

Protocol

Union meeting / Föreningsmöte

Meeting nr: 2022:1
Date: Thursday, 6th of January 2022
Time: at 16.41
Place: Zoom
Attendees: Appendix 3
Time log attendees: Appendix 4

Formalities

F1 The opening of the meeting

Chairman of the meeting, Medicinska Föreningens Inspector Carl Johan Sundberg, opened the meeting at **16.41**. N.B. during 40 minutes before the opening of the meeting, the meeting format and technical issues were discussed. Since they were not part of the meeting, they are not in this protocol. Appendix 5 contains chat messages sent during this time.

Inspector Carl Johan went through formalities of the meeting:

The entities that have the right to invoke or request a Union meeting according to MF bylaws (Appendix 7) are:

- *The Inspector*
- *The Auditors*
- *The Council (Fullmäktige)*
- *50 members*

A group of 86 members have, on 9th December, requested a Union meeting (Appendix 8).

According to the bylaws of MF:

- 4.1.4 *The Inspector chairs the meeting*
- 4.1.5 *The authority of a Union meeting is limited to:*
 - a. *propose recommendations to the other bodies of MF*
 - b. *dissolve Fullmäktige (the Council) and announce a new election*
 - c. *approve a dissolution of the Union according to Ch 16*
 - d. *approve changes of the bylaws according to Ch 15**of which the two first are on today's agenda*

The purpose of the meeting today was to make voting-based decisions on the 4 main items on the agenda (appendix 2).

Such voting should be as informed as is practically possible. Therefore, some information has been provided before the meeting and there will be opportunities to speak for both the group that has requested the meeting and those that consider themselves affected by the proposals.

Carl Johan wished to point out that the meeting is not an investigation and not a court of law. It is a democratic mechanism in a membership association with the overarching purpose to, within the limitations set out above, address 4 issues, deemed important by those that have requested the meeting.

Voting is totally anonymous – nobody has any access to how individuals voted. Decisions are made with a simple majority.

There are 3 options per item: Yes, No or Abstain. If you for any reason fail to press voting buttons correctly within the 1,5 min time allotted for voting your vote will be counted as recorded in the system.

Thus, all members here today have to make difficult and important decisions.

Rules of procedure for the meeting

Ambition: max 2 hours – approximately 25 min/item

Technical:

- *Raise your hand & will be promoted to “panelist”*
- *Unmute & turn on camera*

Behavioural:

- *Respect each other*
- *Do not interrupt*
- *Be concise*
- *4 + 1,5 min*
- *When I as chair deem that the discussion and/or time has reached its reasonable limit, I will make a motion to draw a line in the speaker’s list*

F2 Election of a secretary

16.50, The Union meeting decided:

to elect Anna Eklöf and Natte Hillerberg as secretaries of the meeting

Result from voting poll:

(Question: “Election of meeting secretary)

Anna Eklöf – 45/152 votes, 30%

Natte Hillerberg – 15/153 votes, 10%

Anna Eklöf & Natte Hillerberg – 85/152 votes, 56%

Abstain – 7/152 votes, 5%

F3 Election of two people, besides the Inspector, to adjust the protocol

16.56, The Union meeting decided:

to elect Timo Oosterveld and Sebastian Ols

Result from voting poll:

(Question: “Can we elect the proposed adjusters?)

Yes – 139/153 votes, 91%

No – 2/153 votes, 1%

Abstain – 12/153 votes, 8%

F4 Question of the Union meeting's statutory announcement

The meeting, as stated in the bylaws, was announced more than 1 week before the meeting date, i.e. on December 27, with later reminders.

17.00 The Union meeting decided:
that the meeting was correctly announced according to MF's bylaws.

Result from voting poll:
(Question: "Is the meeting rightfully announced?")
Yes – 99/150 votes, 66%
No – 16/150 votes, 11%
Abstain – 35/150 votes, 23%

Before the meeting started there were protests in the chat that participators could not see each other or who was present during the meeting, see appendix 5 for meeting chat history.

Several members asked if the meeting could not have been held in a normal Zoom format instead of the used webinar format or in another form. The technical team informed that this solution of a meeting is the best with regards to security of whom can attend/vote (only members of MF). There also seems like some members have not got the link sent to them and that it is a democratic problem which is pointed out by several people.

Natte Hillerberg says that this meeting form is undemocratic and a part of the silence culture at Karolinska Institutet and Medicinska Föreningen, which is also the reason why this meeting is being held.

Amanda Wannerholt communicates critique from several members about that it has been very hard to get the message out about what the extra meeting will be about to all MF members.

17.08 Several members propose that all participants of the meeting should be promoted to panellists, so that everyone can see each other. Carl Johan Sundberg makes a proposition that all participants of the meeting will become panellists.

17:12 The Union meeting decides:
that everyone in the meeting will be panellists

Result from voting poll:
(Question: "Promote everyone to panellists?")
Yes: 90/147 votes, 61%
No: 31/147 votes, 21%
Abstain 26/147 votes, 18%

Carl Johan Sundberg once again goes through the rules of the meeting, F1, and how voting will be held.

17:22 The Union meeting decides:
that the meeting procedures will be run as Carl Johan suggested.

Result from voting poll:
(Question: "Can we run the meeting procedures as to CJs suggestions?")
Yes – 125/152 votes, 82%
No – 6/152 votes, 4%
Abstain – 21/152 votes, 14%

F5 Approval of the agenda**17.26 The Union meeting decides:
that the agenda is approved.**

Result from voting poll:
(Question: "Can we establish the proposed agenda?")
Yes – 125/131 votes, 95%
No – 1/131 votes, 1%
Abstain – 5/131 votes, 4%

Decision matters**D1 Dissolution of the Union Council and subsequent new elections**

Reporting the case: Sara Klyvare

17.28, Sara gets 4 min to inform the meeting attendants attendees about this decision:

"Hello current friends and future colleagues,

Right after I first came to KI, I joined MF. That was the beginning of me finding acceptance and friends and coming out of my shell. For this, MF is a place very dear to me, a sentiment I am sure many of you share for similar reasons. It is, to use a current term, a "safe space".

As is often the case in student organizations, I had during the past year heard vague rumours about misconduct at MF, but I am ashamed to say I didn't immediately inquire further. I did, however, decide to join FuM. It was not very hard, as voting turn-out is unfortunately extremely low. I am nothing short of appalled by many things I have seen and heard since.

Firstly, the reason many of you haven't heard about this until now is the blatant lack of transparency which has been ongoing at MF. Members have been kept in the dark of things going on which they are supposed to be privy to and not until a major backlash such as this has information been shared without having to specifically ask for it.

Secondly, and much more crucial, is the fact that several separate allegations of misconduct were made this year against the current president. This in itself of course violates the idea of a safe space at the most basic level, but as concerning was the way it was heard and completely shrugged off by a majority of FuM and several people in the board. The discussions during the FuM meetings have contained such unabashed misogyny, I at many points did not believe what I was hearing.

After the meeting, an email signed by a quarter of FuM was sent to FuM, including one of the women who spoke up. The reasoning for that email was that such allegations should not come forward during election meetings as, and I quote "they hurt the person accused and the organization.". The president was later re-elected by a majority.

Due to this, and more I do not have time to mention, FuM has severely betrayed the trust given to us by MF's members. Indeed, we can barely say we've been truly granted that trust, as many have been voted in by only each other and a handful of other friends. The only reasonable thing to do at this point is to dissolve and re-elect FuM with all of this in the open and let the members make their own informed decision. This is supposed to be a safe space for all members and this year it has, devastatingly, been nothing of the sort."

Mirco Martino, one of the people that sent the DSA-email (appendix 9), informs that the email was not about that the questions that were brought up during the FUM-meeting were not important, but that they should have been discussed in another forum for everyone's safety. The FUM meeting was an election meeting and should not have been an investigation, that should have been done somewhere else.

Sebastian Ols, who also is one of the DSA-members from the email, also states that the main point of the email was on the tone of the meeting. Both the tone against candidates, like a disrespectful questioning of the candidates, as well as to participants in the FUM-meeting who were there for the first time and for them it was shocking. Sebastian also agrees that a whistle-blower function is absolutely a good idea. He also informs everyone that he was one of the members of the nomination committee and that it is unfortunate that the information about the male candidate did not come to the nomination committee before the election meeting.

Laura Andersson asks when it would have been a good time to come forward with the information to FUM. Sebastian Ols answers that it would have been good if the nomination committee would have gotten the information.

Timo Oosterveld says that he was not at the first FUM-meeting, but at the second, and he was shocked about the old fashion way FUM looked at the female vs the male candidate. Where the female candidate was described as "too sensitive" and "not a good leader".

Sara Klyvare says that the members that lifted up the allegations in FUM have felt very unsafe during the last year and since the FUM-meetings and it's been a big decision for these people to tell FUM about it and now there is a feeling that they do not get listened to.

Luca Love brings up that he does not totally agree with how the FUM-meeting is being presented. He thought that one of the candidates had a clear plan for 2022 and the other did not.

Both Luca Love and Mirco Martino want to point out that the elected president was elected because of a clear plan and not about gender.

Lina Abdel-Halim answers Sebastian Ols and she thinks that it should not be a problem that the information did not get to the nomination committee, the most important is that it came at all.

Alessandra Ljung informs that she had a very negative experience from the first meeting and felt that everyone wanted to know all the details from the allegations at the meeting to then decide if it was important or not. She also think that it was inappropriate that the female candidate got comments as "she has a pretty smile" and that she was too emotional and naive.

Victor Svedberg thinks that the first FUM-meeting was the worst MF-meeting he has been to in his 5 years at MF. He says that there is never a perfect time to bring up accusations but it would have helped if the members of FUM had gotten more information before the meeting so everyone could be more prepared.

Sofia Andersson makes a statement in the chat at **17.46** that is read by Lina Abdel-Halim: "I'll just write a short statement/observation here regarding the criticism that the accusations were brought up at the initial meeting – it seems so easy for many to focus on when and how women speak up, rather than the content of what is said. It's a cheap-shot that merely attempts to distract from the matter at hand. When we don't speak up that's the problem, when we do it's "at the wrong time or way". So to those of you that focus on that, maybe you should consider that you are part of the reason why they didn't feel safe to bring it up earlier."

August Lundquist brings up economic issues regarding the staff and the salary of the CEO and states that it's based on a one-time gift from companies.

Sara Klyvare also points out that the board of MF have known about this criticism but it's been hard to get to them and make them take it seriously. So, it has been known by the MF board, but they have not taken the issue seriously.

Alexander Klaréus informs that it was the Administration Committee at MF who proposed to previous FUM about the CEO. The costs are 1,4 MSEK and it is taken from the partnership program, which is not a one-time gift, it is a 3-year contract. Alexander also says that he now sees that MF has a big problem and that MF needs to solve them maybe in other ways than through this meeting.

Madeléne Fodman points out that it is hard to follow what has really happened when you have not been involved in previous FUM-meetings. She can clearly see that things have happened, but the arguments are a bit unclear.

Sara Klyvare writes an answer to Madelene in the chat and informs that the requesting group of this meeting think that FUM have acted inappropriately and should not retain their positions.

Timo Oosterveld also agrees that FUM has not taken the accusations seriously. And that the allegations are so serious and have made an unsafe environment in the organisations. This has led to members not having any trust in FUM and their decisions.

August Lundquist wants to return to the CEO-questions and says that it is not a cost of 1,4 MSEK because besides that there are pension costs of over 300 000 sek. He also points out that the price of the CEO increased a lot from the FUM-decision to when the CEO was hired.

Anders Norell-Bergendahl says that he was the chairman of the administration committee 2021 and responsible for the budget. He reiterates that 1,4 MSEK is the correct cost of the CEO, including everything, and also points out that FUM have approved that cost.

17.53 *Carl Johan Sundberg wants to draw a line in the speakers list and the meeting agrees with 72% yes (112/156 votes) (No 12/156, 8%, Abstain 32/156, 21%).*

Lina Abdel-Halim is not a member of FUM but attended the meetings and she thinks that our highest guarding body should take these accusations seriously.

August Lundquist wants to reply to Anders Norell Bergendahl that it is obviously FUM's decision and that they are responsible for the decision about MF's Budget.

**18:01 The Union meeting decides:
to dissolve the union council and that inspector calls for a new election**

Results from the voting poll:
(Questions: "Dissolvement of the Union Council FUM)
Yes – 123/157 votes, 78%
No – 26/157 votes, 18%
Abstain – 6/157 votes, 4%

Anna Eklöf proposes a five minute break and Carl Johan Sundberg agrees.

18.05 *Five minutes break.*

18.11 *Carl Johan starts the meeting after the break.*

D2 Establishment of a whistle-blower function
Reporting the case: Amanda Wannerholt

18.12, Amanda gets 4 minutes to inform the attendants about this proposal:

*"I would like to start off by emphasizing what I think any person familiar with research, scientific methodology or for that matter, basic group psychology, would agree on: **an organisation should not be investigating itself**. There is an obvious high risk for bias and unfair conclusions when the process inherently is heavily influenced by the potential social consequences*

of a negative outcome. It should be a given at this point to establish a whistleblowing function for the members of MF.

This semester has shown us, in a variety of ways, the apparent lack of opportunities to signal about misconduct within our organisation. In the matter that brings us here today, the person subject to allegation is either engaged in the bodies responsible for investigating him or have ongoing professional relations to those asked to conduct the investigation. As a matter of fact, in this case, the person in question is their superior. The issue at hand becomes even more complex when the allegations of misconduct in question also come from members of the board. Surely, these brave people are putting themselves at great social risk within their day-to-day work environment given how their professional relations might be adversely affected when speaking up.

With a way to anonymously signal to an objective third party, this process could have been made significantly less painful for all parties involved. A whistleblowing function would also be a way for people who have had negative experiences not to be subject to the absurd questioning and requests for details regarding accounts of potentially very intimate/personal nature.

Even more jarring is the fact that during the last days to weeks, us within the requesting group have been approached by even more people with accounts of negative experiences with the individual under investigation - telling us that they have chosen to refrain from taking this further, seeing how the response to the allegations that actually have been brought up has been from FuM. It has also been said that they will choose to abstain from talking during this meeting given the emotional toll it has taken on them already, or the emotional toll that they have observed it taking on those who have dared to speak up until now. This is partially addressed under the point of protocol regarding dissolving FuM, but I would say that this just goes to show that we as of now are fostering a culture of silence within our union. The importance of a whistleblowing function could not be illustrated any clearer than it has been in the recent weeks."

Alexander Klaréus agrees that this is a very important function and that MF should make sure to have it.

Iris Hanoure speaks on behalf of the equal treatment committee at MF and informs that the committee thinks that this is very important and gladly wishes to help out with this. The committee wants to speak more with the group who asked for this meeting and collect more information about the current needs of this function.

Carl Johan Sundberg says that it would be valuable to speak with the legal office at KI about this function at MF.

Laura Andersson thinks it is good that this topic is addressed and asks if the equal treatment committee could be responsible for the function.

Amanda Wannerholt clarifies what a whistle-blower is: "Whistle-blower is an individual who, without authorization, reveals private or classified information about an organization, usually related to wrongdoing or misconduct. Whistle-blowers generally state that such actions are motivated by a commitment to the public interest".

Alexander Kalréus means that the equal treatment committee could create the body and structure of the whistle-blowing function.

Carl Johan Sundberg clarifies that the process could involve him and people who are experts in whistleblowing and that the function is about more than equal treatment. All kinds of questions are supposed to be possible to bring up in a whistle-blowing function.

Frank Ogiemwonyi underlines the importance of that the whistleblowing function is independent from MF.

Carl Johan suggests to draw a line in the speakers list and everyone agrees, no poll is necessary.

***18.27 The Union meeting decides:
to recommend the establishment of a whistle-blower function at MF.***

Result from voting poll:
(Question: "Recommendation to adopt a whistle-blower function")
Yes – 136/138 votes, 99%
No – 0/138 votes, 0%
Abstain – 2/138 votes, 1%

Sara Klyvare brings up a question about what happens to the board of MF when FUM now has been dissolved and if the decisions from the dissolved FUM, for example the election of the MF Board, still are valid.

Carl Johan Sundberg clarifies that the board will continue its work and that the Union meeting can't do anything about the board, that will be a question for the next FUM, if they want to bring it up.

Jens Anderson clarifies that FUM is the highest deciding body at MF but now the MF board will have that position until a new FUM is elected. The board will be able to make decisions instead of FUM but according to MF's bylaws there are some decisions the board will not be able to take as they must be done by FUM; for example, changing the bylaws. The board is also an elected board and is by that not constrained in any way other than morally. But it is important to elect a new FUM as soon as possible. The new FUM will be able to decide if they want to dismiss the board and the presidency.

Carl Johan Sundberg clarifies that in case that there will not be any candidates for FUM then the union meeting will take its place.

Sara Klyvara asked if this meeting is able in some way to dismiss someone or several people in the organisation when we don't have a FUM.

Carl Johan Sundberg says no but the meeting can provide recommendations. This is according to the bylaws that should be followed during this meeting. He also suggests that the current meeting sticks to the advertised agenda points.

D3 Appointment of a bylaws review group

Reporting the case: August Lundquist

18.38 August Lundquist gets 4 minutes to talk about this proposal. He points out that the bylaws are the DNA of an organization and its structure. The past events have showed that MF needs more structure and that is why a bylaw review group should be organized. The meeting today is not about discussing details of the bylaws.

August emphasizes the importance of the bylaws and wants to invite people to join this work. He points out keywords as transparency, accountability and efficiency. Short-term and long-term proposals are mentioned. Short-term: oversight body independent of presidium, shrinkage of FUM, cleaning up old procedures. Long-term: Spending limit on FUM decisions (e.g. 10% of revenue), election reform as direct election of presidium, a squared voting system.

Madelene Flodman points out that it should be up to next FUM to decide on this.

Carl Johan Sundberg agrees and says that this proposal is not about who should do what, that is up to FUM. This proposal is about whether this should happen at all.

Jens Andersson agrees with Madelene and Carl Johan.

No other comments and Carl Johan suggests moving on to decisions and everyone agrees, no poll

is necessary.

**18.49 The Union meeting decides:
to recommend FUM to install a review group of MF's bylaws.**

Result of voting poll:

(Question: Recommendation to instate statutes review group")

Yes – 112/131 votes, 85%

No – 8/131 votes, 6%

Abstain – 11/131 votes, 8%

D4 External investigation of the accusations that have emerged and of the culture within Medicinska Föreningen with proposal for changes

Reporting the case: Lina Abdel-Halim

18.50, Lina gets 4 minutes to inform the attendants about this proposal:

"Hi everyone, my name is Lina and I'm the current president of students in research. What follows is a statement on assigning an external investigation regarding the current president.

As everyone in this meeting knows, as students and staff of a medical university, bias in the medical and scientific community is one of the greatest threats to evidence and objective truths, something we always strive to minimize and is rigorously sought after to be ruled out to the best of our abilities. This should also be the case for a medical university of the dignity that Karolinska carries. Internal investigations, especially of delicate natures, are extremely susceptible to bias, omission of information and conflict of interest.

A couple of weeks ago an internal investigation took place following serious accusations regarding the current president. That internal investigation was unfortunately riddled with weaknesses. Frankly, it can not even be called an investigation as no proper actual investigation was carried out. As an internal investigation conducted by two members who know and have worked with the person in question and have no formal or informal experience of the matter, bias is not only implicit because of these facts, but also, because the authors themselves declared bias in the report. Furthermore, the enormous time constraint given them, a mere two weeks, meant that the authors interviewed quote/unquote "interesting people" and chose them arbitrarily without giving the union members any information. Members in the union who would've wished to speak to them had they known, were not given the opportunity. Members who would've spoken to an objective party in an external investigation, we're also not given the opportunity. As has been pointed out before, several further allegations and stories have surfaced during these weeks after the original investigation, stories and allegations put forward by individuals who feel uncomfortable speaking up in these settings. Every single person whether it be you, a friend or a stranger, deserves to be able to put forward allegations in a neutral and objective setting without fear of bias and conflict of interest.

The intention of an external investigation is not to take on the role of a constitutional state but rather, to shed light on the structures within the union which have allowed the events of these past weeks to happen. It is purely aimed at improving the union and making sure that proper action is taken when needed, as should be for any governing agency. MF should not be above rules and regulations that organisations and companies normally have to enforce. As the union continually grows larger, so does the responsibility of the union towards its members and we must ensure the safety of each member. We owe it to ourselves and everyone else to ensure, as well, that we take these types of allegations seriously and that we respect and uphold the right to a fair external investigation.

Friends and colleagues should never investigate other friends and colleagues. In a setting where we value gold standard in research and medicine, so should be the case for everything else we do

at this university. External investigations are gold standard.

Lastly, we would like to raise the fact that FuM themselves initially wanted an external party to do the investigation from the very beginning, as they deemed that the risk of bias was just, too great. Something we wholeheartedly agree on and wish that they would've carried out. They finally decided against this citing time constraints as they had scheduled a meeting to elect the president for a week later. These time constraints do not exist now, and as such, FuM can once again decide to hire an external party for the investigation, in line with their own first decision. We take pride in that everything we do is peer-reviewed, so should this be."

Timo Oosterveld clarifies that the investigation should look into current happenings but also focus on the culture of MF in general, the environment and power imbalances. The importance is a change in the culture and structure, not pointing out rights or wrongs from recent happenings.

Sara Klyvare underlines that this should be an investigation about the structure in general and that it should be independent and really look into what the accusations are about. So, it needs both an assessment and an investigation of the organisation and the culture at MF and how the organisation is structured and how people have been elected in the organisation.

Lina Abdel-Halim agrees with Timo and the importance in his message.

No other comments and Carl Johan suggests moving on to decisions and everyone agrees, no poll is necessary.

Carl Johan clarifies that this is a recommendation to FUM and it is then up to FUM to decide how this should be done and by whom. It is also up to FUM to decide the timeframe and costs for this recommendation. FUM must look into this and decide what is most valuable for MF.

Jens Andersson wants to specify that the union meeting can make recommendations to different organs at MF, so it is good to specify who the meeting wants to be responsible for this recommendation.

Carl Johan Sundberg asks the meeting if a clarification is needed to whom this recommendation is for at MF.

Manouk Verhoeven agrees with Jens that this recommendation should be sent to FUM.

19:05 The Union meeting decides:
to add that the recommendation will be sent to FUM

Result from voting poll:
(Question: "Can we change the wording to send the recommendation to FUM?")
Yes – 76/105 votes, 72%
No – 2/105 votes, 2%
Abstain – 27/105 votes, 26%

19:08 The Union meeting decides:
to recommend FUM an external investigation and review of internal culture and accusations.

Result of the voting poll:
(Question: "Recommendation to instate external review of internal culture and accusations and send it to FUM")
Yes – 97/121 votes, 80%

No – 2/121 votes, 3%
Abstain – 20/121 votes, 17%

Ending of the meeting

19.09, Carl Johan Sundberg thanks everyone who has participated during this meeting on these important and difficult matters and says that we should move forward and work to strengthen MF, work together and really be respectful towards each other. He also informs that the FUM election should be held in a few weeks.

Sofia Andersson thanks the people who have made this meeting happen and that they make all students feel a lot safer.

The chairman of the meeting, Inspector Carl Johan Sundberg ends the meeting at **19.10**

Appendix

1. Protocol 2022:1 Union meeting
2. Dagordning Föreningsmöte
3. Attendees Union meeting
4. Time log Union meeting
5. Chat log Union meeting
6. Poll report Union meeting
7. Medicinska Föreningen Bylaws
8. Begäran om extrainsatt föreningsmöte
9. Concerns regarding 20th Nov FuM Election meeting
10. Invitation Föreningsmöte 6 januari 2022
11. Rapport till Fullmäktige
12. Kommentar till Sakrevisionens rapport till Fullmäktige
13. Misogyn kultur genomsyrar FuM – det vill vi inte stå för
14. Ordförande om Föreningsmötet
15. Svar på inkommen anmälan - STN

Secretaries

Anna Eklöf, secretary

Natte Hillerberg, secretary

Adjustment

Carl Johan Sundberg, Inspector

Sebastian Ols, adjuster

Timo Oosterveld, adjuster

Signature page

This document has been electronically signed
using eduSign.

eduSign