

13 September, IALS, Russell Square, London, Room L103

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present**  Colin Moore, Rachael Blakey, Ilke Turkmendag, Roxanna Dehaghani, Rosie Harding, John Harrington, Naomi Creutzfeldt, Tahir Abass, Smita Kheria, Diamond Ashiagbor, Marie Selwood, Flora Renz, Tom Webb, Rebecca Moosavian, Amanda Keeling, Amanda Jones, Philip Bremner, Emily Walsh, Daniel Bedford, Neil Graffin |  |
| 1. **Apologies**   Antonia Layard, Vanessa Munro, Ed Kirton-Darling, Maebh Harding, Jed Meers, Jess Mant, Emilie Cloatre |  |
| 1. **Approval of minutes**   Agreed. |  |
| 1. **Officer Reports**     1. **Chair’s report**   RH offered a welcome to the new members – Philip Bremner and Rebecca Moosavian.  RH offered thanks for VM for taking on the role of treasurer.  Two positions have opened on the exec: vice chair and publisher’s liaison.  Antonia Layard has been elected as vice chair with SK and RH supporting nomination.  Roxana Dehaghani has been elected as publisher’s liaison with RH and FR supporting nomination.  RH noted that the call for the 2022 SLSA conference will go out soon and AL will take this forward.  RH notes that the working group for ethical research has been established (to look at the current ethics statements and see if it aligns and complies with GDPR) – CM, TA, RD, and AK will take this forward  RH notes that everyone needs to sign the trustee forms to move to CIO  RH – the resolution to register the SLSA as an Association CIO was passed unanimously at the AGM. MS/RH to provide an update for the newsletter.  RH – we will discuss the Mentoring scheme in September – to be noted as an agenda item.   * 1. **Vice-chair**   Nothing to report (vacant)  **3.3. Treasurer (VM)**  VM was not present. It was noted that finances are healthy and there were no further questions asked.  **3.4. Membership (MH)**  RH noted that members of the executive will need to support members in addressing the issues surrounding their previous standing orders to bank accounts no longer being used.  RH notes that we should be able to make online payments again once the CIO is established and the accounts are sorted out.  **3.5. Recruitment (FR)**  RH suggested that how we address making PGRs into full members of the association needs to be addressed.  It was identified that there is an issue concerning PGRs not availing of free membership and paying full rates for the conference.  FR asked if anyone has conferences let FR/MS know as we have flyers to use.  **3.6. Newsletter and Web Editor (MS)**  MS suggested that there was nothing more to report, beyond what is in the report submitted.  **3.7. PG Student Representative (RB and TA)**  RB and TA noted that everything is going well, and people were saying the conference was a huge success. They wished to extend their thanks to Sarah for running the PGR session and noted that they had noted many positives from the networking opportunities available to PGRs.  RB has asked for feedback from PGRs from the conference.  RB and TA asked: would Portsmouth want to arrange for a member of staff to take the PGR session for next year?  RH asked whether the PGR fee will need to go up for next year? There was a large attendance of PGRs at the Leeds conference, which meant that there were concerns about finances.  Noted that the reason there was a high population at the Leeds conference may be due to the high proportion of PGRs living in relative proximity to Leeds, and ease of access of the venue.  DA – asked whether PGRs are not receiving institutional support and are turning to learned societies for opportunities. Is the SLSA filling a role other institutions are not?  CM asked if we could get more statistics to find out what institutions PGRs are coming from. AK will check this in relation to Leeds.  **3.8. Webmaster (JM)**  JM has intimated that he would like to step down from his role and has communicated (via email) to say that a person might have been identified to help with blog editing.  JM to draft job description and update the exec as this progresses.  **3.9. International liaison (SK)**  SK had a meeting with Trish Luker from LSAANZ, discussing ideas about collaborating and joining our conference in 2023. They also discussed running a joint event at the LSA, as well as trying to get more PGR students to attend events which are happening in countries.  RH – to check in with SK on Asian Law and Society contact.  SK asked if anyone who knows someone in the LSA – NC will put SK in touch  **3.10. Social Media (JMa)**  Nothing further to add.  **3.11. Publisher’s liaison (NC)**  NC suggested there was nothing to add apart from offering thanks to the Leeds team who were supportive and helpful.  **3.12 Data Protection officer (CM)**  See agenda item 10. | CM, TA, RD and AK  ALL  MS  NG  ALL  DB, EW  AK  JM  RH, SK  NC |
| **4. Conferences**  **4.1. a. Leeds 2019 (AK, IJ)**  AK suggested that the Leeds Conference went very well.  AK explained that £1500 to be paid by invoice is still left unpaid.  RH said the Leeds conference was a great success. 579 people attended – this was the biggest conference we have held.  Discussion on number of PGRs attending conference  There were many PGR students at he conference. It was suggested that the large number of PGR attendees creates a significant financial issue because, whilst there are large numbers, many delegates are paying a reduced rate (noting that 36% of delegates were PGRs)  There was a moment where the Leeds conference nearly moved to a loss, but this was recouped at the end in late registrations (something which the Portsmouth organisers will want to bear in mind).  Early registration date for people presenting  RH suggested that there should be an earlier date for registration for people presenting. Agreed that this would be a good idea moving forward.  Specifying time for delivering presentation  It was also suggested that there can be an issue when all delegates want to present on a Thursday. A short discussion ensued on the merits of not allowing delegates to choose their date for delivering their presentation.  AK noted that 84% of people registered for all 3 days.  Issue with day rates?  It was noted that people registering for day rates were worried about valued for money.  RH – asked: what do people think about day rates?  SK suggests that a lot of places do not have day rates – could we say that people pay for the whole conference?  Portsmouth suggests not to have a day rate: Agreed.  Allowing people to conduct Skype presentations  AK asked whether lot of people were asking for Skype or for bursaries. Do we want to consider that?  It was suggested that by not allowing this we may be disadvantaging women who bear the burden of childcare.  RH suggested the technology is not as good enough and conferences are not simply about presenting – they are about networking, etc.  CM asked if we could run concurrent sessions via webchats? Could we do this to make it more accessible?  SK suggests that conferences are about engaging with other people’s work and this is difficult when people on Skype cannot hear what is going on. Trying to conduct Skype sessions along with a main conference can be difficult.  SK suggests that to avoid disappointment it would be good to have a policy on this to go up on the website.  RH suggested another issue is the environmental cost of conferences. RD asked if could people offset their CO2?  Bursaries for those in the Global South  A question was asked whether should we be offering further bursaries? There was £3000 split between three donors, with limitations in each.  IJ notes that we had a lot of bursary applications for the Leeds conference – a lot more than anticipated.  RH suggests it is something for Portsmouth to think about.  AK suggests Leeds made up their own rules with regards to who would receive funding from the bursaries.  IJ notes that a few people suggested at the end that they could not come – she asked whether we need for deadline on the bursary applications?  Multiple paper submissions  RH asked: how many people submitted multiple papers and what do people think about limiting papers or roles?  A discussion ensued concerning submitting multiple papers and adopting different roles and the difficulties this can have for the organisers to ensure that there are no clashes.  IT suggests that having two roles is enough.  RH asked whether we could have a maximum of two contributions? For example, presenting, chairing, and co-presenting? (non-presenting co-authors should be fine)  NC suggests having one paper and one other role.  Action point – Portsmouth team to think about and ask convenors.  **4.1. b. Portsmouth 2020 (DB, EW)**  DB met with AK and IJ. They discussed issues from the Leeds conference.  DB and EW note that the website is up for the conference, external venues have been booked and a proposal has been suggested for the plenary (a roundtable discussion about building a culture of human rights for which they have approached Helena Kennedy and the EHRC)  DB and EW explained that nothing significant has changed concerning the budget but will speak to Leeds about the issue concerning the PGRs  Conference activities have been discussed, including a walking tour and a boat trip  DB and EW asked for clarification for late registration – they want to close this a week before what Leeds proposed for last year    CM asked: should we be careful about closing off late regs?  RH for the next meeting the Portsmouth organisers need to bring a timetable, and final budget (incl all registration rates) to agree.  RH asked whether dinner be an optional extra, or if it will be part of the rate. Organisers will investigate this.  **Cardiff conference**  The team have been assembled and they are looking at rooms and a concept.  **4.3 One Day Conferences (RH)**  Registration for the Impact and Law Reform conference is looking good - we have about 40 places left  MS has asked for someone to write a report of the day – 500 words to put in the newsletter (to go into Autumn). RH to secure this at the conference.  RH asked if people could publicise this through their channels.  **Postgraduate conference**  SK suggested that that best dates seem to be 8 – 9 January 2020. Dates agreed.  The document provided along with the meeting indicates what the cheapest options are.  It is noted that the Edinburgh Law School are not charging for room hire.  RH notes that the old college will be an excellent venue for the conference.  SK asked: should we stick to the programme for next year, and how should sessions be divided up?  RH suggested that it is good to have people from Edinburgh – Sharon Cowan and Mike Adler suggested to work on the conference  There was short discussion concerning the venue options for the evening dinner. RH suggests going for Hemma restaurant option and get rooms booked.  SK to liaise with TA and RB on any further details relating to the PGR conference.  RB asked if we have feedback forms for the Warwick conference. Suggested to chase VM for these.  RH suggested that impact and posters was not covered last year, and it will be useful to think about whether we want to cover these this year.  TA asked if the conference is primarily targeted at first years and it was explained that it is, but RH stated that some content is aimed at whole PhD journey.  RH – suggests that Rosemary Hunter, Sally Wheeler, Linda Mulcahy and Dave Cowan should be invited (in addition to RH) | DB, EW  DB/EW  DB, EW  DB, EW  DB, EW  DB, EW  DB, EW  DB, EW  RH  ALL  SK, TA, RB  RB, VM |
| **5. Prizes and Competitions**  **5.1. Book prizes (RH)**  Nothing to add.  **5.2 Article prizes**  Nothing to add.  **5.3. Grants (EC)**  EC has taken over as chair the grants committee. She is on maternity leave until November 2019. Queries can be sent to other members of the committee in the meantime.  **5.4. Seminars (JHa)**  Nothing to report beyond what was submitted.  RH suggested that once we are registered as a charity we can do more for community outreach. She asked: do we want to open a wider stream for community/public outreach activities? Something to consider later.  **5.5. Research Training and Mentoring Awards (RH)**  Nothing to add. We have had none and mentoring is on hold. The next deadline for RTGs is 1 June. |  |
| **6. Sub-committee membership**  There were several appointments to the various sub-committees:   * RB – books committee * CM, RM – grants committee * RD – seminars committee |  |
| **7. Registering the SLSA as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation**  TW asked that within the constitution there is an appeal process for rejecting members. Should we draft a process? TW will draft something for the next meeting  RH noted that it is a new development that persons can be elected on to three terms, but we may informally only ask people to stay to six years.  RH will continue to progress this over the next few months, and will update the Exec/ask for input as necessary. | TW  RH |
| **8. Open Access**  AL and JH went to Academy of Social Sciences where the new open access policy – Plan S - was discussed at length  Hybrid model will exist for the next REF but this will change thereafter  JH noted areas of concern – for example, with regards to the suggestion that authors would be charged following the changes and other issues identified in the open access report, or in journals losing income (whom we work with and receive income).  Recommendations: we do not need to change significantly as Plan S is not fully implemented in the UK yet – we will revise guidance later.  We will keep a watch on this and an open access group will be set up moving forward.  Noted that green open access will not be enough for Plan S.  CM – is it possible we will need a society journal? It was agreed that this is not something we want to do now because of the level of work involved.  TW – can we push back through SLSA and/ or publisher’s liaison?  RH – could we have something on the website?  Agreed to establish a working group and notify members to get in touch with regards to any problems they identify.  JH – we have an email address for issues and areas of concern-  MS – do we need to update the current guidance? RH suggests we leave as much in place as this is the current REF guidance but check moving forward and maybe revise.  The working group will consist of JH, SK, MS, TW, AL | JH, SK, MS, TW, AL |
| **9. Equality and diversity policy**  The group met on Skype following consulting several policies from different organisations.  The group explained that they want to hand this back to members of the association to see what data we want to collect.  It is expected that chairs of the various committees will need to consider the E&D policy when making decisions.  RH – said thank you for coming up for having a policy and it is important to have a subcommittee.  RH – should we have an equality and diversity monitoring form? RH suggests editing the policy so that it is just ‘one voice’ (currently there are contributions from various authors).  Subcommittee established – JMa, TA, PB, DA, JH (ex oficio CM). | JMa, TA, PB, DA, JH (CM) |
| **10. Data protection policy**  CM has drafted a DP policy but wants to run it past a colleague at Essex  RH suggests also running it past a practising solicitor  CM discussed a number of issues relating to whether reference should be made to third parties – it was decided to keep this content.  MS will check through for anything else.  Cookies? Yes, on website. Run past JM.  CM happier with archive now he has consulted more widely. Only possible thing which might fall under the policy is grant applications comments.  RH – we will need to come up with archiving policy.  RH – makes sense for grants, seminars and prize chairs to be involved in archiving policy.  Archiving policy to be added to the agenda for the next meeting. | MS  JM, CM  CM  CM, RH, EC, JH  NG |
| **11. Future executive committee meeting dates**  -18 September 2019 (noting this a Wednesday)  -16 January 2020  -2 April AGM  -14 May 2020 |  |
| **12. Any other business**  **Nominations to Academy of Social Science**  Three nominations were agreed for the June deadline.  RH suggested a call for nominations in the June newsletter, in time for the December 2019 round. | MS |