



efpsa

*European Federation of
Psychology Students' Associations*

EFPSA

General Assembly

Session I | Minutes

Congress XXXIII, 2019
Grenaa, Denmark

General Assembly I Minutes | 8 April 2019

Members present: Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium (Leuven), Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia (Belgrade), Skopje (Macedonia), Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom

Observers present:

Others present: Board of Management 2018-2019, Working Community 2018-2019, Participants of Congress 2019

Minutes by: Mary-Ann Kubre

Topics/agenda:

General Assembly I

1. Introduction. Technicalities
 2. Approval of Financial Report 2018-2019
 3. Approval of Updated Membership Fees
 4. Approval of Internal Audit Committee's Report
 5. Approval of Working Community involvement in EFPSA
 6. Approval of a new position – Human Resources Responsible
 7. Approval of Certification Exemption Procedure
 8. Approval of a Knowledge Transfer as a Certificate requirement
 9. Approval of Organising Committees Certificates
 10. Approval of increasing Member Organisations involvement in EFPSA
 11. Approval of dismissal of Bulgaria
 12. Statutes & Domestic Regulations
 - 12.1 Approval of amendments to the Statutes & Domestic Regulations
 - 12.2 Approval of changes in grammar, style & syntax etc. made to the Statutes
 - 12.3 Approval of clarifications to the Statutes
 - 12.4 Approval of additions to the Statutes
 - 12.5 Approval of changes in grammar, style & syntax etc. made to the Domestic Regulations
 - 12.6 Approval of clarifications to the Domestic Regulations
 - 12.7 Approval of additions to the Domestic Regulations
 - 12.8 Approval of participation in EFPSA after graduation
 - 12.9 Approval of previous Finance Officer to draft the forthcoming EFPSA Annual Budget
-

Topic	Discussion	Decision
<p>1. Introduction. Technicalities</p>	<p>GS: Here is today's agenda. Introduction what a General Assembly is.</p> <p>VF: Introducing voting on Discord</p>	
<p>2. Financial Report</p>	<p>YC: Approval of EFPSA Financial Report. Have the supporting documents, can compare the amount of money from the start to the end of the mandate. Questions? [None]</p> <p>[Some technical issues with Discord.]</p> <p>VF: I propose moving on to the next Proposal and come back to this, I will reopen this vote later.</p> <hr/> <p>TJ: We will now go back to Proposal 1. Raise your hand when you're done</p>	<p>In Favour: 55</p> <p>Against: 0</p> <p>Abstaining: 2</p>
<p>3. Updated Membership Fees</p>	<p>YC: Approval of Updated Membership Fees. This will be enforced in 2020-2021, this change was done due to inflation. We would also like to change the ranking of countries due to the changed GDP's will divide the countries a bit differently. Questions?</p> <p>Vera Levent (Turkey; VL): Trying to understand GDP, not sure how Turkey is moving to a higher group. Could you explain?</p> <p>YC: Yes. Our source is the IMF, they published last year's ranking of countries and all the GDP's. According to this, Turkey's GDP has risen compared to the GDP from 3 years ago.</p> <p>VL: Thank you!</p> <p>VF: I don't think we can do it online. I don't think we can do it online, we have to switch to pen and paper. Raise your hand once you're done.</p>	<p>In Favour: 37</p> <p>Against: 10</p> <p>Abstaining: 10</p>



<p>4. Internal Audit Committee's Report</p>	<p>TJ: The approval of the Internal Auditing Committee. They were approved at the Joint EBMR Meeting. YC provided us with the details from the EFPSA account. Got feedback from the committee.</p> <p>Isabel Cardenas (Switzerland; IC): How will be proceed with the savings account?</p> <p>TJ: Once we started the Committee, realised it is difficult if the FO keeps the receipts, we created an excel so the Committee can comment. YC did this for the main account but for just the events. We want to audit all of our accounts, we just started with this.</p> <p>YC: For the events accounts, I want to do this in the future, only thing is, we have a lot of people working with the FO, multiple OrgComs use this account, it is difficult to make sure we audit the events account. We are looking for a new accounting platform. For now, it was a big task and hope we can audit all the accounts. Currently it takes a lot of time</p> <p>IC: Okay, another question. You mentioned the difficulty with conversions.</p> <p>YC: I have prepared a template for reimbursement. I tried it with the BM. It's an excel sheet, can fill in which reimbursements you want. I also has instructions.</p> <p>TJ: Cast your votes please</p>	<p>In Favour: 54</p> <p>Against: 0</p> <p>Abstaining: 3</p>
<p>5. Working Community involvement in EFPSA</p>	<p>TJ: More benefits for being part of the Working Community. Want to encourage future BMs to use certain methods to involve the WC more, e.g. surveys.</p> <p>Jose Ramalho (Portugal; JR): Just a question about MtM project. Said we can reject someone when don't find the suitable</p> <p>TJ: This is for a different proposal. We can come back to it</p> <p>Jose: Okay!</p>	<p>In Favour: 55</p> <p>Against: 0</p> <p>Abstaining: 2</p>



TJ: Cast your votes		
6. New position – Human Resources Responsible	<p>NS: We propose a new position. We have been discussing this for the whole mandate, also discussed this at EBMR. It is related to re-evaluating the Skype reports. This person will also create a reporting system. Also have a more objective person for the reports. So, the team can give feedback regarding their coordinator or BM Responsible. They will also work closely with DMR. Questions?</p> <p>Darren Biggar (UK; DB): I think it is a critical position, reports and also the well-being of the Community. Was wondering what kind of support will be put into place for sensitivity training for potential topics that might pop up.</p> <p>NS: We have discussed this. Initially wanted this person to be closer to the EC</p> <p>YC: We wanted to find someone who has some experience with this and are familiar with this position. Did think if they'd have to do a training, idea for the future. Talked to someone on the Ethics Board of EFPA. Because this is a new position, will have to shape it as we go. Have to be careful who gets this position</p> <p>Katarzyna Slawinska (Poland; KS): This person would be connected to the President or Secretary?</p> <p>TJ: We chose Secretary General as they are gathering data and will work with DMR. It is also a more administrative task, so EFPSA Office made sense. We thought of not making them a part of the WC, but it presents its own difficulties. So, we decided they should be together with the WC. If there are not any questions, cast your votes</p>	<p>In Favour: 53</p> <p>Against: 2</p> <p>Abstaining: 2</p>
7. Approval Certification Exemption Procedure	<p>GS: This proposal was made as we realised there is no fixed procedure for receiving a certificate. We put together this document to make this procedure more</p>	<p>In Favour: 55</p> <p>Against: 2</p> <p>Abstaining: 0</p>



objective and clear. Can objectively measure if someone should receive a certificate or not.

Bojan Nys (Belgium; BN): Just to clarify, everyone can ask questions

Hanna Jager (Luxembourg): Everyone who is getting a certificate?

GS: Right now the Coordinator and/or BM Responsible decide this. But we wanted to make it more objective

VF: We had a long discussion about this, the reason we wanted to establish this, is just there have been a few cases where people have disappeared or become unresponsive. We first try to reach this person and not giving a certificate is the last resort if we really don't manage to reach someone

Sarah Fontaine (Belgium; SF): I'm wondering some people will get a discount code, so even if you were absent, will you still get a discount code?

NS: The code is for MO's

VF: The code is how we want to make sure the MOs are awarded. It is up to the MR and MO to give out this code

SF: It's also for the WC right?

VF: Yes unless they stepped down or were dismissed

TJ: There should be a specific reason we don't issue a certificate, they would not then receive the WC discount code, if they are in the MO, they get the MO code. If they still ask for a WC code, they probably will not receive it

GS: The document is very lenient saying if someone works in the last 2 months, they're fine



	<p>Eva Hannon (Belgium; EH): Can it also be a coordinator?</p> <p>GS: Perhaps have the Team vote on it</p> <p>EH: If the coordinator is reluctant to start this, can other Team Members contact the BM Responsible?</p> <p>GS: The BM would probably be aware of this and contact the Coordinator</p> <p>IC: Have you thought about MRs? We have monthly meetings but can't really check if everyone is doing their job. Have you thought about them?</p> <p>VF: Great question. It is different with the MRs. We don't elect them, therefore it is up to the MO's to check their job. MRO can motivate them but we don't have the right to dismiss anyone</p> <p>Demos Alekou (Cyprus; DA): I am a bit skeptical it may create some fear and go against what EFPSA is for, might be demotivating</p> <p>TJ: I don't think it will create fear, that's why we wanted to make this very clear. Not issuing a certificate is the last step. If nothing else works, then we would go to this. You can get a certificate for minimal effort. Right now there is no criteria, wanted to change it. There are maybe a few who don't work so it would only be for specific causes. It won't happen if you miss one task or meeting. Questions?</p>	
<p>8. Approval of a Knowledge Transfer as a Certificate requirement</p>	<p>TJ: Similar to the previous one. We got feedback from the WC saying it is difficult to start with your tasks without a KT or with an incomplete one. Wanted to highlight having this as a mandatory thing for receiving a certificate.</p> <p>IC: Just wanted to clarify, MRs have a task force for KT this year, it is a document for the whole team. So this would not work for Mrs, right?</p> <p>TJ: Yes. This concerns the EB.</p>	<p>In Favour: 55 Against: 2 Abstaining: 0</p>



	<p>HJ: So, this proposal is just for the EB?</p> <p>TJ: Yes, as you have a collective KT.</p> <p>BN: Was wondering how the quality of the KT will be evaluated? What if it's a low-quality KT?</p> <p>TJ: We didn't think about a procedure for this, but made a more comprehensive template of the KT which should help</p> <p>GS: The BM Responsible must also check</p> <p>BN: I'd suggest having KT throughout the year to ensure a KT that is of better quality instead of just at the end of the mandate</p> <p>TJ: Usually people are not too motivated in the middle of the mandate, but perhaps if we highlight this during the mandate and put more emphasis on it, it might motivate people</p> <p>Jayne Hamilton (Ireland; JH): Would this motivate people to do the KT? It is a good idea though, as we need KTs</p> <p>TJ: We haven't discussed group ones, say that the certificate is the official statement they finished the mandate. Increase the importance of the certificate. This is a start of highlighting the importance of KT, if this doesn't help and the problem remains, we have to solve it in another way.</p>	
<p>9. Approval of Organising Committees Certificates</p>	<p>NS: We're proposing to give all members of the OrgComs certificates. Since they work a lot for events, suggest giving them an official certificate, right now just heads of OrgComs get this. Secondly, they have to complete all post-event tasks to receive the certificate. Questions?</p> <p>DA: The KT has a Scientific Programme section, was wondering if the trainer's don't fill this?</p>	<p>In Favour: 55</p> <p>Against: 0</p> <p>Abstaining: 2</p>



NS: We edited this, know that events that do not have a scientific part, will not expect them to fill in this section

EH: Is it just group tasks?

NS: Each team/member has to fill in something, the whole team does one KT.

IC: I think it's an amazing idea to include all the OrgCom members. Love this idea. However, when a coordinator recruits people, there isn't a document with the tasks, right? Isn't it that they know beforehand about the KT?

NS: Everyone who applies for an OrgCom, there is a KT and it also states they have to create one. If this is approved, it will be a requirement.

IC: What about the helpers, volunteers?

NS: Have to discuss this. Just discussed the OrgCom members. Maybe not for volunteers who were just working during the event, but have to discuss this

EH: Just a detail, you said it will be an official EFPSA certificate, will they be WC?

NS: No, different certificate for them

Ana Karljevic (Croatia; AK): Maybe separate certificate for volunteers?

TJ: For now, coordinators only get the certificate, want to expand that to the OrgCom, then discuss volunteers. At different events volunteers have different functions, lots of things to take into account

Caglar Akyigit (Turkey, CA): Coordinator is part of WC, others have to apply separately. Will MRs make special cases for the other members?

TJ: This is just for certificates. Not a part of the WC. This has been discussed in previous years.



	<p>NS: VF said MRs can give exceptions, say an event is happening in their country, so it would be beneficial for them to have a person from this OrgCom to attend</p> <p>John Paul Muscat (Malta; JPM): How will you assess the qualities of the KT's?</p> <p>NS: We're trying to get people to do the KT's, we're trying to tackle the problem one step at a time</p> <p>TJ: More questions? Then cast your votes</p>	
<p>10. Approval of increasing Member Organisations involvement in EFPSA</p>	<p>VF: MO's are the foundation of EFPSA. Have been different complains form various MOs, disconnection between MO and EFPSA, not co-operating that much, MO's felt they were misinformed, didn't receive enough benefits. We discussed this at BMM, came up with steps to improve this, to appreciate the importance of the MOs. This won't be perfect in a year, but initial steps. MO members will get a discount for an EFPSA event, this is to promote students getting involved with their MOs. Often they also didn't know about the LCs, wanted to receive the names. According to GDPR, will share a list and the MOs will have a right to revoke an unsuitable candidate. Also propose having a meeting with an MO, would be once per mandate, can be more often. Could establish collaborations between different MOs. Also, want to change, that when a team applies for an event, the MO is informed and involved.</p> <p>Bojan Stankov (Macedonia; BS): Might not be familiar with procedures, but for us only members of our MOs can apply for EFPSA events. Share events with everyone, but to join EFPSA, have to be a part of MO. Is this the case in other countries?</p> <p>NS: Not all MOs represent all Universities</p> <p>TJ: This was also our goal that members of MOs attend our Events, but this isn't the case in all MOs. This is the first step to have students join their MO's. Will also get the benefit of the discount, didn't think</p>	<p>In Favour: 42</p> <p>Against: 5</p> <p>Abstaining: 10</p>

having just members of the MO attend events, so this is a possible solution

BA: Thanks

Hector Rodriguez Gines (Spain; HRG): Our MO represents every Psychology Student in Spain, they don't have to be a member. Does this then mean every student in the country gets the code?

TJ: This depends on the country and organisation. In your case, yes, all students will get the discount if they are a part of the MO.

NS: This is a new idea and every country and MO are different, so have to be very clear about this

VF: This is not dictated by EFPSA, this will be given to the MO, and the MO will decide how to act. They might want to just give the code to just their Board or to everyone. This will be up to the MOs

JR: MtM and BT project. Said MO's can review and dismiss LC's, how would this process work?

GS: We respect the MOs autonomy, so it will be up to them as long as there are valid arguments

TJ: If there are problems after the election, the MO has the opportunity to approach BM and provide solid arguments about the issue at hand, we will try to solve it.

Ajdin Becirovic (Bosnia & Herzegovina; AB): Need a bit of clarification. We have an EB, Alumni, have different functions in the MO. The MO will have the freedom to distribute the code, will there be some fixed measures we could use for distributing the code? Will there be differences in prices? Give a bigger discount to some, smaller to others?

VF: We just discussed a discount-no-discount. The discount won't be very big. It will be a set amount, set a percentage, depends on the participation fee, will be

a way to give back to the MO. The MO will decide which group of people can use the code.

EH: I'm wondering about this code, I think it's putting a lot of trust in MOs. Someone could give this code for all the members or students and this discount would be meaningless. Seems like a big risk not to put a strict restriction on the code. Say, give the code to a certain number of people. Could be a financial risk

BN: Wanted to add, if just one person in the MO gives out this code, will create a problem. Somehow restrict it?

VF: These are points we discussed. The proposal isn't strict about how to implement it, the specifics will be up for the next FO. Have to monitor the process. The point at hand is if we want to implement something like this or not

TJ: Our rationale was that MO's could motivate people to become a part of the MO. We also thought of having a tick box on the application that they are a member of the MO and share the list of people who ticked this box with the MO

EH: I don't think this will decrease the distance between the MO and EFPSA, the people working the most for the MO aren't usually the people attending EFPSA events. It's often people in the EB.

NS: We have had MOs say they cannot afford the Membership Fee as they don't have enough members, so this is not just getting a stronger connection but showing the students the benefit of joining their MO

Dean McDonnell (Ireland; DM): It is usually the MR communicating with MO, could it undermine it?

NS: We want it to be a collaboration

JH: You say some MOs have a problem with the fee, yet you wanted to increase the fee. Why not keep it the same if you're going to "pay it back" anyway?



YC: The Membership Fees cover the bare minimum, the costs increase every year, hence we wanted to increase the fees.

JH: Did you ask MOs if they'd prefer lower fees?

YC: We had a conversation with an MO, they wanted to see some steps implemented to increase the involvement

VF: So you're saying it is easier to have a lower fee versus discounts. We have to live with inflation, we have to increase the fees anyway. The discount code was a way to offer the MO a small thing they could offer their members. We have heard we are "competition" for MOs with our Events and Services, we thought this could help the MO get more members

JH: Is there a fixed percentage for the discount?

VF: No, this will be up to the new FO. Will depend on the event

Sam Bernard (Luxembourg; SB): Could make it a mandatory thing to be a part of EFPSA. Inform MOs more about the other MOs

TJ: We had meetings with MOs, wanted to have MOs collaborate and communicate more. In our mandate, not all the Presidents of MOs showed up, wanted to improve these meetings.

GS: Have a forum for collaboration

SB: If you want you can, should be more structured. Would be more beneficial for everyone

GS: Want MOs to keep their autonomy

Marko Šopar (Slovenia; MS): Comment on restricting the discount code. Slovenia also has a problem that the MO pays the fee but not all participants at EFPSA events aren't members. This could help. Think we



have to be more specific about different countries, define how to choose who gets a discount.

JH: Maybe keep the fees the same instead of increasing them. The discount will in the end mean EFPSA will lose money

NS: We will also make sure we won't put OrgComs in a bad position. Won't give everyone a big discount, will be careful about it

Leonhard Volz(Austria; LV):

YC: We didn't have a specific amount, maybe 5%.

LV: Where does the money come from?

YC: Have to set a price for participants, the fee should covers OrgComs expenses.

SF: Could we put this into separate proposals?

TJ: Yes and put it into GA III as separate proposals. You can create counter proposals.

VF: Makes more sense to delay it so you can discuss it more and make an informed decision. We have to vote on postponing it though

DM: In terms of next Congress, will this mean we have to find more funding

YC: No

NS: You won't have to cover the discounts, you will decide the prices and we will go from there

JPM: It won't be a discount though, you would increase the fee for regular participants

YC: We wanted to find a way to give back to the MOs and this was a potential solution that wouldn't hurt EFPSA or OrgCom



	<p>EH: You're talking about 2 discounts at the same time. The MO and the WC discount</p> <p>YC: We haven't figured out the specifics yet. Input is welcome</p> <p>EH: Right now WC pays for the scientific programme but isn't able to attend. Does the MO have to have a discussion with the LC or can they just dismiss them?</p> <p>TJ: This will be the first step in trying to increase the involvement of the MO. They should have to try solve the issues and not just dismiss them</p> <p>NS: Ideally it will look like this</p> <p>EH: We had a few countries who aren't in EFPSA, how would this work for them?</p> <p>NS: Social Media</p> <p>GS: We have created a proposal for postponing this. Have to vote for the current proposal and then for postponing it. The second one will override the first one</p>	
<p>11. Approval of dismissal of Bulgaria</p>	<p>VF: We want to dismiss the organisation, not the country. We lost contact with them, they didn't pay the fees. Questions?</p> <p>AB: How will you inform Bulgarian students?</p> <p>VF: We have some participants here who are not part of the MO that is being dismissed.</p> <p>Anna Dimitrova (Bulgaria): We are willing to rejoin EFPSA just from a different Organisation as we greatly appreciate EFPSAs Events and Services offered to students.</p>	<p>In Favour: 57</p> <p>Against: 0</p> <p>Abstaining: 0</p>
<p>12. Statutes & Domestic Regulations</p>	<p>TJ: This is regarding some changes, corrections, additions to the S&DR. Questions?</p>	<p>In Favour: 57</p> <p>Against: 0</p>



efpsa

*European Federation of
Psychology Students' Associations*

		Abstaining: 0
13.	-	
14.	-	
15.	-	