

**16 September 2021**

**Online**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present**  Clare Williams, Rosie Harding, Victoria Adkins, Beverley Clough, Caroline Hunter, Chris Ashford, Clare Williams, Ed Kirton-Darling, Emma Milne, Flora Renz, Huw Pritchard, John Harrington, Maddy Millar, Marie Selwood, Mitchell Travis, Philip Bremner, Vanessa Munro, Jed Meers, Emma Jones, Jed Meers, Sabrina Germain, Rebecca Moosavian |  |
| **1. Apologies**  Colin Moore, Jess Mant, Diamond Ashiagbor, Daniel Bedford |  |
| **2. Approval of minutes**  Agreed. |  |
| **3. Officer Reports**  **3.1 Chair’s report (RH)**  RH would like to offer a warm welcome to Maddy Millar (MM) who is our new PGR rep.  AcSS Learned Societies Meeting  RH said that she had been at the AcSS Learned Societies meeting, where an ESRC representative shared data about EDI issues in ESRC applications. The figures did not demonstrate a significant problem in law & legal studies, but that there were clear issues across the whole of the ESRC remit, demonstrating both ethnicity and gender biases.  RH share intelligence that the review of REF is expected to focus more on use of metrics to cut costs (e.g., by looking at high-ranking journals). This is something to look out for.  The open access review was also discussed briefly – this is going to create issues around open access monographs to make them REF-able.  Hybrid conferencing was also discussed – the SLS conference had 500+ with 120 face to face, most of which were early career. This may have an impact on our conference. Anecdotally it was suggested that there were 40 in person at the CLC and 100 online.  Law Commission  CA and RH went to meeting in June and discussed 14th programme – the report should be published in the autumn of 2021.  AHRC  RH participated in a roundtable discussion about AHRC funding of Law and Legal Studies research in July. A scoping call was published in late July with a deadline of 26 August, and it is difficult to know what level of response the call garnered at this time, given that the publication of the call and deadline were both during the summer period. RH will update if and when more is heard.  Impact Working Group  RH reported that the Impact working group met in August to discuss how the SLSA can best support impact activities for SLSA members. A discussion paper has been drafted, see below.  Commercial Court  Would the SLSA be signatories to a letter of support submitted to us to develop their resources? ***Agreed that we will.***  **3.2 Vice-chair (CA)**  Bar Standards Review of EU law  MT and CA went to this. CA felt there were issues and that they accepted they need to discuss these with learned associations. CA suggested that there was a requirement to rank aspects of EU law at the meeting which CA and MT deemed problematic.  SQE  SQE will need to continue having conversations with learned societies and CHULS. CA to take AL’s position in discussions as part of the SQE review.  **3.3. Treasurer (VM)**  VM suggests that the finances are looking healthy, and we are waiting the money from Cardiff.  Kent returned part of an award that was unspent.  Some small amounts have been donated from eBay – RH suggested that this might be fraud and VM will follow up with the bank.  Some members are paying the old fee. Can members pay the extra £10 via PayPal? CM to send out a message to ask for the top-up.  NE should be keeping track of who has paid what and VM can contact to chase this.  There was a discussion about Institutional SLSA memberships – under the previous constitution, these were possible, but they cause problems under the new CIO constitution.  RH suggests that we stop the institutional membership option. This was agreed.  **3.4. Membership and data protection (CM)**  CM was not present.  CM had requested that we look at a data request for a right to be forgotten from a digitally archived past conference programme. The Board agreed we will do this, not because we must, but because we want to under the circumstances. However, the paper archive at IALS will not be amended by IALS (this is not covered under the right to be forgotten). We also do not have control over the Wayback machine and therefore cannot delete anything from that.  MS to liaise with CM to ensure the right details are deleted from the online programme.  CM to respond to the person who made the data request noting that we will remove details from the online programme but noting that we have no control over digital versions stored by others, and that the paper archive (held at IALS) will not be amended.  **3.5. Recruitment (RM)**  RM asked whether we should be targeting underrepresented groups. ***Agreed that we should.***  **3.6 EDI Report (CW)**  EDI survey  CW would like to thank everyone who attempted the survey.  CW would also like to thank CM for his assistance in sorting out the ethics for the survey.  CW asks – who are we surveying? Members of the SLSA only or the entire socio-legal community? EJ suggests that we should not be targeting people who have left. Also, we do not know how representative it will be. RH suggests that the aim was to find out the EDI details of members and we should retain that aim. ***Agreed to stick to members only***, and we will ensure that this is the case by including a question in the survey.  CW – should we allow for partial surveys to be used? ***Agreed, no, as this does not indicate full consent.***  CW – is the timetable for this OK? RH suggests yes.  CW – has anyone got experience using Qualtrics through a screen reader? NG will check with the OU.  RH would like to express thanks to CW and the EDI team for taking this forward.  Policy on unacceptable behaviour  Can we review the policy on unacceptable behaviour if there are hybrid sessions? Could there be two chairs so that both the live sessions and online sessions can be monitored? JMe suggests that this feasible. CW suggests that for non-members there are no sanctions for unacceptable behaviour. EKD suggests that he is happy to be involved in looking into this.  Precarity rep  Precarity rep – following discussion, it was agreed that a group of volunteers will take forward the advertising for and appointment of a Precarity Rep to be in attendance at Board meetings to represent the needs of socio-legal researchers on precarious contracts.  Retired member fee  It was proposed that the fee should rise from £65 to £100 with an EDI waiver. RH – could this be on the basis of hardship? **Agreed**.  CM and DB will see how retired fee can be paid through PayPal  Vote on policy to freeze membership  Agreed.  MS to put retired membership and policy to freeze membership on to website.  **3.7. Newsletter and Web Editor (MS)**  MS asked whether we would want to stay with black and white and 16 pages, or go back to coloured paper and more paper?  CA – suggests that he preferred the old way. Seconded by NG.  RH notes that we’d received no complaints about the colour.  Agreed to stick to black and white and 16 pages for the time being.  RH would like to express thanks to Marie.  **3.8. PG Student Representative (VA/MM)**  Nothing further to add to the report.  **3.9. Webmaster (DB)**  Nothing further to add to the report.  **3.10. International liaison (SK)**  SK has been reaching out to other socio-legal organisations and four have responded positively. All discussed ways through which members could connect with one another. It was mooted that membership directories might help with this, but this was discussed in a previous meeting as something we do not wish to do.  RH suggests that we could have co-hosted events and we have a history of doing this (e.g., with the German socio-legal society).  CH suggest the new head of school at York has good connections with South Asian organisations and she could seek to utilise these. CH to introduce to SK  RH suggests that it might be appropriate to support some scholars to attend the LSA Global Meeting in Lisbon. Agreed that a working group should be set up to look at this and asked for six volunteers.  **3.11. Social Media (JM)**  Nothing further to add.  **3.12 Publisher’s liaison (PB)**  Nothing further to add. | CA  VM  CM  VM  MS  CM  RM  CW  CW  NG  EKD  MT, RM, FR, SG, EKD.  CW  CM/DB  MS  MS  CH, SK  NG, CA, PB, EJ, RM, SK, MT [VM to liaise after proposal] |
| **4. Conferences**  **5.1. York (CH/ JMe)**  CH reported that the budget is still fluid in terms of income as York are making assumptions who will come in what way due to the hybrid nature of the course. However, the expenditure is much clearer than what it was and there is some room if things go wrong.  JMe - Mosaic is involved and the SLS have been in touch to provide advice - we will hear what their experiences have been in using the platform for the SLS conference.  JMe would like to pass on thanks to the Cardiff team for their help and assistance in the ‘handover’ from the last conference.  JMe – it is possible to register online only. All the other costs are reflective in the price. All sessions will be online and on Zoom. Online access will not be heavily discounted for budgeting reasons.  If someone has registered for the face-to-face session but finds that they cannot attend, they can opt for online and will be refunded the difference.  NG – what about the AGM? Hybrid format expected, but we should discuss this at the next meeting (voting is an issue that needs to be worked out).  A discussion was had around the cost of registration for online only attendance. It was noted that in-person attendees should not subsidise participation costs of online attendees. Costs for online attendance are similar to in person attendance, without food. All other costs are the same. Hybrid/online attendance creates extra costs, including technical and administrative support. The price of online registration reflects these costs.  MT asked how many applications for current topics have there been for the conference? JMe – 19.  **4.1.b Future Conferences**  Nothing to add  **4.2 Postgraduate conference**  A lot of discussion has gone into the new proposal for the postgraduate conference. The group decided that new members should pair-up with experienced members to enable sharing of best practice for the conference. It was agreed that we would publish an open call for expressions of interest in being involved with the PG conference.  **4.3 One Day Conferences (RH)**  No new one day conference proposals have been received. | NG  MS/SK |
| **5. Prizes and Competitions**  **5.1. Book prizes (CW)**  Query from Colin Perry at Routledge – is it ok that prize-winners can attend online, instead of having to attend in-person at the conference? **Agreed that online attendance would be permitted.**  **5.2 Article prizes (RH)**  Nothing to add. Closing date approaching  **5.3. Grants**  Nothing to add. Closing date for applications approaching  **5.4. Seminars (FR)**  Nothing to add. Seminar competition open. |  |
| **6. Ethics statement**  RH would like to extend a thank you to the team for looking at this – it is improved, noting that all that needs to be rectified are a couple of typos and missing paragraph numbers. RH will email these to EJ  RH – should we consult our membership? Agreed that these were minor changes that did not require consultation. | RH |
| **7. Academy of Social Sciences**  Since the meeting the SLSA nomination of Prof Antonia Layard has been approved. One nominee for the December deadline has come forward. | VM |
| **8. Membership fees**  Discussed above. |  |
| **9. Supporting impact in socio-legal research**  A policy document was circulated, and changes were made as follows: current topic convenors to be eligible in the same way as stream convenors for networking funding.  ***Agreed that we should move forward with the proposal, with a impact funding, networking funds and a new impact prize.***  It is planned that this will launch at the York 2022 Conference and the team for this is willing to keep going with MM involved.  Working group to meet to draft and agree documentation for:  Impact funding  Non-academic networking activities  Impact prize | RH, CA, JH, JM, VM, SG, MT, MM |
| **10. Any Other Business**  ESRC PGR review – JH has seen a draft. This hasn’t been haven’t finalised. Doctoral Training Partnerships are noted to be important for the Association as there are socio-legal streams in them. Socio-Legal Methodologies workshops involving ESRC funding students from across multiple DTPs (organised by Linda Mulcahy, and supported by the SLSA and JLS) were offered as examples of best practice in cross DTP cohort building.  The DTP recommission process is coming up and the final report of the PGR review is expected in Autumn 2021. |  |