

**12 January 2023**

**Action points**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Action Point | Who |
| 3.1 | Create short YouTube videos by current trustees, to explain what it is like to be a board member and to promote nominations | EM |
| 3.3 | Confirm where PG conference expenditure sits within the budget | PB |
| 3.12. | Put together and release plan and communicate releases via social media. | EM, EG |
| 3.12. | Review the possibility to produce short videos focused on the History of the SLSA in the autumn. | EM, JH |
| 3.15. | Include report from the SLSA Administrator in the papers for the May Board | NG |
| 4.1.a. | Review submission to conference in light of agreement by the board that speakers should only be allowed to submit one paper | MSi, CF |
| 4.1.a. | Speak to JM concerning what happened at the York conference | MSi, CF, JM |
| 4.1.a. | Set-up non-food area for delegates to support those participating in Ramadan. Communicate the availability of this space to delegates. | MSi, CF |
| 4.1.a. | Add to the conference programme that we are welcoming Muslim delegates during the month of Ramadan, highlighting the measures that are in place.  | MSi, CF |
| 4.1.b. | Advise Portsmouth conference team of the number of online delegates that attended the Ulster conference. | MSi, CF |
| 4.1.b. | Arrange further ad-hoc meeting where the on-going provision of hybrid facilities will be discussed. | JH, NG (EM)  |
| 4.2. | Draft and send round EOI for the open call to PGR conference 2023. | MM, LMcL |
| 5.3. | At the May Board Meeting discuss the reduction in the number of applications for grants over the past few years. | The Board |
| 5.3. | Change Grants and Fieldwork application guidance to make it clear that we do not cover retrospective work. | RM |
| 5.3. | Write to people who do not report, but have received grants on behalf of the Board. | RM |
| 5.3. | Consider steps to escalate for past issues of non-reporting | The Board |
| 6.1. | Review 2(3) of the Stream convenors policy | JM |
| 6.2. | Reconsider the social media position in line with comments from the Board. Also liaise with the EDI committee. | JH, AB |
| 6.2. | Consider whether the person filling the social media position will be attending the conference and how this will be funded. | JH, AB |
| 6.3.a. | Open five spots for VSR PhDs for our PGR conference (January 2024). | JH |
|  | Organise ad hoc meeting to discuss EDI and precarity. | NG |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present**F2F: Simon Flacks (SF), Sabrina Germain (SG), Philip Bremner (PB), Chris Ashford (CA), Elisabeth Griffiths (EG), Arwen Joyce (AJ), Rebecca Moosavian (RM), Marie Selwood (MS), Mark Simpson (MSi), Ciara Fitzpatrick (CF), Colin Moore (CM), Emma Milne (EM), Smita Kheria (SK), Richard Craven (RC), Clare Williams (CW), Maddy Millar (MM), Caroline Hunter (CH)Online: John Harrington (JH), Anna Bryson (AB), Beverley Clough (BC), Lara MacLachlan (LMcL), Daniel Bedford (DB), Matt Howard (MH), Mitch Travis (MT), Marie Burton (MB), Jed Meers (JM), Emma Jones (EJ) |  |
| **1. Apologies**Vanessa Munro |  |
| **2. Approval of minutes** Agreed. |  |
| **3. Questions pertaining to Officer Reports** **3.1 Chair’s report (JH)**JH expressed regret that he hadn’t been able to join the meeting in time. This was due to flooding which required him to turn back on his train journey.JH would like to express thanks to CA and NG for their time and work on the board. There will be two new honorary positions and JH said that it would be good to see diversity in nominations. Other committee positions include appointing a chair to the EDI group and the impact group. JH would like to express his gratitude to CW and VM for their work on the board, as they will be stepping down also. We also have five upcoming vacancies for trustees – again JH is keen to have widest range of nominations. EM has kindly agreed to develop short YouTube videos by current trustees, to explain what it is like to be a board member and to promote nominations. **3.2 Vice-chair (CA)**Nothing to add. **3.3. Treasurer (PB)**PB stated that there was not much to add in addition to the report submitted. Finances are healthy; we need to agree additional funding pots for initiatives currently under development. CH queried PG conference expenditure and where does that sit within the budget? PB will add this to the budget report. **3.4. Membership & data protection (CM)**CM states that there is nothing additional to add, other than to note that we are continuing to chase people for membership fees which are due or unpaid. **3.5. Recruitment (RM)**Nothing additional to report that will not be covered under internationalisation initiatives where RM is working with SK (see below). **3.6. Newsletter and web editor (MS)** Nothing to add. **3.7. PG Student Representative (MM)** Nothing to add. The annual PG conference at Oxford went very well. As regards PGR activities for future conferences, it would be worth considering judges. MT, BC, MH to help. **3.8. International liaison (SK)**Nothing to add – but note the new polices under 6.3a and 6.3b. **3.9. Webmaster (DB)**Nothing to add. **3.10** **Social media (EG)**Nothing to add but note the discussion regarding social media officer at 6.2**3.11. Blog (EJ)**Nothing to add. **3.12. YouTube Channel/ History of the SLSA (EM)**2022 is now complete. 2021 still waiting winners. Should we go ahead and release 2022? Agreed to press on launching what we have. JH suggests doing this prior to Ulster conference to build some publicity around this. Agreed. EM to put together and release plan and will work with EG on social media. CM suggests using one a day at the same time to gain traction. CW suggests having content over a period of time. Agreed to do this. We need five volunteers to record videos. History of the SLSA – we do not have the capacity to fund or run a large project ourselves, but would be able to produce short videos, We will review this in the Autumn. Jen Hendry and Naomi Creutzfeld are continuing with their project on UK-German socio-legal studies and they may be interested in collaborating on this. **3.13.** **Publisher’s liaison (EJ)**Nothing additional to report. **3.14. Open Access (SK)**Nothing additional to report.**3.15. Administrator (NE)**A report was supplied, but only came through after the meeting. It will be considered, with the next report at the May Board meeting. | EMPBEM, EGEM, JHNE |
| **4. Conferences****4.1.a. Ulster (MSi/ CF)**Abstracts and capacityThe call for papers is now closed and there have been 910 abstracts submitted, with the highest number of 56 in one stream. This is an unprecedented number of submissions and Ulster are seeking ways to deal with this issue. Suggestions include having an additional session on the Thursday, using additional meeting rooms, and having parallel sessions running for the same stream at one time. Ulster has the capability of allowing, without changes, 500 in person – but virtual registrations could be permitted. One change which has been made already - stream convenors have been contacted and they have to take four sessions each. MT suggested that people should only be allowed to submit one abstract. MSi suggests some people have submitted two abstracts. JH suggests that we agree that people can only submit one paper. Will we need to find out how many people will be attending virtually and how many in person. This was worked out during the course of the meeting, and it appears that based on past conferences approximately 1 in 9 opted for online. It was recognised that some people opted to attend online as the event drew closer, and this is something we may wish to provide further estimates on. MSi and CF to speak to JM concerning what happened at the York conference. AJ suggests people could be moved from across streams where capacity can be identified. MSi states that we can do that to an extent but there’s not much room. CM suggests that it is important we do not reject papers. NG asks if there is additional cost with an extra session. MSi suggests it will be minimal. RM asks whether additional sessions could be added using up some of the time of the plenary sessions. The board decided not to do this. JH suggests that some papers may not meet the grade and may be rejected.CF suggests that otherwise things are coming together with the conference and there are no other major issues.Provision for RamadanJH asked what provisions have been made for Ramadan. MSi suggests that dinner will not need to change as it will take place after sunset anyway. MSi suggests that a room has been identified as a prayer room. EM asks whether there is a space where food is not being eaten. CF suggests that the library will have minimised food consumption. EM suggests making delegates aware of space. MSi suggests we could set up a no food area. JH suggests that we add to the conference programme that we are welcoming Muslim delegates during the month of Ramadan, highlighting the measures that are in place. **4.1. b. Portsmouth (DB/ EW)** DB notes that Emily Walsh will be re-joining the organising committee. DB will arrange a site visit. DB asked whether Portsmouth should be enquiring for paying for services to video conference? JH suggests we should discuss hybrid arrangement in May. These may not be efficient if not many people are going to attend online. DB suggests that being able to obtain data regarding the Ulster conference will help. CH suggests that the number of online delegates changes as the conference draws nearer, so it is advisable to check on the data at a later stage. [note that there will be a further ad-hoc meeting where the on-going provision of hybrid facilities will be discussed]. **4.1.c Future Conference (JM)**JH has spoken to five universities, of which he thinks three will submit an expression of interest for 2025.  JH proposes that the conference committee then organise meeting, go back to institutions and update. **4.2 Postgraduate conference (MM, LMacL)**MM and LMacL reported that the PGR conference very successful. MM and LMcL have put together a document in terms of hosting for the next conference/s. Do we need to out a call out for next year’s conference? MB suggests that Oxford may be happy to continue to run the conference. JH suggests that we leave it open and keep Oxford in mind. CA suggests that it might be better doing open calls, challenging our own thinking. SK and MT both agree an open call is best, and it is inclusive. SK suggests that it shows socio-legal research takes place in a variety of institutions. It was agreed that we should have an open call. MM and LMcL will draft EOI for the open call. They ask whether we going to ask for an expression of interest for people to run the sessions as well? It was agreed that this should happen. CM suggests that the call to see who may be interested in hosting the conference should indicate that the hosting institution does not need to provide persons to host the sessions. **4.3 One Day Conferences (JH)**RC has submitted a proposal for a one-day conference. He has not asked for finances, just an endorsement. Agreed we are happy to endorse without cost. CM suggests we think about policies moving forward so we are clear about if and when we spend money on one-day conferences. CA suggests that we look at the procedures around endorsements as well. | MSi, CFMSi, CF, JMMSi, CFMSi, CFMSi, CFJH, NGMM, LMcL |
| **5. Prizes and Competitions** 5.1 Book prizes The shortlisting process for the book prizes is still ongoing and there is nothing to report until this finalises. 5.2. Article prizes (JH)One of the papers submitted was subsequently excluded from the competition due to a conflict of interest which had been overlooked.JH provided a breakdown of the scores for the top 5 ranked articles, and asked the Board it wished to consider all 5 in determining the shortlist, or to take the top 3 ranked by aggregate scores. MT asks whether there are any EDI reasons we expand to the 5? SK suggests we do not have any other basis to widen this out.It was agreed that there are no EDI reasons to expand, and there is a distance in the scoring from the between the third and fourth ranked sufficient to justify not expanding to a longer list of short-listed papers. 5.3. Grants (RM)Small grants RM had suggested that we fund the top grants that were awarded over 3 in scoring, and to split the remaining budget across the next grant applications. The board discussed whether we should be doing this where there will be a shortfall for those that applied for the remaining grant funds. NG mentioned how it might be difficult for some applicants to obtain further funding from their institutions. PB suggests we could use the underspend from the impact grant funding to fund all the grants and fieldwork scored over 3 for what they have asked for. The board agreed that all applications can be awarded this year where the applications scored over 3. This takes us slightly over budget - £11,199.85 awarded in total. NG suggests looking at the messaging for grants as the number of applications has gone down over the past few years. This will be discussed at the next Board meeting. Fieldwork grantsRM suggested that the top 3 by rank could be awarded and the remainder split across the rest who scored over 3. The board decided to award all applicants who averaged scores over ‘3’. This leaves 2 apps unfunded, both with scores below 3.Additional considerationsRM asks whether we should be thinking about environment issues when awarding grants. JH suggests this comes up as an issue with respect to internationalisation and so can be discussed later. RM asks about whether we should be awarding money for work that is ongoing at the time of consideration of the awards. Could they recoup the costs? RM suggests that we do not cover retrospective work, but this would involve change to guidance. The board agreed that the guidance should be changed. RM – what about people who do not report, but have received grants? Can any action be taken here? Could this be factored into guidance? EM asks whether there is a prohibition on attending conferences for non-reporting? RM will check guidance. JH suggests we bar people from applying for future grants and we write to them as a board. CA suggests we contact the institution as that is who the money goes to. SK suggests that we take steps to escalate for past issues of non-reporting. The board agreed that we should do this. 5.4. Seminars (SF)Nothing more to report. 5.5 Impact funding awards (VM)JH reminded Board members that we need a new chair. Nothing more to report.   | The BoardRMRMThe Board |
| 6.1 Stream convenors policy (JM)JM indicates that the policy went out to convenors. There was positive endorsement and some minor suggestions. JM noted that a change was made for the requirement that there should be early career involvement. We are not going to require ECR involvement in convenorship, but we have encouraged it. JM noted that we have fallen short of imposing a maximum term on convenors. The policy suggests the term is 3 years, with max of two 3-year terms. JM suggests we use Portsmouth as a pilot for trialling the new policy rather than Ulster, which was previously mooted. The board agreed that this should happen - the next meeting after the AGM will lead to appointment of stream secretary, and the trialling of the policy should happen after this. EM suggests that 2(3) allows stream convenors to continue beyond the terms. JM will revisit this. The policy was approved by the board. 6.2 Social media strategyPayment of positionThe suggestion is for the person to be paid for 3 hours a week for a year at £13 an hour; added benefits that may be attractive proposition. CW asks how the person could be paid – considering the London living wage and tax etc. CA suggests that we ensure that our advert is consistent with our policies in precarity and EDI. CA suggests we should have a letter from the precarity officer approving this position. SK suggests that we check comparable rates from across the sector and document these. SK suggests that we might be specific on it being a PhD student and send the advert out to law schools. AB suggests that the rate was modelled on what is paid at QUB. This is something JH and AB will give more consideration to. JM suggests that it would be better to get someone in place sooner rather than later, so it is in place before the conference. EM asks for additional request that the person edits the YouTube videos. This was not agreed by the board. MT asks if we should wait on appointing someone given that Twitter has had some issues recently, with some users moving to other platforms. BC suggests a person should be agile enough to adapt to new trends in social media. BC is not clear on who we are targeting (e.g., do they need knowledge of social-legal studies?). AB suggests that we keep this open. BC suggests being mindful of the criteria for short-listing purposes. NG suggests that we clarify that the job description specifies that they need their own equipment. CH – where are we going to advertise this position? To the membership or beyond? JH suggests that an understanding of socio-legal studies should be essential. JH suggests that the first round of advertising should be through SLSA channels. EM – agrees we should press on. EM also asks if the person attends the conference and how they would be funded. AB and JH will consider this further. This was agreed by the board. CF suggests that we go directly to PGR network. JH suggests running this by precarity and EDI and thinking of the nature of the contractual relationship, and wage in more detail. JH suggests taking another look at the document and revising it. 6.3.a. Proposal for international collaboration funding scheme (SK)Collab between SLSA and Dutch/ Flemish socio-legal association (VSR). This proposal is aimed at facilitating PGR students from SLSA and VSR to participate in each other’s conferences. It is suggested that VSR will take the first step by opening five spots at the VSR PhD conference (July 2023) for SLSA PGR members, and likewise proposes SLSA to open five spots for VSR PhDs for our PGR conference (January 2024). We have discussed the subvention that each association can make to this exchange. While applied to different participants costs, these will be roughly equivalent, with SLSA contributing around £275 each year. MM and LMcL are in full support. The board agreed this proposal (noting the treasurer is happy to support). JH noted that we will be able to use this as a pilot for other links.6.3.b Specific funding stream for international collaboration (SK)SK laid a detailed paper with a proposal for a competition to fund colleagues to develop links with socio-legal scholars and groups outside the UK. It pays specific attention to developing links with the global south.Restrictions on UK travelSK suggests this scheme runs as a pilot initially. SK asks should we put restrictions on international travel? The proposal would bars UK participants from travelling internationally, though not vice versa, particularly in the case of scholars based in the global south. CW suggests that it may look like we are promoting a hierarchy of knowledge, focussed on the UK/Europe. The board agreed that we should not restrict UK academics going to the global south. Carbon offsetting and travel Do we want to make a carbon-offsetting cost applicable? CM suggests offsetting should be compulsory.  EM suggests banning short haul. CH suggests that people have to justify why they have to travel. RM suggests we assess applications through including reference to environmental factors. CA suggests that we ensure that we are very open and to broaden our networks. CA suggests that we just seek to place ‘justify’ travel and we look at things in the round. JH suggests softening the language and ask we provide a justification. MT suggests that requiring everyone going by train may not be financially viable in some institutions]\*\*The meeting was ended at 4 and we were unable to discuss EDI and precarity. It was agreed to organise an ad-hoc online meeting to discuss these issues and to also discuss the continuing provision of hybrid conference facilities. We will conclude discussion of the scheme for International Collaboration at the next Board meeting. | JMJH, ABJH, ABJH, ABJHNG |