

**13 January 2022**

**Online**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present**  Neil Graffin (NG), Colin Moore (CM), Rosie Harding (RH), Rebecca Moosavian (RM), Mark Simpson (MSi), Arwen Joyce (AJ), Caroline Hunter (CH), Chris Ashford (CA), Clare Williams (CW), Daniel Bedford (DB), Ed Kirton-Darling (EKD), Emma Jones (EJ), Flora Renz (FR), Huw Pritchard (HP), Jed Meers (JMe), Jess Mant (JM), John Harrington (JH), Maddy Millar (MM), Marie Selwood (MS), Mitchell Travis (MT), Philip Bremner (PB), Vanessa Munro (VM), Victoria Adkins (VA), Flora Renz (FR) |  |
| **1. Apologies**  Sabrina Germain, Smita Kheria, Diamond Ashiagbor, Emma Milne,  Beverley Clough |  |
| **2. Approval of minutes**  Agreed. |  |
| **3. Officer Reports**  **3.1 Chair’s report (RH)**  A warm welcome to Mark Simpson who is acting as the Ulster University liaison. There will be a visit to Ulster University in the Spring.  A warm welcome to Arwen Joyce who will be acting as our precarity representative.    And goodbye to Rosie Harding who will be stepping down after the next AGM.    Chris Ashford has indicated willingness to stand for election as chair.  Trustees coming to end of their tenure, or have expressed willingness to stand down, include DA, JM, EKD.  RM, PB and VM come to the end of a three-year term. All are seeking re-election. VM will be stepping down as treasurer but seeks re-election as a trustee – PB has expressed his willingness to stand for election as treasurer.  HP comes to the end of his term as Cardiff 2021 conference rep. The Board thanked him for all his work.  VA has been appointed to a full-time lectureship and will step down as PGR rep at the 2022 AGM. The Board thanked her for all of her work.  RH would like to thank everyone: ‘It has been my great pleasure to lead the SLSA over the last few years, and to work with the wonderful bunch of people who have been on the Executive Committee/SLSA Board in my time. These last few years have been challenging, but I am pleased to be stepping down with the SLSA in good shape, both in terms of our charity status and all the work that has been associated with that, and in terms of membership numbers and a thriving field’.  Under the SLSA CIO Constitution one third of the Board must retire at each AGM; there are 20 trustees on the board, so this means that we need 7 trustees to retire by rotation, though can stand for re-election if they have not served their maximum term. RH asks whether we should increase the board size to 21 to allow dividing by three easier? ***This was agreed.***  There will be 5 vacancies for new trustees at the 2022 AGM.  RH has asked that officers need to send their reports for collation by Friday 4 February to be included in the Trustees Annual Report.  NG to liaise with MS to get voting for the AGM operative.  **3.2 Vice-chair (CA)**  Nothing further to add.  **3.3. Treasurer (VM)**  The balance that was predicted is reflected in the end of year accounts.  VM noted that there is a grant underspend – we have offered extensions, but with covid etc some of the money has not been used.  RH suggests that this is something the SLSA need to keep an eye on.  JH – is there any chance of getting a covid recovery fund to help colleagues get back out, using the underspend? RH suggests that this would be useful.  CA – suggests that this would need to be different from existing schemes. CA suggests that the socio-legal field might be held back without doing something interventionist.    We should place the discussion about a covid recovery fund on to the agenda for May’s meeting.  FR notes there have been similar issues with the seminar series.  Postgraduate conference  RH – suggests that PG conference should move to being hybrid as soon as possible. It may be that we push this into the summer to be more confident about being able to deliver the conference in a face-to-face setting.  CW – notes that F2F is important from the survey.  JM agrees that it should be hybrid, noting that networking is better at the PG conference when PGRs can meet face-to-face.  VM suggests that the 5k budgeted for the PG conference is appropriate given what is projected in our accounts.  MM notes caution about how far we push the PG conference into the summer.  Linda Mulcahy has offered to run a face-to-face event at the Centre for Socio-legal Studies in Oxford. RH suggests that running the PG conference face-to-face in Oxford would be an appropriate way of bringing it back F2F.  ***It was agreed to put £5,000 back into the budget to run the PG conference.***  RH – do we need anything more for website/ CRM development? CM suggests that we’re safe at the minute and there is room for scope to reduce material if needed.  DB – suggests that we will be moving across to new Joomla version which might mean additional IT support required – but not at a cost.  **3.4. Membership & data protection (CM)**  CM - We need to work on procedures and having better information lines with NE. CM, CA, DB, and RH to have a discussion regarding this.  **3.5. Recruitment (RM)**  RM will be attending a Zoom meeting with EDI committee based on survey findings.  JM – can we check and share data on who is an SLSA member when registering for the conference to make sure that we can help to recruit people? JM, CM, RM – will work on this.  MSi –could membership be included in conference fee? RH suggests that this is something to look at for the Ulster conference.  **3.6. EDI (CW)**  CW – survey has been completed, and a PowerPoint has been circulated with some preliminary results – a full report will be produced soon.    We had an 8.2% response rate. EJ has completed a qualitative survey of the data.  CW – if anyone wants to be involved in working on report, to let CW know, including any suggestions. The plan is to publish the report before York.  JMe and CH stated that the York conference organisers are mindful of accessibility– accommodation is something they are looking at as well.  RH – it may be that we have to think of other substantive ways of capturing EDI beyond the survey (e.g., the database). CW suggests that the issue with the database is that we can only obtain five characteristics, the database is not designed for capturing this sort of data, and to ask to go beyond its standard capabilities comes at a high cost.  **3.7. Newsletter and Web Editor (MS)**  MS suggests everything is going smoothly.  It was asked whether we want to speak about the sponsorship scheme, particularly as we have non-payers.  CA suggests that it is not a problem because if someone hasn’t paid, we remove their name from the newsletter. Is there a role for NE to follow this up?  MS asks whether it is worthwhile to have flyers in the packs? JMe suggests that they would encourage it at the conference.  **3.8. PG Student Representative (VA/MM)**  They have recruitment drive and numbers have gone up.  If anyone has ideas for PGR session on diversity to get in touch.  **3.9. Webmaster (DB)**  Nothing further to add.  **3.10. International liaison (SK)**  SK sent apologies. Nothing further to add.  **3.11. Social Media and blog editor (JM)**  JM states that everything going well, and blogs are coming in quickly.  CW say that there are a lot of positive comments on the survey. CW asked if the social media and blog editor roles could be separated.  JM suggested that the two roles are manageable – she suggests it is easier having two people straddling the roles, rather than separating them – as they are linked.  MS suggests that she is happy to do a quick proof-read of any blogs that come in.  EJ suggests that she could help with blog.  JM suggests you should have an editor and deputy editor for the blog so someone else can do a soft review.  RH suggests EJ speaks to JM about the role of blog editing.  JM – needs to liaise with DB about getting a new login for new person for the blog.  CM – looking for someone who is happy to take on social media account – NG/MS to put in advert for when election is being advertised.  **3.12 Publisher’s liaison (PB)**  PB - some publishers have not got back yet regarding attendance at the conference – PB is chasing.  RH suggests Bristol University Press should be there.  RH asks all Board members to encourage publishers they have existing relationships with to attend. | NG, ALL  NG, MS  NG  CM, CA, CD, RH  JM, CM, RM  MSi  ALL  MS, JMe  ALL  EJ/JM  JM/DB  NG/MS |
| **4. Conferences**  **4.1.a. York (JMe, CH)**  Calls are closed – 540 paper submissions have been received. This is similar in size to Leeds.  JM suggests that there is initially indicated 2:1 split F2F v online. This was what was initially budgeted.  There was an issue with the medical law stream – both convenors have had to drop out. It has been opened without convenors, but they are trying to find a new convenor. MT suggests that he can approve/ disapprove papers while this is on-going.  RH suggests that it is very encouraging to see a good number of people willing to attend face to face and the number of papers submitted.  JMe suggests that there is a situation where undergraduate international students are submitting papers, and these are sometimes not easy to spot. The conference organisers are continuing to monitor this.  JM suggests that the decision-making around bursaries is becoming more complicated due to hybrid nature of conference and other issues. RM will help looking into this issue.  PG accommodation is provided for two nights free, but some PGRs who are travelling a long way are having to pay for first night. JM suggests that they take £25 off the cost of accommodation for the Tuesday night. ***All agreed that this is OK.***  VA – if the money has been paid already can they get a refund? JMe agreed to look for a solution to this.  CH – we need to ensure that we have covid contingency (e.g., if there is another lockdown). The vision is that we go online for everything if this happens. The issues are (a) how much the conference organisers have to pay, and (b) at what point they need to do this, and (c) how they refund the difference between the face to face and online. CH suggests that they will speak to conference people about this.  CH –York have asked Geoffrey Vos to conduct the plenary – this is to be confirmed. There is a contingency plan should this not be confirmed. \*update: Geoffrey Vos has now confirmed.  VA – we need 3-4 people to be poster judges. Three people volunteered. Poster judges – CA, RH, MT  VA notes there’s a University of York event taking place online only at the same time as the PGR event. CH explained that this is for international students and will be online.  VA – will there be parking facilities? JM – yes there are.  CM – asked that there is no background music during the dinner so people can network. JM suggests that there will be super soft jazz.  CH – mentioned that there will be at ‘at table’ magician.  **4.2 Postgraduate conference (SK)**  VA – the PG conference went really well and there is a lot of nice feedback. New speakers were really grateful for opportunity. VA/MM have proposals about how they might change it for next time.  CA will be the main point of contact for the PG conference moving forward – NG to add this.  **4.3 One Day Conferences (RH)**  Nothing further to add.  FR suggests she can speak to anyone thinking of doing a one-day conference. | MT  JMe, RM  CA, RH, MT  NG |
| **5. Prizes and Competitions**  **5.1. Book prizes (AL)**  We are up to shortlisting the final candidates.  **5.2 Article prizes (RH)**  There are three shortlisted for the article prize [these are in chair’s report].  MS asked the timing of the announcement – books/ articles are done together.  **5.3. Grants (EC)**  EKD notes that one application sought teaching buy-out. Agreed to offer without teaching buy-out.  EKD notes that that there have not been as many applications this year.  RH – is the grants committee confident that quality threshold is there despite low numbers? EKD suggests yes if we look at the scores.  FR – suggests that we should fund people as many people as possible given the circumstances.  Agreed to approve top six small grants and four fieldwork grants.  **5.4. Seminars (FR)**  FR states that the usual process has been followed and there are five applications. Measures are in place to make sure the judging process ensures quality.  **5.5. Contributions to the socio-legal community (RH)**  Nothing to add. |  |
| **6. Academy of social sciences**  RH notes that the chief execs of learned societies meeting is next week, so RH states there is nothing of note to mention.  One nomination has been submitted to the Academy. |  |
| **7. Supporting impact in socio-legal research**  There was a discussion concerning the documents submitted for the new scheme which aims to support impact in socio-legal research.  Stream convenors. JMe suggests that 5-year period for current topics is sensible. He suggests it might be ‘current topics or themes’. MT to change.  RH suggests that the deadline needs to be changed.  RH suggests that the reference to ‘impact grants committee’ should be changed to whole SLSA board. MT to change.  ***The policy was agreed, and it was also agreed there should be rolling deadlines.***  Impact funding. VA says that it is good to see PGRs included. Nothing further to add. ***All agreed.***  Impact prize. JH - Reference to impact committee should be changed to the board (as above for stream convenors). Agreed to change – otherwise ***agreed.***  CA suggests it might be good to produce small booklets to highlight impact in the future.  RH – how do we advertise? MS will put into the Spring newsletter. RH to provide copy    JM will also publicise through the blog/ social media.  RH suggests having one page on the website for the three separate schemes. | MT  MT  MS/RH  JM  MS |
| **8. AOB**  History of the SLSA (EM)  RH and EM discussed the possibility of recording the oral history of the SLSA – it was agreed to push this to next meeting.  JH – Linda Mulchy and Fiona Cownie may be good to speak to concerning this.  The implementation of UKRI proposals (JH)  Open access group met to discuss UKRI. The key elements are that all articles will need to be open access from 1 April 2022. All monographs from Jan 2024 will need to be open access. JH states that there is not more to say beyond this. JH suggests that two members should join. RM and NG will join the group.  QAA Subject Benchmark Statement Review  EJ will represent the SLSA on this – agreed.  Goodbye to Rosie  CA took some time at the end of the meeting to thank Rosie for all her work for her contributions to the community and for all the innovations during her tenure as chair.  12 May is the provisional date for the next meeting which will be in person.  CA and NG to discuss outside this meeting about booking the next meeting. | NG  RH/EM  RM, NG  EJ  CA/NG |