



ASSOCIATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

LUND EST. 1935

UPF Lund Accountability Guidelines

This accountability policy stands as a beacon, guiding our commitment to the fundamental values of UPF Lund. Upholding transparency, fairness, and justice, our accountability system is designed to ensure the safety and inclusivity of UPF Lund while fostering a culture of responsibility and respect.

By addressing significant breaches and holding responsible parties accountable, we protect the integrity and efficiency of our association. Through clear guidelines for elected members we establish a strong framework for upholding our values and ensuring UPF Lund's continued success.

CONTENT

1) Vision	2
2) Definitions	2
3) Procedure	4

1) VISION

1.1. This policy is a shield against actions that jeopardize the values and the functioning of UPF Lund. It is a tool to maintain the integrity of the association.

1.2. The focus of this policy is on actions that have a tangible impact on the reputation or functioning of our association. The policy shan't be applied to issues of a purely personal nature that do not directly affect the operations of UPF.

1.3. The application of the policy is reserved exclusively for sitting elected members of the association It will not be applied to regular members or trustees.

1.4. The policy is not to be invoked in instances of interpersonal conflicts between board members or for minor errors made in good faith.

2) DEFINITIONS

2.1 The accountability procedure adheres to the fundamental principle of “innocent until proven guilty”. The burden of proof lies on the auditor(s), or in the absence of an auditor, by a fact-finding committee. The person(s) who initiated the accountability procedure must cooperate with the fact-finding committee

2.2 The accountability procedure can be triggered against any active elected position within UPF Lund. Namely, board members, presidium members, committee heads, senior collegium members, nomination committee members, and sexual harassment and discrimination contact persons. However, the auditor is not subject to the accountability procedure, therefore discretion when choosing the auditor is of utmost importance. The accountability procedure cannot be triggered retroactively against anyone who has been discharged from responsibility for the positions specified above.

2.3. A *resolution of no confidence* is the official document which initiates the accountability mechanism. A resolution of no confidence can only be triggered against one person. If multiple individuals are accused of misconduct, distinct resolutions of no confidence must be separately administered in accordance with the criteria outlined below (see section 3.1.e of this document).

2.4. A *vote of no confidence* refers to the official vote in which the board decides the outcome of the accountability procedure. A vote of no confidence can only occur against one person according to the points outlined in a resolution of no confidence (see section 3.3 - 4 of this document).

2.5 List of wrongdoings that merit a resolution of no confidence:

2.5a) Deliberate Misuse of Funds or Means: This entails deliberately using the funds or resources of the association for actions that do not align with the purpose and mission of UPF, for personal gain, or for other inappropriate purposes without obtaining authorization or consulting the board.

2.5b) Misconduct: Public or clearly visible actions or statements that directly oppose the steering documents of the association in connection with its daily operations. Misconduct specifically excludes actions or statements unrelated to the association's daily operations.

2.5c) Mismanagement of responsibilities and duties: This refers to a consistent pattern of disregarding or failing to fulfill the duties and responsibilities outlined in the association's steering documents. It also includes instances of dishonesty and deliberate attempts to conceal wrongdoing.

2.5d) Undisclosed Conflicts of Interest: These are undisclosed personal interests or affiliations that clash with the best interests of the organization, resulting in biased decisions or actions that harm the goals and functioning of the association.

2.5e) Breaking Swedish law: A person is convicted in a court of law of engaging in illegal activity in Sweden, during their tenure as an elected member of UPF.

2.5.1 In case of Discrimination or Harassment: follow the designated process outlined in the sexual harassment and discrimination guidelines.

2.6. A person cannot be held accountable according to the system of accountability for the following reasons:

2.6.a) Minor mistakes: an involuntary or minor mishandling of responsibilities that the person has taken responsibility for and tried with care and professionalism to remedy.

2.6.b) Personal issues: The accountability system must not be used to solve personal issues, conflicts, or minor disagreements between active elected members.

2.6.d) Non-involvement or lack of evidence: If there is no evidence or indication of the individual's involvement in the matter triggering the accountability system.

2.6.e) Incorrect Jurisdiction: If the issue outlined in a resolution of no confidence does not fall within the scope of the accountability systems criteria outlined in points 2.5a-2.5e

2.7. False allegations are statements or accusations that are unproven and untrue in the spirit of deliberateness or deceit. Accusations made in bad faith can trigger a new accountability process. However, if a vote of no confidence fails to pass, it should not be considered a false accusation.

3) PROCEDURE

3.1 Submission of the resolution of no confidence to an oversight body

3.1.a Any current UPF member can submit a resolution of no confidence to an oversight body for the triggering of an accountability process including: board members; presidium members; senior collegium members; sexual harassment and discrimination contact persons; UPF general members.

3.1.b The resolution of no confidence must contain a detailed summary of the main events, including:

- Date of submission;
- the name of the person submitting the resolution of no confidence;
- the name of the person suspected of having committed the wrongdoing;
- the position held by the accused person;
- the wrongdoing/s committed as listed under section 2.5 of this policy document;
- specific written account of what the accused person did that warrants a vote of no confidence;

3.1.c The oversight body must be impartial and independent.

3.1.d The oversight body is composed of the auditor.

3.1.e If there is no current auditor in place, an oversight body comprising three impartial board members should be established. These board members must adhere to the requirements outlined in Section 3.1.a of this policy document. Specifically, they should not have any involvement in the main events under scrutiny and must not possess any conflicts of interest with either the accused or the accuser.

3.1.f The oversight body must consider the submission of the resolution of no confidence in a timely fashion

3.2 Fact-finding process

3.2.a If the oversight body considers that the content of the resolution of no-confidence has merit in accordance with this policy document, then the oversight body can start a fact-finding process.

3.2.b As soon as the oversight body starts the fact-finding process, it must notify the accused person of what they are being accused of.

3.2.c This process shall aim at gathering information. This fact-finding process might include questioning of members or non-members of UPF depending on the nature of the accusation.

3.2.d During the entire fact-finding process the principle of “innocent until proven guilty” must be respected as stated under Section 2.1 of this policy document.

3.2.e At the end of the fact finding process the oversight committee should present the process they have followed to the board, including important facts that the committee has gathered.

3.2.f The oversight committee in its report should state whether the board should proceed on voting for a motion of no-confidence.

3.3 Vote of no-confidence: expulsion from the position

3.3.a After the oversight committee has presented its report and its decision, the accused person has the absolute right to defend themselves from the accusations to the board.

3.3.b The board should hold a discussion, assessing the information presented both by the oversight body and by the accused, with the purpose of deciding whether the accused should be expelled from the position. The discussion must be held in the presence of the accused person.

3.3.c After the discussion, the board should proceed with the anonymous voting.

3.3.d The motion of no-confidence for the expulsion of the accused from the position will be passed with a qualified majority

3.3.e In cases where the severity of the matter warrants, it is advised to consult statutes point 2.13, pertaining to the exclusion of a member: *"Any member who acts contrary to the purposes of the Association as defined in §1.1, or in any other way harms the Association, can be excluded by a decision of the Board. The decision has to be taken with a qualified majority"*.