

**14 September 2022**

**L101, IALS, Russell Square, London**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present**  John Harrington (JH), Anna Bryson (AB), Marie Burton (MB) [online], Beverley Clough (BC) [online], Richard Craven (RC), Neil Graffin (NG), Philip Bremner (PB), Caroline Hunter (CH), Colin Moore (CM), Sabrina Germain (SG), Matthew Howard (MH), Smita Kheria (SK), Emma Milne (EM), Vanessa Munro (VM) [online], Mitchell Travis (MT), Clare Williams (CW), Daniel Bedford (DB), Caroline Hunter (CH), Arwen Joyce (AJ), Jed Meers (JM), Maddy Millar (MM), Marie Selwood (MS), Lara McLachlan (LMcL) |  |
| **1. Apologies**  Emma Jones (EJ), Mark Simpson (MSi), Rebecca Moosavian (RM), Chris Ashford (CA), Simon Flacks (SF), Emma Milne (EM), Elisabeth Griffiths (EG), Flora Renz (FR) |  |
| **2. Approval of minutes**  Agreed. |  |
| **3. Questions pertaining to Officer Reports**  **3.1 Chair’s report (JH)**  JH would like to extend a welcome to LMcL who has joined as a new PGR rep to support MM.  FR is stepping down and JH would like to thank FR for all her work during her time on the board.  CM raised that quite a few trustees have stepped down recently and maybe we should look into this – JH agreed this is something we may need to keep monitored.  CARA fellowships  The question has arisen whether we should be offering free membership to CARA fellows.  CM suggests that we should have a policy on this. However, there was no suggestion that we need a policy at present. CARA will supply a list of names of scholars who are interested. There is no additional cost to the Association.  Everyone agreed that we should be waiving membership fees for those fellows who had been listed by CARA. We will keep overall numbers under review, but currently it is twelve or lower.  **3.2 Vice-chair (CA)**  Nothing to add.  **3.3. Treasurer (PB)**  PB wants to know whether we should be putting money into savings accounts to obtain interest. This would be for one-year.  JH suggests that the buffer could be moved into savings – the current buffer is £50,000.  SK suggests this would be OK as long as there is no penalty for withdrawing it.  JH suggests that the buffer may need to increase if inflation is going up by 10%.  Agreed that PB would seek a suitable account and to discuss this with JH and VM.  PB would like to remind everyone the expenses form is on the website (NG also sent this out following the meeting).  VM and others submitted their report on awards made and this was duly noted.  **3.4. Membership & data protection (CM)**  CM asked ‘how long do we allow someone not having paid their fees to remain as members of the association? Can we reduce the period from 6 months to 3 months?’ This was agreed by the board.  CM will check the constitution to ensure that this is OK.  MM suggests that her account does not allow her to pay. This was an issue NE identified as a result of changes and will be rectified.  DB has raised in his report that many members do not have contact IDs for the website. It has been agreed that an email which be sent out to remind everyone to send their contact IDs – MS will liaise with CM concerning this, including a periodic reminder being established.  **3.5. Recruitment (RM)**  A fundraising policy was submitted as part of the papers for this meeting for consideration of approval. The Board thanks RM for her work on this. The policy now includes Gift Aid, JH having applied for this status from HMRC over the summer. The SLSA website will be updated to include a page on this, with explanations and forms for donors.  The policy was agreed. There is one minor change that is required to be made: ‘executive’ needs to be amended to ‘board’ at points. This needs to be done consistently throughout the website. In addition, addresses for the SLSA need to be updated where necessary.  It was asked whether need to include our Do HMRC number on website? It was agreed that this is not required.  It was asked whether we need further details regarding Gift Aid – It was agreed that a link to the government website is appropriate on our website.  **3.6. EDI (CW)**  JH would like to thank CW and everyone on the board for such comprehensive and detailed document concerning the recent EDI survey.  Following on from the survey and what actions we will take as an organisation following it, CW suggests that CIOs similar in their make-up to the SLSA either (a) focus on one or two initiatives and look at these deeply or, (b) have a broader range of initiatives which do not focus to the same level of depth.  JH indicated that sequencing of work packages will allow us to do both, ie a focus on one or two ‘deep’ initiatives, which are done on a task and finish basis, with further initiatives following on.  JH suggests that when thinking about next steps we need to think about the workload of Board members involved, and costs are also important. We could, for example, look how we could leverage external resources or our existing schemes in our response. This is especially important due to the worsening economic situation and increased claims on SLSA resources from other schemes.  MT suggests that we are ‘piggy-backing’ on issues which are happening in the academy as a whole – it might be better to work with CHULS and the SLS.  CW suggests that we may want to lead the way with regards to inclusivity.  SK suggests that we could embed EDI in relation to funding and within our wider practices, communicating this effectively.  JH suggests that we do not take on too much at once. SK agrees.  CM suggests that everyone needs to contribute and think about EDI in everything we do as an organisation. This was agreed.  **3.7. Precarity (AJ)**  None.  **3.8. Newsletter and web editor (MS)**  None.  **3.9. PG Student Representative (MM)**  CW would like to point out that the PGR conference material is of a high standard and to pass on thanks to those involved.  **3.10. Webmaster (DB)**  Nothing to add beyond the contact ID point above.    **3.11. International liaison (SK)**  SK met with the Dutch and Flemish Association last week who are keen on collaborations with the SLSA membership. They are interested in particular in allowing our PGR students to meet other PGRs. SK suggests that one suggestion is that a number of places are set aside for attendance of PGR students from this organisation, and wanted to ask the board of their views of this proposal?  MM suggests that the funding element might be problematic. CM suggests that it would be best that we have them on the same basis as our students (i.e., we pay for accommodation, conference, and dinner. They would pay for travel). It was agreed that we should support SK speaking to the Dutch and Flemish Association to consider the logistics of this further.  LSA has set up a list of all the reps of all the societies. MS has asked whether she may get on the list.  They also asked whether their PGR reps could get in touch with ours? MM suggests that she would support this. Agreed to take this forward.  Several other international socio-legal organisations are interested in coming to our conference. Could we organise a business meeting to discuss international collaboration at our conference? JH suggests that this kind of collaboration is an important goal for SLSA, and we could work with conference organizers to see how this can be practicably accommodated. This is agreed in principle. JH encourages other associations to come to the Ulster conference.  **3.10. Blog (EJ)**  EJ would like us to encourage contributions to the blog. AJ suggests that experiences of being precariously employed might be the focus. JH suggests that the precarity work is very promising and this would be a good suggestion. To feedback to EJ.  MT suggests that a series of blogs of ‘what is socio-legal studies?’ could be presented and we could link this to the digital archive. MT to follow up.  JH suggests that if we co-sponsor an event, we should expect a blog for it. To be considered systematically by Seminar and Grants committees, and when One-Day conference proposals are discussed.  3.11 **Social media**  EG would like some help with regards to running comms for social media.  CW suggests that we may wish to allocate resources into social media, e.g., create a paid role. It needs some expertise in the long-term. SK suggests that we may need a comms team for consistent messaging etc. AB agreed and suggested that it is a very demanding role.  JM suggests that we may be able ask a paid third party to do some of this work, as well as having a trustee help to co-ordinate it.  JH – ‘is it worthwhile investing in and at what cost?’ JH suggests obtaining some quotations as to the cost.  JM suggests that he can do this, and AB will investigate how the communications role is conducted at their institution. MB suggests that what we may do is to come up with a comms strategy – we may need to know what we want. JH has asked that details are provided of the person MB knows.  The board agreed that this is worthwhile exploring and possibly investing in, dependant on cost.  **3.11. Publisher’s liaison (EJ)**  Nothing to add. | PB  CM  CM, MS  RM  MS  SK  SK  SK  AJ, EJ  MT  MSi, DB  JM, AB, MB, EG |
| **4. Conferences**  **4.1.a. Ulster (JH (MSi/ CF))**  JH very grateful to DB for joining him in the site visit to Ulster in May. This was reassuring as regards facilities, organizational capacity and support from local institutions. JH, DB and PB had a follow-up in meeting with MSi and colleagues in September have had a follow-up meeting to review a detailed budget which was satisfactory. There is a significant subsidy for delegates from Visit Derry. The conference will have a hybrid delivery. There are no capacity issues and entertainment has been discussed. The PGR element of the conference is being developed and will be discussed at a further follow-up meeting. The website will be up and running soon too.  JM said that they have been in touch with the York conference organisers – if they use Oxford Abstracts it can be rolled over to the next year, but that is a decision that needs to be reached.  **4.1. b. Portsmouth (DB)**  DB states that the Portsmouth organisers would like to agree a date for the 2024 conference.  Option 1: Students will be campus this week. Agreed not option 1 for this reason.  Option 2 is just before Easter. **Agreed this will be the date: 26-28 March.**  Option 3 may be when academics are off on leave or are coming back. Agreed this date.  **4.1.c Future Conference (CA)**  Nothing to add.  **4.2 Postgraduate conference (MM, LMacL)**  The issue of students having to obtain and submit £50 cheques to secure a place at the PGR conference was raised at the last meeting.  It has been proposed that students should pay £10 as a bank transfer which will then be refunded. The cheque mechanism will also be maintained as an alternative.  SK – is £10 enough to ensure a lot of people do not turn up?  CM asks whether we could conduct pre-authorisation on cards. MM explains that we have looked into this, and it will not work.  NG queried whether we have any evidence that students not turning up is a concern. CM states that when we ran the PG conference online-only 70% of people turned up.  It was suggested that £50 is a disincentive for PGRs to attend.  JM says to stick to the £10. This was agreed by the board.  SK asked whether we should open up the range of speakers for the PGR last year, as we did last year. SK states that no one has been approached who has not traditionally been running sessions (e.g., ECRs, MCRs etc), and it had been agreed last year that the range of speakers should be more diverse.  CM suggests what about costs of doing this? JH suggests we would be paying travel and accommodation for other persons.  JH states that being back offline means that the institution runs the session, but JH will ask that Linda brings in more junior colleagues to speak as a recommendation. JH states that we should advise, rather than appoint anyone.  Board agreed the budget figure for the conference to be £6000.  **4.3 One Day Conferences (JH)**  A proposal was submitted by MT and it as agreed by the board that we should allow this to proceed.  CW suggests that a clearer statement on EDI is required.  NG stated that a H&S and risk assessment is required from the venues hosting one-day conferences. MT will forward these to NG. | JH  MT/NG |
| **5. Prizes and Competitions**  **5.1. Book prizes (CA)**  Nothing to add  **5.2 Article prizes (JH)**  Circulate email.  **5.3. Grants (RM)**  Nothing to add  **5.4. Seminars (FR)**  It was agreed by the board that SF is to chair this moving forward given that FR has stepped down from the Board. BC is also going to join the seminar committee.  **5.6. Contributions to the socio-legal community (JH)**  The nominations for contributions to the contribution to the socio-legal community prize was voted on by the board and a candidate was selected. |  |
| **6. SLSA Newsletter Editor Remuneration (JH, PB)**  This was discussed in the meeting after 4.1.b (but was 6 in the agenda) MS left the room for the duration of this discussion to avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest.  We need a mechanism to keep the pay of person’s working for the charity under review moving forward. This will need to be added to the agenda for January next year.  £1500 for newsletter and £35 per hour of work agreed.  VM suggested we could make changes to the newsletter should issues arise (e.g., covid).  SK suggests we need to keep all roles under review. | AP/ NG. |
| **7. Breakout rooms plenary**  Nothing to report – these were breakout rooms separate to the main business of the meeting.    Breakout groups addressed 1) internationalization strategy (led by SK); 2) EDI/ Precarity (led by AJ); 3) EDI/Widening Participation (led by MM). Each will report back to the next Board meeting with specific proposals for taking these elements forward. | SK, AJ, MM |
| **8. Committee positions**  Please note above. |  |
| **9. Open Access Update**  This will be discussed at the next meeting. |  |
| **10. Any other business**  **Stream convenors:**  JM presented a policy for stream/ topic convenors for conferences, for consideration of the board. JM notes that there is an issue of an issue of transparency in how convenorships are allocated.  The policy seeks to establish a Stream Secretary role on the board.  JH suggests that some of the policy can be piloted at the Ulster conference, and feedback obtained.  JM explains that we are also going to send the policy to stream convenors for Ulster and invite comments.  SB stated that as per the policy a stream convenor could remain in their post for a long time. The SLS can do two terms and then it’s up for a vote. DB made similar comments. JM has suggested that 3 years is recommended but is not mandatory.  CM suggests that each stream could have two convenors, but could one be an ECR? MT suggests that this might be a good idea to get new persons on to the board.  Does a stream convenor need a commitment (SK) to socio-legal studies? This should be in the policy. JH suggests that they also need be paid up.  The policy isn't in force (and will need approving at the next SLSA board meeting). JM gas sent it out for comments by stream convenors ahead of then. | JM  JM/NG |