

Online

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present**  Neil Graffin, Colin Moore, Daniel Bedford, John Harrington, Daniel Bedford, Marie Selwood, Emma Milne, Chris Ashford, Philip Bremner, Flora Renz, Vanessa Munro, Jessica Mant, Huw Pritchard, Emma Jones, Emily Walsh, Simon Flacks, Diamond Ashiagbor |  |
| **1. Apologies**  Emilie Cloatre |  |
| **2. Approval of minutes**  Agreed |  |
| **3. Officer Reports**  **3.1 Chair’s report**  A warm welcome to the new trustees elected at the 2020 AGM: Chris Ashford, Simon Flacks, Emma Jones, Emma Milne, and Clare Williams.  New officers: Many thanks to Colin Moore for stepping up to the vital role of Membership Secretary. Many thanks also to Dan Bedford for taking on the role of Webmaster for the SLSA.  Vacant Officer Roles: Because of various moves around the committee, John Harrington has decided to step away from chairing the Seminars Sub-Committee. Elections to these roles will take place at the meeting, alongside election to sub-committees.  Congratulations to Jess Mant, who has recently passed her viva.  The Trustees Annual Report (as circulated for the AGM), and the Annual Accounts, once these have been fully signed off, must be submitted to the Charity Commission with our Annual Return within 10 months of the end of our Financial Year. This causes two problems: 1) every 4 years there is an extra day in February which can cause mistakes/confusion; and 2) there is only a very short time between financial year end and the usual date of the SLSA AGM, which takes place at the annual conference – this puts a great deal of pressure on us to prepare the documents we must circulate to members two weeks’ in advance of the AGM.  What are the trustee’s views?  **Agreed** to change year end date to 31 December.  The AcSS are very keen to campaign for the importance of social science in relation to Covid related research. If anyone on the board hears of anything which is of interest, please contact RH.  The next deadline for FAcSS nominations is approaching. We still do not make full use of the nomination opportunities available to us. All executive committee members are strongly encouraged to think of colleagues who would be suitable for nomination.  **3.2 Vice-chair (AL)**  AL and EKD are continuing to be part of the Learned Associations group set up to consider legal education & the SQE. The survey is now live: <https://law.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/sqe-survey>  Quite a lot of academics have answered it – not so many professional colleagues. The SRA has taken an interest in this and were enquiring of views. This will be published as a working paper.  JM – will we push on social media for professional colleagues? Agreed that this should happen.  We have confirmed via email that York will host the SLSA conference in 2022 and were in final discussions for Ulster for 2023. Conference hosting is likely to undergo some scrutiny by host organisations so, at the moment, this remains a little uncertain.  **3.3. Treasurer (VM)**  There was a discussion concerning how to make cost savings given the cancellation of the Portsmouth conference, and the uncertainty about whether there will be face to face conferences in over the next few years.  Membership fees  VM - there is support of pushing the fees up in the next cycle. It is difficult to see about how we might reduce costs from the budget. Are there ways to get more savings?  CA – are we going to increase membership fees in one go? CA suggested that this might be better, but also suggested looking at out-goings and making cuts there.  RH – suggests that it is best to assume that in the next number of conferences that we will get no donation at all. Therefore, we need to find money elsewhere. RH clarified (as a response to CA) that as a CIO we are no longer personally liable for debts of the organisation.  Grants and seminars  JH – suggested about making cuts to seminars and grants. However, JH states that the function of our grants is still a good one, even they are reduced in capacity. JH suggested we can strategically deploy smaller pots of money to help colleagues during this time. EKD agreed that universities are cutting back and we should support people financially during this time with grant money.  RH – wanted to stress that grants and seminars have already been paid so we cannot make savings this financial year.  Moving online and the newsletter printing costs  AL – suggested savings could be made by moving online as much as possible.  MS – we could cut down on the number of pages for the newsletter which could be helpful. MS thinks that we could get save some money on postage and printing and will investigate this.  RM – could we save money from the paper quality for the newsletter? MS suggested that this may be possible – we have used the same quality of paper from the 90s.  RH – suggested that the newsletter can be useful for recruitment.  VM – if we saved 10% in costs that would be helpful.  MS suggested that she will seek to see if we can reduce the number of pages we have in the newsletter.  Members of the SLSA donating money  RH – suggested a couple of people have stated that they would be happy to pay donations for grants. RH suggested that this would be used only for grants.  FR – could we look at giving priority to members of the SLSA who are likely to be more financially hit by Covid?  JMa – could we have a means tested system?  RD – is there some provision for research support for those more affected by Covid and in more need of support?  CM – could we have a graduated fee structure?  VM/ RH – both suggested that having a graduated fee structure this would cause issues with donations. It is best to rely on goodwill.  SK – suggested that asking for salary threshold does not work. Agreed, that it is best to rely on goodwill.  JH – suggested that we launch an initiative relating to Covid to see what donations we obtain.  RH – if we are to do this, it is best to have a working group. RM, VM, EKD, and CW will volunteer.  CW – asked whether we have a legacies system in place for those who want to leave money in their wills. RH suggested that we do not, but this is something to consider, however, all of this must wait until we have provision for Gift Aid in place.  RH – suggested that the last time we changed the membership fee it was problematic in terms of payments, with members paying the old fee for a significant period.  CM suggested we need to do online payments again and it would be a good idea to investigate direct debits. We can then control how much they pay as direct debits. However, it was noted that these can be problematic and may require a lot of work.  CM – suggested that it is taking a very long time for payments to be processed.  EKD – what if we use PayPal, now we have managed to sort things out with them?  DB – has offered to investigate online payments options to see what is the most appropriate.  **3.4. Membership (CM)**  Nothing more to add from what is in report and the issues discussed above concerning payments.  **3.5. Recruitment (RM)**  RM has been added to membership database.  RM asked is it worth targeting specific groups?  EM suggested that like other learned associations you could get half the membership free if you join later in the year.  **3.6. Newsletter and Web Editor (MS)**  MS had nothing further to add, other than we are looking at cost savings for the next issue.  MS suggested there are opportunities to allow us to increase money from advertising – e.g. the e-bulletin.  JH suggested as funding gets tighter, having a dedicated space to Covid will showcase why we should get funding. MS suggested that we can utilise the blog for this.  MS suggested that if we are to showcase work in the newsletter that we will likely have less pages to do this as we will be reducing the number of pages.  **3.7. PG Student Representative (TA)**  TA suggested that over the summer we start promoting the SLSA to PGRs by approaching PGR directors etc and asking them to promote the SLSA.  TA also stated that a PGR group have started mobilizing to discuss and support campaigns relating to Covid and asked whether we would consider supporting them (e.g. by signing open letters etc).  RH suggested that we could look at the different campaigns on a case-by-case basis, but as a CIO we should not have a political purpose and we should be mindful of that.  RH suggested (in response to a question from JM) that we should not have overtly political contributions on our blog.  JH suggested that we could raise ‘cases of need’ without making directly political statements (e.g. we can raise issues without them being linked to political campaigns).  RH suggested that we need to recruit a new PG representative. MS will advertise this in the e-bulletin.  **3.8. Webmaster (DB)**  Nothing further to add from the report. DB spoke to Lewis to discuss online payments and the members system.  DB also explained that we will need to upgrade to JOOMLA 4 in two year’s (will come at a cost).  **3.9. International liaison (SK)**  It has been proposed that we organise virtual drinks at the LSA.  CM suggested that with Zoom meetings you can have breakout rooms which allows for a better social experience.  Could CW investigate this?  CW asked, would this only be for people who have signed up to LSA? DA suggested that we could send out an email for those members attending and try it out.  SK suggests that she will need technical support for this, and that she will get people to sign up via Eventbrite.  RM, MS, CM, CW volunteered to provide support for this.  RH – we will discuss this more fully in the next meeting.  RH – should we make any representations to the LSA for the anti-social times they are being asked to present. RH – we are not involved – but suggested would send an email.  **3.10. Social Media (JMa)**  Nothing to add to the circulated report.  **3.11. Publisher’s liaison (RD)**  There are several publishers getting in touch offering discounts currently. Following the report, Cambridge have also got in touch offering a discount.  **Publisher Prize Draw:** As detailed in report (01/04), several publishers are interested in engaging in a prize draw.    RH – asked whether this is compliant with the Gambling Commission’s rules?  RD suggests that she will make 100% sure that it will comply with the Commission’s rules before establishing the prize draw. | RH  ALL  JM  MS  MS  RM, VM, EKD, CW  DB  MS  CW  RM, MS, CM, CW |
| **4. Conferences**  **4.1. a. Portsmouth**  Db stated that all losses resulting from the conference having to be cancelled due to covid-19 have been mitigated.  Virtual presentations/ videos from conference for website  A few have asked about virtual poster presentations – is this something we could sort out?  CW – could we have a gallery on the website?  Could we do interviews/ videos on the website? DB will liaise JM as to how we might do this.  Day rates issue  We removed the option for day rates for the Portsmouth conference, but DB explained that this caused a lot of issues, and complaints.  DB suggests that we consider providing day rates for the next conference.  Managing convenors  EW explained that there is an issue surrounding managing convenors. For example, their current details are not up to date on the system etc. Also, some convenors do not understand what their role is, they do not have adequate time to dedicate to organising their streams, and they need to understand that they have to attend the conference. EW asked whether we could we have clearer instructions for the future?  **4.1.b Cardiff conference**  HP has explained that an administrator has now appointed to help with the Cardiff conference.  HP stated that the restrictions to the facilitation of conferences are clear to us all and, currently, he explained that information from Cardiff University is limited. He explained that next Spring there will be restrictions in place. For example, in rooms with the normal capacity for 300 students, 40 people will be permitted in these. 3 – 5 persons will be permitted into conference rooms, making ordinary conference proceedings unfeasible.  HP discussed two options:  **A blended conference.** This would include some F2F contact and would allow us to balance digital and human presence. Restrictions would be in place which would mean that catering would be staggered, and the number of people allowed in rooms limited.  **Digital conference**. Everything would be conducted online. The issue concerning this is how do we keep collegiality together, will we want to go online, how do we generate income, and can we be creative?  Delaying the conference or staggering it over a period  NG – is there an opportunity to delay the conference until a later date?  JH – Cardiff would be unable to do this as they would not get the institutional support.  PB – could we do smaller sessions over a period? JH and RD to take a note of this.  CA – stated that currently within universities financial planning is in flux, but events are still going ahead.  RH – suggested that having a blended conference might be very complicated.  HP – there is an issue around there being a lot of preparation and then there being another spike meaning we cannot go ahead.  NG – would institutions be happy to pay conference fees for online events which look inexpensive on the face of them?  RD – we could be transparent about what we do when charging a fee and this might alleviate some concerns from institutions.  AL – suggested that using the platform Hop-In Conferencing could be a possibility to use for an online conference.  RH – is it possible to try for a blended conference and not have expensive events (e.g. dinners) and see how it might be planned? With the caveat that we protect Cardiff as much as possible from any economic fallout.  DA – asked whether a blended conference would be a desirable option for members.  RH suggested that it might operate on the basis that 3-4 people in a room and the rest would come in via IT.  SK – noted that she shares scepticism about blended conferences, suggesting that there are practical concerns, such as the use of microphones in rooms.  EJ – also suggested that it might be difficult to persuade an institution to allow their staff to go to the F2F option if there is online option open.  CM – asked how much an online conference would cost? JH suggested it could come in at 10k-15k.  JH suggested that Cardiff have things in place, but we need to confirm things ASAP, and JH would be concerned about organising things at short notice.  EM – is it worth putting a survey out to members?  RH – suggested we should survey the membership.  DB noted with respect to organising the Portsmouth conference that there were a lot of requests for blended experience.  NG – raised concern over surveying the members when they have not been party to discussions, nor may understand the limitations which Cardiff are working under in delivering the conference.  DB – could the survey be to the convenors rather than the membership?  CA – we could approach CHULS.  JH – can we decide in 6 weeks’ time?  **4.2 Postgraduate conference**  RH – the postgraduate conference will be held virtually in January. It will be free (no cheques required).  Agreed. Cardiff team will receive support from other members of the exec (JM, CM, EKD helping).  **4.3 One Day Conferences (RH)**  Nothing to report. | DB, JM  HP, RD  JH, RD  RH  RH  JM, CM, EKD |
| **5. Prizes and Competitions**  **5.1. Book prizes (RH)**  We had a discussion in the last meeting about how we ensure that book prize submissions are socio-legal. It was agreed that all submissions should include 500 words on why the books are socio-legal.    MS – suggested that we will need the rules to be finalised by 25 June.    DA – suggested that we should not define what socio-legal is within the rules.  DA suggested that we are going to get more submissions as indicators of esteem will be harder to obtain. DA also suggested that there are increasing pressures on ECRs.  The book committee should address the rules and circulate them.  NG – will we have smaller groups of reviewers to enable that large numbers of submissions do not have to be reviewed by a small number of people?  AL – if we stopped nominations to only one prize this would work, but it has been agreed that we do not wish to do this.    NG, EJ and CW will join the book committee moving forward.  **5.2 Article prizes**  Nothing to report.  **5.3. Contributions to the socio-legal community (RH)**  To note that that the deadline for submissions from the exec for nominations is the first week in September.  **5.3. Grants (EC)**  Nothing further to report – we will discuss in the next meeting the guidance provided for grant applications.  **5.4. Seminars (JHa)**  JH is stepping down from this role.  AL – suggests that we could run seminars online over the next year.  EKD – agreed with this.  RD – suggests we could share best practice if we learn to do things online.  CM – most institutions will be happy to co-badge with the SLSA if we decide to run online events.  Seminar rules will need be re-written – FR, RD, CM and SK.  CA, JM, RM, SF have now joined the seminar committee.  **6. Sub-committee membership**  Research training grants – we will not be funding these in the new year.  **7. PGR cheques**  Discussion not required as PGR will be online this year.  **8. Open Access**  JH – all research articles to be immediately open access from 2022/ monographs 2024.  JH explained that processing charges will have to be paid meaning that some universities may not want to publish the work of some authors. This may lock some academic staff out of publishing, and this is a concern.    CA and CW will join the open access working group.  **9. CIO policies**  **9.a. Complaints policy**  EKD will revise and finalise the complaints policy.  **9.b. Appeals policy**  EKD will revise finalise the appeals policy.  **9.c. Equality and diversity policy**  CW suggests that neurodiversity should be added into the policy. It was agreed that this should happen.  MS – will put the policies online with a dedicated policies page on the website.  **9.d. Data protection policy**  CM noted that this has now been passed.  JM - do we need an online policy? We should have guidelines.  RH – we need a conflict of interest policy and RH will draft this.  CW – do we have a policy on contentious issues and no platforming? RH suggests that misconduct/ hate speech might be covered under complaints – EKD will look at this.  Team for complaints policy? EJ will help, FR too, JM.  **13. Ethics statement**  TA explained that a draft of the ethics statement has been drafted, but we need a new team as the previous members have now left the board.  EM, DB, AL to be added to the ethics statement team.  **14. Future Executive Committee Meeting Dates**  RH asked that whether we should have another shorter meeting throughout the year. Agreed.  June – 25th (short meeting – 90 mins – 1pm)  September – digital – 17th  Jan – 14th (TBC)  May – 13th (TBC)  **15. Any Other Business**  ACSS nomination  REF criminology – any comments or thoughts to Rosie.  Could we ask membership to update address to send newsletters to home address? | AL  NG, EJ, CW.  ALL  FR, RD, SK, CM, PB, CA, CM.  CA, CW  EKD  EKD  DA  MS  RH  EKD  EJ, FR, JM  EM, DB, AL  RH  ALL |