

March 15th, 2020



This meeting was held in Swedish. The protocol, however, is written originally in English.

Protocol for the Board Meeting of the Uppsala Association of Foreign Affairs 2020-03-15

1. Opening of the meeting

Present: Johan Bergman, Per Risberg, Miriam Lind, Rebecka Bjuremalm, Alicia Nathanson Thulin, Rebecca Rieschel (from point no. 10) Isak Lefvert, Elliott Syrén, Melker Hörner (*all present at Uffice*).

Karin Kristensson, Ebba Berg Gorgén, Sofia Hjerpe, Clara Alm (*present via video link*).

Absent: Rebecca Bengtsson, Embla Holmgren, Gizem Tütüncü, Sara Ölander, Joakim Ydebäck.

Authorised signatories: Johan Bergman, Embla Holmgren, Clara Alm.

The meeting starts at 15:34.

2. Election of meeting secretary (1) and adjusters (2)

Lefvert gets elected as meeting secretary. Bjuremalm och Nathanson Thulin get elected as adjusters.

3. Verifying the validity of the meeting announcement

The board decides to verify the validity of the meeting announcement at 15:38.

4. Follow-up of last meeting's protocol

Bergman refers to specific topics below. No one has anything specific to follow up here.

5. Approving the agenda after addition of miscellaneous matters

Syrén suggests that discussion point no. 20 be merged into discussion point no. 12. Bergman suggests the adding of a co-opting point. Risberg suggests the addition of a discussion point about the Chile night. The updated agenda is approved.

6. Co-option

Daniel Rezanian is co-opted to the meeting.

7. Reports from the board-members

President and Vice-President:

Bergman is the one present at the meeting. He recounts that he has been working a lot with the previously revised budget and that he is starting to draw conclusions for next operational year. Bergman also speaks about the upcoming annual election meeting and mentions that he will forward more information from the election committee later during the meeting. Finally, he says that he is open if any board members have any queries concerning the application process or any specific applications.

Treasurer:

Alm reveals that she has ensured that, after a meeting with one of the association's auditors, all revision is up-to-date and adequate. She also mentions that she is working with bookkeeping to write reports for the FBA and MUCF grants. Finally, Alm says that she wants to stress that all expenditure on UF's behalf should, in order to be booked correctly, be reported on a receipt separate from private expenditure. She mentions that she has allowed this exception-wise before, but will do so no longer.

Member-Secretary:

Ölander is not present at the meeting. Bergman forwards a message from her anyway: The total number of members is now 1.066. Bergman furthermore forwards from Ölander that the share of members with an age below 26 is approximately 74 %.

Activity Coordinators:

Risberg presents that the Chile night will go through as planned. So will the gasque, he tells that the plan is. Risberg also mentions that he and Lind have got an assurance from ÖG that they neither plan to cancel the gasque, even if some people cancel. However, he says, they will give no refunds after Tuesday 17/3.

Nathanson Thulin asks whether UF or ÖG will cover the cost of probable cancellation.

Lind responds that it is unclear as of yet. Most likely, she says, ÖG will cover the costs.

Head of the Debate-Club:

Hjerpe tells that the debate club has arranged five meetings in total with around 10-15 people per meeting. Meetings next week, she explains, are cancelled, mainly since sick

people turned up last meeting and attendance on her course is now not mandatory. She discusses with her group on whether it is possible to hold debate meetings over Skype.

Head of Career:

Tütüncü is not present. Rezanía is present in her stead. He explains that Career day is postponed. The Academy has cancelled two events and will organize cover-up events.

Head of Lectures:

Syrén discusses how good prospects for the spring turned into a corona crisis for the lectures. He says that they have been in regular contact with the university for security advice through several channels. The Corona Panel is the best event of the year on Facebook, Syrén adds.

Lefvert explains how they still as of now are set on carrying through with the events. They will take some precautions but, Lefvert tells, have opted to solely follow the recommendations of relevant authorities.

Head of PR:

Bjuremalm explains how the songbook is done and that delivery will be due in one week. The communication course they both attended, she says, was really useful. Bjuremalm tells how 2 out of 3 trustees have quit and the third one will possibly be recalled to her home country. Overall, Bjuremalm describes, they are proud of the work the last month, but it is a shame that it is not possible to make better use of the group.

Nathanson Thulin agrees on that the course provided important info on how to communicate more concretely, e.g. though Facebook.

Editors-in-Chief:

Kristensson explains that the Work issue is now sent to the printer. The planning for the new edition is already ongoing, she tells. Kristensson adds that no measures because of the pandemic have been taken by the editorial board as of yet.

Head of Travel:

Berg Gorgén describes that the travel destination is now chosen, with 45 applications for the Rwanda journey. The work with the new trustee is going well, she states. Due to the new advice from the foreign department, Berg Gorgén says the decision to book the journey is on hold. They are into possibilities for other activities in case that travel is impossible, she mentions.

Radio Coordinator:

Hörner describes that the broadcast next week will be for the fourth week in row, which he is happy about. He mentions that the group has around 11 active members, who are now being tutored. There is an issue, he explains, with many exchange students who might have to leave.

8. Economic Outlook

Alm starts with describing that there is probably 80 000 kr in the project financing budget. They are, she says, accounted for and will be included in the budget. Furthermore, she mentions, application to the project financing is up now.

Alm describes that there is still 10 000 kr still in the “association development” (“föreningsutveckling”) budget post to spend.

The Forum Syd grant amounts to 55 000 kr, 7000 kr more than budgeted for, Alm recounts. Uttryck, she says, will be allocated some specifically, as will lectures/activity, and PR and other organization expenditures will share the rest. Alm tells that the MUCF 17 000 kr more has no specified allocation tied to them. Alm suggests that this money may be used for fika and the spring special event. She encourages all groups to spend up to their budget ceilings.

Lind asks what will happen if the pandemic prevents the money to be spend on events.

Alm explains that some of the grants will remain as surplus to next semester, probably will Forum Syd and the others be understanding if we still use the money for the same purpose later, as long as the surplus is not very large.

Kristensson asks what will be the consequences of a surplus in printing and postage cost, if these can be allocated to a different budget post.

Alm responds that these money can be used to cover up for other deficits.

Nathanson Thulin asks if we have received any application for project financing.

Alm responds that that is not the case, why there might be a need for marketing these

money in a more effective way.

Rezania asks what would happen with the budgeted money for Career Day.

Alm responds that the organization will probably be able to ensure that these money can be used for the postponed Career Day.

9. Vision Committees

Digitalisation:

Alm tells that despite no more meetings, the group has continued to look over the cost of Uttryck. Hörner suggests that it is relevant to formulate a plan for digital meetings. Bergman approves.

Member Appreciation:

Through Bergman, Ölander lets the board know that the committee plans to organize a pub crawl. Risberg develops that it will include a quiz on foreign policy. Bergman recounts from a message from Ölander that the planned date is the 7th of April. Hörner tells that the committee has also planned a pizza night after lectures.

Rezania brings up a disconcert amongst the Career group members about not feeling part of UF and asks for solutions to the problems. Lind suggests that they be encouraged to join parties and cross-group projects to get to know more UF members. Lind mentions that as head of a group, one might have the possibility to integrate the group members in the rest of UF. Bjuremalm emphasizes that the possibilities with more social events are much bigger now as we have more money to work with. Bergman agrees with what Lind said and that the social events, specifically those including food, are very effective in integrating the association.

Alm stresses that it is important to check with her previous to making any purchases for spontaneous social events. Bergman asks if the board now should allocate money specifically beforehand to assure that there is money available. Alm approves. Bergman suggests that the member appreciation committee should draft a motion. The board approves.

Diversification:

The diversification committee has had a meeting but no of the participants is present at the board meeting.

10. UF Operations during Covid-19 outbreak

Bergman starts by saying that the board must make a decision on how to proceed with different activities, to from there take specific decisions in different groups.

Bergman suggests that UF follow the recommendations from the university, despite department-specific decisions. Risberg agrees, since UF is working at the university. Hörner emphasizes that it is always best that members can make their own decisions on whether to attend events, rather than that the association take too precautionary measures. Nathanson Thulin suggests that we offer back-ups to live events, such as live-streaming on Facebook. Bergman says that our microphone can be used for that. Syrén mentions that it might be possible to take help from the University to live-stream the very anticipated corona panel on Thursday the 19th.

Hjerpe emphasizes that there needs to be space for personal decisions concerning holding meetings, despite if the main policy suggested above be implemented. Bergman asks if she might be able to find a replacement for holding debate meetings. Hjerpe says that she will look into that. Syrén supports Hjerpe and ties back to the point that Hörner made about that social interactions must be a personal decision.

Berg Gorgén asks if the new guidelines from the foreign department should be a sufficient reason to cancel travel immediately. Lind points out that many applicants were intent on going this semester, so that they might even not be able to go another semester, should the travel be postponed. Rezanja asks about the contact with the Rwandan embassy. Berg Gorgén replies that she did not hear back from them. Syrén points out that the return journey either way must be taken into account when deciding whether to go.

Lefvert asks for a clarification if we should follow strictly the recommendations of the university or take into account the decisions of individual university departments with lower dignity. Syrén mentions that it might look bad if our members see that Ekonomikum courses cancel their lectures but we do not. Hörner replies that he does not think that people will make the connection between NEK's decisions for instance, since that was founded on infected students, rather than the virus being present at Ekonomikum. Lind suggests that it can be clarified that we follow the guidelines of the 'University Administration.' Bergman seconds, and suggests that this be the policy of UF.

Risberg emphasizes that we can make a new decision if many university departments go

in a different direction. Lefvert says that it must be decided whether the decision of specific departments should be relevant to UF's, and that he does not think so. Nathanson Thulin counter-argues that it will either way be perceived as odd if the University main administration's decision will be at odds with the decision of the rest of its departments.

Rebecca Riechel joins the meeting.

Nathanson Thulin points out that the communication which was published in the week lacked a proper board decision backing, and highlights that this put into question the decision-making procedure in the board. Bergman suggests that the changing of the decision below be made through a per capsulam-decision, which then will be pending for 72 hours. Lefvert argues that there needs to be a mandate to make changes with a shorter notice than that, since lectures and such might be needed to be shut down on close notice.

The three subsequent proposals for UF's policy toward the covid-19 pandemic is put forward:

1. Follow only the recommendations of Folkhälsomyndigheten or the University administration.
2. Take said recommendations into account, but also follow the departments which are active at Ekonomikum.
3. Take all recommendations into account and make a free decision.

The board decides to make their decisions based only on the recommendations of the University Administration and Folkhälsomyndigheten, in line with proposal 1. Bergman emphasizes that this still means that every board member can take individual decisions on whether to take part in activities.

Meeting adjourned at 17.00.

Meeting resumed at 17.16.

11. Election committee

The election committee has according to Bergman sent out descriptions for specific board posts. The nomination period will be 4 - 24 April, he says. The election committee trusts, Bergman forwards, that board members will be encouraging members to apply for next year's board.

Nathanson Thulin says that PR will release marketing for all board posts, in a cheesy but serious manner to encourage people to apply.

Bjuremalm suggests that board members should look in each others' groups for prospective applicants to make a big pool of possibly interested members.

Bergman tells that the election committee has suggested a meet-the-board mingle. Bjuremalm suggests that such can be organized at the same time as a pizza night after a lecture. Rezania mentions that many in the Career Group might be interested. Nathanson Thulin, to which Bjuremalm fills in, points out that it is important to make the approach attractive and not too formal, to accenture *why* you get active. Bergman asks if the application period is long enough. Nathanson Thulin replies that it might be too long and suggests two weeks. Lind proposes that the Facebook event might come up before the actual application period opens to create a hype. Bergman suggests that the board mandates PR together with the election committee to make a decision considering the application period. The board decides so.

12. Point of discussion & decision: Decision-making and number of board positions

Syrén and Lefvert have discussed that it is vague on what grounds the board can make decisions. When should the board make a decision, and when can a decision be made by a single board member, they would like to discuss. The board decides to mandate Syrén and Lefvert to organize a workshop on the subject, in which all interested members can take part.

Lind asks if the board has considered having vice heads of the committees. Lefvert suggests that the vice should not in that case be elected by an annual meeting, to which Bergman agrees. Lind clarifies that the important part is that the vice, instead of a trustee, would be involved and responsible from the start.

Rezania argues that the board should decide to seek a second Head of Career. The two groups right now have separate interests, he says, which becomes too much to handle

for one person. Rezia further adds that part of the Career activities is now not really covered by a board representative.

Hörner asks if Career Day and Utrikespolitiska Akademin should be different groups.

Rezia replies that the groups share members and much intel as it is, but have different objectives.

Bjuremalm and Bergman suggest that it be specified which responsibilities the different Heads of Career have. Lefvert questions this on the basis that they can decide that amongst themselves, to which Lind agrees. Rezia replies that it is not essential that the responsibilities should be locked to the specific heads.

Rieschel suggests that the creation of a second Head of Careers post and UFMUN head post in the board would make it too big.

Nathanson Thulin agrees with that the two suggested new posts should be created, but mentions that it might be necessary with regards to people's work-load to sometimes lower the ambitions of the board work.

Syrén asks if it is in accordance with the bylaws to create a new post in the boards. Lefvert suggests the board does not have the mandate to create a new post, but that in practice the board seeks the nomination of new board members, which the annual meeting then approves. Nathanson Thulin highlights that it is then important to make an explicit decision at the annual meeting to approve a new post in the board.

Bergman proposes that the board organize a workshop on how many members there will be in the board. The board agrees and decides to do so.

Bergman describes that UFMUN and its organizers feel that they are not represented in the UF board, and also that it might be important for the board to control the substantial budget post which UFMUN controls. Lind and Nathanson Thulin agree that it might be a good idea to create a new UFMUN role in the board, and the latter points out that the creation of the new post might still be subject to debate.

Syrén suggests that the role of the board becomes vaguer by creating a UFMUN head post in the board. Riechel agrees and mentions that board work might be a burden on the UFMUN project leader. Lefvert follows up and argues that a project should not be

represented per se in the board. Lind and Hörner point out that contrary to that, previous projects have now evolved into board posts. Bjuremalm notes that the time aspect is an argument for creating an UFMUN post in the board since it is important with thorough preparations for the project. Bergman says that an UFMUN responsible would be responsible for more than just this project, why Riechel suggests that the decision should be rather that an UFMUN post should be responsible for the idea of MUNs in UF.

Bergman asks whether the decision on a new Head of Careers could be made before UFMUN. 9 board members were ready to go to a decision on Career, 8 were ready to decide on UFMUN. The board decides to go to a decision on both posts separately.

The board decides to mandate the election committee to seek a new head of career.

The board decides not to mandate the election committee to seek a UFMUN representative.

Bergman will ask the present president of UFMUN to submit a suggestion of description of a new head of UFMUN, for the board to consider before making a new decision on whether to seek an UFMUN representative for next year's board.

13. Annual report, operational plan and hand-over documents

Bergman states that all group heads will be expected to write descriptions of their activities by Sunday the 22nd of March.

14. Motion: Songbook subsidy

Background: see attachment A.

PC-decision - Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstained: 3

15. Motion: Appointing travel trustee

Background: see attachment B.

PC-decision - Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstained: 4

16. Motion: Career expenditure approval

Background: see attachment C.

PC-decision - Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstained: 4

17. Motion: Travel destination

Background: see attachment D.

Berg Gorgén asks for a decision on the travel destination regardless of whether the travel would be possible.

The board decides on Rwanda as the travel destination by approval of the motion.

18. Motion: Subsidising UF-Trip

Background: see attachment E.

Berg Gorgén proposes an alteration of the motion so that 4000 kr more than the 12 000 kr budgeted be allocated to travel subsidies. Nathanson Thulin asked why one more reserve was not admitted to the journey. Berg Gorgén replied that the group now is of regular size.

The board decides to allocate 16 000 kr by approval of the adjusted motion.

The meeting is adjourned at 18.40.

The meeting is resumed at 18.43.

19. Motion: Vegetarian policy

Background: see attachment F.

Risberg explains his alteration of the Environmental Policy (“Miljöpolicy”) with an adding of a vegetarian norm. Nathanson Thulin suggests that the norm be precised so that when UF is solely responsible for purchases, the association should buy vegetarian. Risberg, Nathanson Thulin and Bergman propose unanimously that the next board meeting should decide between Nathanson Thulin’s and Risberg’s motions.

20. Motion: Change of titles

Background: see attachment G.

Risberg explains his motion on renaming the official titles of the board members so that all group heads should be named accordingly, and not “Coordinator.” Lind and Risberg point out that this is already practice.

The board decides to alter all titles containing “coordinator” to “Head of ...”

21. Point of discussion: Merchandise

Bjuremalm asks whether there is an interest in more merchandise produced. Rezanía and Hörnor show such interest specifically in the shirts. Lind is sceptical. Rezanía asks

for a web shop, an idea Nathanson Thulin is positive about but she doubts whether PR will have time to design a web shop this semester. Bergmans suggests that PR should make the design they like to propose to the next board meeting. The board decides so.

22. Point of discussion: Cooperation with Blue Arena

Lind explains that she has been approached by the initiative-taker to a new foundation on democratic debate. Lind asks if there is interest in the board to collaborate with them.

Bergman asks if the foundation has any political connection. Lind replies that there does not seem to be one.

Lefvert asks how Lind perceives the foundation. Lind replies that her impression is that the initiative is unclear and not really thought-through. Bergman suggests that Lind look deeper into what frame of cooperation the initiative-taker seeks. The board decides to approach the initiative critically.

23. Point of discussion: Radio trustee

Hörner explains a proposal of making the radio trustee, who will be returning to London after this semester, a “UF-correspondent” for next semester with the possibility to remain to have insight in the association to uphold the radio activities. Riechel points out that this should not prevent the Radio from admitting a new trustee. Hörner clarifies that it will not. Bergman approves and mentions that this type of trustee network comes with great possibilities.

24. Point of discussion: Common venue-booking deal

Lefvert mentions that two suggestions might be possible, pending more information from the university: it is likely that UF will not be able to get one contract with uniform conditions for all campuses, but it is not impossible. Lefvert explains that the other suggestion is to choose a person in the UF board to single-handedly handle venue booking. Due to the pandemic, he says, the prospects for advancing further in the negotiations with the university are slim at the moment. The board suggests to await further developments before deciding between the suggestions above.

Clara Alm left the meeting.

25. UFS

Rieschel tells the board that the Forum weekend was a success. Rieschel also mentions that the UFS annual meeting is now open for application and it will be held in Uppsala, why she encouraged the board to participate. Rieschel describes that she was able to negotiate 5000 kr more to UF Uppsala in MUCF grants. She will now take part in more budget negotiations, she says, where Uppsala and Lund have a common ground.

Rieschel asks for input on the internal communication toward UF Uppsala board members. Bjuremalm describes that PR has been reached by emails but that they have not got any replies from UFS to PR's replies. Lefvert says that the same goes for lectures. Berg Gorgén replies that she has got a positive impression of the outreach to her.

Rieschel furthermore encourages the entire board to apply for the UFS board. The deadline for the board, she informed, closes midnight this day. Rieschel emphasizes the flexibility of a board role in UFS.

26. Miscellaneous matters: Chile Night

Risberg and Lind ask for volunteering board members to help out during the Chile night the subsequent night with serving food and standing in check-in. Rieschel, Bergman and Nathanson Thulin volunteered.

27. Date for next meeting and Fika-responsibility

The board decides to consider the dates on slack. Rieschel volunteers to take on fika-responsibilities.

28. Miscellaneous matters: Appreciation for groups of cancelled events

Bergman and Rezanía suggest that a social event to appreciate the efforts of the groups of UFMUN and Career Day should be organized. Bergman describes that, since Career Day was a cooperative event, it would be difficult to combine the two.

29. Ending of the Meeting

The meeting ended at 19.23.

Meeting secretary: Isak Lefvert

Date, place: 24-03-2020, Uppsala

Isak Lefvert

Adjuster: Alicia Nathanson Thulin

Date, place: 18-04-2020 Stockholm

Alicia Nathanson Thulin

Adjuster: Rebecka Bjuremalm

Date, place: 11-04-2020, Stockholm

Rebecka Bjuremalm