hamilton (JH)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AO: introduced the proposal and JH. - JH: this proposal is to ask for permission to restructure the EFPSA Junior Researcher Programme (JRP). The reason for it is what we sent you in the email, that is, Kai, the Director, has left their position because in their own words they wanted to “end the partnership between EFPSA and JRP” and this is, simply put, physically not possible because there was never a partnership because JRP has always been a service of EFPSA. - JH: What we’re asking for is permission to look into the programme and see what is going on, the issues, obviously there was something that wasn’t working, and we’re asking for permission to do this and keep you updated on that and when we have a decision of what we think JRP should look like, we will bring it back to you and seek your approval of that. We’re saying give us permission to look into it. - Hannes Jarke (HJ) (Austria): I would like to ask you some questions, if it’s okay, about the whole situation to make it clear. What I would like to know, what events and in general, how did it come to the JRP leaving EFPSA? 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JH: just to clarify the JRP has not left EFPSA. - HJ: but the whole branch, the whole team left. - JH: The Research Officer has also left their position and this has only been confirmed last night at 19:05 (CET +1). The new team were due to start their mandate but we never received application forms because the JRP team never sent the application forms. As standard procedure, I asked for applications to be sent through applications@efpsa.org but they didn't do that when I asked for the applications and their choices they ignored that so at the minute there is no JRP team because the RO has left their position and Kai left. - HJ: What factors led to Kai and Irena leaving? - JH: Irena I don't really know. Kai as far as I know, a misunderstanding. We have documentation saying that the JRP is and always has been a service of EFPSA. Kai disagreed. - HJ: all the factors that led to Kai and his team and the JRP leaving is that you disagreed upon being partners? - JH: JRP has not left EFPSA, from the beginning of the mandate I tried to have communication but he didn't receive that too well. At the beginning I emailed all the services as the BM Responsible and I asked what sort of communication - how frequent, how frequent they would like Skype Meetings - they wanted. All the other teams responded. I eventually had a meeting with Kai at the end of June and spoke about upcoming plans about the summer and that was fine but when I asked about the future he said that we would talk mid-September because that was when he 	
--	---	--

	<p>had news.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HJ: I also know that you had a meeting with JRP teams? - JH: Benedikt, Ana and I had the EBMR Reports with the JRP and that meeting took place two weeks after, later than the rest of the reports. - HJ: what were the outcomes? I heard that the JRP team wasn't very pleased with it? - JH: they were content with how the mandate had gone, it was a very nice and honest meeting. They weren't entirely happy, it's difficult for them because of the different mandate and this causes difficulty for them and they mentioned the complication and confusion and miscommunication that that causes but in my opinion it was a nice productive and insightful meeting. - HJ: So you didn't expect something like this and you didn't fear anything problematic? - JH: We knew that the JRP team weren't the happiest but we thought it was something that, when we met with Kai, would be able to be resolved but as Kai shut communication down we never had opportunity to do this. - HJ: Do you think that it could have been the communication between you and the team? I am not blaming you just the communication could have been more effective. - JH: I don't believe so at all. Any communication I made they didn't always reply, but when they did the only thing I had was Kai telling me to stop emailing 	
--	--	--

	<p>him because “I was wasting both my time and his”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- HJ: Kai asked for Grant Applications right?- JH: No he didn't.- HJ: are you sure?- JH: 100%- HJ: Because that's what he told me.- JH: Never.- HJ: About the emails you wrote to supervisors and former sponsors and sponsors, do you think it is really wise and what context does it serve if you drag other people in this situation?- JH: We sent emails out to the working community, alumni, and posted the public statement on Facebook & Podio, we wrote to the JRP current supervisors and asked to forward the email to teams because we didn't have access to emails. We emailed the sponsors that were on JRP website. We don't want somebody who has left EFPSA to talk in EFPSAs name.- HJ: How did you acquire these?- JH: They were on the EFPSA Website.- HJ: Richard Griffith also received an email.- AO: he is a lecturer from Florida who was at the ESS last year and the Institute of Technology in Florida was on the list of partners, we contacted the person who was listed as partners I honestly did know that was him.	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HJ: You basically gave the JRP cohort the choice to stick with EFPSA or follow Kai's. What would happen with these students presenting at the Congress? - JH: If they decide to follow Kai's, that is something we have to make an agreement with EFPSA about since the current agreement is between EFPSA JRP and the EFPSA Congress. If Kai's other programme want to present their work that is something that would have to be a new agreement. - AO: that is not a practice, so of course, if the people decided not to continue with EFPSA JRP but go for the other they can still apply as participants and present their research independently and they would never be discriminated against. We just want to provide opportunities, but there is no agreement about the specific session between that JRP and the EFPSA Congress. - HJ: I think I'm coming to the last question ... in the email you said "we would like to reassure you that the EFPSA JRP is currently under-review ..." you can't guarantee any of that apart from JEPS you can guarantee supervision because they're not involved in the programme? - JH: If you continue reading it says that I will be standing in as the Research Officer on a temporary basis as the BM responsible and as a final year PhD student. - HJ: So you think you can replace the Research Officer? - JH: No not at all but on a temporary basis yes. 	
--	---	--

- HJ: that's all my questions.
- Monika Schwarz (Austria): under what intention did you write to the sponsors?
- JH: To simply clarify, as previously it was Kai presenting himself to the sponsors, as EFPSA JRP and now he will write to them as JRP.
- Monika Schwarz (Austria) Have you received any reply?
- JH: from the sponsors no, no.
- Jolien Vandeneynde (Leuven, Belgium): I had a Belgian girl coming to me saying she was in the JRP and she asked for my help to find sponsors but I'm not sure how to help since I'm not sure if she's a part of the EFPSA JRP. She's one of the research teams and she is looking for sponsors for travel costs and she asked me, as the MR, but I don't know if her team is EFPSA JRP or JRP I don't know if I should help her as EFPSA ...
- JH: you can give her our contact details.
- AO: I think it's up to you as a person regardless if you are an MR or not, but we cannot say until we get the information from the supervisors. Your decision is up to you.
- Marc Portugal (Portugal): before we got the email, about two weeks before, Kai contacted me to ask for the contact email for the Head of the next Congress.
- JH: If he emails you that is completely fine and it is up to you and you ask your BM responsible as standard

	<p>to see if it's an agreement that you can come to or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marc Portugal (Portugal): I have been contacted by Tiago. - AO: If he is contacting as EFPSA JRP that is something that the BM responsible should be involved in. If you still have on-going communication just make sure that the org com knows that he is not speaking in the name of EFPSA JRP and if he wants his own session then that should be documented and signed by people responsible. - Parla Buyruk (Turkey): so you said you gave participants the option to be part of the EFPSA JRP is this the same option for the supervisors? - JH: We couldn't contact the participants directly (no details) so we asked both supervisors and their team if they wanted to remain part of the EFPSA JRP – the initial team they signed up to. - AO: it doesn't make sense that individuals decide because it's a group project. It has to be a whole team it's just how the whole team is structured and I think it's a good decision to make as a whole team. - Gabija Kisieliūtė (Lithuania): I wanted to be sure, for what are we voting exactly because you said for investigating the thing, but what are you planning to do? Create a Task Force? - JH: There are some really core things missing, for example the core description of the Director. We need to see what other information we are missing to see the programme in its entirety because there wasn't always that clear communication and we want to see what changes we can make. 	
--	--	--

- Monika Schwarz (Austria): do you have intentions to contact Kai again on what went wrong, there are two sides and there's lots of confusion with people seeing the statement but none on JRP or from Kai.
- JH: Based on the final emails, we don't have any intentions.
- AO: we want to make sure that people know our side of the story and we encourage Kai to state his own opinion. We are not looking into personal closure; we just wanted everyone to know our stance. If he is open for communication and personally, this is just my personal opinion, I don't see a reason for contacting him in order to clarify it, we encourage him to state his point of view but I don't see why we should be seeking communication.
- JH: that's exactly what I've been trying to do since the beginning of the mandate.
- Monika Schwarz (Austria): but there are clearly some things, which need to be clarified such as the Facebook page on the professional level.
- JH: we have already contacted Kai. There's the JRP Facebook page and we contacted Kai as he's admin of it and the ESS group and we asked for access to both in the direct response to the email about ending the partnership. He said no to giving us access and we would be able to enter a discussion if we take our statement down. We believe in our statement as a whole BM and that's something we believe and that we don't want to retract. We then went to Facebook to get the page back.
- Monika Schwarz (Austria): why does he want you to

	<p>take the statement down?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JH: we don't know. - Artemis Stefani (Cyprus): you said you don't know the role description for the supervisor? - JH: no, there's no role description for the Director. The Director position is not an EB position - it's an advisory considering that the Director wasn't a student and it's against the statutes. - Artemis Stefani (Cyprus): didn't we have ownership? - JH: the problem is that Facebook pages are connected to an account and there were no BM people on that page and despite asking for it, it was refused. - Monika Schwarz (Austria): if we vote in favour how would you ensure the communication with us and what would be the next step for us, could you just quickly outline? - JH: We would look into all the information and data that we have and then come up with a structure of the programme and how we think it should be from now on to prevent further problems like this. Then we would send you that structure for approval at the e-Voting and join your MR meeting to discuss with you more and ask for feedback. - BR: it wouldn't be just the BM coming up as the structure. We will consult it with other people who have more experience with the JRP such as alumni who were there since the beginning. - AO: Any more questions? Objections? Please vote and once you're ready raise your hands please. 	<p>35 In Favour 3 Against 7 Abstaining</p> <p>The proposal</p>
--	---	--

	- None.	passes.
--	---------	---------