

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

England & Wales · Charity number 254021

Details

Status Registered

Legal form Other

Registered 1969-01-29

Register [View on the Charity Commission register](#)

Contact

Address The Aristotelian Society
Room 280
Steward House
Russell Square
London
WC1B 5DN

Phone 020 7862 8685

Email mail@aristoteliansociety.org.uk

Website <http://www.aristoteliansociety.org.uk>

Activities

Objects: THE ADVANCEMENT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE FIELD OF THE SYSTEMATIC STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY; FIRST, AS TO ITS HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT; SECOND, AS TO ITS METHODS AND PROBLEMS AND THE PUBLICATION OF ITS PROCEEDINGS TO THIS END.

Activities: The Aristotelian Society, founded in 1880, meets fortnightly in London, throughout the academic year, to hear and discuss philosophical papers. These meetings are open to the public and the Proceedings are published as a journal. The Society holds an annual philosophy conference with the Mind Association and also makes grants to organisers of philosophy conferences.

Classification

- **How:** Makes Grants To Organisations, Sponsors Or Undertakes Research
- **What:** Education/training
- **Who:** The General Public/mankind

Geography

- Throughout England And Wales

Finances

Period end	Income	Expenditure	Assets	Employees
2024-12-31	£144,331	£119,224	-	-
2023-12-31	£122,092	£120,850	-	-
2022-12-31	£142,987	£116,930	-	-
2021-12-31	£126,537	£85,824	-	-
2020-12-31	£124,871	£94,927	-	-

Trustees

Name	Role	Appointed
Dr Alexander Douglas		2020-10-05
Dr Fiona Victoria Leigh		2021-10-04
Dr Komarine Romdenh-Romluc		2020-10-05
Dr Lee Walters		2021-10-04
Dr Michael Jonathan Hannon		2021-10-04
Dr Mona Simion		2021-10-04
Dr Sarah Fine		2020-10-05
PROFESSOR MARY MARGARET MCCABE		2022-10-03

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

England & Wales - Charity number 254021

Accounts

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY
Registered Charity Number: 254021

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
31st DECEMBER 2024

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2024

The Executive Committee present their report along with the accounts for the Society for the year ended 31st December 2024. The accounts comply with the Society's rules and applicable law.

Legal and Administrative Information

The Aristotelian Society for the systematic study of philosophy, based at Room 280, Steward House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN, is a registered charity (No. 254021) and is governed by a set of rules dated 1984. The Society was originally founded in 1880.

The officers of the Society are as follows:

Honorary Director	Dr Michael Hannon
President	Fabienne Peter
Editor	Jessica Leech

Aims and Organisation

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. The society is staffed by a part time administrator, editors, web editor and editorial assistant.

The ordinary business of the Society is managed by an Executive Committee consisting of the officers and the following elected members during the year to 31st December 2024 and up to the date of this report:

Dr Michael Hannon
Dr Fabienne Peter
Dr Jessica Leech
Dr Sarah Fine
Dr John Callanan
Dr Aidan McGlynn
Dr Lucy O'Brien
Dr Giulia Felppi
Dr Fiona Leigh
Dr Mona Simion

Excluding the Editors, The Trustees of the Charity comprise the members of the Executive Committee and the officers of the Society.

Review of Progress

The Society continued to meet fortnightly during the academic year to hear papers on philosophical matters. Papers were published prior to the meetings on the Society's website. The Proceedings were published in three online issues during the year as well as in hardback and the Supplementary Volume was also published online and in hardback.

The annual Joint Session with the Mind Association was held at the University of Birmingham and there were 177 delegates (last in person conference 2023: 212). The Society's direct costs were £43,451.50 (last in person conference 2023: £19,074). The local organiser made a profit of £713.50 (last in person conference 2023: £13,716).

Overall subscriptions to the publications were 178 at the end of 2024 (2023: 229). There were 13 new subscriptions in the category of Lifetime membership (no publications) (2023: 11), which brings the total number of individual members in this category to 599 (2023: 546)- these are exclusive of institutional subscriptions, which are handled by OUP. Lastly, there were 215 other general subscriptions (no publications) (2023: 236).

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2024

Review of Financial Position

Membership income has increased from £6,196 in 2023 to £7,725 in 2024. The Society received income from Oxford University Press (OUP) (the publisher of the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume) of £99,399 (2023: £84,838). There was a net income over expenditure for the year of £25,107 (2023: £1,242) leaving cash (current and deposit accounts) balances of £259,683 at 31st December 2024 (2023: £232,469). The net assets of the Society have increased to £418,681 (2023: £334,257), including cash held on longer term deposits.

Publication of Proceedings and Joint Session talks and income from JSTOR remain the Society's main income stream. The 2024 Joint Session conference involved higher catering costs and room hire fees than the Society was able to obtain in 2023, but this was compensated for by higher registration fees, and made up for through increased income. Bursary expenditure remains the same it has been since 2022.

Statement of Executive Committee's Responsibilities

The Charities Act 2011 requires the Executive Committee to prepare a statement of accounts for each financial year which comply with the regulations made under the Act.

The Executive Committee are responsible for keeping accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy the financial position of the charity and contain entries showing from day to day all monies received and monies expended by the charity and the matters in respect of which those transactions took place and also contain a record of the assets and liabilities of the charity. The law also sets out the Executive Committees' responsibilities for the preparation and content of the Executive Committees' Annual Report.

The Executive Committee are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and ensuring their proper application under charity law and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Statement of Public Benefit

The Executive Committee confirms that it has referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit, including its guidance (PB2) "Public Benefit: Running a Charity", when reviewing the charity's aims and objectives and in planning future activities.

The Aristotelian Society continues to be very proud of its placement in the voluntary sector, the impact it continues to have, and the benefit it believes it is able to present to the general public.

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. Through affordable subscription rates, free podcasts of talks, social media engagement, and a programme which covers a broad range of philosophical traditions, the Society continues to make philosophy widely available to the general public. The Society also co-organises the Joint Session with the Mind Association - the largest gathering of philosophers in the UK - and also provides grants to philosophy conferences all across the UK.

Reserves Policy

The Society has payments of approximately £100,000 per year and has approximately £200,000 in reserves. The Society aims to have in reserves approximately two years of payments.

Reasons for Policy

The Society has for many years aimed to have significant reserves. This is for three main reasons:

1. The income of the society comes very largely from one source: the receipts from Oxford University Press for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume. The Society has little control over the extent of that income, and it could in theory dry up very quickly.

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2024

Reserves Policy continued

2. The commitments of the Society are fixed and stretch two to three years into the future. It is, for example, already committed to producing the material for publication in the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume of the Society for two years, and committed to a Joint Session for July next year. Should the income dry up the Society would need, as far as possible, to be able to meet the commitments it has made and wind down its affairs in an orderly fashion.

The Society needs easily accessible reserves, beyond those of running costs for a short period because the responsibility of the Joint Session means that it faces, annually, the risk of having to make large 'rescue payments'. This can occur, if, for example, the accommodation arrangements fall through, the local organiser drops out and an organiser has to be bought in on a market salary, or if the local organiser makes a serious mistake on the budget.

3. Given the fixed nature and extent of its income, the Society is able to consider new worthwhile initiatives, such as switching to on-line publication of Proceedings, only if it is able to insulate itself against risk. Having significant reserves enables it to do this.

Statement of Trustees' Responsibilities

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

The law applicable to charities in England and Wales requires the Trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Charity and of the incoming resources and application of resources for that period.

In preparing those financial statements the Trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgments and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- Prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in business.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and to enable them to ensure the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011, the Charities SORP and the provisions of the trust deeds. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

This report has been approved by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf



.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

Date: 28 October 2025
.....

Independent Examiner's Report to the Trustees of The Aristotelian Society For the year ended 31st December 2024

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of The Aristotelian Society for the year ended 31 December 2024.

Responsibilities and basis of report

As the charity trustees of the Trust you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ('the Act').

I report in respect of my examination of the Trust's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination giving me cause to believe:

- accounting records were not kept in respect of the Trust as required by section 130 of the Act; or
- the accounts do not accord with those records.
- the accounts do not comply with the applicable requirements concerning the form and content of accounts set out in the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 other than any requirement that the accounts give a 'true and fair view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

Moore Kingston Smith LLP

Karen Wardell
Partner, Moore Kingston Smith LLP
For and on behalf of Moore Kingston Smith LLP
Chartered Accountants

Date: 28 October 2025

9 Appold Street
London EC2A 2AP

The Aristotelian Society
Receipts and Payments Account
For the year ended 31st December 2024

		2024		2023	
	£		£	£	£
Income Receipts					
Membership Subscriptions			7,725		6,196
Receipts from publications					
JSTOR	13,921			14,243	
Permission fees received	-			-	
Joint session receipts	4,115			-	
OUP's sales of journals	99,399			84,838	
Net VAT movements	17,964			15,635	
Miscellaneous	-			428	
			135,400		115,144
Investment Income					
Interest income and sale of investments			1,207		752
Total Receipts			144,331		122,092
Direct Charitable Expenditure					
Conference grants	7,313			7,201	
Podcast expenses	-			-	
Speaker expenses	24			2,101	
Joint session expenses	4,863			4,086	
General Expenses	713			579	
Net salaries and editors' fees	33,406			35,600	
Presidents' costs	6,405			5,217	
PAYE and NI	6,492			3,647	
Pension	1,138			1,118	
Student Bursaries	29,317			23,653	
Postage	38			88	
			89,710		83,290
Other Expenditure					
Rent	7,506			7,516	
Stationery and postage	-			140	
Computer and IT costs	1,306			1,175	
Bank charges	415			381	
Audit, accountancy and payroll	5,184			4,775	
Catering	-			1,677	
Miscellaneous	-			-	
Subscription	-			-	
VAT paid	13,689			21,173	
Travel	-			104	
Website	902			143	
Insurance	513			476	
			29,514		37,560
Total Payments			119,224		120,850
Net Income			25,107		1,242

All receipts and payments are Unrestricted funds movements. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Aristotelian Society
Cash and Reserves
For the year ended 31st December 2024

	2024 £	2023 £
Net Receipts for the year	25,107	1,242
Net Transfers (to)/ from Reserves	2,107	100,293
Cash and bank balances at 1 January	<u>232,469</u>	<u>130,934</u>
Cash and bank balances at 31 December	<u><u>259,683</u></u>	<u><u>232,469</u></u>

The Aristotelian Society

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

at 31st December 2024

	Notes	2024		2023	
		£	£	£	£
Monetary Assets					
Bank and Cash balances:					
Bank deposit accounts		3,085		3,025	
Bank current account		220,342		199,728	
CAF Cash account		135		-	
PayPal account		<u>36,121</u>		<u>29,716</u>	
			259,683		232,469
<i>- held for investment purposes</i>					
CAF 90 Day Account		<u>72,663</u>		<u>71,516</u>	
			108,919		71,516
Debtors:					
OUP sales	3	58,414		42,003	
Other debtors		<u>4,379</u>		<u>500</u>	
			62,793		42,503
Total Assets			<u>431,395</u>		<u>346,488</u>
Liabilities					
Creditors:					
Auditors' remuneration		4,163		4,082	
Accruals & deferred income		1,355		4,853	
Grants		1,820		2,192	
VAT		<u>5,376</u>		<u>1,104</u>	
Total Liabilities			<u>(12,714)</u>		<u>(12,231)</u>
Net Assets			<u><u>418,681</u></u>		<u><u>334,257</u></u>

All assets and liabilities of the Charity are held in Unrestricted funds. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Annual Report and Accounts were approved for issue by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf by:



.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

Date: 28 October 2025

The Aristotelian Society

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended 31st December 2024

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The financial statements have been prepared under the Charities Act 2011, on the receipts and payments basis, following the guidance issued by the Charities Commission.

Allocation of Expenditure

All expenditure in connection with the Society's meetings and publications, together with an appropriate proportion of travel and office costs, has been treated as direct charitable expenditure in the Receipts and Payments Account.

2 Trustees and Employees

The Society had an average of two (2023: one) employees during the year, whose staff cost amounted to £33,406 (2023: £35,600). An honorarium of £5,957 (2023: £5,126) was paid to the editors. Trustees were reimbursed expenses of £6,405 during the year (2023: £5,217).

3 Publishers' Sales

	2024	2023
	£	£
Sales of OUP journals net of VAT for the year	101,748	85,337
Less advanced payments	(43,334)	(43,334)
Amount due at 31 December 2024	<u>58,414</u>	<u>42,003</u>



THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & COUNCIL

MONDAY 22 APRIL 2024

13.00-16.00

Meeting held on Microsoft Teams.

AGENDA

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

No new matters arising. Fine asked for further news of what had occurred with the profit split from the 2023 Joint Session. Hannon and Stelle confirmed that the profits had been split 30%/30%/40%, that the Society had invoiced for their proportion and been paid, and that they had received confirmation that the IP had divided the profits in the way it was asked to.

2. OUP ANNUAL REPORT

Adam Blow (Publisher, OUP) introduced himself and provided further detail on the marketing and publishing reports. Blow indicated that 2023 was a peak year for content engagement for the Society; the highest since 2020. Blow also indicated that readership for the Proceedings journal was vastly European (48%) and reviewed the most-downloaded articles of the past year. Blow noted that institutional subscriptions for the Proceedings were slightly down because of increased interest in Open Access, but that this did not appear to be affecting statistics and engagement very negatively.

Leech asked whether it was possible to break down the data from the 'Other' category on the marketing report, on the topic of which websites users come from when visiting content on the journal. If for instance one of the leading websites was PhilPapers, there might be an opportunity to encourage authors to promote their papers on PhilPapers and increase access from that end. Blow was unaware but stated that he would investigate this and report back to Leech and Stelle.

Institutional subscriptions for the Supplementary Volume were declining for the same reasons above, but again, this did not appear to be cause for significant concern. Leech asked why the Supplementary Volume was not included in many subscription packages, because it contains papers by more established philosophers than the Proceedings and is published in the US. Blow indicated that packages were put together by the sales team so he had no answer for this but would investigate internally at OUP and return a response.

Fine asked whether the journal still ran a promotion demonstrating the most-read articles for philosophy journals, and whether they would do one this year, as she thought this might be a good way to promote AS journals. Blow thanked her for the suggestion and agreed to look into this as well.

Stelle asked about causes for the increase in Open Access income for 2024 and whether it was possible to predict whether these numbers would decrease, stay stable, or grow. Blow stated that Open Access was performing strongly as a category of publication and would likely remain stable, if not grow, but there was no way to predict this for certain. He noted positively however that the Society's reader base lines up with the biggest Open Access markets in the world.

Blow thanked the Committee for their work publishing the journal.

Action: Stelle to follow up with Blow about information regarding (a) more granular data for website access trails, (b) sales packages for the Supplementary Volume, and whether the journal could be expanded into more of these, and (c) promotions for most-read articles.

3. ANNUAL ACCOUNTS FOR 2023

Hannon invited the Committee to view the Accounts and noted that a draft copy could be located in the Dropbox folder, pending the production of bank statements from the closed old CAF Gold Account to be formalised. He noted that the final version of the accounts would be distributed when this was available along with a brief summary to the Committee via email, and invited the Committee to ask any questions about the draft version now, and to do the same in future when the final version was available.

Action: Hannon to send the Committee an update with the final accounts when these were available and an overview of the financial situation they presented.

4. THE PROCEEDINGS

(i) Update on speakers 2024/25

Leech directed the Committee to the list of confirmed speakers in the Dropbox and noted there had been two changes of date to accommodate Bank Holiday Mondays. The confirmed speakers and new dates were:

First term

30-Sep-24	Inaugural Address: Fabienne Peter (Warwick)
14-Oct-24	Chike Jeffers (Dalhousie)
28-Oct-24	Greg Restall (St. Andrews)
11-Nov-24	Christopher Cowie (Durham)
25-Nov-24	Susanna Schellenberg (Rutgers)

Second term

13-Jan-25	Monima Chadha (Monash)
-----------	------------------------

27-Jan-25 Alexander Prescott-Couch (Oxford)
10-Feb-25 Nadine Elzein (Warwick)
24-Feb-25 Claire Field (Zurich)
10-Mar-25 Pauline Kleingeld (Groningen)

Third term

28-Apr-25 Léa Salje (Leeds)
12-May-25 Frisbee Sheffield (Cambridge)
19-May-25 Vid Simoniti (Liverpool)
02-Jun-25 Rahel Jaeggi (Humboldt Berlin)
16-Jun-25 Sarah McGrath (Princeton)

(ii) Nomination of Speakers 2025/26

Leech thanked the Committee for their nominations and noted that Pamela Hieronymi had been invited last year and been unable to attend, as had Anna Pakes. After discussion, the following shortlist was reached:

Colin Chamberlain (UCL) [Early modern]
Greg Currie (York) [aesthetics]
Giulia Felappi (Southampton) [Language]
Kathrin Glueer-Pagin (Stockholm) [Mind/epi/pol]
Anil Gomes (Oxford) [Mind/Kant]
Pamela Hieronymi (UCLA) [ethics/action]
Thomas Hofweber (UNC) [Metaphysics]
Sophie Horowitz (Amherst) [Epistemology]
Anneli Jefferson (Cardiff) [moral and psychology]
Malcolm Keating (Smith visiting Glasgow) [Indian philosophy, lang and epi]
Anna Pakes (Roehampton) [aesthetics/dance]
Lewis Ross (LSE) [legal]
Joe Saunders (Durham) [Kant, post-Kantian, ethics]
Simon Shogry (Oxford) [Ancient]
Johanna Thoma (Bayreuth) [ethics, philosophy of public policy]
Christopher Willard-Kyle (Kentucky) [Epistemology/ethics/race]
Joel Smith (Manchester) [Phenomenology]
Ema Sullivan-Bissett (Birmingham) [Mind]

Action: Leech to send draft list round for approval in order to determine who to prioritise and who to designate as reserve speakers.

(iii) Suggestions for virtual issues

Fine suggested an issue on Michael Dummett; McGlynn one on Peter Clark.

Action: Leech to canvass for suggestions via email.

(iv) Suggestions for blog post

Leech raised the idea of writing something, perhaps in an online forum like Daily Nous, about the Society's unique publication model as a method of generating interest in its activities.

Simion voiced a concern that the journal's model might be increasingly out of step with a wider shift toward triple-blind reviewing in academic journals, and a blog post on this topic may therefore backfire. Leech responded that although this was true there were virtues to the journal's publication model, and Walters noted that in his editorial role he has found triple-blind does not always result in greater diversity of institution or seniority. Peter noted that forums like Warwick University's Pea Soup blog may be appropriate.

Action: Leech to invite the Committee to email in suggestions for alternate publication venues.

5. THE JOINT SESSION

(i) 2024 Joint Session (University of Birmingham)

a. Editor's update on postgraduate papers, symposia programme, and chairs

Leech confirmed the symposiasts, postgraduate speakers, and chairs for 2024, noting that all chairs but two had been confirmed. The final list of symposiasts and postgraduate speakers was as follows:

Symposiasts:

Inaugural Address- Quassim Cassam (Warwick)

Freedom and Domination- Cécile Laborde (Oxford) and Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen (Aarhus)

Political Epistemology-Linda Martín Alcoff (CUNY) and Robin McKenna (Liverpool)

Metaethics and the Nature of Properties- Jussi Suikkanen (Birmingham) and Neil Sinclair (Nottingham)

Bertrand Russell on Experience- MGF Martin (Oxford/Berkeley) and Donovan E Wishon (Mississippi)

The Humanities- Stephen Grimm (Fordham) and Lilian O'Brien (Helsinki)

Logical Consequence- Gillian Russell (Australian Catholic University) and Sara Uckelman (Durham)

Postgraduate Speakers:

Theoretical

Christabel Cane (UCL)

Jacopo Berneri (Oslo)

Frederik Anderson (St. Andrews)

Wouter Cohen (Manchester)

Practical

Lauren Miano (Princeton)

Joseph Sibley (UCL)

Owen Clifton (Queen's University)

Zachary Brants (UCSD)

Leech commented on postgraduate papers this year, stating she did not have robust data but approximately only 20% of submissions appeared to be from women. There was one woman on each panel, but due to low submissions nothing more than this could be done without distorting the review process to an unacceptable degree. Leech therefore proposed revisiting in a future meeting the question of how the Society might solicit more applications from female scholars.

Simion asked whether the journal could commit to publishing the postgraduate papers, as a way of supporting junior scholars going forward. Leech suggested committing to sending out all 8 papers

for review every year as another solution, which was adopted by the Committee.

Action: Leech to raise the issue in the July meeting of how to solicit applications, particularly from female scholars, for the Postgraduate Sessions.

Action: Leech to coordinate with Stelle how to implement the new process for reviewing all postgraduate papers from the Joint Session.

a. Registration

Stelle confirmed that all postgraduate speakers and invited speakers had registered, and encouraged all Committee members who had not registered to do so. She also noted that Vale Village accommodation would close by 13 May so those interested in staying there needed to bear this in mind.

(ii) 2025 Joint Session (University of Glasgow) – Editor’s update on symposia speakers

Leech confirmed symposiasts for the 2025 Joint Session:

Inaugural address- Helen Beebee (Leeds)

Christoph Kelp (Glasgow) and Anne Meylan (Zurich)
Elizabeth Camp (Rutgers) and Eliot Michaelson (KCL)
Chris Lebron (Johns Hopkins) and Aness Webster (Durham)
Anna Alexandrova (Cambridge) and Kareem Khalifa (UCLA)
Sara Heinämaa (Helsinki) and Kate Kirkpatrick (Oxford)
Therese Cory (Notre Dame) and Hamid Taieb (HUB)

(iii) Preliminary nomination of speakers for 2026 (University of Leeds)

Leech invited nominations for the 2026 Joint Session. Leech noted need to ensure diversity across geography, subject area, career stage, race, ethnicity, and gender. After discussion, the following suggestions were presented:

Yuriko Saito (Rhode Island School of Design) 1st / Nick Riggle (San Diego) 2nd
Tom Dougherty (UNC) / Manon Garcia (FUB) (either way around)
Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh) 1st / possible 2nd Louise Richardson (York).
Seyla Benhabib (Yale) 1st / Olúfẹ́mi O. Táíwò (Georgetown) 2nd
Some combination of Kurt Sylvan (Southampton), Selim Berker (Harvard), Lisa Titus (nee Miracchi) (Denver)
Kathrin Koslicki (Neuchatel) 1st

Action: Leech to conduct follow-up discussion on pairs by email.

(iv) Update on venue for 2027 and 2028

Hannon confirmed that the venue for 2027 would be Reading and 2028 had now been confirmed as Sheffield, although Max Hayward had indicated he would prefer to have a co-organiser.

(v) Venue nominations for 2029

Hannon guided the Committee toward the Venue Nominations tab on the Nominations google document and invited Committee members to think about locations and associated organisers who are competent and would be good choices for the role.

Fine asked how many rooms were necessary for the conference because Jesus College Cambridge had excellent facilities and may be a good choice for 2029. Hannon will confirm this and report back to Fine.

Action: Hannon to update on the number of rooms necessary for the conference and to solicit suggestions via email.

(vi) Changes to Joint Session schedule going forward

Hannon indicated that in July he would bring up the following proposals for changing the JS schedule, and invited comments or objections before these formal proposals went to the Mind meeting in July.

- (1) Remove Society meetings from the official public programme.
- (2) Use the Society meeting times to free up slots for other programmes
- (3) Shorten symposium sessions to 1hr 30 mins, and perhaps allocate this time to the PG sessions
- (4) Running *all* symposium sessions in parallel or on their own to eliminate worries about hierarchy between parallel/non-parallel speakers.

Simion suggested no parallel sessions at all for symposia so that more junior symposiasts did not lose out to more popular, parallel symposiasts, and a buffet-style dinner instead of seated, which she was keen to implement in 2025 at Glasgow.

McGlynn added that he believed some of the features the Committee was proposing to change had been implemented fairly recently for contingent reasons— in one recent year, a particular cohort had needed later sessions on the Friday, for example—but remained in the schedule, and tradition should not be a barrier to making the schedule more accessible and comfortable.

Leech noted that for 2024 the symposia were all running parallel, as an efficient response to the problem of an over-long schedule, but confirmed this was not a final decision and still open to change from 2025 onward.

Action: Hannon to bring these proposals to forward to the AGM meeting with the Mind Association in July.

6. CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATIONS & REPORTS

Hannon reminded the Committee of the need to prioritise one-off events and graduate conferences, and to give lower priority to invitation-only conferences and established events, although all applications should be considered on their merits. Callanan asked what the policy was around

recurring events, and Hannon indicated this was acceptable, particularly if they were graduate events, but there was no bar in theory to funding a recurring event.

Leech, Walters, and Fine suggested eliminating CG042155 on the basis that it was not, strictly speaking, a philosophy conference. Leech noted that CG042164 was an invite-only conference, which the Society should not fund, and that the application for CG 042154 indicated they would use the money for conference perks, which did not seem like an efficient allocation of resources.

Simion proposed eliminating CG042152 because this was a reading party not a conference; Hannon indicated this was also not a one-off event and had taken place without Society funding in the past, though this was not a deal-breaker. Callanan seconded eliminating CG042154 and CG042152, citing concerns about costs of venue for the former and a worry that the latter historically has not privileged new research, and then left the room to allow the Committee to discuss his own grant proposal (CG042161). This proposal raised the concern that it was ineligible on the wording of guidelines because it took place in Dublin. The idea of changing the guidelines going forward to allow conferences in Ireland was suggested, with Fine indicating support. This may need to be decided over email or at a future meeting but the rules could not change retroactively for the current group of applications, so CG042161 must be eliminated as ineligible.

Hannon noted that CG042163 contained no philosophy speakers except those doing a publishing workshop; Leech worried that postgraduates were not well represented for a postgraduate conference. Simion and Callanan raised concerns about CG042160 and CG042157; Hannon and Leech seconded these. The eventual outcome was a decision to fund:

Grant	Institution	Amount
CG042153	University of Bristol/University of Southampton	300
CG042156	University of Manchester	500
CG042158	University of Oxford	300
CG042159	University of Nottingham	450
CG042162	UCL	500
CG042165	University of Sheffield	500
CG042166	University of Warwick	500

7. RESPONSE TO CHANGES IN PUBLISHING

Hannon noted there were no new concerns on this front.

8. COUNCIL MATTERS

(i) New committee members for 2024/25

Leech invited the Committee to discuss the submitted Expressions of Interest, noting that a possible factor to bear in mind was the need to maintain someone with Logic and Language expertise once Walters departed. She recommended Giulia Felappi for this purpose. McGlynn voiced support for Lubomira Radoilska on the basis of her expertise and commitments with regard to decolonizing

philosophy; Fine recommended Mohammad saleh Zarepour (McGlynn seconded). Simion discussed Elise Woodard as a strong candidate with commitments to supporting minority scholars, Committee experience, and an impressive body of work for someone at her career stage. At this point Hannon left the room to allow the Committee to discuss Woodard impartially.

After subsequent discussion the Committee voted and elected Giulia Felappi by majority.

Action: Hannon to write to Felappi inviting her to the join the Committee.

At this point multiple members needed to leave because the meeting time had overrun. Leech indicated they would need to reconvene soon to discuss the rest of the agenda. The meeting was concluded at 16:05.



THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & COUNCIL

TUESDAY 14 MAY 2024

10.00-11.00

Meeting held on Microsoft Teams.

AGENDA (cont. from 22 April 2024)

8. COUNCIL MATTERS

(ii) Multiple terms for Committee members

Leech invited the Committee's thoughts on what the Society's policy should be on multiple terms for Committee members going forward. In 2021 the Committee had discussed allowing members to renew their terms if they wanted to, and subsequently approved this for Fine, Leigh, and Simion. Leech and Hannon both thought it appropriate to raise the issue again in order to confirm the details of the policy. Leech asked whether the Committee still believed that renewal was appropriate, how many terms they envisioned if so, and what the renewal procedure should be.

Fine said that the original discussion in 2021 had emphasised the value for the Society of continuity in terms of knowledge and governance if committed members wanted to stay on. Walters disagreed, stating that regular turnover had the advantage of more equitably distributing the opportunity to be a member. To this, Hannon noted that in current year the Committee had a wide and strong group of applicants, but only one position to award.

Leech wondered if the problem might be solved contextually, with the Committee evaluating on the basis of the applications received whether it was a small application pool, in which case it might make sense to maintain a member for the sake of continuity, or a year like the present one in which there were many promising applicants. Leech also proposed maintaining the policy of optional renewal for another term but a cap at two terms, and indicated that the Committee might want to maintain the right to decline renewal in anticipation of the unlikely but possible scenario where the member seeking renewal had inadequately fulfilled their duties or been difficult to work with; she also asked what the Committee thought about requiring a re-application process instead of automatic renewal.

Simion disagreed with this suggestion, concerned that evaluating the CVs of fellow Committee members would endanger comity on the Committee. Hannon suggested that, whatever the method

of renewal, if it was not automatic the decision could be taken by the Officers to preserve goodwill on the Committee.

He then proposed the following language: *“Standing members may serve at most one additional term, in agreement with the Officers of the Society.”* The reasons for this wording were: (a) to avoid the issue of having Committee members reapply, (b) to avoid the issue of having Committee members assume that the decision to extend for another term is entirely their own, (c) to shield the full Committee from bearing any responsibility (or dealing with awkwardness) in cases where Officers were not in favor of extending for another term.

This language was approved by the Committee.

(i) Update on 2026/27 presidency

Hannon confirmed that Alexander Bird had received the most votes from the Committee in October and been invited to be President for 2026/27, which he accepted. He then drew the Committee’s attention to the nominations list for 2027/28 and asked that members fill this out.

Action: Hannon to invite the Committee via email to nominate for the 2027/28 presidency.

9. YEARLY SALARY REVIEW

Hannon reminded the Committee of when that the policy on salary increases was decided at the Joint Session in 2022, and Stelle referred them to the document demonstrating a 2.5% increase in line with inflation. The Committee was happy to approve.

10. REVIEW OF STUDENT BURSARY FUNDING

Hannon noted this was a historical item, begun when the bursary amounts had increased from £3,000 to £5,000 to monitor the financial impact of offering higher awards. As the Society’s finances appeared to be in relatively good health Hannon reported there were no present concerns to be discussed.

11. EXTRAORDINARY STUDENT BURSARY FUNDING

Stelle left the room. The following minutes were provided and approved by Leech and Hannon.

Leech informed the committee of Anna Stelle’s outstanding contributions to the Society in her new role as Managing Editor. Leech highlighted that the demands of the position significantly exceeded the advertised time commitment, posing a challenge to Anna’s PhD studies. In recognition of her exceptional efforts, the Committee decided to award Anna an ‘Extraordinary Student Bursary’ of £5000. This award, in addition to the five regular Society Student Bursaries, aims to support her PhD studies and acknowledge her remarkable work in promoting philosophy in the UK.

Stelle re-entered the room and was informed of the decision, for which she thanked the Committee. The Committee thanked her for her service to the role.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Leech asked the Committee to confirm again whether they had voted on 22 April to approve conference grant CG042166, because there had been a discrepancy after the last meeting in Stelle's minutes. The Committee confirmed this grant was approved.

The meeting was concluded at 11:00. The date of the next meeting of the Executive Committee will be in July 2024, in person at the Joint Session in Birmingham.



The Aristotelian Society

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee

Friday 12 July 2024
12:30 – 14.00

Rooms 109, Teaching and Learning Building, University of Birmingham

PRESENT: Jessica Leech, Fabienne Peter, Lee Walters, Aidan McGlynn, Sarah Fine, Anna Stelle, Michael Hannon

APOLOGIES: Mona Simion, Fiona Leigh, Scott Sturgeon, MM McCabe

Agenda

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

Hannon made apologies for Sturgeon's absence, introduced the meeting, and began by asking if there were any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

2. 2026 Joint Session – Leeds: review of nomination of speakers from Mind

Leech began by giving the background to Yuriko Saito's invitation—Saito was unable to accept last year due to caring responsibilities, and Leech had expected that the Society would go back to Saito. On this basis she expressed surprise that Mind had ranked Saito last of the Society's nominations, and asked the Committee's advice for whether they should support her nomination in the Joint Meeting.

Fine noted that both lists were heavily skewed toward international speakers, in the context of a conference that was intended to showcase the depth and diversity of UK philosophy. Walters noted that Mind's suggestions didn't include seconds, and the Society should try to add UK scholars through these suggestions.

Hannon also reminded the Committee of the need for diversity of topics.

After some discussion, the Committee agreed the following pairs and points to take forward to Mind:

Kurt Sylvan = ??

Matti Eklund (Uppsala)

Yuriko Saito (RSDI) = (UK philosopher)

Tom Dougherty (UNC) / Manon Garcia (FUB) == either way around

Seyla Benhabib (Yale) 1st. Olúfẹ́mi O. Táíwò (Georgetown) 2nd.

3. Joint session venue nominations 2027 and 2028

Hannon reminded the Committee that the University of Reading were hosting in the 2027, with Luke Elson as Local Organiser; and the University of Sheffield in 2028, putatively with Max Hayward as Local Organiser, but Hayward had indicated it was likely he would need a co-organiser. Fine announced to the Committee that Jesus College Cambridge had agreed to host the Joint Session in 2029, with Clare Chambers, based at Jesus, acting as Local Organiser.

4. Student Bursaries

Hannon announced the list of Bursary winners for 2024-25 and thanked the sub-Committee for their work in evaluating applications. The winners were:

- Alex Murphy, UCL
- Adham Al-Shazly, Cambridge
- Alice Wright, KCL
- Mariona Miyata-Sturm, Oxford
- Leia Hopf, Bristol

5. Any other business

No other business.

The meeting was concluded at 13:40.



The Aristotelian Society

Minutes of the Annual General Meeting

Friday 12 July 2024
14.00 – 14.15

Rooms 109, Teaching and Learning Building, University of Birmingham

PRESENT: Jessica Leech, Fabienne Peter, Lee Walters, Aidan McGlynn, Sarah Fine, Anna Stelle, Michael Hannon

APOLOGIES: Mona Simion, Fiona Leigh, Scott Sturgeon, MM McCabe

Agenda

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no corrections.

2. 2024 subscriptions

Stelle reported on the subscription figures for 2023 (179 new member subscriptions), which were an improvement from 2022 (83 new subscriptions).

3. Future presidencies

Hannon reported on the following future appointments:

2024/25 Fabienne Peter, 2025/26 Lucy O'Brien, 2026/27 Alexander Bird.

Hannon then referred to the nominations document he had circulated to the Committee ahead of the meeting, which provided a ranking of nominations for 2027/28 as: Jessica Brown, Sarah Sawyer, Rosanna Keefe (in order of votes).

Action: Hannon to extend an invitation to Brown.

4. Any other business

No other business.

The meeting was concluded at 14:15.



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 30 September 2024
13.00-16.00

Meeting held on Teams.

Agenda

1. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

Sturgeon asked if anyone had corrections to the previous minutes; Leech noted that Oderberg/Koslicki was a reserve for 2026. Regarding future invitations, she stated that if we didn't need reserves for 2026 we could invite those speakers for 2027, and in general that since we were inviting two years in advance for the SAV and PAS, and could push reserves forward across the board.

2. Proceedings

i. Update on speakers for 2025/26

Leech reported that we have a full programme for 25-26 and directed the Committee's attention to the listed speakers and dates in the Dropbox folder. These are:

First term

29-Sep-25	Inaugural Address: Lucy O'Brien (UCL)
13-Oct-25	Sophie Horowitz (Amherst)
27-Oct-25	Joe Saunders (Durham)
10-Nov-25	Malcolm Keating (Smith)
24-Nov-25	Guilia Felappi (Southampton)

Second term

19-Jan-26	Lewis Ross (LSE)
02-Feb-26	Anna Pakes (Roehampton)
16-Feb-26	Colin Chamberlain (UCL)
02-Mar-26	Anneli Jefferson (Cardiff)
16-Mar-26	Johanna Thoma (Bayreuth)

Third term

20-Apr-26	Simon Shogry (Oxford)
27-Apr-26	Chris Lebron (Johns Hopkins)
11-May-26	Anil Gomes (Oxford)
18-May-26	Pamela Hieronymi (UCLA)
01-Jun-26	Thomas Hofweber (UNC)

3. Joint Sessions

i. Report from 2024 Joint Session (Birmingham)

Stelle referred the Committee to the report in contained in the papers for the meeting and let the Committee know that the 2024 Joint Session had made a net profit of £350. This meant the Society had succeeded in its ambition to merely break even, not make a profit, and Stelle thanked the Local Organisers, Jussi Suikkanen and Nikk Effingham.

ii. Update on arrangements for 2025 (Glasgow)

Stelle invited Simion to give the Committee an update. Simion indicated that the website was nearly up and running, and should be ready for the following day (1 October). What remained was only to check that all the links were working correctly.

iii. Update on speakers for 2026 and 2027

Leech reported that the programme was nearly full for 2026, and progress had been made for 2027. At the moment, the line-up looked as follows:

2026

1. Angela Breitenbach (Cambridge). 'Kantian Climate Justice' = Alyssa R. Bernstein (Ohio)
2. Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh). Grief and moral virtue = Louise Richardson (York).
3. Pekka Vayrynen (Leeds) = Matti Ekland (Uppsala). Specific topic pending.
4. Gregory Currie (York emeritus). "Art as the manifestation of agency" = Eileen John (Warwick).
5. David Oderberg (Reading). 'Hylemorphism as a Generalised Research Programme'.
6. Manon Garcia (FUB). 'Sex as shared agency' = Carol Hay (University of Massachusetts Lowell).

2027

1. Asa Wikforss (Stockholm). Deadline 1st June 2026. Knowledge resistance, disinformation and "bad beliefs" = Kurt Sylvan (Southampton).
2. Seyla Benhabib (Yale) seems to be on for 2027. Waiting for confirmation. Topic will take a while.

iv. Update on venue for 2026

Stelle informed the Committee of trouble in the planning of the 2026 Joint Session, set to be in Leeds. The Leeds Conferences team had provided a quote for conference costs that was much higher than had been paid in previous years; after negotiation, Stelle had managed to lower the quote to £55,991, which was high, but in the range of the more expensive conferences the Society had run in the past (Edinburgh 2017: £51,486).

This seemed to be due to higher rates for room hire than the Society had paid in the past, and the requirement of a flat 'daily delegate rate' of £44 per delegate, negotiated down from £45. Daily delegate fees had been used in a Joint Session contract once before (Edinburgh 2017) and counselled against by McGlynn in the July 2024 Joint meetings because they made it more difficult to meet expenses through increasing delegate numbers. The rate quoted was also much higher than the rate paid in Edinburgh

(£27.50 per person). The second problem was that Leeds's only availability was 29-31 July 2026, meaning the conference would be pushed to later in the year than ever before; the third was that Leeds had not yet appointed Local Organisers. There had been a previous miscommunication about this point and it seemed the contacts did not intend to be Los and needed to recruit for the role. She added that it might also be reasonable to consider whether inflation, rising costs in general post-pandemic, and rising costs across the university sector meant that the conference would be more expensive to put on going forward.

Stelle invited comments from the Committee from the situation, including suggestions on whether: (a) the plan to hold 2026 in Leeds should be abandoned; (b) whether the entire schedule should be moved up one year; (c) whether 2027 (Reading) should be moved up with the attempt to find a new institution to fill 2027, the rest of the schedule remaining the same.

Simion was worried about the impact higher costs would have on the registration fee and about the prospect of fewer numbers if the conference was held later in July, when academics were closer to or in the August holiday. Uncertain attendance would also make it difficult to confidently calculate in advance what level of registration fee would be needed to cover costs. McGlynn also worried about delegate rate and asked Stelle to confirm whether the contract contained a minimum spend/attendance requirement, suggesting that in his opinion it would be a very bad deal if so.

Leech noted that it was important for her to know the dates in the near future, as she had issued invitations to symposiasts on a vague timeline while this issue was being worked out, but specific days would need to be confirmed with them soon.

O'Brien asked if the other future years/venues had local organisers attached. Hannon indicated that Reading (2027) had Luke Elson as LO; Sheffield (2028) had a contact, though not necessarily an LO—it was as yet unclear—and Cambridge (2029) had Clare Chambers as LO.

Peters said that if Leeds was untenable, the reasonable next step would be to see if the Society could switch the years for Reading and Leeds, instead of moving everyone up. Fine agreed.

Stelle noted to the Committee that Leeds had indicated to her that they had no availability for earlier July dates in any year as they had standing conferences which were always hosted there during that time of year, but she would check with Leeds to confirm this.

Actions: Stelle to investigate whether Leeds could accommodate earlier dates in 2027 and whether they required a minimum attendance guarantee for the conference.

Actions: Stelle to contact Luke Elson (2027) and ask whether it was possible at this point for Elson to move 2027 planning to 2026.

Actions: Stelle and Hannon then to return the issue to the Committee in future meetings.

v. Venue nominations for 2030

Hannon suggested this item be skipped for now, given that the 2026 session was a greater priority, and the Committee was already unusually well-covered in terms of future provision relative to the Society's normal timelines for planning.

4. Conference funding applications and reports

Hannon introduced grant application process for new members of the Society and invited comments on applications.

Discussing the individual applications, Committee members variously highlighted issues including whether or not a conference was invite-only, the diversity of the listed speakers, and how well-worked out the proposals and budgets were, among others.

The outcome of the discussion was to fund the following grants:

Ref	Institution	Amount requested	Amount approved
CG042168	Birkbeck University	468	340
CG042170	University of York/University of Leeds	500	340
CG042171	University of Nottingham	500	340
CG042172	University of Oxford	500	340
CG042174	University of St. Andrews	500	340
CG042175.	University of Reading/Bristol/ University Italian Switzerland	300	300

Leigh noted that it might be helpful to add a statement to the website about the Committee only funding applications which furthered the 'aims and principles of the Aristotelian Society'; this was approved.

The Committee also approved Robson's request to add a requirement to the application guidance that conference reports must be contained in a single document, though they noted this could be Word or PDF.

Stelle action: Stelle to notify Robson of the grant outcomes and ask her to update wording of the conference grant page to reflect the changes above.

5. Website statistics

Stelle informed the Committee of the statistics contained in the papers, and pointed out in particular that the average email open rate of 51% (compared to 38% last year) was a welcome increase, and excellent in terms of MailChimp's average of 21%.

6. Society nominations

i. Update on Council members

Hannon indicated that Sturgeon would now be moving to the Council and thanked him for his work as President.

Hannon introduced a separate issue that some members of the council were now deceased, including the Society's relative recent former President, Robert Stern. He asked the Committee for their views on how that could be indicated on the website.

Simion stated that dates of the person's lifespan (birth-death) could be placed below the person's name. Peter suggested that maybe the solution was to divide the page into three sections: members of Council, recent presidents (say 10 years), and a full list of past presidents. One consideration was that this might interfere with the steady chronology currently displayed on the Council page.

Fine noted she was in favour of keeping all past presidents listed under the 'Council' portion, and that she liked the photos the Society currently had and thought they should keep these.

Leech asked what the practical distinction was between Executive Committee and Council. If the Council was involved in nominations, then it seemed appropriate that they should attend meetings where nominations to the Executive Committee, Presidents, and Officers would occur. O'Brien noted that when she was Director, this had been a practice upheld by some former Presidents.

O'Brien made the point that it was odd for non-governing people with no attachment to the Society to be on the Council. Hannon noted that maybe this required a longer discussion about what the distinction is between 'Past Presidents' and 'Council,' what the function of the Council was, and what language was most appropriate for these bodies. Hannon noted that the Society had not treated the Council as any sort of decisionmaking body during his time in the role.

Actions: Hannon, Leech, and Stelle will come up with proposals to send to the Executive Committee on what the Council portion website could look like.

Actions: Stelle to put a longer discussion about the role and composition of the Council on the agenda for the April 2025 meeting.

ii. Update on President for 2027-28

Hannon updated the Committee on the future presidents, including Lucy O'Brien for 2025-26 and Alexander Bird for 2026-2027. Hannon informed the Committee that in July the Committee nominated Jessica Brown; he had written to her but not yet received a response. If this was a negative response he would, following the vote in July, then write to Sarah Sawyer, the Rosanna Keefe, reflecting the proportions of the votes these candidates had received in the July meeting.

Action: Hannon to invite Jessica Brown and update the Committee on the eventual outcome.

iii. Honorary member nominations

Hannon reminded the Committee that in 2016 Longworth proposed that former Editors should be Honorary Members. This had not yet been done for Longworth himself and Hannon indicated he would write to Longworth inviting him. Hannon also proposed that anyone who has given significant support to the Society should qualify for honorary membership.

Leech indicated that Directors should also receive this commendation, in addition to Editors, as there seemed no reason to make a distinction between the two.

O'Brien indicated that it might be difficult to keep track of who does or doesn't have a subscription; Hannon suggested discussing with Stelle how the subscriptions work and what the administration process behind this would be.

Action: Hannon to write to Longworth inviting him to be an honorary member and discover how intricate the process of adding honorary members would be to maintain.

7. Any other business

Sturgeon called for any other business.

Callanan, referring back to discussions had about conference grants, indicated that there was a strong argument to have an expansionist attitude going forward to what they funded so that the applications they received did not become siloed in particular areas of philosophy, as seemed to be the case this year, where the applications privileged metaphysics.

Action: Stelle to mention this when introducing conference grants in the April meeting, to ensure diversity of approach and subject matter.

Stelle asked for recommendations on how to increase online (facebook, twitter, email) engagement from women, indicating that of the 6.k page likes and 6495 page follows on the Society's facebook page, 72% of these were men and 27% women. This did not reflect the composition of the Society's speakers, audiences, or Committee, nor the gender split in the discipline. Stelle was unsure why the numbers skewed this way, though suggested it might have something to do with gendered trends in professional facebook usage, and invited Committee members to email her with thoughts about how to shift these figures if they had any.

The meeting was concluded at 14:45.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee & Council will be held on 28 April 2025 at 13.00 on Teams, link to follow.

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

England & Wales - Charity number 254021

Accounts

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY
Registered Charity Number: 254021

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
31st DECEMBER 2023

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2023

The Executive Committee present their report along with the accounts for the Society for the year ended 31st December 2023. The accounts comply with the Society's rules and applicable law.

Legal and Administrative Information

The Aristotelian Society for the systematic study of philosophy, based at Room 280, Steward House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN, is a registered charity (No. 254021) and is governed by a set of rules dated 1984. The Society was originally founded in 1880.

The officers of the Society are as follows:

Honorary Director	Dr Michael Hannon
President	Scott Sturgeon
President outgoing	Professor M. M McCabe
Editors	Dr Guy Longworth and Dr Jessica Leech

Aims and Organisation

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. The society is staffed by a part time administrator, editors, web editor and editorial assistant.

The ordinary business of the Society is managed by an Executive Committee consisting of the officers and the following elected members during the year to 31st December 2023 and up to the date of this report:

Dr Komarine Romdenh-Romluc
Dr Alexander Douglas
Dr Sarah Fine
Dr Michael Hannon
Dr Fiona Victoria Leigh
Dr Mona Simion
Dr Lee Walters
Dr Aidan McGlynn
Dr John Callahan

Excluding the Editors, The Trustees of the Charity comprise the members of the Executive Committee and the officers of the Society.

Review of Progress

The Society continued to meet fortnightly during the academic year to hear papers on philosophical matters. Papers were published prior to the meetings on the Society's website. The Proceedings were published in three online issues during the year as well as in hardback and the Supplementary Volume was also published online and in hardback.

The annual Joint Session with the Mind Association was held at Birkbeck University and there were 212 delegates (last in person conference 2022: 196). The Society's direct costs were £19,074 (last in person conference 2019: £7,838). The local organiser made a profit of £13,716 (last in person conference 2022: £4,829).

Overall subscriptions to the publications were 229 at the end of 2023 (2022: 83). There were 11 new subscriptions in the category of Lifetime membership (no publications) (2022: 12), which brings the total number of individual members in this category to 546 - these are exclusive of institutional subscriptions, which are handled by OUP. Lastly, there were 236 other general subscriptions (no publications) (2022: 152).

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2023

Review of Financial Position

Membership income has increased from £5,534 in 2022 to £6,196 in 2023. The Society received income from Oxford University Press (OUP) (the publisher of the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume) of £84,838 (2022: £102,222). There was a net income over expenditure for the year of £1,242 (2022: £26,057) leaving cash (current and deposit accounts) balances of £232,469 at 31st December 2023 (2022: £130,934). The net assets of the Society have increased to £334,257 (2022: £333,163), including cash held on longer term deposits.

Publication of Proceedings, joint Session talks and income from JSTOR remain the Societies main income stream. The Proceedings talks and Joint Session conference were held in person again during 2023 and this led to an increase in spending on catering and travel costs. Similarly, there has been an increase in the society's bursary expenses compared to pre-2022 levels because more bursary funding is being awarded.

Statement of Executive Committee's Responsibilities

The Charities Act 2011 requires the Executive Committee to prepare a statement of accounts for each financial year which comply with the regulations made under the Act.

The Executive Committee are responsible for keeping accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy the financial position of the charity and contain entries showing from day to day all monies received and monies expended by the charity and the matters in respect of which those transactions took place and also contain a record of the assets and liabilities of the charity. The law also sets out the Executive Committees' responsibilities for the preparation and content of the Executive Committees' Annual Report.

The Executive Committee are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and ensuring their proper application under charity law and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Statement of Public Benefit

The Executive Committee confirms that it has referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit, including its guidance (PB2) "Public Benefit: Running a Charity", when reviewing the charity's aims and objectives and in planning future activities.

The Aristotelian Society continues to be very proud of its placement in the voluntary sector, the impact it continues to have, and the benefit it believes it is able to present to the general public.

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. Through affordable subscription rates, free podcasts of talks, social media engagement, and a programme which covers a broad range of philosophical traditions, the Society continues to make philosophy widely available to the general public. The Society also co-organises the Joint Session with the Mind Association - the largest gathering of philosophers in the UK - and also provides grants to philosophy conferences all across the UK.

Reserves Policy

The Society has payments of approximately £100,000 per year and has approximately £200,000 in reserves. The Society aims to have in reserves approximately two years of payments.

Reasons for Policy

The Society has for many years aimed to have significant reserves. This is for three main reasons:

1. The income of the society comes very largely from one source: the receipts from Oxford University Press for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume. The Society has little control over the extent of that income, and it could in theory dry up very quickly.

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2023

Reserves Policy continued

2. The commitments of the Society are fixed and stretch two to three years into the future. It is, for example, already committed to producing the material for publication in the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume of the Society for two years, and committed to a Joint Session for July next year. Should the income dry up the Society would need, as far as possible, to be able to meet the commitments it has made and wind down its affairs in an orderly fashion.

The Society needs easily accessible reserves, beyond those of running costs for a short period because the responsibility of the Joint Session means that it faces, annually, the risk of having to make large 'rescue payments'. This can occur, if, for example, the accommodation arrangements fall through, the local organiser drops out and an organiser has to be bought in on a market salary, or if the local organiser makes a serious mistake on the budget.

3. Given the fixed nature and extent of its income, the Society is able to consider new worthwhile initiatives, such as switching to on-line publication of Proceedings, only if it is able to insulate itself against risk. Having significant reserves enables it to do this.

Statement of Trustees' Responsibilities

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

The law applicable to charities in England and Wales requires the Trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Charity and of the incoming resources and application of resources for that period.

In preparing those financial statements the Trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgments and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- Prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in business.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and to enable them to ensure the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011, the Charities SORP and the provisions of the trust deeds. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

This report has been approved by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf



.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

Date: 19 October 2024
.....

Independent Examiner's Report to the Trustees of The Aristotelian Society For the year ended 31st December 2023

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of The Aristotelian Society for the year ended 31 December 2023.

Responsibilities and basis of report

As the charity trustees of the Trust you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ('the Act').

I report in respect of my examination of the Trust's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination giving me cause to believe:

- accounting records were not kept in respect of the Trust as required by section 130 of the Act; or
- the accounts do not accord with those records.
- the accounts do not comply with the applicable requirements concerning the form and content of accounts set out in the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 other than any requirement that the accounts give a 'true and fair view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

Moore Kingston Smith LLP

Karen Wardell
Partner, Moore Kingston Smith LLP
For and on behalf of Moore Kingston Smith LLP
Chartered Accountants

Date: 25 October 2024

9 Appold Street
London EC2A 2AP

The Aristotelian Society
Receipts and Payments Account
For the year ended 31st December 2023

		2023		2022	
	£		£	£	£
Income Receipts					
Membership Subscriptions			6,196		5,534
Receipts from publications					
JSTOR	14,243			13,238	
Permission fees received	-			-	
Joint session receipts	-			1,610	
OUP's sales of journals	84,838			102,222	
Net VAT movements	15,635			19,510	
Miscellaneous	428			400	
			115,144		136,980
Investment Income					
Interest income and sale of investments			752		473
Total Receipts			122,092		142,987
Direct Charitable Expenditure					
Conference grants	7,201			5,004	
Podcast expenses	-			1,163	
Speaker expenses	2,101			-	
Joint session expenses	4,086			7,196	
General Expenses	579			103	
Net salaries and editors' fees	35,600			45,996	
Presidents' costs	5,217			2,941	
PAYE and NI	3,647			5,317	
Pension	1,118			1,121	
Student Bursaries	23,653			15,246	
Postage	88			5	
			83,290		84,092
Other Expenditure					
Rent	7,516			7,516	
Stationery and postage	140			65	
Computer and IT costs	1,175			815	
Bank charges	381			322	
Audit, accountancy and payroll	4,775			4,047	
Catering	1,677			693	
Miscellaneous	-			-	
Subscription	-			-	
VAT paid	21,173			18,359	
Travel	104			218	
Website	143			803	
Insurance	476			-	
			37,560		32,838
Total Payments			120,850		116,930
Net Income			1,242		26,057

All receipts and payments are Unrestricted funds movements. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Aristotelian Society
Cash and Reserves
For the year ended 31st December 2023

	2023	2022
	£	£
Net Receipts for the year	1,242	26,057
Net Transfers (to)/ from Reserves	100,293	(1,186)
Cash and bank balances at 1 January	<u>130,934</u>	<u>106,063</u>
Cash and bank balances at 31 December	<u><u>232,469</u></u>	<u><u>130,934</u></u>

The Aristotelian Society

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

at 31st December 2023

	Notes	2023		2022	
		£	£	£	£
Monetary Assets					
Bank and Cash balances:					
Bank deposit accounts		3,025		2,976	
Bank current account		199,728		104,416	
PayPal account		<u>29,716</u>		<u>23,542</u>	
			232,469		130,934
- held for investment purposes					
CAF Gold Account		-		97,212	
CAF 90 Day Account		<u>71,516</u>		<u>70,890</u>	
			71,516		168,102
Debtors:					
OUP sales	3	42,003		47,799	
Other debtors		<u>500</u>		<u>780</u>	
			42,503		48,579
Total Assets			<u>346,488</u>		<u>347,615</u>
Liabilities					
Creditors:					
Auditors' remuneration		4,082		3,500	
Accruals & deferred income		4,853		3,420	
Grants		2,192		890	
VAT		<u>1,104</u>		<u>6,642</u>	
Total Liabilities			<u>(12,231)</u>		<u>(14,452)</u>
Net Assets			<u>334,257</u>		<u>333,163</u>

All assets and liabilities of the Charity are held in Unrestricted funds. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Annual Report and Accounts were approved for issue by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf by:



.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

Date: 19 October 2024

The Aristotelian Society

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended 31st December 2023

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The financial statements have been prepared under the Charities Act 2011, on the receipts and payments basis, following the guidance issued by the Charities Commission.

Allocation of Expenditure

All expenditure in connection with the Society's meetings and publications, together with an appropriate proportion of travel and office costs, has been treated as direct charitable expenditure in the Receipts and Payments Account.

2 Trustees and Employees

The Society had an average of one (2022: one) employees during the year, whose staff cost amounted to £35,600 (2022: £45,996). An honorarium of £5,126 (2022: £8,671) was paid to the editors. Trustees were reimbursed expenses of £5,217 during the year (2022: £3,265).

3 Publishers' Sales

	2023	2022
	£	£
Sales of journals net of VAT for the year	85,337	91,133
Less advanced payments	(43,334)	(43,334)
Amount due at 31 December 2023	<u>42,003</u>	<u>47,799</u>

OUP's total sales for the year ended 31 December 2023 amounted to £85,337. An advance of £43,334 was received during 2023, leaving a sum of £42,003 due at the year end, which is to be received in 2024. In the prior year, OUP's gross sales amounted to £91,133 and similarly £47,799 was recognised as a debtor at year end and was received during 2023.



The Aristotelian Society
Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 2 October 2023
13.00-16.00

Meeting held over Zoom: <https://ucl.zoom.us/j/93141848380>

PRESENT: MM McCabe (Chair and outgoing president), Scott Sturgeon (President), Jessica Leech (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Fiona Leigh, Aidan McGlynn, John Callanan, Lee Walters, Sarah Fine, Anna Stelle (Managing Editor, minutes), Fabienne Peter (President Elect)

1. Welcome and Introductions

McCabe invited Hannon to introduce the new Managing Editor (Anna Stelle), new/incoming President (Scott Sturgeon), and two new Committee Members, Aidan McGlynn and John Callanan.

2. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

Stelle noted that nearly all the actions from previous meetings were completed apart from those on the agenda for later in the meeting.

3. Proceedings

Update on speakers for 2024/25

Leech reported that speakers for the 2024-25 Proceedings talks had been confirmed:

First term

30-Sep-24 Inaugural Address: Fabienne Peter (Warwick)
14-Oct-24 Chike Jeffers (Dalhousie)
28-Oct-24 Greg Restall (St. Andrews)
11-Nov-24 Christopher Cowie (Durham)
25-Nov-24 Susanna Schellenberg (Rutgers)

Second term

13-Jan-25 Monima Chadha (Monash)
27-Jan-25 Alexander Prescott-Couch (Oxford)
10-Feb-25 Nadine Elzein (Warwick)
24-Feb-25 Claire Field (Zurich)
10-Mar-25 Pauline Kleingeld (Groningen)

Third term

28-Apr-25 Léa Salje (Leeds)
12-May-25 Frisbee Sheffield (Cambridge)
19-May-25 Vid Simoniti (Liverpool)
02-Jun-25 Rahel Jaeggi (Humboldt Berlin)
16-Jun-25 Sarah McGrath (Princeton)

4. Joint Session

i. Report from 2023 Joint Session (Birkbeck)

Stelle indicated that the Committee was still waiting on the local organiser from 2023, Alex Grzankowski, to file his report.

Stelle also invited Hannon to discuss the Grzankowski's proposal to split profits from the 2023 Joint Session four ways between Birkbeck, Mind, and the Institute of Philosophy.

Hannon explained that the 2023 Joint Session had made a much larger profit than usual (£13K), due to donated accommodation, negotiated discounts, low childcare uptake, and sponsorship of the wine reception. The traditional method of dividing any profit, detailed in the Local Organiser's Guide, mandates that it be split three ways between the Society, the host institution, and Mind. Hannon, on behalf of Grzankowski, presented the alternate proposal Grzankowski wished to make to the Committee (above).

Grzankowski's argument was that the profit largely arose from the activities of Birkbeck and the Institute of Philosophy (IP), so the latter should receive some of the benefit. Grzankowski also proposed that Birkbeck would dedicate the profits to the Annual Dorothy Eddington Lecture fund and that the IP would dedicate the profits to support a nationwide philosophy postdoc event led in collaboration with Sheffield scheduled for April 2024.

Alternate proposals of how to split the surplus were offered by Leech and Simion; the eventual allocation was decided to be 30% to the

Aristotelian Society, 30% to Mind, and 40% to Birkbeck pending Birkbeck's confirmation that this proportion would be equally split, by them, with the IP (resulting in an eventual distribution of 20% for Birkbeck and 20% for the IP).

Action: Stelle to obtain confirmation from Grzankowski that Birkbeck would split their proportion of the surplus equally with the Institute of Philosophy.

Action: Stelle to follow up with Grzankowski on the 2023 report.

ii. Update on arrangements for 2024 (Birmingham)

Stelle reminded the committee that the local organisers for next year's conference at Birmingham were Jussi Suikkanen and Nikk Effingham, and the arrangements for the conference were going well. The official website was in progress and the first CFP would go out shortly.

iii. Update on speakers for 2024 (Glasgow)

Leech reported difficulties in securing agreement from the nominated speakers on such short timelines (asking in September for delivery of a paper the following July 31, for first symposiasts) and suggested contacting speakers earlier in the year, instead of during or at the end of the summer, so they had more time to plan. This was agreed by the Committee.

Action: Leech to report the full list of speakers for the Joint Session 2024 at the April meeting.

iv. Update on venue for 2026/2027/2028

Hannon reported that confirmed future venues were as follows and that Max Khan Hayward had indicated positive interest in being the local organiser for 2028:

2026- Leeds

2027- Reading

2028- (provisionally) Sheffield

Action: Hannon to confirm 2028 venue and LO role with Hayward.

5. Conference funding applications

Hannon explained the funding differences between the April and October meetings. He summarised that there was usually £2000 available in October and £4000 in April, due to the fact that more applications tended to be received in April, but noted that it was possible for the Society to allocate more than £2000 in October, and simply remove this money from the budget for April. He also noted that the society tended to fund graduate rather than non-graduate conferences, and conferences that were non-recurring rather than recurring.

The eventual allocation of funding from the meeting was as follows:

Ref	Institution	Amount Requested	Amount Approved
CG042148	University of Oxford	500	350
CG042147	University of Oxford	300	300
CG042150	University of Nottingham	500	350
CG042146	University of Nottingham	500	350
CG042145	University of Southampton	500	350
CG042143	University of Nottingham	470	350

6. Student Bursaries

Hannon confirmed to the Committee that the successful applicants, who each received £5000 from the Society in 2023/24, were:

Han Edgoose (Glasgow)
Filippa Ronquist (UCL)
Camille Fouche (St. Andrews)
Alex Fisher (Cambridge)
Lucija Duda (Manchester)

7. Website statistics

Stelle highlighted key points from the website and social media report prepared by the new Administrator/Web Editor, Ellie Robson.

She summarised that the Society Twitter account has 21.4k followers, which is up from 21k last year. The society's average tweet reaches around 7800 people. There has been an increase of about 100 to the society's mailing list, and the open rate for emails has increased from 32.1% in 2022 to 38% in 2023. The figures for Facebook represent a levelling off after years of increase, which may have to do with a general decline in Facebook use. Website views in 2023 are in line with those in 2022, with an average of approximately 6000 views a month.

8. Society Nominations

i. Committee member update

Stelle confirmed that the Committee had welcomed Aidan McGlynn and John Callanan, and that Mona Simion, Lee Walters, and Fiona Leigh would be coming to the end of their three-year terms in July 2024. Expressions of interest would thus need to be sought for new members before the April 2024 meeting.

Action: Stelle to solicit expressions of interest in becoming a Committee member in advance of the April 2024 meeting.

ii. Update on Council Members

Stelle announced that MM McCabe, as outgoing President, and Scott Sturgeon, as incoming President, would be joining the Council.

iii. Update on President for 2026/27

Hannon noted that the Society would need to nominate a President for 2026-27, following the terms of Fabienne Peter (2024-25) and Lucy O'Brien (2025-26). Nominations were solicited and Hannon indicated that he would email around a google sheet allowing for Committee members to vote for their top 5 candidates. If any candidate garnered the support across the board they would be chosen.

Action: Hannon to distribute google sheet for voting.

iv. Honorary Member Nominations

9. Funding for Early Career People

Hannon invited McCabe to comment on the prospects for funding for Early Career People as discussed at the April 2023 and July 2023 meetings. In July, McCabe began a discussion about whether all four main philosophy societies could come together in a joint funding initiative. At the July 2023 meeting, the idea McCabe and Fine had mooted was that of a 'prize' or 'award' that could be given to early career people on short-term contracts. This wording should avoid universities seeing the money as any encouragement towards short-term contracting, and the prize would be financial but could also involve a mentor. Potentially, with each award someone could volunteer to be the mentor to the recipient. The award could be as short-term as one month, or up to three.

McCabe had intended to write the proposal for such an award to be brought to Mind but had not been able to complete this in time for the meeting. The Committee proceeded to discuss what the technicalities of such an award would look like. It was decided to move this to the agenda for the April 2024 meeting, and attempt to discuss a proposal there which could be brought to Mind in advance of July.

Action: Stelle to bring this up under AOB at April 2024 meeting.

10. Any other business

The committee thanked Stern for McCabe for work as President of the society in 2022/23 and welcomed Sturgeon to the Presidency for 23/24.

The meeting was concluded at 15.30

The next meeting of the Executive Committee & Council will be held
22 April 2024 at 13.00 over Zoom.



The Aristotelian Society

meeting of the executive committee

Friday 07 July 2023
14.00 – 14.15

G16 Senate House, Malet St, London WC1E 7HU

PRESENT: MM McCabe (chair and president), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Fiona Leigh, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes),

Apologies: Scott Sturgeon (President Elect), Lee Walters, Mona Simion.

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no corrections.

MM reported and de las Casas confirmed that the matters arising from the previous AGM had already been reviewed at the October 2022 committee meeting.

2. 2022 subscriptions

de las Casas reported on the subscriptions figures for 2022, which were in line with previous years. Figures were slightly higher than normal in 2021 due to a new website, which meant that many people re-purchased subscriptions between October and December 2021.

3. Future presidencies

Hannon reported on the following future appointments:

2023/24 Scott Sturgeon, 2024/25 Fabienne Peter, 2025/26 Lucy O'Brien

de las Casas confirmed that Rae Langton did not want to be considered for a future presidency.

4. Officers & executive committee members for 2022/23

de las Casas reported that Romdenh-Romluc and Douglas would be leaving after July 2023, and the committee thanked them for their service. de las Casas reported that Fine would stay on for another 3

year term, along with new committee members John Callanan (KCL) and Aiden McGlynn (Edinburgh).

5. Any other business?

There was no further business.

The meeting was concluded at 14.17.



The Aristotelian Society

meeting of the executive committee

Friday 07 July 2023
12.30 – 14.00

G16 Senate House, Malet St, London WC1E 7HU

PRESENT: MM McCabe (chair and president), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Fiona Leigh, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes),

Apologies: Scott Sturgeon (President Elect), Lee Walters, Mona Simion, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

McCabe introduced the meeting and begun by asking if there were any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Matters arising:

de las Casas confirmed that the matters arising from the minutes of the April 2023 meeting were all completed or in hand.

2. 2025 JOINT SESSION –GLASGOW: REVIEW OF NOMINATION OF SPEAKERS FROM THE AS AND MIND

Longworth confirmed that preliminary nominations for the 2025 Joint Session had been discussed at the April meeting. He reported that Hannon had consolidated the Mind and AS nominations into a helpful list and summarised this. The committee discussed nominations and agreed on the following list of preferred speakers:

Epistemology: Jane Friedman (NYU) + Adam Carter or Chris Kelp (Glasgow)

Language: Liz Camp (Rutgers) + Eliot Michaelson (KCL)

Political: Danielle Allen (Harvard) , plus a second speaker.

Aesthetics: Yuriko Saito (Rhode Island School of Design + Nick Riggle (San Diego)

Philosophy of science: Anna Alexandrova (Cambridge) + Kareem Khalifa (UCLA)

Existentialism: Sara Heinämaa (Helinski) + Kate Kirkpatrick (Oxford)

3. joint session venue nominations 2027 to 2028

Hannon reported that the upcoming Joint Session venues as follows:

Birmingham	2024
Glasgow	2025
Leeds	2026
Reading	2027

Hannon then reported that Sheffield would like to go ahead with hosting the conference in 2028, with Max Hayward as local organizer, but that this would need to be discussed and confirmed with Mind at the Joint meeting.

4. Honorary Editor position

Longworth reported that there have been 4 applications for the position of Honorary Editor. The committee agreed that there were good candidates for the role. Longworth suggested, and the committee agreed, that Longworth, Hannon, McCabe, and de las Casas would be on the interview panel for the role. As members of the panel would be away from 25th July, de las Casas would try to set up interviews before then. If a date was not possible it was agreed that interviews could wait until September.

ACTION: de las Casas to contact panel members and applicants for the Honorary Editor position and arrange interviews either in July, before July 25th, or for September.

5. Learned societies, collaborative funding discussion

McCabe introduced the topic of organising further and more collaborative funding to support early career people in philosophy. She explained that the British Academy had started a pilot early career network but that this was oriented towards helping people with career advice rather than funding.

MM suggested the society might directly fund early career people with, for example, giving a month to complete a research paper instead of their needing working in a part time job. She noted, and the committee agreed, that those who already had post-docs needed this help less than those on short term teaching contracts who would not have time to research and publish. It was agreed that those with post-docs often already had the time and opportunities to progress. The committee agreed that early career people were often trapped by short term teaching positions.

The committee discussed the possibility of helping to buy-out time from teaching contracts but it was agreed that this would be complicated and that it might be easier to give small packages of money directly to the person, rather than through the university itself. Another reason for this would be so as not to give an incentive for universities to continue to place early career people on bad contracts.

It was noted that some people on, for example, 12 month teaching contracts, do have some research time over summer but that 9 month contracts were the bigger problem.

McCabe noted that some universities were better behaved about their hiring practices but that the future picture did not look optimistic. She agreed to look into the situation further and report back to the next committee meeting.

Douglas noted that some universities did offer bridging grants for when teaching contracts end, to tide people over before they might find a new position.

Longworth agreed that practices vary and noted the need to keep in mind that the society would not want to create a negative incentive for universities to use bad hiring practices.

Hannon noted that McCabe's suggestion to fund early career people was a very good one but that currently the society funds bursaries for students and there would not be enough money to fund early career people in addition to this. There was a concern that it would not be good to take money away from the existing student funding.

Longworth suggested that the society should speak with Mind about the possibility of collaborating on joint funding for the new initiative. It was agreed that this should be bought up under Any Other Business at the upcoming joint meeting with Mind. There would be a financial gain in grant making capacity if the society were to join up with another society with substantial resources.

Longworth suggested that perhaps one of the 5 existing bursaries could be given to an early career person, and that Mind- if they were interested- or another society could then match one or more additional grants. This would enable the society to fund both graduate students and early career people.

Douglas noted, as a potentially useful precedent, that at St Andrews there was funding available for two students and two to early career people who do not have post docs.

Leigh wanted to highlight that the existing society grants, which go to help students and are gender balanced and not centred on Oxbridge, are a very good thing and should not be lost in the process of making new grants.

Longworth suggested that the society might communicate with the royal institute of philosophy, as they have similar schemes to the ones being proposed, and that it might be possible to apply for additional funding from philanthropic societies.

Douglas commented that the change that needs to happen is within universities and that departments need to hire on the basis of teaching experience and not just publication record. Those who have been on teaching contracts cannot currently compete with those who have full time to produce publications. The committee agreed with this.

Leigh suggested that grants for early career people on short term teaching contracts could be called 'publications grants'. It was agreed that these grants would probably not be so big that they would create any further negative practices within universities.

Action: De las Casas to put funding for early career people on the agenda for next AS committee meeting in October, and for the upcoming Joint meeting with Mind on Saturday 8th July 2023 under Any Other Business.

Action: McCabe to speak to colleagues and research the situation of short-term teaching contracts across different universities in more detail, then report back to the committee at the next committee meeting in October.

6. any other business

The meeting was concluded at 13.20

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held 2nd October 2023.



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 24 April 2022

13.00-16.00

Meeting held remotely via Zoom video conference

PRESENT: M.M McCabe (chair and president), Scott Sturgeon (President Elect), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Fiona Leigh, Mona Simion, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Victoria Neads (Publisher OUP, for item 1 only).

Apologies: Bob Stern, Lee Walters, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc.

1. OUP

i. OUP 2023 PUBLISHERS REPORT

McCabe welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Neads as the new publisher for OUP. Neads let the committee know that she would briefly summarise and then answer any questions about the publishers reports for 2022.

She reported that subscriptions income for both journals was generally good. For the Proceedings, usage for 2022 was slightly higher than in previous years. For the SV the numbers were slightly down, but were still better than 2019. She noted that there had been some promotions around the Joint Sessions in previous years that had not been continued in 2022, and that this might be one reason why usage was down for the SV journal. Neads reported that she would get in touch with marketing to look at increasing online promotions and presence again for this year. She also noted that OUP were planning on having a manned presence at the JS conference.

Neads also reported that usage for both journals fell mainly in Europe and North America, but that this was normal for this kind of journal. She also let the committee know that the most downloaded articles were similar to the popular classic titles from previous years but that a 2022 article by Heather Widdows was also on the list.

Neads commented that subscriptions to the journal had been fairly constant over the past years but that there had been a drop in 'conventional academic' subscriptions, meaning those institutions that subscribe to a journal as a stand-alone product, as opposed to as part of a larger package. She confirmed that this was a general trend that had developed over the past 10 years.

Neads mentioned that it had not been unusual to have some production delays in recent years, and that this trend had continued in 2022. She noted, however, that it was good to see that the mean number of days to publications has almost halved for the journals due to gains in publication speed. McCabe let Neads know that the reminders and deadlines had been very helpful in the process of submitting her paper for publication. She asked if this was a recent change, and Neads reported that there had not been substantial changes to the number of reminders.

Neads reported that the OUP annual accounts for the journals would be ready soon. She noted that some revenue for 2022 would need to be deferred to 2023 because there had been delays to publication. She explained that the accountants at OUP had requested that any journal issues that had been published late in the subsequent year would be paid in that year, rather than before.

Neads then asked the committee there was any reason why it seemed that copy flow had dropped in the past years. She reported that OUP had received less manuscripts for publication. Longworth relayed that the society has a fixed number of articles for both journals each year, but that there may have been one or two authors who failed to produce a paper for publication. He commented that there may be a similar situation with the SV this year.

ii. CHANGES IN PUBLISHING UPDATE

Continuing the discussion about the slight drop in journal papers, Neads brought the discussion to open access publishing. She reiterated that, with the new read and publish deals, journal income would be increasingly linked with the amount of papers published. Longworth let Neads know that it would be difficult for the society to significantly increase its output because its journals are proceedings journals. He

let her know that there had been discussion about how to respond to changes in publishing, but that there were no current plans to grow output.

Neads let the committee know that she would send through projections in the next couple of months for how the society income may be effected in coming years by open access publishing.

Longworth summarised to the committee that the only way to equalise the income the society makes, going forward, would be to publish more papers.

McCabe commented that increasing the amount of papers the society publishes would radically alter the journals and the society as a whole. She added that such changes would require more editors, and quality would go down.

Longworth added that perhaps the main problem with increasing output is that the journals are currently proceedings journals. The most straightforward way to increase revenue would be to add in peer review and publish more but this would add significant demands on editorial staff. He suggested, though, that this would be better than trying to increase the number of talks. Neads reasoned that introducing a system of review in order to publish more would be better because then there would be no cap on growth. With a proceedings journal, output is linked to the number of actual talks. McCabe added that she didn't think there was an audience for many more talks per year.

Longworth noted that another way forward would be to reduce the society's outgoing costs. Examples of this would be to not continue to fund conferences and graduate bursaries, or to let go of the office in Senate House.

Fine suggested that it might be possible to add an additional paper per year in the form of a prize for an early career researcher or student paper. Longworth commented that the society does already review abstracts for the postgraduate sessions and that some of these papers from the conference were each year externally reviewed and published in the Proceedings journal. He noted that adding more would be a significant job and that highlighted the importance of thinking about what the society is for. McCabe added that one way the society really supports early career and student researchers, as well as its wider audience, is by providing the talks themselves.

The committee decided to wait until Neads' projections had arrived to discuss further the open access situation and plans for the future

McCabe thanked Neads for her helpful contribution to the meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

de las Casas confirmed that all actions from the previous meeting had been completed or were on the Agenda for the current meeting. The minutes from the meeting were approved as correct.

3. ANNUAL ACCOUNTS FOR 2022

Hannon introduced the annual accounts for 2022 and summarized that the society is in good financial health. He commented that the society had made some income over the past year but that the society's aim was not to generate a large profit.

Further to the discussion about open access, he noted that the main financial concern for the future is that is 90% of the society's income is generated through OUP. He noted Neads' suggestion that this income could be halved in the future, unless the society were to change its publishing processes. He reiterated that it may be necessary to scale

back on spending or try to publish more. He noted that increases to bursaries and grants could be reversed but that changes to salaries were less easy to reverse.

4. THE PROCEEDINGS

(i) Update on speakers 2023/24

Longworth commented that there were Australian speakers on the program, which would be good in terms of extending the society's reach beyond the UK and North America. MM highlighted the need to also represent Europe properly.

Longworth reported the program of speakers as follows:

First term

02-Oct-23	Prof Scott Sturgeon
16-Oct-23	Prof Catherine Rowett
30-Oct-23	Dr Max Khan Hayward
20-Nov-23	Dr Jonathan Birch
27-Nov-23	Dr Karen Jones

Second term

15-Jan-24	Prof Michele Moody-Adams
29-Jan-24	Prof Alistair Wilson
19-Feb-24	Prof Gabriel Richardson Lear
04-Mar-24	Dr Jessica Isserow
18-Mar-24	Dr Daniela Dover

Third term

22-Apr-24	Dr Adrian Alsmith
13-May-24	Prof Eric Schliesser
20-May-24	Dr Louise Hanson
03-Jun-24	Dr Daniel Watts

17-Jun-24 Dr Umrao Sethi

(ii) Nomination of speakers 2024/25

The committee had proposed nominations for speakers for the Proceedings and Joint Session onto a shared spreadsheet, which was circulated before the meeting.

Longworth explained that 15 speakers in total were needed and that it would be a good idea to have a list of 16 or 17 nominations from the meeting because some would decline or drop out. He commented that it was good to have a spread of topics on the program, both within each year and over the years. It would be important to have some speakers from Europe and the USA but to retain the Proceedings as a showcase for UK talent. He noted that the program should contain some big-name speakers as this was important, both for drawing an audience and for the society finances.

Hannon noted the convention with nominations was to not invite a speaker if they had spoken already within the past 5 years

de las Casas noted an action point from the last meeting, which was that the committee wanted someone to speak on the History of Epistemology.

Longworth noted the importance of keeping in mind a range of topic coverage. He also noted the need to keep diversity of speakers in mind, and to keep the society's record for good gender balance.

After discussion, the following shortlist of names was agreed for the Proceedings:

Frisbee Sheffield (Cambridge)
Vid Simoniti (Liverpool)
Greg Restall (St. Andrews)
Chris Cowie (Durham)
Alastair Prescott-Couch (Oxford)
Nadine Elzein (Warwick)
Jeff McMahan (Oxford)
Richard Pettigrew (Bristol)
Anna Pakes (Roehampton)
Chike Jeffers (Dalhousie)
Lea Salje (Leeds)
Rahel Jaeggi (Humboldt Berlin)
Pauline Kleingeld (Leiden)
Claire Field (Stirling)
Susanna Schellenberg (Rutgers)
Pamela Hieronymi (UCLA)
Sarah McGrath (Princeton)
Kareem Khalifa (UCLA)
Monima Chadha (Monash)

Action: Longworth to invite the nominated speaker for the 2024/25 Proceedings program.

(iii) Presidents choice

Longworth let Sturgeon know that the society had a tradition of inviting the incumbent president to put together a list of articles and an introduction which would then be made available on the OUP and society websites. The President's Choice selection would be publicised both by OUP and on our own social media and the articles would be made open access for a period of time. This serves as a good marketing device for the journals too. He noted that McCabe was in the process of putting together her selection for this year.

5. THE JOINT SESSION

- (i) 2023 Joint Session (Birkbeck)
 - a. General update and registration.

de las Casas reported that organisation was going well for this year's conference but that there had been some delays to the budget and registration system at BBK so that this had run a month late.

She further noted that a problem caused by the fact that the Open Sessions call for papers had asked for extended abstracts but the SWIP call for papers had requested a full paper. Because of this there were substantially less submissions (just 3 initially) for the SWIP this year. In response, the SWIP deadline was extended. de las Casas reported that she had discussed this with the SWIP organisers and they agreed it would be important that the CFP were standardised in future years to avoid this problem.

de las Casas reminded committee members to register for the conference and especially to book accommodation as soon as possible.

de las Casas reported that there had been problems setting up childcare for the conference. Alex Grzankowski, the local organiser at BBK, had let her know that there were so far 6 children that might need childcare, and that there could be more as others register. The best solution so far was through UCL, who had full facilities to offer, however they were having some problems with a leak in the building and therefore so couldn't say for sure whether they would be able to help.

Alex Grzankowski wanted to let the committee know that he had found a company which is he said like taskrabbit for babysitters, but that this service didn't include a venue. The conference could hire a

venue, but it would need to be set up with the correct safety regulations and provisions for childcare. This did not seem possible.

Simion commented that the best way to provide childcare at conferences was to provide attendees with the name of an agency or a list of sitters who they could contact themselves in order to arrange childcare. She said that the conference should also offer reimbursement for this. The idea would be that people could set up childcare in their own hotels, and this would avoid the need for a venue. The important thing, she said, would be to have sitters available and for this to be paid for by the conference. It was noted that people would likely hire sitters for chunks of time during the day or evening. Fine opened a discussion about what the society's responsibilities might be in relation to the sitters, noting that the sitters would need to be properly vetted and approved. Simion commented that the best way of ensuring sitters were properly vetted would be to use an agency that itself made checks and approved all of its staff. She noted that carers.co.uk, for example, did not provide this kind of service.

Action: de las Casas to feed back Simion's advice about childcare provision to the organisers at BBK.

- b. Editors update on Editor's update on postgraduate papers and symposia programme

Longworth noted that one symposiast, Elseijn Kingma, had not been able to provide a paper the Supplementary Volume this year. Veronique Munoz Darde, who was to be her respondent, will instead give a standalone paper. Longworth noted that Munoz-Darde subsequently decided to co-write her paper with Mike Martin. He flagged that Martin was already planned to speak at the 2024 Joint Session and that, although not ideal, this would be fine.

Longworth asked the committee if they would be okay with Elseijn Kingma speaking at the Joint Session, if she is able to, despite the fact that she would not have a published paper in the SV this year. The committee agreed to this. It was agreed that de las Casas would let Kingma know that she could give a paper at the conference this year, if she is able, and that she also has the option of publishing that paper in the SV next year. This could give her enough time to have the paper ready, but without applying any pressure either way.

Action: de las Casas to let Kingma know she is welcome to speak at the Joint Session in 2023, if she is able, and to also publish the paper in the SV for the following year.

Longworth presented the list of symposiasts and postgraduate speakers as follows:

Symposiasts

Inaugural address- Ursula Coope (Oxford)

Elseijn Kingma (KCL) and Véronique Munoz-Dardé (UCL & UC Berkeley)
Justice and the Family

Kate Manne (Cornell) and Carla Bagnoli (Modena/Oslo)
Gaslighting

Christopher Ba Thi Nguyen (Utah) and Stacie Friend (BBK)
Aesthetic knowledge and Appreciation

Dan Zahavi (Oxford) and Katalin Farkas (CEU)
Second Person Perspectives

Errol Lord (Pennsylvania) and Conor McHugh (Southampton)
Foundations of Normativity

Jack Woods (Leeds) and Anandi Hattiangadi (Stockholm)
Logic and Convention

Linda Martin Alcoff (CUNY) and Kristoffer Ahlstrom-Vij (BBK)
Jussi Suikkanen (Birmingham) and Prof Neil Sinclair (Nottingham)
MGF Martin (Oxford/Berkeley) and Donovan E Wishon (Mississippi)
Stephen Grimm (Fordham) and Ray Monk (Southampton)
Gillian Russell (Australia Catholic University) and Sara Uckelman
(Durham)

Postgraduate Sessions

Theoretical

Will Moorfoot (Southampton)
Cansu Yüksel (KCL)
Alice C.W. Huang (Toronto)
Benjamin Davis (Leeds)

Practical

Lauren Miano (Princeton)
Aidan Penn (NYU)
Annalisa Costella (Rotterdam)
Evan Behrle (NYU)

- (ii) 2024 Joint Session (Birmingham) – editor’s update on symposia speakers

Longworth presented the symposium speakers for the 2024 Joint Session as follows:

Inaugural Address- Quassim Cassam
Cécile Laborde (Oxford) and Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen (Aarhus)

- (iii) Questions from Birmingham 2024

de las Casas reported that the organisers for Birmingham had a question about what exactly was needed in terms of childcare arrangements for the conference. The matter had been dealt with earlier in the meeting under item 5.i, in relation to the BBK conference. It was agreed that de las Casas would feed this back to the organisers at Birmingham too.

Action: de las Casas to let the organisers for the JS Birmingham know what is needed for the conference in terms of childcare provision and to update the local organiser’s guide accordingly.

- (iv) Preliminary nomination of speakers for 2025 (Glasgow) and review of Mind’s nominations

Simion noted that the official organizer for the Glasgow Joint Session was actually going to be the Epistemology Research Centre at Glasgow, and not the university itself. This may mean that the conference would be very epistemology based because of the reputation of the Centre and also because of the amount of epistemologists in Scotland.

The following shortlist of names was agreed for the Joint Session 2025:

- Jane Friedman (NYU) + Adam Carter (Glasgow) or Chris Kelp (Glasgow)
- Sara Heinämaa (Helinski) + Kate Kirkpatrick (Oxford)
- Danielle Allen (Harvard)+ Ralph Woolf (KCL)
- Anna Alexandrova (Cambridge) + Kareem Khalifa (UCLA)

The committee then agreed that the top choices from Mind's list of nominations, which were circulated in the papers for the meeting were as follows:

1. Liz Camp (Rutgers), philosophy of language. Possible second symposiast: Eliot Michaelson (KCL).
2. Sharron Vallor (Edinburgh), ethics of AI
3. Yuriko Saito (Rhode Island School of Design). Aesthetics. Possible second symposiast: Nick Riggle (San Diego).
4. John Marenbon (Cambridge), medieval. Possible second symposiast: Cecilia Trifgli (Oxford).
5. Maria Lasonen-Aarnio (Helsinki), epistemology.
6. Stephan Leuenberger (Glasgow), metaphysics. Possible second symposiast: Fabrice Correia (Geneva).

Action: de las Casas to send to Mind the list of AS nominations for the Joint Session 2025, as well as the AS's ranking of Mind's suggestions.

- (v) Update on venue for 2027, and venue nominations for 2028

Hannon reported that Sheffield would be happy to host in 2028. This would now need to be agreed with Mind at the joint meeting in July.

Action. De las Casas to add the suggestion of Sheffield as a note to the agenda for the July joint meeting, under venue nominations.

Hannon updated the committee that the following venues had been arranged for the upcoming years.

- 2027 Reading – Luke Elson at Reading nominated the University.
- 2026 Leeds – Helen Steward and Julian Dodd as organisers.
- 2025 Glasgow - Chris Kelp as organiser with help from Adam Carter and Mona Simion.
- 2024 University of Birmingham – with Jussi Suikkanen as organiser.

6. CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATIONS & REPORTS

The Society had received 18 applications in total this time. Hannon reminded the Committee that the usual grant budget for the meeting was £4000. He noted that there were a lot more applications this year than in previous years. He suggested streamlining the decision making process by first ruling out any conferences that the committee did not want to fund, and then splitting the budget between the remaining applications. The aim would be to not fund all the conferences. Longworth added that another idea would be to fund all the conferences by splitting the budget equally between all, apart from any there was a serious problem with. There was some discussion over whether it would put people off from Applying for funding if (due to the society splitting the budget amongst too many applicants) they only tended to receive smaller amounts.

Action: Hannon to write to the organisers of conference grants CG42119 and GC42120, which are planned at the same institution on the same date, for more information. Hannon to let de las Casas know, and de las Casas to then share the budget between the rest of the applications the committee had agreed to fund.

The grants for the present meeting were eventually awarded as follows:

Ref.	Institution	Requested	Approved
CG042117	St Andrews	500	333
CG042118	Warwick	300	333
CG042119	Nottingham	400	333
CG042120	Nottingham	500	333
CG042121	Cambridge	500	0
CG042122	Newcastle	500	333
CG042123	Oxford	250	0
CG042124	Sheffield	500	333
CG042125	Warwick	500	333
CG042126	Bristol	500	0
CG042127	Edinburgh	500	0
CG042128	Manchester	500	333
CG042129	York	300	0
CG042130	Oxford	500	0
CG042131	St Andrews	300	333
CG042132	St Andrews	500	333
CG042133	Glasgow	500	333
CG042134	Oxford	564	333

7. COUNCIL MATTERS

(i) New committee members for 2022/23

Hannon summarised that Sarah Fine had elected to stay on for another 3 year term on the committee but that two members would be leaving in

July 2023 and would need to be replaced. The position had been advertised and that there were 9 expressions of interest to consider. These had been circulated with the papers for the meeting.

It was decided that John Callanan and Aiden McGlynn would be invited to join the committee from October 2023/25.

Action: Hannon to invite John Callanan and Aiden McGlynn to join the executive committee.

(ii) Editor Position

Longworth reported that, as expected, he would be leaving the role of Editor soon, and that the society would advertise the role. It had been agreed at the October meeting that the committee needed to decide on remuneration for this role and that the position would then be advertised after the April meeting. A rough job description for the role had been included in the papers for the meeting.

It was agreed that the honorarium for the role would stay as it stands now, and that there would likely be a handover for the role in the mid to late summer.

Action: de las Casas to advertise the role of Editor with the honorarium at its current level.

(iii) Update on 2024/25 and 2025/26 presidency

Hannon confirmed the future presidents of the society as follows:

Scott Sturgeon 23/24, Fabienne Peter 24/25, Lucy O'Brien 25/26.

8. REVIEW OF BURSARIES FUNDING

McCabe needed to leave the meeting at this point in order to take the train to London to chair the Proceedings talk that evening. Hannon took over the chairing of the meeting.

Hannon noted that there had been a question at previous meetings about whether to increase student bursary funding. He noted that the society currently offers 5 student bursaries at £3000 each. He explained that this amount had not increased in a while and that the society might want to provide further support for underfunded PHD students. He proposed increasing the funding for the 5 students from £3000 to £5000 each year. He explained that it would be possible to roll this funding back in future years, if the society's financial situation were to change.

Leigh suggested that it might be better to make the change sustainable, and so to increase by a more incremental amount at first. Simion suggested that it would be a good idea to give as much as the society can, while it can, because it is possible to roll the change back if needed.

Longworth spoke to the idea that the society might need to increase its financial holding while its finances were good, because of the effect that open access will have in the future. He agreed, however, that it would be a good idea to go ahead with the increase to the bursaries now.

The committee agreed to increase student bursaries to 5 bursaries of £5000 a year, from 2023 onwards.

Action: de las casas to action increasing student bursary funding to 5 bursaries of £5000 a year, from 2023 onwards. de las Casas to

add this as a standing item on the agenda in case bursaries needed to be decreased again at some future point.

9. PHILOSOPHY SOCIETIES – JOINT FUNDING IDEA

Longworth explained that this had been an agenda item to discuss the idea, originating with McCabe, of philosophy societies working together to provide funding, and even of pooling their resources into one pot. It was agreed that it would be best to discuss this further with McCabe present at the meeting.

Action: de las Casas to add the idea of join funding between philosophy societies, and of societies working together more generally to the agenda for a future meeting.

10. YEARLY SALARY REVIEW

Hannon summarised that at the July 2022 meeting it was agreed that staff salaries should generally increase by 2.5% each year, to keep somewhat in line with inflation. This was also to be kept under review. It was agreed that Hannon would discuss this with members of the committee who would not be subject to the pay increase over email and to then let de las Casas know if there were any changes to implement.

Action: Hannon to agree any pay rises with the committee over email, and to let de las Casas know if there were changes to implement.

11. NEW BANK ACCOUNT AND BANK CARD

de las Casas explained that one of the society's savings accounts, the CAF Gold account, needed to be closed and re-opened. This was due to the fact that it was no longer possible to hold a GOLD savings account without also holding a second 'CASH' account with CAF. The new cash account would be charged at £60 a year. Due to the fact that the GOLD account has high interest rate, the officers had felt it was worthwhile to sign up for the chargeable account in order to be able to keep the GOLD account.

De las Casas noted that the interest rates for the GOLD account for 2022 were included in the papers for the meeting.

She asked the committee for approval to open the new Cash account and to re-open the GOLD account under these terms. The committee agreed to this.

de las Casas then asked for the committees approval for the Director, Michael Hannon, to have an HSBC Business debit card. The committee approved this.

de las Casas also asked the committee to approve adding the capacity to make international bank payments to the society's HSBC current account. She explained that this was important for paying grants and bursaries to students with non UK accounts. The committee agreed this.

ACTION: de las Casas to do the paperwork to open the GOLD and CASH accounts with CAF, to apply for a business debit card for Hannon, and to add international payments to the society's current account with HSBC.

12. SUPPORT FOR STANFORD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF PHILOSOPHY PROJECT

Guy drew the committees attention to an email from Sarah Wieten (Durham) in the papers for the meeting which asked for suggestions for funding for a project to write a history of the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Longworth proposed, and the committee agreed, that this was not the kind of project the society was able to fund currently.

Action: de las Casas to let Sarah Wieten know that the society is unable to fund the SEP project.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

de las Casas presented the committee with a question from student who wanted to know if they were eligible to apply for a bursary. The student's university was not in the UK, but they would be visiting a UK institution for part of the year. Guidance on this was currently unclear, so the options were now to either restrict applications to students based at a UK institution or to open the competition. The committee agreed that bursaries should be restricted to students studying in the UK.

There was no other business and the meeting was concluded at 4.00pm.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Friday
9th July 2023 at the joint Session in London

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

England & Wales - Charity number 254021

Accounts

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY
Registered Charity Number: 254021

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
31st DECEMBER 2022

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2022

The Executive Committee present their report along with the accounts for the Society for the year ended 31st December 2022. The accounts comply with the Society's rules and applicable law.

Legal and Administrative Information

The Aristotelian Society for the systematic study of philosophy, based at Room 280, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN, is a registered charity (No. 254021) and is governed by a set of rules dated 1984. The Society was originally founded in 1880.

The officers of the Society are as follows:

Honorary Director	Dr Michael Hannon
President	Professor M. M McCabe
President outgoing	Professor Robert Arthur Stern
Editor	Dr Guy Longworth

Aims and Organisation

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. The society is staffed by a part time administrator, editor, web editor and editorial assistant.

The ordinary business of the Society is managed by an Executive Committee consisting of the officers and the following elected members during the year to 31st December 2022 and up to the date of this report:

Dr Komarine Romdenh-Romluc
Dr Alexander Douglas
Dr Sarah Fine
Dr Michael Hannon
Dr Fiona Victoria Leigh
Dr Mona Simion
Dr Lee Walters

Excluding the Editor, The Trustees of the Charity comprise the members of the Executive Committee and the officers of the Society.

Review of Progress

The Society continued to meet fortnightly during the academic year to hear papers on philosophical matters. Papers were published prior to the meetings on the Society's website. The Proceedings were published in three online issues during the year as well as in hardback and the Supplementary Volume was also published online and in hardback.

The annual Joint Session with the Mind Association was held at the University of St Andrews and there were 196 delegates (last in person conference 2019: 159). The Society's direct costs were £7,838 (last in person conference 2019: £7,156). The local organiser made a profit of £4,829 (last in person conference 2019: £2,673).

Overall subscriptions to the publications were 83 at the end of 2022 (2021: 115). There were 12 new subscriptions in the category of Lifetime membership (no publications) (2021: 29), which brings the total number of individual members in this category to 535 - these are exclusive of institutional subscriptions, which are handled by OUP. Lastly, there were 152 other general subscriptions (no publications) (2021: 253).

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2022

Review of Financial Position

Membership income has decreased from £5,916 in 2021 to £5,534 in 2022. The Society received income from Oxford University Press (OUP) (the publisher of the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume) of £102,222 (2021: £90,693 for the year ended 2021). There was a net excess of income over expenditure for the year of £26,057 (2021: £40,714) leaving cash (current and deposit accounts) balances of £130,934 at 31st December 2022 (2021: £106,063). The net assets of the Society have increased to £307,105 (2021: £307,020), including cash held on longer term deposits of £168,102 (2021: £167,635).

The coronavirus (COVID-19) has had a minimal financial impact in 2022 as publication of Proceedings and Joint Session talks and income from JSTOR remain the Societies main income stream. The Proceedings talks and Joint Session conference were held in person during 2022 and this led to an increase in spending on catering and travel costs. Similarly, there has been an increase in the society's conference grant and student subsidy expenses. These costs have been higher than 2021 but are no higher than pre-pandemic levels.

Statement of Executive Committee's Responsibilities

The Charities Act 2011 requires the Executive Committee to prepare a statement of accounts for each financial year which comply with the regulations made under the Act.

The Executive Committee are responsible for keeping accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy the financial position of the charity and contain entries showing from day to day all monies received and monies expended by the charity and the matters in respect of which those transactions took place and also contain a record of the assets and liabilities of the charity. The law also sets out the Executive Committees' responsibilities for the preparation and content of the Executive Committees' Annual Report.

The Executive Committee are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and ensuring their proper application under charity law and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Statement of Public Benefit

The Executive Committee confirms that it has referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit, including its guidance (PB2) "Public Benefit: Running a Charity", when reviewing the charity's aims and objectives and in planning future activities.

The Aristotelian Society continues to be very proud of its placement in the voluntary sector, the impact it continues to have, and the benefit it believes it is able to present to the general public.

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. Through affordable subscription rates, free podcasts of talks, social media engagement, and a programme which covers a broad range of philosophical traditions, the Society continues to make philosophy widely available to the general public. The Society also co-organises the Joint Session with the Mind Association - the largest gathering of philosophers in the UK - and also provides grants to philosophy conferences all across the UK.

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2022

Reserves Policy

The Society has payments of approximately £100,000 per year and has approximately £200,000 in reserves. The Society aims to have in reserves approximately two years of payments.

Reasons for Policy

The Society has for many years aimed to have significant reserves. This is for three main reasons:

1. The income of the society comes very largely from one source: the receipts from Oxford University Press for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume. The Society has little control over the extent of that income, and it could in theory dry up very quickly.

2. The commitments of the Society are fixed and stretch two to three years into the future. It is, for example, already committed to producing the material for publication in the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume of the Society for two years, and committed to a Joint Session for July next year. Should the income dry up the Society would need, as far as possible, to be able to meet the commitments it has made and wind down its affairs in an orderly fashion.

The Society needs easily accessible reserves, beyond those of running costs for a short period because the responsibility of the Joint Session means that it faces, annually, the risk of having to make large 'rescue payments'. This can occur, if, for example, the accommodation arrangements fall through, the local organiser drops out and an organiser has to be bought in on a market salary, or if the local organiser makes a serious mistake on the budget.

3. Given the fixed nature and extent of its income, the Society is able to consider new worthwhile initiatives, such as switching to on-line publication of Proceedings, only if it is able to insulate itself against risk. Having significant reserves enables it to do this.

Statement of Trustees' Responsibilities

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).


The law applicable to charities in England and Wales requires the Trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Charity and of the incoming resources and application of resources for that period.

In preparing those financial statements the Trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgments and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- Prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in business.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and to enable them to ensure the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011, the Charities SORP and the provisions of the trust deeds. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

This report has been approved by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf


.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

Date: 24 March 2023
.....

Independent Examiner's Report to the Trustees of The Aristotelian Society

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of The Aristotelian Society for the year ended 31 December 2022.

Responsibilities and basis of report

As the charity trustees of the Trust you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ('the Act').

I report in respect of my examination of the Trust's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination giving me cause to believe:

- accounting records were not kept in respect of the Trust as required by section 130 of the Act; or
- the accounts do not accord with those records.
- the accounts do not comply with the applicable requirements concerning the form and content of accounts set out in the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 other than any requirement that the accounts give a 'true and fair view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.

Karen Wardell
Partner, Moore Kingston Smith LLP
For and on behalf of Moore Kingston Smith LLP
Chartered Accountants

Date:
9 Appold Street
London EC2A 2AP

The Aristotelian Society
Receipts and Payments Account
For the year ended 31st December 2022

	2022		2021	
	£	£	£	£
Income Receipts				
Membership Subscriptions		5,534		5,916
Receipts from publications				
JSTOR	13,238		12,383	
Permission fees received	-		30	
Joint session receipts	1,610		192	
OUP's sales of journals	102,222		90,693	
Net VAT movements	19,510		17,279	
Miscellaneous	400		-	
		136,980		120,576
Investment Income				
Interest income and sale of investments		473		45
		142,987		126,537
Total Receipts				
Direct Charitable Expenditure				
Conference grants	5,004		350	
Podcast expenses	1,163		300	
Printers charges	-		-	
Joint session expenses	7,196		2,258	
General Expenses	103		-	
Net salaries and editors' fees	45,996		36,013	
Presidents' costs	2,941		855	
PAYE and NI	5,317		3,428	
Pension	1,121		661	
Student Bursaries	15,246		15,000	
Postage	5		-	
		84,092		58,865
Other Expenditure				
Rent	7,516		7,516	
Stationery and postage	65		156	
Computer and IT costs	815		554	
Bank charges	322		361	
Audit, accountancy and payroll	4,047		4,077	
Catering	693		-	
Miscellaneous	-		-	
Subscription	-		-	
VAT paid	18,359		13,180	
Travel	218		49	
Website	803		675	
Insurance	-		391	
		32,838		26,959
Total Payments		116,930		85,824
Net Income		26,057		40,713

All receipts and payments are Unrestricted funds movements. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Aristotelian Society
Cash and Reserves
For the year ended 31st December 2022

	2022	2021
	£	£
Net Receipts for the year	26,057	40,713
Net Transfers (to)/ from Reserves	(1,186)	(1,357)
Cash and bank balances at 1 January	<u>106,063</u>	<u>66,707</u>
Cash and bank balances at 31 December	<u><u>130,934</u></u>	<u><u>106,063</u></u>

The Aristotelian Society


Statement of Assets and Liabilities

at 31st December 2022

	Notes	2022		2021	
		£	£	£	£
Monetary Assets					
Bank and Cash balances:					
Bank deposit accounts		2,976		2,970	
Bank current account		104,416		85,041	
PayPal account		<u>23,542</u>		<u>18,052</u>	
			130,934		106,063
<i>- held for investment purposes</i>					
CAF Gold Account		97,212		96,842	
CAF 90 Day Account		<u>70,890</u>		<u>70,793</u>	
			168,102		167,635
Debtors:					
OUP sales	3	47,799		44,439	
Other debtors		<u>780</u>		<u>1,626</u>	
			48,579		46,065
Total Assets			<u>347,615</u>		<u>319,763</u>
Liabilities					
Creditors:					
Auditors' remuneration		3,500		3,320	
Accruals & deferred income		3,420		3,132	
Grants		890		800	
VAT		<u>6,642</u>		<u>5,491</u>	
Total Liabilities			<u>(14,452)</u>		<u>(12,743)</u>
Net Assets			<u>333,163</u>		<u>307,020</u>

All assets and liabilities of the Charity are held in Unrestricted funds. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Annual Report and Accounts were approved for issue by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf by:



 Dr Michael Hannon
 Honorary Director

Date: 24 March 2023

The Aristotelian Society

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended 31st December 2022

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The financial statements have been prepared under the Charities Act 2011, on the receipts and payments basis, following the guidance issued by the Charities Commission.

Allocation of Expenditure

All expenditure in connection with the Society's meetings and publications, together with an appropriate proportion of travel and office costs, has been treated as direct charitable expenditure in the Receipts and Payments Account.

Going concern

The trustees have considered the impact of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic on the charity and its activities.

With regard to the annual financial statements as of 31 December 2022, the charity has been able to adapt and continued to operate effectively, primarily by holding online events in place of those usually held in person. Outside of the joint session, the remainder of the charity's operations have been largely unaffected.

While the spread of the coronavirus has had a limited impact on business activities, the trustees do not deem that this represents a threat to the charity's ability to continue as a going concern and accordingly the financial statements have been prepared on a going concern basis.

There are no further events after the balance sheet date that require disclosure.

2 Trustees and Employees

The Society had an average of one (2021: two) employees during the year, whose staff cost amounted to £45,996 (2021: £36,013). An honorarium of £8,671 (2021: £6,902) was paid to the editor. Two trustees were reimbursed expenses of £3,265 during the year (2021: £905).

3 Publishers' Sales

	2022	2021
	£	£
Sales of journals net of VAT for the year	91,133	87,773
Less advanced payments	(43,334)	(43,334)
Amount due at 31 December 2022	47,799	44,439

OUP's total sales for the year ended 31 December 2022 amounted to £91,133. An advance of £43,334 was received during 2022, leaving a sum of £47,799 due at the year end, which is to be received in 2023. In the prior year, OUP's gross sales amounted to £87,773 and similarly £44,439 was recognised as a debtor at year end and was received during 2022.



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 3 October 2022
13.00-16.00

Meeting held over Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT: Robert Stern (chair and outgoing president), MM McCabe (President), Scott Sturgeon (President Elect), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director and Secretary), Fiona Leigh, Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes)

Apologies: Lee Walters, Mona Simion.

1. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

Longworth noted that nearly all the actions from previous meetings were completed apart from those on the agenda for later in the meeting.

2. Proceedings

i. Update on speakers for 2023/24

Longworth reported that there had not been quite enough suggestions for a full set of Proceedings talks for 2023/24 and so had gone back to the committee over email to ask for further names. He reported that he was happy to use these names to invite speakers, and that he would find a balance of location and topics. The committee agreed to this.

Action: Longworth to confirm the speakers for Proceedings 2023/24 at the April 2023 meeting.

3. Joint Sessions

i. Report from 2022 Joint Session (St. Andrews)

de las Casas introduced the local organiser's report from the 2022 Joint Session at St. Andrews university and asked for any comments from the committee.

McCabe asked if there was a system of making recommendations to new local organisers based on the reports. Longworth and de las Casas confirmed that there was a local organiser's guide and that the reports from each year were sent to future organisers to help advise them.

Longworth noted that the local organiser's guide should state that the aim of the conference is not to make a profit. de las Casas confirmed that this

was already the case, and that there one reason the conference in 2022 made a large profit was due to unexpected numbers attending.

Douglas commented that childcare provision should be prioritised and noted that if the conference this year had arranged for childcare provision this might have reduced the profits. de las Casas confirmed that childcare provision was now a requirement in the guide.

ii. Update on arrangements for 2023 (Birkbeck)

de las Casas reminded the committee that the local organiser for next year's conference is Alex Grzankowski. She let the committee know that arrangements for the 2023 conference are reported to be going well. The official website is in progress and the first CFP will go out as soon as some points are clarified about the collection of demographic data from the open sessions submissions. The organisers are currently in discussion with accommodation providers to try to find affordable accommodation in London for the conference and are securing rooms at BBK and Senate House.

de las Casas raised that the organisers don't have facilities for running hybrid talks at the Joint Session, though had said they could look into running the committee meetings as hybrid if that would be helpful. She commented that the hybrid committee meetings at the Joint Session this year were not successful as it was difficult to hear and join in remotely. She suggested that she report back to the organisers for 2023 that they should prioritise the ability to run the main symposia hybrid if needed, over anything else, even if this had a financial impact.

Action: de las Casas to feedback to the Local Organisers for 2023 that they should prioritise the ability to run the main symposia as hybrid, if needed, even if this had a financial impact.

iii. Update on speakers for 2024 (Birmingham)

Longworth reported on developments in the program for 2024.

He reported that he has a full set of first speakers, but that he would need to ask the committee for second speaker suggestions over email once the first speakers let him know which topics they will be speaking on.

Action: Longworth to report the full list of speakers for the Joint Session 2024 at the April meeting.

iv. Update on venue for 2027

Hannon reported that Luke Elson had written to volunteer to host reading in 2027 and that this had been agreed with Mind. He confirmed future venues as follows:

2024- Birmingham
2025- Glasgow
2026- Leeds
2027- Reading

v. Venue nominations for 2028

Stern noted that Sheffield's name had appeared in previous meetings, as a potential host for a future Joint Session. He reported that he had checked with the department and they were keen to do this. Hannon asked the committee asked if they were happy with this and they agreed. Longworth noted that we would need to check this with Mind first.

Action: Stern to double-check Sheffield would be happy to host the Joint Session in 2028.

Action: de las Casas to bring the Sheffield nomination for discussion with Mind at the 2023 July Joint Meeting.

vi. Potential data collection- open sessions

Longworth outlined that the data collection issue was raised by the local chapter of Minorities And Philosophy (MAP) at St. Andrews at the second Joint Meeting in July.

They had done some analysis of submission and acceptance data at the open sessions in that year and saw that there were too few submissions from women and also proportionally too few acceptances of papers from women.

Longworth outlined that one question for the committee was whether the society should collect data around gender and ethnicity for analysis, and another question was whether the society should use this data in its selection process. He noted that the second would likely not be possible because of GDPR.

It was suggested that one reason for the gender imbalance may be that the SWIP session was operating as a filter for the open sessions. Romdenh-Romluc replied that the SWIP attracts very few entries so it would be unlikely that it was having such a filtering effect.

The committee all agreed that it was important to work to actively encourage submissions from women and underrepresented groups.

Romdenh-Romluc noted the fact that there was no funding for the Open Sessions papers, and that this might be an obstacle for minorities applying and attending the conference.

It was noted that collecting data would probably lead to the society working even harder to encourage people from minorities.

McCabe commented that she felt that data collection would be fundamental going forward, and that information would be necessary in order to properly think about the society's response. The information would make it easier to strategize and make changes to protocols. She suggested, for example, that there could be a special funding for an open session paper.

Hannon strongly agreed with McCabe on the importance of data collection, and added the question of whether and how to do this shouldn't be left up

to the Local Organiser each year. The society should give very clear guidance about what to do. He suggested one solution would be for local organisers to use an online submissions system, and that this should then be added to the guide.

McCabe commented that she didn't think the society should make selections based on the data, and added that this could be damaging to people who would then feel they were accepted due partly to demographic reasons.

Douglas noted that what MAP had in mind was an equality tracking form that people could fill in separately to their application. He suggested that we could ask people to fill this form in alongside their submissions. Longworth commented that any such process should be straightforward for local organisers to follow. Douglas noted that there could be a system that splits off the data collected from the main application, so that local organisers then only need to add a link to this form with their submission information (form or email address).

In terms of encouraging applications from minorities, Stern suggested that the society might write to heads of department asking them for their support to encourage the right people to apply. Romdenh-Romluc added that we could perhaps contact MAP in each department as well, so as not to rely only on heads of department.

Romdenh-Romluc also noted that there were some forms that the society could utilise that had been already designed by others, for example psychologists. Longworth agreed, noting HR also use such forms, and that it would be a good idea to copy these to some extent. He also noted that there might not be time for setting it up for this year.

Douglas suggested the society could use an online form using Microsoft Forms, and send out the CFP using a link to this. Romdenh-Romluc noted that google forms, was another option.

It was agreed that Romdenh-Romluc and Douglas would help de las Casas set up a form for the local organiser to use this year.

de las Casas, Romdenh-Romluc and Douglas to work towards setting up a form to collect data on demographics for the Open Sessions applications for inclusion in the CFP this year.

de las Casas and other officers to work at encouraging Joint Session paper applications from minorities, by emailing heads of department and MAP representatives with the CFP

4. Conference funding applications

Hannon explained the funding differences between the April and October meetings. He summarised that there was usually £2000 available in October and £4000 in April. He noted that the society tended to fund graduate rather than non-graduate conferences, and conferences that were non-recurring rather than recurring.

de las casas noted that, because the society did not allocate all its funding from the previous April 2022 meeting, some of its budget would roll over to the current meeting. £3660 in grants were allocated at the April meeting, leaving £340 to add to the current October budget. The budget for the meeting was therefore £2340 in total.

It was agreed that de las Casas would ask the organisers of CG042118 for more information about the costs for room hire.

Action: de las Casas to ask CG042118 for more information on the budget for room hire at the conference. de las Casas to fund all other conferences at £400 each, or to split the budget evenly between all 6 if CG042118 was also viable.

The eventual allocation of funding from the meeting was as follows:

Ref	Institution	Amount requested	Amount approved
CG042117	University of Warwick	500	390
CG042118	University of Durham	500	390

CG042119	University College London	500	390
CG042120	University of Sheffield	500	390
CG042121	University of Cambridge	500	390
CG042122	University of Warwick	400	390

5. Student Bursaries

The successful applicants, who have each received £3000 from the Society in 2022/23, were:

Johann Go (Oxford)
Wouter Cohen (Cambridge)
Emilia Wilson (St. Andrews)
Margarida Hermida (Bristol)
Anna Milioni (KCL)

The bursary selection for 2022/23 had for the first time been made by committee (Simion, Hannon, and Brewer) and it was agreed that this worked well.

de las Casas confirmed that there were 59 applications (62 last year) received this year but noted that it could be up to 90 in other years.

Fine wondered if there could be a way to involve bursary recipients more in society business and whether there could be a way to use more of the society's funds for bursaries in future years.

Longworth suggested that one way to do this would be to involve bursary recipients via the Joint Session. For example, there could be a route for them to give a presentation at the JS. He noted that this shouldn't be a separate extra session, and so that this would require more thought. Another idea would be to offer some extra money if recipients wanted to attend the conference.

Fine suggested that the society might encourage bursary recipients to come to the proceedings and invite them to dinners.

McCabe suggested a further example of funding, which would be to provide individuals with a 'writing month' where they didn't need to work and could focus on research. Romdenh-Romluc noted, in relation to this, that many teaching fellows jobs don't run over the summer and so these people fall foul of maternity pay and other benefits of continuous employment. She suggested that it might be good to ask universities to employ these fellows continuously instead. Longworth agreed that universities should be offering this but commented that the society should be careful not to help them to evade the provision of proper (less casualized) employment practices by funding employment gaps.

Longworth noted that there could be discussion about providing further funding for bursaries and that the society needn't stick to its traditional modes of funding for this. He also noted that there would need to be careful discussion, particularly because the society has needed to be conservative lately due to changes to open access publishing and the negative financial effects of this.

Stern commented that there had been some discussion at previous meetings that learned societies should cooperate and think together about their support to students or those at an early career stage. He noted that while each society would have its own priorities, commitments and financial issues going on, it would be very good to have a joined up response to the problems faced by students and early career academics. He also noted that this could help with the administration of the various forms of support.

McCabe noted that this idea came from a discussion between herself and Stern last year. She had sent an email about this to Stern to start a further discussion and hopefully a coordination of efforts. She also noted the need to provide ways for people at an early career stage to meet other philosophers and find support and advice this way.

Action: de las Casas make further funding or opportunities for involvement in the society for bursary recipients a discussion point at the next meeting. In the meantime, Hannon, Longworth, and de las Casas to discuss the societies finances and to look over past discussions of the idea of a joined up response to funding on behalf of learned societies.

Action: de las Casas to write to committee near the time of choosing bursary recipients to ask if anyone from the committee would like to be involved in the selection subcommittee.

6. Website statistics

de las Casas highlighted key points from the website and social media report prepared by Lauren Slater.

She summarised that the Society Twitter account has 21k followers, which is up from 19.8k last year. The society's average tweet reaches around 7800 people. There has been an increase of about 120 (200 last year) to the society's mailing list, but the open rate has again seen a very slight decrease. The figures for Facebook represent a levelling off after years of increase, which may have to do with a general decline in Facebook use. Website views in 2022 are in line with those in 2021, with an average of approximately 6000 views a month.

7. Society nominations

i. Committee member update

de las Casas reported that three committee members (Romdenh-Romluc, Fine, and Douglas) would be leaving after July 2023. Last time new members were needed, in 2020, the committee had advertised for expressions of interest. The result of this was 15 applications, 1 of which was also for the honorary director role, and 3 of which were not eligible.

de las Casas asked the committee members due to leave in 2023 if they want to extend their term by three years. She summarised that the committee had previously agreed that members could renew for 3 years if they want to, but that this was not expected.

Fine let the committee know that she would like to stay in the role for another three years.

Action: de las Casas to advertise for expressions of interest in the committee member role, with a deadline of January 2023, and to bring the applications for review at the April committee meeting.

ii. Editor Position update

Longworth reported that he is due to leave the role of editor of the society, and that he will step down as soon as is reasonable to do so. The hope was to be able to do a handover with the new editor at the Joint Session next year. He noted that if it isn't possible to find a replacement by then, then he stay on for a while longer.

Longworth reported that he would write a job description for the role in order to send out a call for expressions of interest. He asked that if committee members had people in mind for the role of editor it would be very helpful if they encouraged these people to apply. He offered to speak to anyone who would like to know more about the role and to answer any questions. He also noted that it would be helpful if the editor had a broad range of interest in philosophy and that it would be easiest if they were in London.

Longworth further noted that Proceedings dinners are a large part of the editor role, normally split with Hannon's director role, and this is why it would be good if the editor was in easy reach of senate house. Stern noted that there might be another way to handle the dinners, for example asking committee members to attend some of them. Fine suggested that the society might open the role to a job share arrangement.

Stern commented that there could be some discussion about whether there should be a teaching buy-out arrangement for the editor, if there wasn't already. Longworth commented that there was a small honorarium for the role and that something teaching buy-out could also work. Stern emphasised the need for something like this to ensure the role attracted someone skilled. Sturgeon and Longworth agreed with this need to make sure the university of the editor took the role seriously.

Longworth agreed that he was happy to wait until the April meeting to discuss further, and agree on a financial incentive for the position. It was noted that this might mean that it wouldn't be possible to handover the role until after the Joint Session in 2023.

Action: Longworth to write a job description for the role of Editor, to be finalised after discussion at the April meeting, and to email this to the committee to help them think of people to encourage to apply.

de las Casas to draft a final call for expressions of interest based on this after the April meeting, once the financial incentive for the role had been agreed.

iii. Update on Council members

de las Casas reported that Stern will now pass from Executive Committee to the Council. There were no further updates.

iv. Nominations for President - 24/25 and 25/26

Hannon confirmed future presidents of the society as follows:

Scott Sturgeon 23/24

Hannon reported that Rae Langton was not able to take on the role in 2022/23 and that McCabe had taken her place. Crispin Wright had also needed to decline a future presidency for logistical reasons.

Hannon let the committee know that he would email them to ask for nominations for 2024/25 and 2025/26.

Action: Hannon to email committee members asking them for top 3 suggestions for future presidents. Hannon to manage the nominations process and then invite the nominated presidents for 2024/25 and 2025/26.

v. Honorary member nominations

No nominations for honorary membership were received this time.

8. Any other business

The committee thanked Stern for his work as president of the society in 2021/22 and welcomed MM to the presidency for 22/23.

The meeting was concluded at 15.00

The next meeting of the Executive Committee & Council will be held 24 April 2023 at 13.00 over Zoom or – if in person- at Senate House, Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HU, from 13.00 to 16.00



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 25 April 2022
13.00-16.00

Meeting held remotely via Zoom video conference

PRESENT: Bob Stern (chair and president), Rae Langton (President Elect), Bill Brewer, Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Lee Walters, Fiona Leigh, Mona Simion, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Holly O'Niell (Publisher OUP, for item 1 only).

Apologies:

1. OUP

i. OUP 2022 PUBLISHERS REPORT

Stern welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced O’Niell as publisher for OUP. O’Niell let the committee know that she would briefly summarise and then answer any questions on the publishers reports for 2021. She reported that subscriptions for both journals were healthy and are growing year on year. She highlighted that subscriptions income is the bedrock of financial stability of the journals. She reported that usage is also very healthy on both titles, but that OUP would like to increase and improve these figures. She noted that there had been an increase in the usage figures from 2020 to 2021 on the Supplementary Volume and some increase in the figures for the Proceeding too, though taking into account a slight dip after the increase in usage in the summer of 2020.

ii. PRODUCTION ISSUES FEEDBACK

O’Niell thanked the committee for its patience with the recent production issues that had been reported for both journals. She reported that OUP had moved its production to a different supplier for typesetting, and would no longer be using KGL. She let the committee know that she, de las Casas and Longworth, had been in touch about the society style guide in order to make sure the new suppliers would be working from the correct document. The aim of this review had also been to consolidate production labour and, in particular, to make sure that the Aristotelian Society administrator was not doing work that would then be replicated by the OUP suppliers.

Stern asked whether OUP were confident that the move to a new production team would be smooth and O’Niell reassured the committee that the transition would be smooth. She commented that the transition would be slow and would take place over the summer 2022

iii. CHANGES IN PUBLISHING UPDATE

O’Niell reported that there has been an increase in open access publishing in the last year. She commented that this increase was predictable and had happened solely through Read and Publish (R&P) agreements. These R&P deals have been going well and have had a good impact on the finances of the journals. She flagged that the deals did also have the capacity to bring a negative impact, and that OUP’s advice to the journals to mitigate this hadn’t changed. She summarised this advice as to try to make a 5% increase to publication per year and emphasised that this would make sure that journals gain rather than lose from the R&P deals. She acknowledged the need for the society to produce high quality growth in its journals, and highlighted that even an increase of one article per year would have a positive impact against loss. She reported that the society could lose 6% on income if it did not increase production, and could gain 5% if it did. She then asked for any questions from the committee.

Longworth noted that the society is limited with how much it can grow its journal output because production is generated almost exclusively by inviting speakers and publishing papers that are linked to these talks. He asked O’Niell to clarify whether the 6% predicted loss would be in total or year on year. O’Niell answered that the loss would be 6% every year. She let the committee know that she would send out an R&P analysis in the next weeks which would show a more positive picture than was predicted last year. She also noted that revenue could potentially be made up for in other places than journal sales and that, for example, 2021 had been a good year for digital archive.

Longworth asked for any information about how the society might actively increase these other sources of revenue. O’Niell replied that there were no active steps that could be taken with regard to licencing or the archive, because revenue in these areas was linked and shared with other journals. She mentioned that charging for some types of permissions - for example where this would generate profit for another organisation - might be a way

to generate some income, though she understood the society may want to continue to offer this for free.

Stern commented that he was struck by the high number of downloads for the Mike Beaney paper, especially given that it had only recently been published in the last year. He wondered if there was something the society might learn from this, such as that there was a demand for papers on Chinese philosophy, or whether the high number of downloads may have had to do with it being open access. O’Niell offered to come back to the committee with an analysis of what might have generated the high numbers of downloads. She commented that it would likely be due to the paper being open access. Douglas commented that Mike Beaney had sent an email around to many people to promote the paper, including to colleagues in China, and that this could be something to learn from.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

Romdenh-Romluc noted that M.M McCabe should be affiliated with KCL and not Cambridge. Langton commented that she may have a position at both institutions. de las Casas made a note to check her affiliation for future reference.

Apart from this, the minutes from the meeting were approved as correct.

Action: de las Casas to check M. M. McCabe’s institutional affiliation.

Matters arising:

Stern reported that all actions from the last meeting were completed or would be taken care of on the current agenda.

3. ANNUAL ACCOUNTS FOR 2020

Hannon presented the annual accounts for 2021 and asked if the committee had any questions or concerns. No concerns were raised from the

committee. Hannon highlighted that Covid-19 had had little financial impact in 2021 and that OUP income had increased slightly from the previous year. He summarized that the society’s financial situation is stable and that looked good at the current time.

Stern raised the possibility that the BPA may approach the society for funding for research into how to support BAME representation in philosophy. Hannon reported that there had been such a request at the last meeting and that it had been approved. de las Casas confirmed that the funding to the BPA had been paid.

4. THE PROCEEDINGS

(i) Update on speakers 2022/23

Longworth reported the program of speakers as follows:

First term

03-Oct-22	Prof Rae Langton
17-Oct-22	Dr Nilanjan Das
31-Oct-22	Prof James Warren
14-Nov-22	Prof Lisa Herzog
28-Nov-22	Dr Jessie Munton

Second term

16-Jan-23	Dr Rachel Fraser
30-Jan-23	Dr Megan Blomfield
20-Feb-23	Dr Salvatore Florio
06-Mar-23	Prof Catarina Dutilh Novaes
20-Mar-23	Dr Jonathan Beere

Third term

24-Apr-23	Prof Nicholas Stang
08-May-23	Prof Matthew Boyle
22-May-23	Dr Anita Avramides (tentative)

05-Jun-23 Prof Kristie Dotson
19-Jun-23 Prof Axel Honneth

Longworth noted that Anita Avramides may not be able to give her talk, but that this was unlikely. If he needed to consult with the committee about a replacement then he would do so over email.

(ii) Nomination of speakers 2023/24

The committee had proposed 22 nominations for speakers for the Proceedings and Joint Session onto a shared spreadsheet, which was circulated before the meeting.

Longworth noted the importance of keeping in mind a range of topic coverage. He also noted the need to keep diversity of speakers in mind, and to keep the society's record for equal gender balance. He also noted that the society might want to represent more non-western philosophy.

To help with the nominations, the committee took a five minute break for members to nominate their top five choices. Hannon suggested that, next time, it would be good to ask members to do this ahead of time.

Action: de las Casas to make a note to, in future, ask committee members to nominate their top 5 speakers for the Proceedings ahead of time.

After discussion, the following shortlist of names was agreed for the Proceedings:

UK speakers

Louise Hanson (Oxford) - Aesthetics and Metaethics
Daniel Watts (Essex) - Kierkegaard, Wittgenstein, Subjectivity
Jonathan Birch (LSE) - Philosophy of Science
Adrian Alsmith (KCL) - Mind, Psychology
Max Hayward (Sheffield) - Normative Ethics, Metaethics

Catherine Rowett (UEA) - Ancient
Daniela Dover (Oxford) - Ethics, Moral Psychology, Social and Political Philosophy
Jessica Isserow (Leeds) - Moral and Political Philosophy
Alistair Wilson (Birmingham) - Metaphysics, Science

Non-UK speakers

Umrao Sethi (Brandeis) - Mind, Metaphysics, Early Modern
Myisha Cherry (California, Riverside) - Moral psychology, social and political philosophy.
Karen Jones (Melbourne) - Ethics, Metaethics, Feminist philosophy

It was noted that the committee also wanted to re-invite Eric Schliesser (Amsterdam), who had not been able to give a paper in 2022 due to Covid-19.

(iii) Presidents choice

Longworth let Langton know that the society had a tradition of inviting the incumbent president to put together a list of articles and an introduction which would then be made available on the OUP and society websites. The President's Choice selection would be publicised both by OUP and on our own social media and the articles would be made open access for a period of time. He commented that Stern had just done this himself and that the articles and would be available soon.

(iv) Dinners 2022/23 Proceedings

Longworth explained that, apart from when the talks have been running online, the society normally holds dinners after each of the Proceedings talks. The organisation and attendance for these has usually been shared between the Editor (Longworth) and the Director (Hannon). Hannon is not able to attend the dinners next year for 22/23 and Longworth asked if anyone on the committee may be able to step in to help. He explained that the role involved gathering people to come to the dinner after the talk, making sure everyone contributes the required amounts, and then asking

for reimbursement from de las Casas. He offered to send around a list of dates to committee members, who might then volunteer to run the dinners for these dates.

Langton suggested that it would make things easier if there were an expenses card to use the purpose of paying for dinner. Longworth commented that this may be able to be arranged but that, if not, it might be possible to make an account arrangement with the regular restaurant used for the dinners. Leigh, Langton, and Brewer all volunteered to help with the dinners.

Action: Longworth to send a list to the committee and to agree who would run the dinners for each of the Proceedings talks in 22/23 where help was needed. Longworth to share this list with de las Casas.

5. THE JOINT SESSION
 - (i) 2022 Joint Session (St Andrews)
 - a. a. Editors update on Editor's update on postgraduate papers and symposia programme

Longworth presented the list of symposiasts and postgraduate speakers as follows:

Symposiasts

Inaugural Address – Jessica Brown (St Andrews)
Group belief for a reason.

Arthur Ripstein (Toronto) and Zofia Stemplowska (Oxford)
Mandatory cooperation

Peter Sullivan (Stirling) and Rob Trueman (York)
Identity theories of truth

Elisabeth Schellekens Dammann (Uppsala) and James Shelley (Auburn)
Aesthetics and intellect

Katja Vogt (Columbia) and Tamer Nawar (Groningen)
Kataleptic impressions

Mark Schroeder (USC) and Marya Schechtman (Illinois)
Narrative and personal identity

Lucy O'Brien (UCL) and Luvell Anderson (Syracuse)
Sneering

Postgraduate Sessions

Nikhil Venkatesh (UCL)
Petronella Randell (St Andrews)
Ane Engelstad (Sussex)
Lauren Miano (Oxford)

Will Stafford (Irvine)
Chiara Martini (Oxford)
Angela O'Sullivan (Edinburgh)
J. Jace Snodgrass (St Andrews)

b. Registration

de las Casas reported that nearly all symposia speakers and chairs, as well as all graduate speakers, had now registered for the conference. Longworth and de las Casas reminded committee members to register as soon as possible, if they had not already, as accommodation at the university would be limited.

- (ii) 2023 Joint Session (Birkbeck) – editor’s update on symposia speakers

Longworth presented the symposium speakers for the 2023 Joint Session as follows:

Inaugural address- Ursula Coope (Oxford)
Elselijn Kingma (KCL) and Véronique Munoz-Dardé (UCL/Berkley)
Kate Manne (Cornell) and Carla Bagnoli (Modena/Oslo)
Christopher Ba Thi Nguyen (Utah) and Stacie Friend (BBK)
Dan Zahavi (Oxford) and Katalin Farkas (CEU)
Errol Lord (Pennsylvania) and Conor McHugh (Southampton)
Jack Woods (Leeds) and Anandi Hattiangadi (Stockholm)

- (iii) Preliminary nomination of speakers for 2024 (Birmingham)

The following shortlist of names was agreed for the Joint Session 2024:

Ernie Sosa (Rutgers)
Tommy Shelby (Harvard) -possibly as a first speaker with Mind’s suggestion of Cécile Laborde (Oxford).
Linda Martin Alcoff (Hunter/ CUNY)

The committee then agreed that the top choices from Mind’s list of nominations, which were circulated in the papers for the meeting were as follows:

Jussi Suikkanen (Birmingham), Fiona Macpherson (Glasgow) and Cécile Laborde (Oxford). There was a suggestion to pair Cécile Laborde with

Tommy Shelby as first speaker. The committee also suggested that there could also be a possibility of pairing Mike Martin (UCL) with Fiona Macpherson, and of Stephen Houlgate (Warwick) speaking with either (Keren Gorodeisky (Auburn) or Samantha Matherne (Harvard) from Mind’s list.

- (iv) Update on venue for 2025 and 2026

Hannon updated the committee that the following venues had been arranged for the upcoming years.

2026 Leeds – Helen Steward and Julian Dodd as organisers.
2025 Glasgow - Chris Kelp as organiser with help from Adam Carter and Mona Simion.
2024 University of Birmingham – with Jussi Suikkanen as organiser.
2023 Birkbeck, University of London, with Alex Grzankowski as organiser.

- (v) Venue nominations for 2027

Hannon noted that the society had received a self-nomination for Reading from Luke Elson for 2027. Reading had not hosted since 1992. Other nominations suggested at the meeting were for Nottingham or Sheffield. The committee agreed to invite Reading to host in 2027.

Action: Hannon to invite Reading to host the Joint Session in 2027, and to begin conversations with Nottingham and Sheffield to see if they might be interested in hosting a future Joint Session.

- (vi) Lex Academic Essay Prize

Longworth summarised for the committee that Lex Academic were a company that offer private copy editing services and that the company is run, in part, by Constantine Sandis, who organised the 2021 Joint Session.

Longworth explained that Lex Academic had offered to award a £500 prize for graduate paper at the Joint Session.

The committee explored options for running the prize that would not cost too much extra labour for the society. One option was for Lex Academic to sit-in on the graduate sessions papers and to select a prize for themselves, rather than rely on the society to award it. A positive aspect of this would be that Lex Academic would be able to announce the prize during the Joint Session in which the papers were presented. One problem with this could be if the prize was awarded to a different paper than the one that the society later chose to publish in the Proceedings.

Another option suggested was that Lex Academic could award the prize to one of the graduate papers that the society itself chose to publish in the Proceedings. It was noted that this would mean that the prize could not be announced until the society had made its decision about which paper (or papers) to publish. Hannon reported that Lex Academic would be happy with this delay, so long the society announced the prize on its website and social media.

Romdenh-Romluc suggested that it would be good to split the prize money between graduate papers that were chosen to be published in the Proceedings, rather than to award it to one paper over the other published papers. Langton agreed that this would be better, noting that it would be invidious to award the prize to only one of the published papers. A problem with this was noted, which was that sometimes the society might chose to publish more than two papers (and had in the past published five in one year) and that this could lead to the prize being split up between too many recipients.

Fine bought a different concern, which was with regard to why the society would chose to partner with a particular private company to award a prize of this kind. She noted that there would be a clear benefit to the company, but only a small benefit to the student and no particular benefit to the society. The committee agreed with this, and it was decided that it would

decline the offer to partner with Lex Academic. It was agreed that the society could offer that Lex Academic fund all or some portion of the student subsidies to attend the Joint Sessions, as this would have a clearer benefit to the society going forward, especially given the society's finances would be put under pressure in the coming years.

Action: Hannon to write to Constantine Sandis to thank him but decline the offer of Lex Academic sponsoring a prize for a graduate paper at the Joint Session. Hannon to offer to discuss the option of Lex Academic funding the society's student subsidies instead.

Langton then raised the issue that she would not be able to attend the Joint Session in 2023 as she had already agreed to another commitment. It was agreed that either Langton or de las Casas would write to Scott Sturgeon to ask if he would be able to chair the meetings and Inaugural Address at the 2023 joint Session instead. Langton also asked if she might be able to attend the 2022 joint Session meetings remotely, and de las Casas agreed to check with the local organiser about this.

Action: de las Casas to check with Ben Sachs, the local organiser for the 2022 Joint Session, whether it would be possible for committee members to attend the Joint Session meetings remotely.

Action: de las Casas to write to Langton to ask if she would like write to Scott Sturgeon, or otherwise to write herself and ask him to chair the 2023 Joint Session meetings and Inaugural Address.

6. CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATIONS & REPORTS

The Society had received 6 applications in total this time. Hannon reminded the Committee that the usual grant budget for the meeting was £4000. Longworth suggested, and it was agreed, that any unspent budget from the meeting would be carried over to the October meeting.

Action: de las Casas to note that from now on any unspent budget for conference grants would be transferred to the next meeting.

The grants for the present meeting were awarded as follows:

Ref.	Institution	Requested	Approved
CG042111	Nottingham	380	380
CG042112	Southampton	500	500
CG042113	Oxford	500	500
CG042114	Oxford	500	500
CG042115	Warwick	500	500
CG042116	Sheffield	400	400

7. CHANGES TO PUBLISHING AND HOW TO RESPOND

Longworth suggested, and it was agreed, that this item could be moved to the July meeting when the committee would likely have received the Read and Publish (R&P) report from OUP about the changes and their impact going forward.

Action: de las Casas to add an agenda item on changes to publishing to the agenda either for the next meeting after OUP send in their updated R&P report on the situation with open access publishing.

8. BARCELONA PRINCIPLES

Stern reported to the committee that the society had been asked to express solidarity with the ‘Barcelona Principles’, which are a set of principles that aim to highlight and address the structural inequalities that non-native English users face in contemporary philosophy. He noted that an email about this was included in the papers for the meeting. If the committee

agreed, the society would then publicise its solidarity with the principles on its website and in its social media.

Hannon commented that it would be difficult if the society were required to keep track of its compliances with the principles in some way, as it did not have the labour to do this. It was further noted that the society should be careful to not be called-out for being hypocritical, as its speakers did generally have good spoken and written English and the society did not currently tend to employ translators to help allow non-native English speakers to contribute.

Walters commented that it would be good to know what the society could do to positively implement the principles and noted that, at the present time, they seemed to be weak in their requirements such that any organisation might be said to support them.

Romdenh-Romluc commented that the society might be said to be compliant with the principles so long as it invited some speakers who are not fluent in English and do not count this as a reason not to invite them. Longworth agreed and noted that there were non-native English speakers coming up on the society’s programs and that hiring translators is not something the society would rule out. The committee agreed to endorse and express solidarity with the Barcelona Principles.

Action: de las Casas to arrange to publicise the Barcelona Principles on the society website (scrolling front page, but not at the front) and social media.

9. COUNCIL MATTERS

(i) Update on new committee members for 2022/23

There were no nominations needed for the committee this time. Three members would be leaving in July 2023, so the committee should next nominate in October 2022.

Action: de las Casas to add to the agenda a brief item on advertising for new committee members at the July meeting.

(ii) Update on 2024/25 presidency

Hannon confirmed the future presidents of the society as follows:

Rae Langton 22/23, Scott Sturgeon 23/24, Mary McCabe 24/25.

Hannon confirmed that he had invited Crispin Wright (NYU/Stirling) to the presidency in 25/26 but had no reply yet.

Action: Hannon to follow up his email to Crispin Wright inviting him to the presidency in 25/26 and, if this doesn't work out, to email the committee to ask for nominations for who to invite next.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business and the meeting was concluded at 3.45pm

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Friday 08th July 2022 12.30-14.00, at the joint Session in St.Andrews



The Aristotelian Society

meeting of the executive committee

Friday 08 July 2022
12.30 – 14.00

Meeting Room 1, Main School of Medicine building, University of St. Andrews

PRESENT: Bob Stern (chair and president), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Mona Simion, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor), Lauren Slater (minutes).

Apologies: Fiona Leigh, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Lee Walters, Rae Langton (President Elect), Bill Brewer

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

Stern introduced the meeting and begun by asking if there were any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting.

The minutes of the last meeting were then approved.

Matters arising:

de las Casas confirmed that the matters arising from the minutes of the April 2021 meeting were all completed or in hand.

2. 2024 JOINT SESSION – BIRMINGHAM:

(i) REVIEW OF NOMINATION OF SPEAKERS FROM THE AS AND MIND

Hannon presented the lists of preliminary nominations, which were also sent in the papers for the meeting as follows:

From Mind:

- 1st: Fiona Macpherson (Glasgow)
- 2nd: Dan Cavedon-Taylor (Open)
- 1st: Karen Bennett (Rutgers)
- 2nd: Anna-Sofia Maurin (Gothenburg)
- 1st: Jussi Suikkanen (Bham) 2nd: Neil Sinclair (Nottingham)
- 1st: Cécile Laborde (Oxford)

- 2nd: Matthew Clayton (Warwick)
- 1st: Michela Massimi (Edinburgh) 2nd: ?
- 1st: Keren Gorodeisky (Auburn) 2nd: Samantha Matherne (Harvard)

From the AS:

- 1st: Tommie Shelby (Harvard) 2nd: Linda Martin Alcoff (CUNY)
- 1st: Cécile Laborde (Oxford)
- 2nd: Hrishikesh Joshi (BGSU) OR Dorothea Gädeke (Utrecht)
- 1st: Mike Martin (UCL)
- 2nd: Fiona Macpherson (Glasgow)
- 1st: Stephen Grimm (Fordham) 2nd: Quassim Cassam (Warwick)
- 1st: Jessica Isserow (Leeds) 2nd: Neil Sinclair (Nottingham)
- 1st: Gillian Russell (ACU) 2nd: Sara Uckelman (Durham)

(ii) SPEAKER NOMINATIONS PROCEDURE REVIEW

Hannon

From Mind:

1. Each organisation comes up with a list of 6-8 candidates in advance of our joint meeting in July, plus one or (at most) two suggestions for second speakers.
2. Each then considers and rank the other's suggestions to arrive at a top 4, for which they suggest one or (at most) two additional suggestions for second speakers.
3. This list is shared in advance of the meeting of the two associations at the Joint Session.
4. At the shared meeting, a final list is drawn up.

Hannon noted that there is some hesitance from MIND about re-inviting speakers who have previously been invited.

The committee decided that there should not be a blanket ban on re-invitation of previous speakers but agreed that we should aim for minimum of 5 years and a preference of 10 years, between initial invitation and re-invitation.

Hannon noted that there has been some confusion about the speaker rankings between the AS and MIND. It was decided that the AS should suggest some more names, since MIND have endorsed speakers primarily from their own list.

Simeon wanted to note that there were no Epistemology talks on the current list, and this is something to be aware of. There was also a concern that History of Philosophy was underrepresented.

Longworth suggested that it would be good to have someone speak on the History of Epistemology (possibly, on Stebbing, for example) next year.

ACTION POINT: de las Casas to log the suggestion that it would be good to have someone speak on the History of Epistemology (possibly Stebbing) at the Proceedings. To make a note for the agenda for April 2023.

Sonia Rocca Royes from Stirling was suggested as a suitable symposium partner for Stephen Grimm. If Sonia is unavailable, it was decided that the AS would think of another suggestion at the next meeting.

The AS are happy with the general process for nominating speakers.

The provisionally agreed upon list of speakers:

1st: Cécile Laborde (Oxford)
2nd: Hrishikesh Joshi (BGSU) OR Dorothea Gädeke (Utrecht)

1st: Tommie Shelby (Harvard)
2nd: Linda Martin Alcoff (CUNY) OR Myisha Cherry (Riverside)

1st: Jussi Suikkanen (Birmingham)
2nd: Neil Sinclair (Nottingham)

1st: Fiona Macpherson (Glasgow)
2nd: Mike Martin (UCL)

1st: Stephen Grimm (Fordham)
2nd: Sonia Rocca Royes (Stirling)

1st: Gillian Russell (ACU)
2nd: Sara Uckelman (Durham)

3. joint session venue nominations 2025 to 2027

Hannon:

Birkbeck College, UOL 2023
Birmingham 2024
Glasgow 2025
Leeds 2026

Reading 2027 (ACTION POINT: confirm this one with MIND).

The committee was happy with these nominations.

4. additional nominations for Proceedings 2023/24

Longworth confirmed that these would be decided via email.

ACTION POINT: Longworth agreed to action deciding on further nominations for Proceedings 23/24 over email. A total of 15 or 16 names are required.

5. student bursaries: 2021/22 recipients

de las Casas said that the recipients hadn't yet confirmed with her, but that the process has been wrapped up.

6. Staff salary review

Hannon:

The AS used to annually review salaries to keep up with CPI (usually between 1-3%). This hasn't happened in recent years.

Four issues were outlined:

1. Inflation.
2. Increased Hours.
3. Back dating pay.
4. General salary review.

Several options were outlined. In sum:

Option 1: (for Administrator/Web Editor) 2.5% increase per year. (For Managing Editor) 2.5% increase per year + to increase hours to 22.5 per week.

Option 2: (for Administrator/Web Editor) 2.5% increase per year + £2 per hour increase for new web editing role. (For Managing Editor) 2.5% increase per year + to increase hours to 22.5 per week + Option to review role again if there are further increases.

Option 3: Salaries to be increased according to RPI levels.

The committee decided to endorse Option 2 with back pay. Since the society has made some savings due to COVID, these one-off back payments would be affordable. The society can afford option 2 on an ongoing basis.

There was some concern about the society's finances being affected by the possibility of open access. It was noted that there may be some scope to review option 3 when the AS has more information about how finances may be affected.

The committee members decided to review the pay annually moving forward. Staff salary will be discussed again at the April meeting (it will be a standing item on the agenda for that meeting).

The committee members were happy with these pay increases.

ACTION POINT: de las Casas to action the pay increases and back dated pay.

7. hybrid talks

de las Casas reported that she had contacted the Institute of Education regarding their hybrid facilities. She also reported that Senate House had the capacity to host the AS talks during an earlier slot (between 1-5pm, so could host at 3pm-5pm). She noted that it would be expensive to change venues, since the AS currently has the price of the venue

included in the rent payment for Senate House (which also includes the office space).

Longworth noted that we ought to revisit the question about the AS office space later down the line.

Longworth also noted that an earlier meeting time wouldn't be suitable and, although 5.30pm was better, 6pm is working fine.

Longworth suggested that the universities in London might collectively apply some pressure to Senate House to provide better hybrid facilities. (Possible action point in the future).

Stern noted that the numbers for in-person talks have improved since we've been back at Senate House. Slater noted that some members have asked about attending online, but most are happy to listen to the podcast a week after the event.

de las Casas raised the question about whether committee meetings should take place online or in-person. The committee decided that these meetings would work best as hybrid. de las Casas noted that she would need to book a room and catering in advance of any in-person (or in-person in part) meetings.

ACTION: de las Casas to arrange for hybrid committee meetings going forward.

8. any other business

Simeon noted the disappointment that there was no childcare arranged for the 2022 Joint Session conference, especially since we ask that all AS and MIND funded conferences adhere to the BPA SWIP guidelines.

Longworth noted that he will discuss with MIND about what goes into the information pack for local organisers. The committee agreed that the guidelines need to be made clear and stated explicitly, rather than just mentioned.

de las Casas noted that this issue around childcare has come up during the discussions in previous years. In many cases it is quite difficult, but important and worth pursuing. Stern noted that we should make sure we understand exactly what went wrong this year so that we can avoid the mistake in the future.

de las Casas, on behalf of Lee Walters, raised the point about executive committee members only being funded for two nights at the Joint Session (to cover attendance for the meetings) rather than the full three. The committee agreed that we can be flexible about this.

ACTION POINT: de las Casas will remove the current stipulation that the AS will only pay for committee members to attend the Joint Session for the days that allow them to attend the committee meetings.

The meeting was concluded at 14.00

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held in October 2022.



The Aristotelian Society

meeting of the executive committee

Friday 08 July 2022

14.00 – 14.15

Meeting Room 1, Main School of Medicine building, University of St. Andrews

PRESENT: Bob Stern (chair and president), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director), Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Mona Simion, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor), Lauren Slater (Minutes).

Apologies: Fiona Leigh, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Lee Walters, Rae Langton (President Elect), Bill Brewer

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no corrections.

Stern reported and de las Casas confirmed that the matters arising from the previous AGM had already been reviewed at the October 2021 committee meeting.

2. 2021 subscriptions

de las Casas reported on the subscriptions figures for 2021. These were higher than normal, but we think this is due to the website change, which meant that many people re-purchased subscriptions between October and December 2021.

3. Future presidencies

Hannon reported on the following future appointments:

Rae Langton is president for 22/23, Scott Sturgeon for 23/24, and M. M. McCabe for 24/25. Crispin Wright was invited for 25/26 but has declined.

ACTION POINT: A discussion about who might be president for 25/26 will be added to the agenda for the next meeting (October 2022) by de las Casas.

4. Officers & executive committee members for 2022/23

de las Casas reported that no new committee members would be joining the Executive committee and council for 2022/23. She reported that Romdenh-Romluc, Douglas, and Fine would be leaving after July 2023, but there would be no new members needed until October 2023. The committee would discuss advertising for the roles at the October 2022 meeting.

5. Any other business?

There was no further business.

The meeting was concluded at 14.17.

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

England & Wales - Charity number 254021

Accounts

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY
Registered Charity Number: 254021

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
31st DECEMBER 2021

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2021

The Executive Committee present their report along with the accounts for the Society for the year ended 31st December 2021. The accounts comply with the Society's rules and applicable law.

Legal and Administrative Information

The Aristotelian Society for the systematic study of philosophy, based at Room 280, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN, is a registered charity (No. 254021) and is governed by a set of rules dated 1984. The Society was originally founded in 1880.

The officers of the Society are as follows:

Honorary Director outgoing	Dr Rory Madden
Honorary Director	Dr Michael Hannon
President outgoing	Professor Bill Brewer
President	Professor Robert Arthur Stern
Editor	Dr Guy Longworth

Aims and Organisation

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. The society is staffed by a part time administrator, editor, web editor and editorial assistant.

The ordinary business of the Society is managed by an Executive Committee consisting of the officers and the following elected members during the year to 31st December 2021 and up to the date of this report:

Dr Komarine Romdenh-Romluc	
Dr Alexander Douglas	
Dr Sarah Fine	
Dr Nicholas Jones	Resigned July 2021
Dr Heather Logue	Resigned July 2021
Dr Barbara Sattler	Resigned July 2021
Dr Michael Hannon	Appointed October 2021
Professor Robert Arthur Stern	Appointed October 2021
Dr Fiona Victoria Leigh	Appointed October 2021
Dr Mona Simion	Appointed October 2021
Dr Lee Walters	Appointed October 2021

Excluding the Editor, The Trustees of the Charity comprise the members of the Executive Committee and the officers of the Society.

Review of Progress

The Society continued to meet fortnightly during the academic year to hear papers on philosophical matters. Papers were published prior to the meetings on the Society's website. The Proceedings were published in three online issues during the year as well as in hardback and the Supplementary Volume was also published online and in hardback.

The annual Joint Session with the Mind Association was held online, hosted by the University of Hertfordshire. 520 delegates booked in advance but it was not possible to check how many in total attended the conference. There were at least 100 attendees for the presidential address, approximately 50 for most of the plenary sessions, and 25 for the postgraduate sessions (2020 there were 9261 hits to the website in total with 2439 separate visitors). The Society's direct costs were £2,740 (2020: £2,046.47). The local organiser did not make a profit as registration was not charged, (there was similarly no profit in 2020 but the organiser was able to partially repay Aristotelian Society and Mind loans to the value of £1306.59).

Overall subscriptions to the publications were 115 at the end of 2021 (2020: 80). There were 29 new subscriptions in the category of Lifetime membership (no publications) (2020: 34), which brings the total number of individual members in this category to 523 - these are exclusive of institutional subscriptions, which are handled by OUP. Lastly, there were 253 other general subscriptions (no publications) (2020: 149).

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2021

Review of Financial Position

Membership income has decreased from £6,548 in 2020 to £5,916 in 2021. The Society received income from Oxford University Press (OUP) (the publisher of the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume) of £90,693 (2020: £88,497) for the year ended 2021. There was a net excess of income over expenditure for the year of £40,714 (2020: £29,944) leaving cash (current and deposit accounts) balances of £106,063 at 31st December 2021 (2020: £66,707). The net assets of the Society have increased to £307,020 (2020: £278,389), including cash held on longer term deposits of £167,635 (2020: £167,590).

The coronavirus (COVID-19) has had a minimal financial impact in 2021. Publication of Proceedings and Joint Session talks are the Societies main income stream and final figures from JSTOR for the annual revenue sharing payment for 2021, which will be paid in 2022, are expected to no lower than previous years. The Proceedings talks and Joint Session conference have been online during 2021 but will both be in person from the summer term 2022. With pandemic restrictions continuing in 2021, and large events being planned or moved online, there continued to be some reduction in the society's conference grant and student subsidy

Statement of Executive Committee's Responsibilities

The Charities Act 2011 requires the Executive Committee to prepare a statement of accounts for each financial year which comply with the regulations made under the Act.

The Executive Committee are responsible for keeping accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy the financial position of the charity and contain entries showing from day to day all monies received and monies expended by the charity and the matters in respect of which those transactions took place and also contain a record of the assets and liabilities of the charity. The law also sets out the Executive Committees' responsibilities for the preparation and content of the Executive Committees' Annual Report.

The Executive Committee are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and ensuring their proper application under charity law and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Statement of Public Benefit

The Executive Committee confirms that it has referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit, including its guidance (PB2) "Public Benefit: Running a Charity", when reviewing the charity's aims and objectives and in planning future activities.

The Aristotelian Society continues to be very proud of its placement in the voluntary sector, the impact it continues to have, and the benefit it believes it is able to present to the general public.

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. Through affordable subscription rates, free podcasts of talks, social media engagement, and a programme which covers a broad range of philosophical traditions, the Society continues to make philosophy widely available to the general public. The Society also co-organises the Joint Session with the Mind Association - the largest gathering of philosophers in the UK - and also provides grants to philosophy conferences all across the UK.

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2021

Reserves Policy

The Society has payments of approximately £100,000 per year and has approximately £200,000 in reserves. The Society aims to have in reserves approximately two years of payments.

Reasons for Policy

The Society has for many years aimed to have significant reserves. This is for three main reasons:

1. The income of the society comes very largely from one source: the receipts from Oxford University Press for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume. The Society has little control over the extent of that income, and it could in theory dry up very quickly.
2. The commitments of the Society are fixed and stretch two to three years into the future. It is, for example, already committed to producing the material for publication in the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume of the Society for two years, and committed to a Joint Session for July next year. Should the income dry up the Society would need, as far as possible, to be able to meet the commitments it has made and wind down its affairs in an orderly fashion.

The Society needs easily accessible reserves, beyond those of running costs for a short period because the responsibility of the Joint Session means that it faces, annually, the risk of having to make large 'rescue payments'. This can occur, if, for example, the accommodation arrangements fall through, the local organiser drops out and an organiser has to be bought in on a market salary, or if the local organiser makes a serious mistake on the budget.

3. Given the fixed nature and extent of its income, the Society is able to consider new worthwhile initiatives, such as switching to on-line publication of Proceedings, only if it is able to insulate itself against risk. Having significant reserves enables it to do this.

Statement of Trustees' Responsibilities

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

The law applicable to charities in England and Wales requires the Trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Charity and of the incoming resources and application of resources for that period.

In preparing those financial statements the Trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgments and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- Prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in business.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and to enable them to ensure the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011, the Charities SORP and the provisions of the trust deeds. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

This report has been approved by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf

M. Hannon

M.Hannon (Apr 11, 2022 11:52 PDT)

.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

11.04.22

Date:

Independent Examiner's Report to the Trustees of The Aristotelian Society

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of The Aristotelian Society for the year ended 31 December 2021.

Responsibilities and basis of report

As the charity trustees of the Trust you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ('the Act').

I report in respect of my examination of the Trust's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination giving me cause to believe:

- accounting records were not kept in respect of the Trust as required by section 130 of the Act; or
- the accounts do not accord with those records.
- the accounts do not comply with the applicable requirements concerning the form and content of accounts set out in the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 other than any requirement that the accounts give a 'true and fair view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.



Karen Wardell
Partner, Moore Kingston Smith LLP
For and on behalf of Moore Kingston Smith LLP
Chartered Accountants

Date: 11 April 2022
60 Goswell Road
London EC1M 7AD

The Aristotelian Society
Receipts and Payments Account
For the year ended 31st December 2021

	2021		2020	
	£	£	£	£
Income Receipts				
Membership Subscriptions		5,916		6,548
Receipts from publications				
JSTOR	12,383		13,609	
Permission fees received	30		-	
Joint session receipts	192		-	
OUP's sales of journals	90,693		88,497	
Net VAT movements	17,279		15,947	
		120,576		118,053
Investment Income				
Interest income and sale of investments		45		270
Total Receipts		<u>126,537</u>		<u>124,871</u>
Direct Charitable Expenditure				
Conference grants	350		587	
Podcast expenses	300		500	
Printers charges	-		742	
Joint session expenses	2,258		1,886	
Speaker expenses	-		149	
Net salaries and editors' fees	36,013		32,452	
Presidents' costs	855		1,044	
PAYE and NI	3,428		2,734	
Pension	661		663	
Student Bursaries	15,000		15,000	
Postage	-		101	
		58,865		55,858
Other Expenditure				
Rent	7,516		8,341	
Stationery and postage	156		-	
Computer and IT costs	554		951	
Bank charges	361		6	
Audit, accountancy and payroll	4,077		3,980	
Catering	-		1,281	
Miscellaneous	-		158	
Subscription	-		32	
VAT paid	13,180		23,505	
Travel	49		61	
Website	675		435	
Insurance	391		319	
		26,959		39,068
Total Payments		<u>85,824</u>		<u>94,927</u>
Net Income		<u>40,713</u>		<u>29,944</u>

All receipts and payments are Unrestricted funds movements. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Aristotelian Society
Cash and Reserves
For the year ended 31st December 2021

	2021 £	2020 £
Net Receipts for the year	40,713	29,944
Net Transfers (to)/ from Reserves	(1,357)	(3,308)
Cash and bank balances at 1 January	<u>66,707</u>	<u>40,071</u>
Cash and bank balances at 31 December	<u><u>106,063</u></u>	<u><u>66,707</u></u>

The Aristotelian Society
Statement of Assets and Liabilities
at 31st December 2021

	2021		2020	
	£	£	£	£
Monetary Assets				
Bank and Cash balances:				
Bank deposit accounts	2,970		2,970	
Bank current account	85,041		50,749	
PayPal account	18,052		12,988	
		106,063		66,707
<i>- held for investment purposes</i>				
CAF Gold Account	96,842		96,832	
CAF 90 Day Account	70,793		70,758	
		167,635		167,590
Debtors:				
OUP sales	44,439		49,680	
Other debtors	1,626		3,038	
		46,065		52,718
Total Assets		319,763		287,015
Liabilities				
Creditors:				
Auditors' remuneration	3,320		3,050	
Accruals & deferred income	3,132		3,328	
Grants	800		900	
VAT	5,491		1,348	
Total Liabilities		(12,743)		(8,626)
Net Assets		307,020		278,389

All assets and liabilities of the Charity are held in Unrestricted funds. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Annual Report and Accounts were approved for issue by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf by:

M. Hannon

 Dr Michael Hannon
 Honorary Director

Date: **11.4.22**

The Aristotelian Society

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended 31st December 2021

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The financial statements have been prepared under the Charities Act 2011, on the receipts and payments basis, following the guidance issued by the Charities Commission.

Allocation of Expenditure

All expenditure in connection with the Society's meetings and publications, together with an appropriate proportion of travel and office costs, has been treated as direct charitable expenditure in the Receipts and Payments Account.

Going concern

The trustees have considered the impact of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic on the charity and its activities.

With regard to the annual financial statements as of 31 December 2021, the charity has been able to adapt and continued to operate effectively, primarily by holding online events in place of those usually held in person. Outside of the joint session, the remainder of the charity's operations have been largely unaffected.

While the spread of the coronavirus has had a limited impact on business activities, the trustees do not deem that this represents a threat to the charity's ability to continue as a going concern and accordingly the financial statements have been prepared on a going concern basis.

There are no further events after the balance sheet date that require disclosure.

2 Trustees and Employees

The Society had an average of two (2020: two) employees during the year, whose staff cost amounted to £36,013 (2020: £32,452). An honorarium of £6,902 (2020: £6,860) was paid to the editor. Three trustees were reimbursed expenses of £905 during the year (2019: Two trustees were reimbursed expenses of £1,104).

3 Publishers' Sales

	2021	2020
	£	£
Sales of journals net of VAT for the year	87,773	93,013
Less advanced payments	(43,334)	(43,333)
Amount due at 31 December 2021	44,439	49,680

OUP's total sales for the year ended 31 December 2021 amounted to £87,773. An advance of £43,334 was received during 2021, leaving a sum of £44,439 due at the year end, which is to be received in 2022. In the prior year, OUP's gross sales amounted to £93,013 and similarly £43,333 was recognised as a debtor at year end and was paid during 2020.


Aristotelian Society - final accounts


Final Audit Report


2022-04-11


Created:	2022-04-11
By:	Holly De Las Casas (hdelascasas@aristoteliansociety.org.uk)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAWjIbrWD2LwDsBMsI5pLTjlyAe2aKSITC


"Aristotelian Society - final accounts" History

 Document created by Holly De Las Casas (hdelascasas@aristoteliansociety.org.uk)
2022-04-11 - 9:03:59 AM GMT- IP address: 213.205.200.63

 Document emailed to M.Hannon (michael.hannon@nottingham.ac.uk) for signature
2022-04-11 - 9:04:20 AM GMT

 Email viewed by M.Hannon (michael.hannon@nottingham.ac.uk)
2022-04-11 - 6:50:30 PM GMT- IP address: 24.113.18.242

 Document e-signed by M.Hannon (michael.hannon@nottingham.ac.uk)
Signature Date: 2022-04-11 - 6:52:17 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 24.113.18.242

 Agreement completed.
2022-04-11 - 6:52:17 PM GMT



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 26 April 2020

13.00-16.00

Meeting held remotely via Zoom video conference

PRESENT: Bill Brewer (chair and president), Bob Stern (president elect), Guy Longworth (Editor), Rory Madden (Honorary Director) Heather Logue, Nicholas Jones, Barbara Sattler, Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Katie Pryce (Publisher OUP) and Kelly Cook (Marketer OUP), for items 1 and 2 only)

Apologies: Komarine Romdenh-Romluc

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

Matters arising:

Brewer summarised that all actions from the last meeting were completed or in hand.

2. OUP

(i) OUP 2020 Publisher's Report

Pryce (OUP) presented the annual publishers reports for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume. She introduced herself as the new publisher for the society's journals, replacing Sarah Scutts who has moved on to a new role at OUP. She noted that she was to be a temporary replacement, and that a new publisher would be appointed within the next two months. She introduced Kelly Cook as the new permanent marketer for the society's journals.

Pryce presented pertinent points from both the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume report, using figures from the Proceedings report as the main example but commenting that the general trends and figures were the same for both journals.

She reported on numbers for visits to journal content with engagement, and commented that the peaks and troughs of engagement in 2020 coincided with previous years. She reported no real adverse impact of the pandemic on usage levels. There had been a drop in usage in March but OUP had been able to respond by enabling online access for people with print access only, and this mitigated the effects of drop.

She also reported that referrals via google were increasing, as was to be expected.

Pryce commented on the statistics around popular articles and noted that certain historic pieces still garner a lot of attention and that some in the past 12 months were popular too.

The statistics around subscriptions showed the importance of collection deals over the traditional model. She noted that this matched the patterns in subscription models over their whole portfolio. She commented that while the pandemic hadn't affected the number of subscriptions received, there would be ongoing constraints on library budgets, and that OUP will be keeping an eye on this. One reason there was no impact on subscriptions in 2020 was because subscriptions were made prior to the pandemic, therefore a drop may come into view later in 2021. Pryce mentioned that the vast amount of institutional subscriptions continue to be from Europe and North America.

Fine bought a question about the statistics around "visits with content engagement by referrer", asking what sorts of things would come under the category "other". She noted that this was the category with the third highest figured. Jones agreed that this would be interesting data and noted that Phil papers plays a big role in the society's referrals and so it would be good to know how much this generates. Cook commented that some of this data was not tracked in detail, and that the data would not be discipline specific. Pryce agreed to look into whether this would be possible, and to report back if so.

Pryce then spoke to the committee about the current open access content of the journals, reporting a minimal amount of one OA paper in the last year but explaining that OUP do expect this to increase

incrementally over coming months and years. She noted that this will be somewhat dependent on outcome of UKRI access policy review. She reported that these changes will have an impact on the society's income.

Finally, Pryce reported that there had been some delay in online publication speeds, due to their suppliers transition to remote working.

Cook then introduced herself as the new marketer for the society's journals, and ran over the highlights of 2020. She reported a 26% increase in alert registrants for the Proceedings and a 29% increase for the Supplementary Volume. She commented that these much higher increases, than usual. She also mentioned that the promotion of the President's Choice collection was very successful, with 8% of the year's total usage.

The "best of philosophy" collection -which is run by OUP every year and features articles from OUP's whole philosophy portfolio- featured 6 articles from both of AS journals in total, bought 2500 visits to the society landing page, and 8000 article views for the journals.

Brewer thanked both Pryce and Cook for their review and commented that the situation seemed encouraging. Pryce then went on to report on the situation with open access publishing.

She reported that OUP had seen an increase in demand for open access, and that this was likely to increase OA content in the society journals over time. OUP were also now seeing more R&P (Read and Publish) deals. She explained that the proliferation of these deals would come to have an impact on the society's revenue when a certain level of journal content becomes OA.

Pryce noted that uptake to publish OA at the moment is still minimal some of what happens next, including the number of articles published OA will be dependent on the UKRI review. Pryce reported that OUP have modelled the potential impact on the journals including the impact from different regions in the world. Their current model indicates the likely impact by 2025 - if things continue as they are - will be a 8% net decrease in revenues.

She highlighted that the way Journals can mitigate the effects of this will be by content growth (publishing more articles) rather than increasing the number of subscribers.

Sattler asked whether- if the society raised its content production by 5%- this would need to be 5% OA or just 5% more articles. Pryce confirmed that it would need to be 5% more OA papers, because the model makes assumptions about the proportion of articles being OA.

Brewer asked how the move to OA would affect the USA market, noting that the US is the society's second largest subscription base. Pryce commented that OA is in its infancy in the USA still, but may come to follow trends from UK and northern Europe. The society is entering a precarious position because revenues will become more linked to authors rather than subscribers, but US authors may not be publishing open access.

Stern noted that journals are sold in bundles and asked how much of the society's revenue will be dependent of what it does as an individual journal and how much will be depend on the bundle. Pryce answered that individual journals have a lot of agency because of the "publish" component in "read and publish" deals, which is allocated to individual journals on basis of how many OA articles they publish. The "read" part of the deal is allocated in the usual way, with regards to how many subscribers. At the same time there is also some degree of protection due to the fact that the journals are in a bundle.

Pryce commented that OUP expect to see subscriptions cancellations as the OA model comes into effect.

Longworth asked about the possibility of raising our prices and asked how the price to authors and institutions will be calculated. Pryce commented that price increases are certainly something to consider and that some journals were considering this. She added that OUP hadn't issued price increases lately, because of the difficulty of last year's pandemic, but that they would be pleased to hear the society's thoughts on this. She let the committee know to bear in mind the possibility that raising prices might – at some levels- be a deterrent to publication.

Longworth commented that he assumed marketing was one of the key advantages of the society continuing to publish with OUP, rather than self-publishing its journals, and asked whether OUP would be directing their marketing more towards authors in the future. Pryce and Cook agreed that there was a shift to looking at the author as the customer, rather than the subscriber. Cook noted that this would be a gradual shift and that- for now- OUP were continuing to focus on usage.

Sattler asked OUP about their earlier comment that there would not be too much of a worry about price sensitivity with authors because the new deals are still made with institutional libraries. She asked whether this would be the case with all authors and universities. Pryce answered that, if authors needed to self-fund, there would then be more price sensitivity. She added that they had made a deal with JISC so that most UK authors should have funding through institutions and that they were able to report on which institutions are part of this deal. Where the deal was not in place there would be more price sensitivity.

Stern commented that authors who were unable to secure funding through their institution were likely to be early career researchers, and potentially on teaching contracts. There was a request for OUP to model how publishing would work in these cases.

Jones asked whether it was to be within institutions to control which of their employees are able to publish. He asked to know more about the way in which the deals are set up and how funds are actually provided to authors. Pryce answered that most of the deals leave it to the discretion of institution to decide whether an author can use the funds, and that the institution would have an account managed by someone at the library to check institutional affiliation.

The committee were keen to know whether institutions would have control beyond checking the institutional affiliation of authors, and were concerned that this might be a problem. Jones suggested publishers could mitigate this problem by limiting institutional controls to make sure the allocation of funds for publishing are fair. Pryce commented that OUP were actively considering how to make it as easy as possible for researchers to claim funds. They added that they would be working with an “author as customer model” and so there would be a lot of work going into how to make it easy for authors to use the system.

Madden asked Pryce to clarify whether the 8% modelled decreased in income- if the society were to keep its operations the same- is still above the guaranteed income in the society's contract. Pryce confirmed this as correct.

Brewer and the committee thanked Pryce and Cook for their helpful report and for answering questions from the committee. Pryce and Cook then left the meeting

It was agreed to move discussion of changes to publishing forward from item 7 on the agenda and to discuss it next. Brewer asked committee members for suggestions about how to respond to the changes brought by open access and the new read and publish deals.

Madden commented that OUP's prediction of the society's income being halved in 5 years has shifted to an 8% decrease and that this is much less of a worry. He commented that the decrease is less than the society's yearly student bursary expenditure and that – given this was the most recent addition to the society's grant making costs- it could be cut if needed. Longworth agreed but noted that income would continue to decrease after 2025 and therefore it was good to be considering options now.

Stern suggested that the society make an attempt to bring other learned society's together in their thinking and to pool resources so that various forms of funding could still remain available to students and researchers. He suggested that it might be possible to cover the various studentships collectively. He commented that it would also be a good idea to encourage dialogue between different societies, to compare information and financial models from various publishers. Douglas agreed and offered to speak with Stern about organising this.

Brewer commented that publishing more papers may need to be a part of all future planning and that it would be good if this could have a positive early career angle.

de las Casas suggested that one idea could be for the committee to nominate and decide on early career researchers to publish in the journal. The idea would be to invite speakers, rather than encourage open submissions, so as to reduce editorial labour and peer review. She reported another suggestion from Venkatesh (administrative Executive) that the society might publish more of the postgraduate papers presented at the Joint Session each year. Again, the idea would

be to reduce the labour of additional peer review. Longworth commented that one problem with such ideas was that early career researchers and students may not be funded to publish open access, and so would not generate the required income for the society.

Madden suggested that it might be possible to add another Proceedings date to the summer term. Jones commented that – because what was needed was an increase of one paper per year- it would eventually lead to a substantial increase in talks that might not be sustainable. Stern noted that it might be worth adding one extra speaker anyway, as it would make some difference.

The committee agreed that the threat to the society's income was smaller than previously thought and that there was nothing urgent that needed to be done. It was agreed to create a standing agenda item at the April committee meeting to continue to think about the issue. It was agreed that de las Casas should keep a running list of ideas for mitigating the effects of open access publishing on the society's income.

Action: de las Casas to keep a running list of ideas for mitigating the effects of open access publishing on the society's income, and to add a standing agenda item on open access publishing to the April committee meeting.

Action: Stern and Douglas to discuss how to open a dialogue with other learned societies around changes to publishing and how to respond. Stern and Douglas to report back at the April 2022 meeting.

Action: Pryce to look into if there can be a more fine grained result with regard to 'other' sources of referral for both journals, and to report to the society on any developments with how to ensure

researchers have equal access to institutional funds controlled by institutions.

3. ANNUAL ACCOUNTS FOR 2020

Madden presented the annual accounts for 2020 and asked if the committee had any questions or concerns. No concerns were raised. He noted that there had been a slight increase in net income for 2020, because- due to the pandemic- the society had saved money on the funding of grants and subsidies. Savings were also due to the fact that there were no dinners after the Proceedings talks that year.

Stern suggested, and it was agreed, that Brewer should be able to attend Proceedings dinners in 2021/22 at the expense of the society, due to the fact that there were no dinners in his year as president.

Brewer noted that there would be a dinner in the summer for officers and members of the committee, when gatherings are possible again. This dinner would also serve as a leaving dinner for Madden and Venkatesh, and to welcome new officers into their roles.

Action: de las casas to set up a dinner for outgoing and incoming officers and committee members once this is Covid safe.

4. THE PROCEEDINGS

(i) Update on speakers 2021/22

Longworth noting that there would be some changes to the dates for the Proceedings 2021/22 talks- due to the pandemic- but that all speakers were fully confirmed. He reported the program of speakers as follows:

First term

04-Oct-21 Professor Robert Stern
18-Oct-21 Professor Heather Widdows
01-Nov-21 Professor Eric Schliesser
15-Nov-21 Professor Cecile Fabre
29-Nov-21 Professor Alexander Mourelatos

Second term

17-Jan-22 Dr Rachael Wiseman
31-Jan-22 Dr Rachel Cristy
21-Feb-22 Dr Andrew Huddleston
07-Mar-22 Dr Dawn Wilson
21-Mar-22 Co Author Prof Jack Spencer and Branden Fitelson

Third term

25-Apr-22 Professor Emma Borg
09-May-22 Dr Mazviita Chirimuuta
23-May-22 Professor Miriam Schoenfield
06-Jun-22 Professor Michael Della Rocca
20-Jun-22 Samuel Scheffler

(ii) Nomination of speakers 2022/23

The committee had proposed 17 nominations for speakers for the Proceedings and Joint Session onto a shared spreadsheet, which was circulated before the meeting.

Longworth summarized that the overall aim of nominations should be to showcase both talented people from the UK and speakers from further afield, such as the USA and Australia. He noted that, for marketing and other reasons, it is important to invite some big-named speakers, as well as talented early-career speakers. He highlighted the importance of securing a wide enough range of topics and

geographical spread. It was agreed that the committee should nominate 15 people minimum, and preferably 17 in case some didn't accept the invite.

The following shortlist of names was agreed for the Proceedings:

Sara Uckelman (Durham) – medieval logic
Kristie Dotson (Michigan) - epistemology
Salvatore Florio (Birmingham) -logic
Jessie Munton (Cambridge) - epistemology/perception
Anita Avramides (Oxford) - mind
Megan Blomfield (Sheffield) - environmental
Catarina Dutilh Novaes (VU Amsterdam) – history of logic
Lisa Herzog (Groningen) - economics
Meinard Kuhlmann (Mainz) – physics / economics
Tommie Shelby (Harvard) – black political thought
Matthew Boyle (Chicago) – mind/epistemology
Axel Honneth (Columbia)- Critical theory/ ethics /political
Jonathan Beere (HU Berlin)- Ancient (Aristotle)
James Warren (Cambridge)- ancient philosophy
Daniel Watts – (Essex) – later history of philosophy /religion
Rachel Fraser (Oxford) – aesthetics.
Nick Stang (Toronto) – Kant and metaphysics
Nilanjan Das (UCL)- Indian / Epistemology
Rolf Peter Horstmann (HU Berlin) – Hegel/Kant
Vid Simoniti (Liverpool)- aesthetics

(ii) Presidents choice

Brewer confirmed that his chosen papers for the annual President's Choice virtual issue had been passed on to Kelly Cook at OUP to be publicised on the OUP website.

5. THE JOINT SESSION

(i) 2021 Joint Session (Hertfordshire)

a. Update on Covid-19 and online Joint Session

de las Casas reported that the organisation for the Joint Session in Hertfordshire was going well. The conference will be held online with the symposia, postgraduate, and SWIP sessions taking place live over zoom. The open sessions and Mind fellows talks will be pre-recorded videos, linked from the conference website, with discussion happening in the comments under the videos. It is planned that the videos will be ready to view by 31st May so that delegates will have plenty of time to watch them before the conference begins.

Hertfordshire currently have 32 registrations and 135 accepted papers for the Open Session. Free registration for the conference is already open, but society publicity has not gone out yet because the program had not been finalised. It had been difficult to schedule the talks because of speakers being in such diverse time zones. The program is now ready and with the society's web editor for upload to the website, so publicity should go out to mailing lists by next week.

b. Editors update on postgraduate papers and symposia program.

Longworth presented the list of symposiasts and postgraduate speakers as follows:

Symposiasts

Inaugural Address - Brad Hooker

Does Having Deep Personal Relationships Constitute an Element of Well-Being?

Nishiten Shah (Amherst) and Robert Simpson (UCL)
Mill on Freedom of Speech

Yujin Nagasawa (Birmingham) and Keith Frankish (Sheffield)
Panpsychism

Lynne Tirrell (Connecticut) - Mari Mikkola (Amsterdam)
Toxic Speech

Agustin Rayo (MIT) and Penelope Mackie (Nottingham)
Modal Metaphysics

Catriona Mackenzie (Macquarie) and Maria Alvarez (KCL)
(Cambridge)
Blame

Constantine Sandis (Hertfordshire) and Sophie Grace Chappell
(OU)
Virtue and Particularity

Postgraduate Sessions

Theresa Clark (NYU)
Romy Eskens (Stockholm)
Thomas Lambert & Joseph Moore (Princeton)
Linda Eggert (Oxford)
Tamaz Tokhadze (Sussex)
Francesco Praolini (CONCEPT)
Sophie Kikkert (LSE)
Tomasz Zyglewicz (CUNY)

(ii) 2022 Joint Session (St Andrews) – editor’s update on symposia speakers

Longworth presented the symposium speakers for the 2022 Joint Session as follows:

Inaugural address- Prof Jessica Brown (St Andrews)
Arthur Ripstein (Toronto) and Zofia Stemplowska (Oxford)
Peter Sullivan (Stirling) and Rob Trueman (York)
Elisabeth Schellekens Dammann (Uppsala) and James Shelley (Auburn)
Katja Vogt (Columbia) and Tamer Nawar (Groningen)
Mark Schroeder (USC) and Marya Schechtman (UIC)
Prof Lucy O’Brien (UCL) and Luvell Anderson (Syracuse)

(iii) Preliminary nomination of speakers for 2023 (Birkbeck)

Committee members had been asked to nominate Joint Session speakers ahead of the meeting on a shared spreadsheet. It was noted that Mind had recently proposed that the two committees make some changes to how they nominate second speakers. This would be to help give the choice of second speakers more time and attention. They proposed that when each committee makes its initial list of first speakers, they also propose one or (at most) two candidate second speakers. Then, when each committee ranks the others' suggestions, they propose one or (at most) two additional candidate second speakers for those that make the top four and share this with the other association in advance of the meeting. The idea is that by the time of the joint meeting, there will be two ranked lists of first

speakers plus two to four candidate second speakers for the top eight or so. The committee agreed to this proposal.

The following shortlist of names was agreed for the Joint Session 2023:

Alistair Wilson (Birmingham) - with Thomas Kroedel (Hamburg)
Jessica Moss (NYU)- with Ursula Coope (Oxford) or Gabriel Richardson Lear (Chicago)
Dan Zahavi (Copenhagen/ Oxford) – with Naomi Eilan (Warwick)
Robin Dembroff (Yale) – with Alex Byrne (MIT) or Suki Finn (Royal Holloway)
Elselijn Kingma (Southampton) – with Robin Dembroff (Yale) or Thomas Pradeu (CNRS & University Of Bordeaux)
Tommie Shelby (Harvard) - no respondent suggested

It was agreed to add Tommie Shelby to the proceedings list if – in discussion with Mind- he is not selected for the Joint Session.

(iv) Update on venue for 2024 and 2025

Madden reported that Birmingham were confirmed as hosts for 2024, and reminded the committee that Birkbeck would be hosting in 2023. The host for 2025 was yet to be decided but Madden summarised that there had been a good response from both Glasgow and Leeds. Steward confirmed that Leeds were open to the idea for 2025 or 2026.

Madden noted that the final decision on which university to invite for 2025 would be made at the joint committee meeting with Mind in July, and that he would write to Leeds or Glasgow after this. It was noted that Glasgow wrote to offer themselves as a host and therefore may be easier to approach first.

Madden confirmed that he would write to Kent before the Joint meeting with Mind, to see if they were still interested in hosting a second time. They had expressed an interest in hosting again because - due to the pandemic- they had needed to host an online conference at short notice.

Action: Madden to write to Kent before Joint Meeting to ask if they are still interested in hosting a future conference.

(v) Venue nominations for 2026

Nominations for 2025 and 2026 were Glasgow, Leeds, and potentially also Kent.

6. CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATIONS & REPORTS

The Society had received 4 applications in total. Madden reminded the Committee that the usual grant budget for the meeting was £4000 but that- due to the pandemic- we hadn't received as many requests as normal. The committee agreed to fund all requests, with the proviso that the money be repaid if the conference should not go ahead.

The grants for the present meeting were awarded as follows:

Ref.	Institution	Requested	Approved
CG042101	Oxford	500	500
CG042102	Manchester	500	500
CG042103	Edinburgh	300	300
CG042104	St Andrews	300	300

7. CHANGES TO PUBLISHING AND HOW TO RESPOND

Item 7 had been discussed under item 2 on the Agenda, during the discussion of changes to publishing and potential loss of income.

de las Casas further asked the committee for some feedback on whether the society might save money by no longer printing posters and flyers to send to UK departments. She noted this would also save labour costs for the design and mail-out of posters. It was agreed that she should look into how much could be saved by making these cuts, and to make an executive decision based on this. The committee expressed some desire to keep posters if possible, particularly to draw in people who did not already know about the talks but just came across a poster, but also agreed that most publicity for the talks now happened online.

Action: de las Casas to research costs and make an executive decision about whether to continue to print and mail out Proceedings posters to UK philosophy departments.

8. COUNCIL MATTERS

(i) Recruitment for new committee members for 2021/22

Brewer summarised that it had been decided that the society should recruit for committee member roles by advertising for expressions of interest. Madden directed the committee's attention to the spreadsheet of names of those who had expressed an interest in joining the committee in October 2021/22. It was agreed that the committee would decide on three names of people to invite, to replace Logue, Jones, and Sattler. The rest of the names would be kept to draw on when more members were needed. Madden noted that the committee should pay particular attention to subject area and geographical location, and should also take into account gender, race,

and other categories important to equal representation on the committee.

The committee decided to recruit Lee Walters (Southampton) and Mona Simion (Glasgow) to the committee for 2021/22.

The committee then agreed it was necessary to nominate a third member who had not expressed an interest in the role, but who could fill a gap in the general subject expertise of the committee. Sattler noted that this could also address the gender imbalance of the list of those who write expressed an interest. She commented that this imbalance could reflect the tendency of women to not put themselves forward as easily as men.

It was decided that Madden would invite Fiona Leigh, in the first instance and, if she was unavailable, would consult with the committee (Sattler and Douglas in particular) over email for further suggestions.

Jones bought the suggestion that committee members might serve a longer term than 3 years to reduce hiring time and to allow people to grow into the role and contribute more. Some members agreed that it did take time to get used to the role and that they might contribute more deeply to the running of the society as time went on.

Steward agreed with the points but also noted that, if the role was considered to be a privilege, then it would be important to share this out and therefore not to have individuals serve for too long

It was agreed that the society would offer members to renew their role for another term if they wanted to. It was agreed that de las Casas would look into any legal difficulties with this first, and report back.

Action: Madden to invite Lee Walters and Mona Simion (who both expressed an interest) and also Fiona Lee to join the committee in October 2021. Madden to consult with committee members (Sattler and Douglas in particular) if Fiona Lee is not available.

Action: De las casas to research any legal implications of offering committee members the chance to remain in the role for a second term, and to report back to the committee on this.

(ii) Recruitment for new Honorary Director

Brewer reminded the committee that Madden would be leaving the role of Honorary Director after the summer. The committee agreed that there should be a panel to interview the two eligible people who expressed an interest in the role of honorary director. It was discussed and agreed that Madden should be on the interview panel for the role, in order to answer any questions the applicant may have. It was agreed that the interview panel would consist of the officers of the society, including the president. Committee members were invited to let de las Casas know if they would also like to attend.

(iii) Recruitment for new Administrative Assistant

Brewer reported that Venkatesh was moving on from his role at the society. Brewer and the whole committee expressed thanks to Venkatesh for his excellent work with the society. de las Casas reported that the role had been advertised and the deadline for applications was 17 May. Interviews were scheduled for 28 May, and there would be a handover period for the new administrative executive to learn the role.

(iv) Update on 2023/24 presidency

Confirmed future presidents were reported as follows:

Bill Brewer 20/21 Bob Stern 21/22 Rae Langton 22/23

The committee then considered nominations for 23/24. Jones nominated Scott Sturgeon (Birmingham) and Steward and others agreed this was a good suggestion. It was agreed that everyone on the list of nominees was a good choice and could be drawn on for future years.

It was agreed that de las Casas would keep a rolling list of the following nominees: Ian Rumfitt, Samir Okasha, Huw Price, Crispin Wright, Gregory Currie, Andy Clark, Ursula Coope, Alexander Bird, John Hyman, Lucy O'Brien.

Action: Madden to invite Scott Sturgeon (Birmingham) to the role of President for 2023/24.

Action: de las Casas to keep a rolling list of nominees for future presidents.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

de las Casas reported the suggestion from Mind that just a few representatives of each committee, rather than the full membership of each, be present at the joint meeting this year. This was how the meeting was run last year, and the idea was that this makes the meeting more manageable over zoom. It was agreed that not all committee members need attend the joint meeting. She reported the dates of the meetings as follows:

Executive committee and AGM Friday 16th July 13.00-15.00
Joint Meeting I and II Friday 23rd July 13.00-15.00

Stern raised the question of when the committee would decide about returning to meeting in-person. Brewer reported that the situation was under continuous review, and de las Casas confirmed that venues were now booked for the full proceedings program in case meetings could happen in person in the upcoming year.

de las Casas to email the committee with the dates of the committee and joint meetings for the Joint Session this year, and to remind them it is not a requirement to attend the joint meeting with Mind.

There was no other business and the meeting was concluded at 4.20pm

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Friday 16th July 2020, 13.00-15.00, over Zoom video conference.



The Aristotelian Society

meeting of the executive committee

Friday 16 July 2020
11.00 – 12.30

Meeting to be held over Zoom due to Covid-19: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT: Rory Madden (Honorary Director and Secretary), Guy Longworth (Editor), Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Bill Brewer (President), Heather Logue, Sarah Fine, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Michael Hannon (observing as incoming Honorary Director).

APOLOGIES: Bob Stern (President-Elect), Helen Steward (president 2019/20), Alexander Douglas, Barbara Sattler, Nicholas Jones.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

Brewer introduced the meeting and begun by asking if there were any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting. Committee members pointed out that Rachel Fraser, Fiona Leigh and Gregory Currie's names were spelled incorrectly in the minutes of the April 2021 meeting.

The minutes of the last meeting were then approved.

Action: de las Casas to correct the spelling of Rachel Fraser Fiona Leigh and Gregory Currie's names in the minutes of the April 2021 meeting.

Matters arising:

Brewer confirmed that the matters arising from the minutes of the April 2021 meeting were all completed or in hand.

de las Casas commented on one action point from the April meeting concerning the renewal of committee member roles. She reminded the committee, it had been agreed that the society should offer committee members the opportunity to renew their role for a further 3-year term if they wanted to. She reported that there were no legal problems with this but that, in order to comply with the charity commission, the society would be required to update its governing document to reflect the new policy.

Action: De las casas to update the society's governing document to state that committee members be allowed to serve on the committee for two consecutive terms, should they wish to.

2. 2023 JOINT SESSION – BIRKBECK: REVIEW OF NOMINATION OF SPEAKERS FROM MIND

Brewer asked the committee to nominate second speakers to go with Mind's list of first speaker nominations, and also to rank Mind's list of speakers in order of preference. Mind's nomination list was circulated to the committee prior to the meeting. Brewer noted that the final decision about which speakers to invite would be discussed and agreed at the joint meeting with Mind. Longworth asked the committee to bear in mind subject area and geographical spread when nominating. He highlighted the importance of thinking internationally and inviting some speakers particularly from the USA and Australia. He also reminded the committee of the importance of there being one or two 'big name' speakers in order both to attract people to attend the conference and for marketing the journal.

A question was raised about how much control the society has over the content and quality of the supplementary volume papers. Longworth reported that, in principle, the society does not exert a huge amount of editorial control because papers are not sent out for peer review. He further commented, this meant that the committee should chose speakers who would be sure to produce a good standard of academic quality. He reported that he did not stipulate which topics speakers should give their talks on, but that there were some ways by which to encourage speakers to present on a particular topic. One way of encouraging particular topics was to invite first and second speakers in pairs.

The preliminary nominations from the Aristotelian Society, decided at the April committee and circulated prior to the meeting, were as follows:

Alistair Wilson (Birmingham)- with Thomas Kroedel (Hamburg)

Jessica Moss (NYU) - with Ursula Coope (Oxford), Gabriel Richardson Lear (Chicago), or Joachim Aufderheide (KCL)

Dan Zahavi (Copenhagen/ Oxford) – with Naomi Eilan (Warwick), Luna Dolezal (Exeter), Uriah Kriegel (Rice), or Irene McMullin (Essex).

Robin Dembroff (Yale) – with Alex Byrne (MIT) or Suki Finn (Royal Holloway)

Elselijn Kingma (Southampton) – with Robin Dembroff (Yale) or Thomas Pradeu (CNRS & University Of Bordeaux)

Tommie Shelby (Harvard) - Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh) and Amia Srinivasan (Oxford)

The committee had already nominated most of these speakers at the April meeting but now added Luna Dolezal (Exeter), Uriah Kriegel (Rice), and Irene McMullin (Essex) as second speakers for Dan Zahavi. They added Joachim Aufderheide (KCL) as second speaker for Jessica Moss. They also added Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh) and Amia Srinivasan (Oxford) as second speakers for Tommie Shelby.

The preliminary nominations from Mind were as follows:

Kathrin Glüer-Pagin (Stockholm)
Second speakers: Hans-Johann Glock (Zürich), Asbjørn Steglich-Petersen (Aarhus)

Anil Gomes (Oxford)
Second speaker: None suggested

Cecile Laborde (Oxford)
Second speakers: Emily McTernan (UCL), Matthew Clayton (Warwick)

Errol Lord (Pennsylvania)
Second speaker: Benjamin Kiesewetter (TU Dresden)

Kate Manne (Cornell)
Second speaker: None suggested

Thi Nguyen (Utah)
Second speaker: Stacey Friend (Birkbeck), Jon Robson (Nottingham)

Jussi Suikannen (Birmingham)
Second speaker: Nicholas Southwood (ANU)

It was reported that Daniel Whiting from Mind had written to say that Ursula Coope is an incoming Mind President and will give her inaugural address at the 2023 Joint Session. Whiting noted that, because of this, she should be removed from the list of candidate respondents to Moss. He also noted that it would be possible that Lord might want to discuss aesthetics and that, in that case, he would be a natural pairing with Nguyen. In turn, as the only Birkbeck speaker on the list, Stacey Friend would be a candidate first speaker.

Mind's ranking and suggestions for the AS proposals were as follows

Elselijn Kingma (KCL)
Second speakers- Alex Broadbent (Johannesburg), Adrian Currie (Exeter), Tanja Staehler (Sussex), Cailin O'Connor (Irvine)

Thommie Shelby (Harvard)
Second speakers- Tommy Curry (Edinburgh)

Jessica Moss (NYU)
Second speakers - Catherine Rowett (UEA)

Dan Zahavi (Copenhagen/Oxford)
Second speakers - Katalin Farkas (CEU)

The committee then ranked the Mind proposals as follows:

1. Kate Manne (Cornell)
2. Thi Nguyen (Utah)
3. In no particular order: Anil Gomes (Oxford), Cecile Laborde (Oxford), Errol Lord (Pennsylvania)

The committee suggested second speakers for Mind's list of first speakers as follows:

Kate Manne (Cornell)
Second speakers- Amia Srinivasan (Oxford), Anastasia Berg (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Elizabeth Anderson (Michigan), Kristie Dotson (Michigan State), Rae Langton

(Oxford), Jennifer Hornsby (Birkbeck), Helen Beebee (Manchester)

Thi Nguyen (Utah)
Second speakers- Aaron Meskin (Georgia)

Errol Lord (Pennsylvania)
Second speakers- Pekka Väyrynen (Leeds) or Christopher Ba Thi Nguyen (Utah)

Anil Gomes (Oxford)
Second speakers- Léa Salje (Leeds) or Alix Cohen (Edinburgh).

Cecile Laborde (Oxford)
Second speakers- Jeremy Waldron (NYU)

Action: de las Casas to send to the Mind committee the AS ranking of Mind nominations and the AS suggested second speakers to Mind's nominated first speakers, ahead of the Joint meeting with Mind in July.

3. joint session venue nominations 2024 to 2026

Madden reported that Birmingham were confirmed as hosts for 2024, and reminded the committee that Birkbeck would be hosting in 2023. He noted that venues for 2025 and 2026 would be discussed and decided at the joint meeting with Mind. He reported that Helen Steward and Julian Dodd had said that Leeds were in principle interested in hosting one of these years and that Glasgow had also put themselves forward. He reminded the committee that Kent had felt they might like the chance to host an in person conference because their turn had been held online at

the last minute. Simon Kirchin had agreed to speak to Kent to see if they were still interested in this.

4. Request for funding: BPA Diversity and inclusion working group

Brewer reported that the society had been contacted by the British Philosophical Association (BPA) asking for support to help fund a new diversity and inclusion working group to address the underrepresentation of BME students and staff in Philosophy. Madden explained that the idea behind the working group was for learned societies to do something more concrete than just putting out statements in support of the Black Lives Matter movement. The idea was also following on from the success of the Society for Women in Philosophy (SWIP) research and guidelines. Madden reported that the matter had been discussed at a recent meeting of the officers of the society and it had been provisionally agreed that the society might offer £2000 of the £5000 suggested donation. It was felt that the society was not in a financial position to offer the full amount but that it was very important to help with the project. The committee agreed to offer this funding.

Action: de las Casas to write to the BPA and offer £2000 to the Diversity and Inclusion working group.

5. British Academy- support for young researchers

Brewer presented to the committee an email he received from Mary McCabe outlining plans within the British Academy to support early career colleagues in Philosophy. de las Casas circulated the email during the meeting. Mary McCabe's idea, outlined briefly in the email, was that the problems faced by early career researchers might be addressed by a

group of learned societies working together, and with a relatively small financial cost to the individual societies. It was agreed that the society would enter into further discussion about this and that it would work with other societies to support Mary McCabe in this goal.

Action: Brewer to write to Mary McCabe and let her know that the society are happy to keep in touch and work with other learned societies to support initiatives for early career researchers.

6. Request for support: Industrial action at Liverpool

Brewer presented an email, circulated to the committee before the meeting, from Nikas Gkogkas in the Philosophy department at Liverpool University. The email asked the society to support industrial action at the University of Liverpool, in response to redundancy threats against colleagues in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences. The letter from Liverpool outlined that redundancy plans under 'Project SHAPE' targeted individuals for redundancy using criteria that pertain only to the research element of their jobs.

The committee discussed whether it would be a good idea for the society to help by writing a letter to senior management at Liverpool. Romdenh-Romluc noted that, while the request had come from the philosophy department at Liverpool, the department under threat was Health and Life Sciences. She raised the question whether it was appropriate for a philosophy society to get involved, but noted that it could be good to stand with the Health and Life Sciences department as the situation would likely have knock on effects for other departments too. Logue agreed that if there is a threat to academic community it may not matter which specific department is involved. She commented that there would

be little to stop senior managers using such metrics against other departments.

Longworth noted that the AS is not a professional society and wondered if support might be better coming from members of the committees individual departments, rather than directly from the society. Members of the committee agreed that it was unclear whether the action was within the remit of a charity that aims to support philosophy, even if members of the committee did all individually condemn the form of the redundancies at Liverpool.

There was further discussion and it was agreed that it would be important to find out more about the dispute before writing any letter of support. Brewer spoke in favour of taking the opportunity to take a stand on a change that would likely be experienced more widely and by philosophy departments. He noted that the amount of international support for an industrial dispute at King's had been a huge help in the campaign.

Romdenh-Romluc offered to research and compose a considered letter, responding to certain but not all aspects of the dispute. It was agreed that it would be important to condemn the particular metrics used by senior management for the Liverpool redundancies. The committee thanked Romdenh-Romluc and agreed this was a good idea. It was noted that individual members could then also raise this with their own departments should they want to.

Action: Romdenh-Romluc to draft a letter to senior management at Liverpool University in response to industrial action in the Health and Life Sciences department. If committee members approve the letter and agree individually to sign, de las Casas to send this letter to Liverpool.

7. any other business

de las Casas raised a question about whether the society might want to broadcast Proceedings talks over the internet in the coming academic year. This would be in order to maintain and grow the wider international audience the talks had attracted in the past year due to the Covid-19 pandemic. She reported that this idea was raised by Nikhil Venkatesh, the outgoing Administrative Executive for the society.

de las Casas noted that it might be difficult to managing broadcasting the questions section of the talks, and reminded the committee that talks were already recorded and publicized as a podcast. Longworth noted that there would be no real gain in broadcasting unless it were possible to broadcast the Questions as well as the talk. Madden added that it may disincentivize people to come to the talks in person if they were able to log in and watch remotely. He noted that the podcast didn't seem to have this effect on attendance, but the possibility of attending from home may pose a bigger problem.

The committee agreed it had been wonderful that the talks had been able to reach a wider international audience, but in the end decided that it would be too complicated to broadcast the talks in a way that included the questions section. Logue suggested that the society revisit the question of broadcasting the talks when people are more used to managing hybrid learning situations.

The committee then briefly discussed whether the Proceedings talks in the Autumn term of 2021 should be held online or in person. It was agreed that de las Casas would check the capacity of Senate House

rooms and also ask the speakers how they felt about speaking in person, before coming to any decision on the matter.

Action: de las casas to contact the Proceedings Autumn term speakers to ask how they feel about giving their talk in person, and also to check room capacity with senate house. de las Casas to report back and discuss with the officers of the society in order to come to a decision about whether to hold the autumn term proceedings talks in person or over zoom.

The meeting was concluded at 12.40.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on 4 October 2021. It will be confirmed whether the meeting will be in person or over Zoom



The Aristotelian Society

AGM

MINUTES

Friday 16 July 2021

12.30 – 12.45

Meeting held over Zoom due to Covid-19: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT: Rory Madden (Honorary Director and Secretary), Guy Longworth (Editor), Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Bill Brewer (President), Michael Hannon (observing as incoming Honorary Director), Heather Logue, Sarah Fine, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc.

APOLOGIES: Bob Stern (President-Elect), Helen Steward (president 2019/20), Alexander Douglas, Barbara Sattler., Nicholas Jones.

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no corrections.

Brewer reported and de las Casas confirmed that the matters arising from the previous AGM had already been reviewed at the October 2020 committee meeting.

2. 2020 subscriptions

Brewer reported on the subscriptions figures for 2020. There had been a very slight increase since 2019.

3. Future presidencies

Madden reminded everyone that Robert Stern was the incoming President for 2021/22. He reported that Rae Langton was confirmed as president for 22/23, and Scott Sturgeon for 23/24.

4. Officers & executive committee members for 2021/22

Brewer reported that three new committee members would be joining the Executive committee and council for 2021/22. The new members will be Lee Walters (Southampton), Mona Simion (Glasgow), and Fiona Leigh (UCL). He confirmed that there would be no new members needed until July 2023. He reported that Jones, Sattler and Logue would be leaving the committee after the July meetings.

Brewer reported that Lauren Slater had been hired as a replacement for Nikhil Venkatesh who was leaving the role of Administrator for the society. He welcomed Hannon as the incoming Honorary Director, to replace Madden. Madden commented that he was happy the committee had found such an outstanding candidate to pass the role on to. It was agreed that de las Casas would thank all outgoing members of the committee for their service.

Action: De las Casas to write and give thanks to the outgoing executive committee members for their service to the society.

5. any other business*

There was no further business.

The meeting was concluded at 12.50

The Aristotelian Society & The Mind Association
Joint Meeting I and II – Speaker and venue Nominations

Friday 23 July 2021
13.00 – 15.00

Meeting held over Zoom due to Covid-19: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT:

AS: Guy Longworth (Editor), Bill Brewer (president), Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Bob Stern (President Elect)

Mind: Daniel Whiting (Director), Brad Hooker (incoming president).

Local organisers (item 1 only): Constantine Sandis (Hertfordshire), Ben Sachs (St Andrews)

The meeting began at 13.00

1. Local organisers' reports:

2021 Hertfordshire – Constantine Sandis

Sandis and Moyal-Sharrock presented their report from the recent Joint Session which was held online, due to Covid-19, between 16-18th July. They reported very good numbers attending, though less than had officially registered. The committee and organisers agreed it was common that many more people would register online than would actually attend, especially where attendance was free of charge.

Sandis and Moyal-Sharrock reported that they were relieved and pleased that the conference went very well. The committee agreed it was a great success. They reported they had 526 registrations in total, with website traffic from across the globe. They had been worried that they might reach the Hertfordshire Zoom limit for participants (300 maximum), so were pleased that everyone was able to attend. There were 150+ participants for Brad Hooker, 50+ for the symposia, 30+ for the specials, 20+ SWIP, and 14 for each PG session. They reported that there were 15+ people during Friday's wonder me social, and 5-10 in the remaining socials. Apart from 1 link mishap for the socials, which was quickly fixed, there was overwhelmingly positive feedback on all accounts.

The organisers and both committees commented that the Wonder me socials went well, and Sandis added that conversations felt very similar to in person conversations.

It was noted that people were generally happy with the open sessions being prerecorded, and the organisers reported that some of these talks may have had a very small audience if they had been over zoom. It had been a help that these talks could also be publicized on social media. There was then a discussion about whether there might have been more parallel sessions at the conference, in order to allow for some of the open sessions talks to be live. The committees and organisers settled on the opinion that running more sessions parallel would not have been a good idea, because this would have reduced attendance at each individual session. The organisers reflected on the fact that the postgraduate sessions were less well attended, and noted that in hindsight they should have scheduled them before the final plenary, and ideally not as parallel sessions.

The organisers let the committee know that they felt that there could have been more time allocated for the main talks, but that the timing had worked fine overall.

Sandis reported that there was no registration fee this year and no costs or income apart from the 2 loans from AS and Mind, most of which went to the conference assistant Katja Behrens, who also designed the website and organized the socials. de las Casas added that there had been £290 In income from the virtual publishers foyer on the website. She had taken into the AS account because there was no dedicated conference account at Hertfordshire. It was agreed that this income should be split two ways between AS and Mind. The organisers reported that the virtual publisher's Foyer included OUP, Bloomsbury, Polity, and the British Journal for Philosophy of Science.

Sandis then consulted the committee about whether and how to make the zoom recordings of the plenary sessions available online. He noted that the

Hertfordshire website would not be available forever and so it was agreed that the recordings could be hosted on the AS and Mind websites instead. Sandis agreed he would check the quality and trim the recordings before sending them to de las Casas, who would check if the speakers were happy to share these on the AS and Mind websites. It was agreed that it would be better to share the video and not just the audio of the talks. Sandis would also send the videos to those present on the committee to check they were happy with the quality of the videos before sharing publicly.

Whiting noted that the website, and the landing page in particular had been very good, and that it had made it easy to know what was happening and when. Sandis noted that the 'loans' had been very helpful, because it enabled the organisers to hire an assistant to create and manage the website. Both committees extended thanks and gratitude to the organisers for putting on such a successful conference under difficult circumstances.

Action: Sandis to send videos to all present at the meeting to check both Mind and AS are happy with the quality. de las Casas to then check with speakers that they are happy for the recordings to be shared.

Action: de las Casas to wait for the rest of the income from the Publishers foyer to come in, and then to pay out half of this income out to Mind.

2022 St Andrews– Ben Sachs

Sachs reported that the organization for the 2022 conference at St Andrews was going well. He let the committee know that all bookings had been made, including conference space and accommodation. He had arranged for the loans from AS and Mind to come through and had

received the list of invited speakers for the conference. He added that there was already a website in place, though it was currently hidden from view and with limited content. He confirmed that it will be ready to go by October as required.

Whiting raised the question of how easy it would be to cancel bookings if the pandemic meant the conference needed to move online. Sachs reported that the window for cancellation was very generous.

Sachs mentioned that the golf Open championship would be happening at St Andrews the week after the conference. This would mean that the town itself would be crowded, but this shouldn't pose a problem as they had secured plenty accommodation. He added that it would only pose a problem for delegates if they wanted to stay in town in alternative accommodation, or if they wanted to stay around after the conference. He also mentioned that they could do a philosophy and golf related tour if there might be golf fans among the delegates.

2. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no corrections.

3. 2022 Joint Session- Speakers update

Stern noted that in the list of speakers circulated before the meeting, only some speakers had been named with their professional titles.

Longworth noted that Matthew Keiran had needed to pull out of being the respondent for Elisabeth Schellekens Dammann. Further, because

Mark Schroeder chose to speak on personal identity issues, Longworth had invited Marya Schechtman instead of James Lenman or Jack Woods.

Longworth then presented the speakers as follows:

Inaugural address- Jessica Brown (St Andrews)
Arthur Ripstein (Toronto) and Zofia Stemplowska (Oxford)
Peter Sullivan (Stirling) and Rob Trueman (York)
Elisabeth Schellekens Dammann (Uppsala) and James Shelley (Auburn)
Katja Vogt (Columbia) and Tamer Nawar (Groningen)
Mark Schroeder (USC) and Marya Schechtman (UIC)
Lucy O'Brien (UCL) and Luvell Anderson (Syracuse)

4. 2023 Joint Session – Birkbeck: Speaker nominations

Brewer and Whiting presented the lists of preliminary nominations, which were also sent in the papers for the meeting, as follows:

From the Aristotelian Society:

Alistair Wilson (Birmingham)- with Thomas Kroedel (Hamburg)

Jessica Moss (NYU) - with Ursula Coope (Oxford), Gabriel Richardson Lear (Chicago), or Joachim Aufderheide (KCL)

Dan Zahavi (Copenhagen/ Oxford) – with Naomi Eilan (Warwick), Luna Dolezal (Exeter), Uriah Kriegel (Rice), or Irene McMullin (Essex).

Robin Dembroff (Yale) – with Alex Byrne (MIT) or Suki Finn (Royal Holloway)

Elselijn Kingma (Southampton) – with Robin Dembroff (Yale) or Thomas Pradeu (CNRS & University Of Bordeaux)

Tommie Shelby (Harvard) - Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh) and Amia Srinivasan (Oxford)

From Mind:

Kathrin Glüer-Pagin (Stockholm)
Second speakers: Hans-Johann Glock (Zürich), Asbjørn Steglich-Petersen (Aarhus)

Anil Gomes (Oxford)
Second speaker: None suggested

Cecile Laborde (Oxford)
Second speakers: Emily McTernan (UCL), Matthew Clayton (Warwick)

Errol Lord (Pennsylvania)
Second speaker: Benjamin Kiesewetter (TU Dresden)

Kate Manne (Cornell)
Second speaker: None suggested

Thi Nguyen (Utah)
Second speaker: Stacie Friend (Birkbeck), Jon Robson (Nottingham)

Jussi Suikannen (Birmingham)

Second speaker: Nicholas Southwood (ANU)

Brewer proposed that the committee agree on the first four speakers according to the rankings Mind and the AS had already given, and which were circulated prior to the meeting. He explained that the committees had both ranked each other's list of suggestions and had suggested second speaker nominations for the other committee's first speaker nominations.

The committees then discussed and agreed a list of first speakers, with some additional second speaker suggestions. It was agreed that Longworth would invite some second speakers from a longlist of suggestions only once he had secured the name of each first speaker, rather than try to decide who to invite as second speaker before knowing what the topic of the first speakers paper would be.

It was noted that Ursula Coope would be the Mind President in 2023 and would give the inaugural address at the conference.

It was noted that the reason committee members were encouraged to invite speakers from the UK as well as abroad was not so much to do with costs, but because the Joint Session was set up in part to showcase UK talent.

Turning again to final the list of nominations, the following shortlist was agreed for 2023, with potential respondents:

1. Elselijn Kingma (Southampton). Longworth to consult on the second speaker once he has an idea what Kingma will speak on. Nominated second

speakers were as follows: Robin Dembroff (Yale), Thomas Pradeu (CNRS & University Of Bordeaux), Alex Broadbent (Johannesburg), Adrian Currie (Exeter), Tanja Staehler (Sussex), Cailin O'Connor (Irvine), Luna Dolezal (Exeter).

2 Kate Manne (Cornell) – Longworth to consult on second speaker once he has an idea what Manne will speak on. Nominated second speakers were as follows: Amia Srinivasan (Oxford), Anastasia Berg (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Elizabeth Anderson (Michigan), Kristie Dotson (Michigan State), Rae Langton (Oxford), Jennifer Hornsby (Birkbeck), Helen Beebee (Manchester).

3 Christopher Ba Thi Nguyen – Longworth to invite Nguyen together with Stacie Friend (Birkbeck) first, then Errol Lord (Pennsylvania). If neither of these are possible then Longworth to consult with the committee on further second speakers. Other nominated second speakers were as follows: Benjamin Kiesewetter (TU Dresden), Jon Robson (Nottingham), Aaron Meskin (Georgia).

4 Tommie Shelby (Harvard) – with possible second speakers Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh), Amia Srinivasan (Oxford), or Stella Sandford (Kingston).

5 Jack Woods (Leeds) – with possible second speaker Errol Lord (Pennsylvania).

6 Dan Zahavi (Copenhagen/ Oxford) – with Luna Dolezal (Exeter), Uriah Kriegel (Rice), Irene McMullin (Essex), or Katalin Farkas (CEU).

7 Errol Lord (Pennsylvania) – with Pekka Väyrynen (Leeds) or Christopher Ba Thi Nguyen (Utah).

Action: Longworth to invite symposiasts for 2023 based on the agreed shortlist.

5. Update on 2024 Joint Session venue
(2023: Birkbeck; 2024: Birmingham)

Brewer confirmed that Birmingham had agreed to host in 2024 and that Jussi Suikkanen will probably be the local organizer.

6. Nominations for 2025 and 2026 joint session venues

Brewer summarised previous discussions about future Joint Session venues, and reported that Leeds, Glasgow and Kent were the main possible venues. de las Casas added that Hull had also been discussed as a potential host at the Joint Meeting in 2020. Stern mentioned that Newcastle are developing their philosophy department and that this could be a good choice for the future. Whiting commented that Hull was suggested for the similar reason of supporting a new or struggling department. Liverpool were also mentioned as potential hosts.

Taking geographical spread into account, the committee agreed to invite Glasgow first for 2025, then Leeds for 2026.

Brewer reminded the committee that Kent had asked whether it might be possible for them to host another Joint Session soon, given that they had needed to move their Joint Session (in 2020) online at short notice. Kent wanted to know whether the societies were in principle open to their hosting again soon. Simon Kirchin at Kent had not yet spoken with his colleagues to come to a decision about whether they do want to host

again. Brewer asked the committees if they felt it would be a good idea in principle to accept an application from Kent to host again soon. Stern noted that they had hosted in 2004, which wasn't that long ago and so had had two opportunities recently. Whiting commented that it was not possible to rule out another Joint Session needing to move online. With these points in mind, it was agreed that we would accept an application from Kent again, but not for a few years.

Action: de las Casas to report to Hannon and ask him to write to Kent letting them know that we would welcome their interest in hosting, but not for a few years. Hannon to invite Glasgow to host in 2025, and Leeds in 2026, though these could be switched around if needed.

7. Late Saturday Session

De las casas reported that, at the meeting last year, Graham A Forbes from Kent had suggested that it would be a good idea to remove the late Saturday session and replace it with an extra parallel session. The idea behind this was to remove pressure from staff at the host university to work long hours at the weekend and to make the schedule easier for speakers and delegates of the conference. Longworth added that one problem with the late Saturday session was that it was after the dinner, and that this was not ideal for either speakers or delegates. He also noted, however, that it was important to keep parallel sessions to a minimum. It was agreed that Whiting would consult with members of the wider Mind committee before making a final decision on this. The committee agreed that one option would be to leave the decision to the discretion of the local organisers.

Action: Whiting to consult with the larger Mind committee on the possibility of removing the late Saturday session at the conference, and replacing it with a parallel session. Whiting to report back to de las Casas before the next AS committee meeting in October. Once agreed, de las Casas to update the local organiser's guide and let the current local organisers know what to do.

8. Joint Session poll

de las Casas reported that there had been a discussion at the 2020 joint meeting about whether to send out a poll of AS and Mind members to ask them whether they would prefer the joint session to take place on a weekend or weekday. The main idea of the poll was to find out which set of dates would be better for those with children and other dependents. de las Casas reported that one concern about the idea of the poll was that it might be confusing to people, and might interrupt the tradition and stability of when the conference happens each year.

Whiting commented that a poll would be particularly confusing now, because of the Covid-19 pandemic. It was agreed to leave the idea of the poll until things are more stable in general.

9. Any other business

Whiting brought a question about the presence of Mind fellowship and studentship holders at the Joint Session. He noted that the fellowship holders would usually speak after the Presidential Address but that this has caused some scheduling difficulties and meant the first evening of the conference can feel overly-long. He suggested the Mind fellowship and Studentship holders might be billed as a separate parallel session running

concurrently to the Open Sessions. The committee agreed that this was a good idea and that the Mind session shouldn't run parallel and compete with the postgraduate, SWIP or main symposia

Stern raised a question about whether the Mind session might be run online but Longworth commented that there should be no difficulty in having an extra parallel session alongside the Open Session. Because of this, it was agreed the session should run in person.

Action: Whiting to speak to Ben Sachs from St Andrews to let him know to run the new Mind session alongside the Open Sessions at the 2022 conference. De las Casas to the new instructions to guide.

Hooker opened a brief catch-up and discussion about Open Access publishing. He commented on the minutes of the last meeting and asked how things currently stood with the AS. Longworth commented that the situation – as reported to the society by OUP – did not seem as bad as it did the previous year and therefore reflected in the minutes. Hooker reported that Mind have put aside much of their income in case they should need this to survive a shift to open access. He also noted that they were hopeful that they may not need this support.

Longworth reported that the AS are not in the position to put aside a large enough sum and do feel some pressure from the threat of losing income. He commented that the worst case scenario was that the society could break even by adding an extra paper to its publication output per year.

Whiting noted that the editors at Mind had reported problems with the OUP production team in the past year, because of Covid, but also to some extent before this. He reported that they had a number of late issues.

Longworth commented that recent problems were likely due to the Covid situation in India where the production team is based, and asked de las Casas for comment. De las Casas reported there had been particular serious issues with production due to the Covid situation in India, but that there had been a decline in quality before this too. She commented that the pandemic seemed to have exacerbated structural problems that were there anyway.

Whiting noted that it was good to share experiences and problems with publishing going forward and to offer support to each other with what appears to be a gradual decline in quality at OUP.

There was no further business.

The meeting was concluded at 15.10



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 4 October 2021
13.00-16.00

Meeting held over Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

- PRESENT: Robert Stern (chair and incoming president), Bill Brewer (outgoing president), Guy Longworth (Editor), Michael Hannon (Honorary Director and Secretary), Fiona Leigh, Mona Simion, Lee Walters, Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes)
- Apologies: Rae Langton (president elect).

1. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

Stern reported that he would be chairing the meeting in his role as incoming president for 21/22. He noted that the outgoing president would normally chair the October meeting, but that Brewer was unable to attend until 14.30. Stern welcomed new committee members Simion, Walters and Leigh, to the meeting. He also welcomed Langton as president-elect, though it was noted that she may not be able to attend.

Stern noted that nearly all the actions from previous meetings were completed apart from those on the agenda for later in the meeting. He asked de las Casas to comment on the one remaining action. de las Casas reported that - at the July Joint meeting with Mind - it was agreed that Constantine Sandis, local organiser from the Joint Session that year, would send videos of the zoom symposia sessions to de las Casas, so that they could be shared on the society's website. de las Casas would then check the speakers were happy with the videos. She let the committee know that Sandis was currently in the process of trimming the videos and in the meantime the society's web editor was preparing a page ready for these to be hosted on the website.

2. Proceedings

i. Update on speakers for 2022/23

Longworth reported that there have been delays with inviting speakers for the Proceedings, because there were complexities that needed to be resolved in the Joint Session program first. Typically Joint Session speakers are invited before proceedings speakers

Action: Longworth to confirm the speakers for Proceedings 2022/23 at the April 2022 meeting.

3. Joint Sessions

i. Report from 20120 Joint Session (Hertfordshire)

Stern introduced the local organiser's report from the 2021 Joint Session at Hertfordshire university and asked for any comments from the committee. It was agreed that conference was a success and that the society had learned how to run things successfully online, should this be necessary again.

ii. Update on arrangements for 2022 (St Andrews)

de las Casas reminded the committee that the local organiser for next year's conference is Ben Sachs. She let the committee know that arrangements for the 2022 conference are reported to be going well. The official website is live and the first CFP will go out this week. The assumption at the moment is that the conference will go ahead in person, but this will be kept under review and finalised towards the end of the year.

Douglas noted that there was limited accommodation in St Andrews town and that, therefore, it might be important for delegates to book rooms fairly soon. It was also noted that there would be a golf championship at the same time as the conference, so that rooms in town might book up especially early. de las Casas commented that there would be accommodation for delegates available at the university campus, but noted that perhaps not all delegates would want to stay there as campus accommodation can be basic. Douglas also reported that student accommodation on campus is not very accessible. Finally, others commented that delegates who had booked accommodation on campus might want to stay on after the conference and could find it difficult to find accommodation for this.

Action: de las Casas to flag potential conference accommodation issues with Ben Sachs at St Andrews.

iii. Update on speakers for 2023 (Birkbeck)

Longworth reported on developments in the program for 2023. He noted that the process of inviting speakers had been more complicated and time consuming this time, because Mind had requested conditional invites be made. He needed to wait until he knew what topic the first speaker was going to speak on, before deciding who to invite to be the second speaker. He commented that this was also the reason there had been a delay in making the Proceedings invites. He let the committee know that the list of Joint Session speakers would be finalised soon.

Longworth noted that he had invited Tommie Shelby (Harvard) but that he was unable to speak at the Proceedings or Joint Session in 2023. He would, however, be able to speak in a different year.

Looking at the nominations from the July meeting with Mind, Walters commented that, in the minutes of the meeting Stacie Friend had been incorrectly written as 'Stacy'.

Longworth then reported the following list of confirmed speakers for 2023:

Kate Manne (Cornell) – will invite second speaker once topic is known.

Christopher Ba Thi Nguyen (Utah) – potentially as a pair with Stacie Friend but still in negotiations.

Elselijn Kingma (Southampton) - will second speaker once topic is known.

Dan Zahavi (Copenhagen/ Oxford) - with Irene McMullin (Essex) confirmed.

Action: de las Casas to correct Stacie Friend's name in the minutes of the July meeting.

Action: Longworth to report the full list of speakers for the Joint Session 2023 at the April meeting.

iv. Update on venue for 2025 and 2026

Confirmed future venues were reported as follows:

2022- St Andrews

2023- Birkbeck

2024- Birmingham

Hannon reported that he was in the process of inviting Glasgow to host in 2025 and Leeds for 2026. He was waiting to secure Glasgow before inviting Leeds, in case the year each was hosting needed to be switched around. He let the committee know that he had been in conversation with David Bain from Glasgow, and that he was enthusiastic but needed to check with his department before confirming. David Bain had asked some questions about financing, and about the availability of loans, and Hannon had let him know that loans were available for teaching buyout or administrative support. Hannon and Longworth explained to the committee that the loans from both the society and Mind did not need to be repaid, and that they were named 'loans' only so that wouldn't be usurped by the institution.

Simion reported that David Bain had been planning to write before the meeting to confirm that Glasgow would like to host in 2025. She noted that the main organiser would likely be Christoph Kelp, with Adam Carter and herself helping. Hannon suggested that he would write to David Bain after the meeting to confirm. He also noted that the society had received a self-nomination to host a future Joint Session, from Luke Elson at Reading University, and that this had been added to the nominations list.

Action: Hannon to confirm Glasgow as the host of the Joint Session in 2025, and to invite Leeds to invite them to host in 2026.

v. Saturday Session

de Las Casas reminded the committee that the organisers of the Joint Session at Kent in 2020 had suggested removing the traditional late Saturday session and replacing it with an extra parallel session. The idea behind this was to remove pressure from staff at the host university to work long hours at the weekend and to make the schedule easier for speakers and delegates of the

conference. The session would normally run after the dinner on Saturday, which was not ideal. She reported that there had been some support for the proposal, but that there were also concerns about adding more parallel sessions into the conference. At the July 2021 meeting it was agreed that Daniel Whiting from Mind would consult with members of the wider Mind committee and report back.

de las Casas reported that Whiting had now consulted with the Mind committee and wrote in an email that “the Mind Exec decided in favour of allowing local organisers to decide whether to run a late Saturday symposium or, instead, run an additional parallel session. However, the Exec also suggested that, if some symposia run in parallel, all should run in parallel to avoid giving the impression of a pecking order. Again, though, they're happy to leave this to the discretion of local organisers”.

The committee discussed the email from Whiting. Longworth commented that delegates and speakers tended to complain about any parallel sessions. This was because any sessions running at the same time will have a reduced audience. He also noted the difficulty of the Saturday session running late. He suggested that the local organiser’s guide be updated to leave the decision about what to do up to the discretion of the local organisers. He said it would be important, and the committee agreed, to stipulate in the guide that there not be any more than two parallel sessions.

Walters asked if it might be possible to cut one symposia session from the program, in order to make room. Longworth replied that the symposia were important for publication, and that they could not be cut. He commented that it would be better to cut other things from the program instead, if needed.

Fine noted that online sessions could be difficult at the weekend, and so that – if the conference was to be online again- parallel sessions might then be preferred.

Action: De las casas to update the local organiser’s guide to allow the local organiser to decide whether to run a late Saturday symposia session or whether to add a second parallel session instead . The guide should also note

that a parallel session might be preferred if the conference was to be online again (as it was in 2020 and 2021). Finally, the guide should state that there be as few parallel sessions as possible, and never any more than two.

4. Conference funding applications

Stern noted that there was a late addition to the grant applications which is now in the main document with the others. He explained that the October budget was £2000, and the April budget will have a larger budget of £4000, because the April meeting receives substantially more applications. He added that the committee should not allocate more than £500 per conference.

Stern reported that there were 6 applications for the meeting this time and Longworth commented that there were fewer than normal because of the pandemic. Longworth let new members of the committee know that, the committee tended to prioritise away from regular events that would be likely to go ahead anyway. In cases where there were not so many applications, however, it was often possible to fund all applications.

Simion commented that it might be an idea to prioritise graduate conferences, rather than necessarily just one off events. She explained that this would give less weight to whether the conference would go ahead anyway, but might instead help with the quality of graduate conferences. Longworth commented that one reason the society hadn’t tended to prioritise graduate conferences in the past was the concern that these should be the responsibility of the institution. He agreed, though, that the society should help fund graduates where there would be a difference made to the quality of the event.

The committee agreed to change the information on the website, letting potential applicants know that priority will be given to conferences that are open to graduate students.

Action: de las Casas to change the information on the website, letting potential applicants know that priority will be given to conferences that are open to graduate students.

There was a discussion around whether some further specific information was needed on the budget for one of the conferences, and whether the society might ask for more detailed budgetary information in general. Longworth commented that it would also important not to make the form too onerous for applicants.

Action: de las Casas to write to ask for further details on the budget for CG042107 and report back to the committee before deciding whether to fund the conference.

The committee then discussed how the society might better encourage conference applicants to factor in the BPA SWIP guidance in their planning. It was agreed that this was an important concern, but the committee noted that it would be hard to enforce applicants keeping to the guidelines.

Stern wondered if it would be a good idea to put something in the website information that would encourage applicants to think about environmental concerns. He noted that there BPA have guidelines on this and wondered whether it would be possible to ask applicants to take these into account. Douglas noted that a consideration about increased access could conflict with environmental concerns, but that these concerns would have to be weighed up and offset during the planning of the conferences.

Simion noted that people tended to understand that the SWIP guidelines are about inviting equal numbers of male and female speakers, but that they tended not to read further in the guidelines about other important issues, such as how to conduct a Q&A. She noted the importance of thinking about who is most comfortable raising a hand, and of making sure to leave time between a talk and its Q&A. She suggested that the society include an extra sentence in its conference grant information, to encourage thinking about how applicants plan to conduct Q&A sessions. The idea would be that this might encourage applicants to properly read the guidelines. Another idea might be to remind them of the full guidelines in email correspondence sent when the grants are offered too.

Action: de las Casas to add a note in the conference grant application form to encourage applicants to fully read the BPA SWIP guidelines, and take into account not just the balance of male and female speakers, but how to properly conduct a Q&A. The form should also link to BPA environmental guidance.

The final allocation of funding from the meeting, taking into account further information received via email after the meeting, was as follows:

Ref	Institution	Amount requested	Amount approved
CG042105	University of Cambridge	500	400
CG042106	University of Birmingham	500	400
CG042107	Royal Holloway	500	400
CG042108	King's College London	500	400
CG042109	University of Canterbury	500	400
CG042110	University of Swansea	400	0

5. Student Bursaries

The successful applicants, who have each received £3000 from the Society in 2021/22, were:

Matthew Hewson (Oxford)
Rebecca Rowson (UCL)
Lilith Newton (Edinburgh)
Thomas Baker (Birmingham)
Kate Nave (Edinburgh)

Longworth asked for confirmation of how many applications were received this year. de las Casas confirmed that there were sixty two applications received this year but noted that it could be up to 90 in other years. Longworth reported that Rory Madden (Honorary Director at the time of selection) and Longworth had each ranked the applications, before agreeing on the top five. He noted that this year some applicants had

funding already, so they had needed to go further down the list to make all five awards.

Longworth noted that, going forward, the selection would traditionally be made by Longworth and Hannon (Editor and Hon Director) but, if others wanted to be involved, this could be discussed. Walters agreed that a subcommittee would be a good idea, and said that he would himself be happy to be involved. He noted that the subcommittee should ideally have a proper gender balance, but that no one should feel pressured to be involved. It was agreed that, around the time of the next application round, de las Casas would write to committee members and ask if anyone would like to be involved in selection. It was agreed that Longworth needn't necessarily be involved in the next round.

Stern asked about whether selection for student bursaries needed to involve a spread of research areas. Longworth answered that in the past, decisions were more based on academic merit, publications and references, and not particular areas of research. Having said that, he noted that it would be good, if possible, to have a spread of interests amongst those deciding on the award each year. He also commented that the awards had tended to go to those in their final year of study.

Stern noted that it might be a good idea to check, periodically, that the society's publicity about bursaries was getting to the right people.

Action: Holly to write to committee near the time of choosing bursary recipients to ask if anyone from the committee would like to be involved in the selection subcommittee.

6. Website statistics

de las Casas highlighted key points from the website and social media report prepared by the society's new Administrative Executive, Lauren Slater.

She summarised that the Society Twitter account has 19.8k followers and is growing steadily. The society's average tweet reaches around 7000 people. There has been an increase of about 200 to the society's mailing list, but the

open rate has seen a very slight decrease. The figures for Facebook represent a levelling off after years of increase, which may have to do with a general decline in Facebook use. Website views in 2021 are in line with those in 2020, with an average of approximately 6000 views a month.

Stern asked de las Casas for a quick update on the new website. de las Casas reported that there had been some teething problems but that the site was nearly finished. The idea with the new site was that Lauren Slater and de las Casas would be able to update it without the help of a web editor. Mark Cortes-Favis had been the society's web editor for many years, but was leaving at the end of the month. Stern asked if it would be helpful to have the committee's suggestions on the site and de las Casas confirmed this would be very helpful. It was agreed that, because many issues had already been noted and were in the process of being fixed, it would be best if the committee made suggestions for the website without expectation of reply.

The committee then discussed whether it would be important to continue to employ someone to produce artwork for each year's Proceedings program. de las Casas confirmed that Cortes-Favis would not be able to continue in this role going forward. Stern wondered if it would be a good idea to run the design as a competition for graduates but it was decided that this might be too labor-intensive. It was agreed that the society should hire a professional graphic designer to create artwork each year, if this was not at too great a cost. The artwork could then be emailed out to departments, or posted if necessary.

Action: Committee members to send any suggestions for changes to the new website to de las Casas. de las Casas to remind the committee members about this.

Action: de las Casas to look into hiring a graphic designer to produce Proceedings artwork for each new program, that could be emailed or posted to departments ahead of the new program each year.

7. Society nominations

i. Committee member update

There were no nominations needed for the committee this time. Three members would be leaving in July 2023, so the committee should next nominate in October 2022.

ii. Update on Council members

Brewer will now pass from Executive Committee to the Council. There were no further updates.

iii. Update on President for 24/25

Confirmed future presidents were reported as follows:

Bob Stern 21/22
Rae Langton 22/23
Scott Sturgeon 23/24

The committee then considered nominations for 24/25.

Longworth noted that the committee had been trying to alternate male and female presidents. The committee discussed ideas for nominations and agreed to invite M. M. McCabe (Cambridge) for 24/25, then Crispin Wright (NYU/Stirling) 25/26.

Action: Hannon to invite M. M. McCabe (Cambridge) to the presidency in 24/25 and Crispin Wright (NYU/Stirling) to the presidency in 25/26.

iv. Honorary member nominations

Longworth explained that honorary membership was something sometimes offered to past officers, and that Rory Madden would be someone we might now offer this to. Stern opened a discussion about whether the society would ever want to offer the honorary membership to someone external who might benefit the society, financially or otherwise.

Melvin Bragg was mentioned, as an example of someone who may give some publicity to the society. Others mentioned were Hanif Kureishi, who was a philosophy student at KCL, and Ricky Gervais who was at UCL. It was agreed that this was something to consider for the future, but that it was important to keep in mind that there would need to be someone to do the labour of inviting and entertaining these guests. It was also noted that the honorary membership, at this time, just offered a £50 lifetime membership of the society.

No nominations for honorary membership were received this time.

8. Any other business

Hannon suggested that the committee discuss the decision about whether the spring term talks would be in person. He noted that the reason to discuss this now was because the committee wouldn't meet again until April, after the decision would need to have been made. de las Casas confirmed that the cost for the senate house rooms was included in the society's rent payment to UOL, but that a decision sooner rather than later would still be best for relations with Senate House. It was agreed that a decision should be made by end of November 2021. In the meantime, de las Casas would email the speakers to collect their feelings about whether they would prefer to meet in person or give their talks remotely

Action: de las Casas to email Proceedings speakers for spring 2022 speakers and ask whether they would prefer to give their talks online or in person.

Stern suggested that it might be an idea to arrange a mixture of in-person and online talks for the Spring term, and asked de las Casas whether this could work. de las Casas commented that it would work but that it might confuse people and interfere with the regularity that helped many to attend the talks each week. It was agreed that it would be better to make a blanket decision about whether talks be online, in-person, or hybrid.

Stern commented that hybrid talks could be a very good idea, and asked whether anyone had checked with Senate House to see whether it would be possible. de las Casas commented that it would likely be possible technically,

but that the committee had decided against hybrid talks for other reasons. Rory Madden's concern, for example, had been that the talks might lose their in-person audience if they were too easy to attend online. Hannon added that a reduction to the in-person audience could mean that the sense of community fostered at the talks would be lost. Longworth commented that, with talks being primarily remote, the society would run the risk of becoming a straight philosophy event, and lose its public audience.

Hannon commented that hybrid talks would be good but that they would require a technically oriented chair, or at least 2 different people chairing, so there was someone would need to be on a laptop to check sound and technical issues. Longworth suggested it would probably require the society paying someone to do this, for example the administrative executive.

Longworth pointed out that the society already recorded and publicised podcasts of the talks, so that what would be gained by a hybrid model would just be that remote attendees could join in the questions section. Stern agreed that audience members would be more likely to attend live, if this was the only way they could partake in the discussion.

Action: de las Casas to check the arrangements for hybrid talks at Senate House, in case the committee did decide to use this model in the future.

Walters raised the question of how long the society's contract with its current publisher OUP will last for. He noted that, as the editor with the journal Analysis, there have been some problems with OUP. He added that they will be in contract with OUP for some time, so were not in a position to move publisher. Longworth commented that the society are also in contract with OUP for some time, but raised a question as to whether another publisher would be better. He reported that there had been problems with OUP in the last year, but that many of these were due to outsourcing to India and the very difficult situation there. He added that it wasn't long ago that the society moved publishers from Wiley, who were not as good as OUP.

It was agreed that the problems with OUP at both journals predated Covid, but that they had got worse since the pandemic. Walters reported that Analysis

were considering CUP, Chicago (who weren't taking on new journals at the moment), and had heard good things about both. Brewer suggested that the committee think about this more fully when it comes to the renewal of the society's contract with OUP.

Romdenh-Romluc reported that, at the April committee meeting, the committee had agreed to sign a letter in support of industrial action at the University of Liverpool. She reported that the committee had sent this letter, and that the campaign had been won. Stern commented that it was good to see learned societies being more involved in such issues, and that the philosophical community might speak with one voice on these matters. He noted that the society had agreed in principle to be involved with the meetings Mary McCabe was organising within the British Academy, which aimed to support early career colleagues in Philosophy. Brewer reported that there was no further movement on this yet.

Finally, Stern thanked Brewer for his work as president of the society in 2020/21 and noted that he had steered the society through a very challenging year.

The meeting was concluded at 15.00

The next meeting of the Executive Committee & Council will be held on 25 April 2022 from 13.00 to 16.00

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

England & Wales - Charity number 254021

Accounts

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY
Registered Charity Number: 254021

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
31st DECEMBER 2020

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2020

The Executive Committee present their report along with the accounts for the Society for the year ended 31st December 2020. The accounts comply with the Society's rules and applicable law.

Legal and Administrative Information

The Aristotelian Society for the systematic study of philosophy, based at Room 280, Stewart House, 32 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DN, is a registered charity (No. 254021) and is governed by a set of rules dated 1984. The Society was originally founded in 1880.

The officers of the Society are as follows:

Honorary Director	Dr Rory Madden
President outgoing	Professor Helen Steward
President	Professor Bill Brewer
Editor	Dr Guy Longworth

Aims and Organisation

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. The society is staffed by a part time administrator, editor, web editor and editorial assistant.

The ordinary business of the Society is managed by an Executive Committee consisting of the officers and the following elected members during the year to 31st December 2020 and up to the date of this report:

Nick Jones	
Heather Logue	
Barbara Sattler	
Prof David Owens	Resigned July 2020
Dr Elinor Mason	Resigned July 2020
Dr Clare Chambers	Resigned July 2020
Professor Helen Steward	Resigned July 2020
Dr Komarine Romdenh-Romluc	Appointed October 2020
Dr Alexander Douglas	Appointed October 2020
Dr Sarah Fine	Appointed October 2020

Excluding the Editor, The Trustees of the Charity comprise the members of the Executive Committee and the officers of the Society.

Review of Progress

The Society continued to meet fortnightly during the academic year to hear papers on philosophical matters. Papers were published prior to the meetings on the Society's website. The Proceedings were published in three online issues during the year as well as in hardback and the Supplementary Volume was also published online and in hardback.

The annual Joint Session with the Mind Association was held online, hosted by the University of Kent. There were 9261 hits to the website in total with 2439 separate visitors (2019 there were 159 in person delegates). The Society's direct costs were £2046.47 (2019: £7,155.86). The local organiser did not make a profit as registration was not charged, but was able to partially repay Aristotelian Society and Mind loans to the value of £1306.59 (profit in 2019 was: £2,672.75).

Overall subscriptions to the publications were 80 at the end of 2020 (2019: 92). There were 34 new subscriptions in the category of Lifetime membership (no publications) (2019: 24), which brings the total number of individual members in this category to 496 - these are exclusive of institutional subscriptions, which are handled by OUP. Lastly, there were 149 other general subscriptions (no publications) (2019: 130).

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2020

Review of Financial Position

Membership income has increased from £5,100 in 2019 to £6,548 in 2020. The Society received income from Oxford University Press (OUP) (the publisher of the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume) of £88,497 (2019: £87,278) for the year ended 2020. There was a net excess of income over expenditure for the year of £29,944 (2019: £28,273) leaving cash (current and deposit accounts) balances of £66,707 at 31st December 2020 (2019: £40,071). The net assets of the Society have increased to £278,389 (2019: £235,915), including cash held on longer term deposits of £167,590 (2019: £167,320).

The coronavirus (COVID-19) has had a minimal financial impact in 2020. Final figures from JSTOR for the annual revenue sharing payment for 2020, which will be paid in 2021, are expected to be the same as in 2019 or higher. It is possible that the coronavirus will lead to a drop in income from publishing in the coming years, however, and the executive committee will review the ongoing impact of the pandemic at its April meeting. Publication of Proceedings and Joint Session talks is the Societies main income stream. The Proceedings talks and Joint Session conference will continue to be held online for the time being. Because of this there is little possibility of the Joint Session making a profit by charging registration fees. This will not affect the society's finances directly, however, as it does not aim for the Joint Session to be profit making. While the pandemic continues, and large events cannot be held in person, there will continue to some reduction in the society's conference grant and bursary expenses.

Statement of Executive Committee's Responsibilities

The Charities Act 2011 requires the Executive Committee to prepare a statement of accounts for each financial year which comply with the regulations made under the Act.

The Executive Committee are responsible for keeping accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy the financial position of the charity and contain entries showing from day to day all monies received and monies expended by the charity and the matters in respect of which those transactions took place and also contain a record of the assets and liabilities of the charity. The law also sets out the Executive Committees' responsibilities for the preparation and content of the Executive Committees' Annual Report.

The Executive Committee are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the charity and ensuring their proper application under charity law and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Statement of Public Benefit

The Executive Committee confirms that it has referred to the guidance contained in the Charity Commission's general guidance on public benefit, including its guidance (PB2) "Public Benefit: Running a Charity", when reviewing the charity's aims and objectives and in planning future activities.

The Aristotelian Society continues to be very proud of its placement in the voluntary sector, the impact it continues to have, and the benefit it believes it is able to present to the general public.

The object of the Society is the advancement of public education in the field of philosophy and the publication of its proceedings to this end. Through affordable subscription rates, free podcasts of talks, social media engagement, and a programme which covers a broad range of philosophical traditions, the Society continues to make philosophy widely available to the general public. The Society also co-organises the Joint Session with the Mind Association - the largest gathering of philosophers in the UK - and also provides grants to philosophy conferences all across the UK.

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2020

Reserves Policy

The Society has payments of approximately £100,000 per year and has approximately £200,000 in reserves. The Society aims to have in reserves approximately two years of payments.

Reasons for Policy

The Society has for many years aimed to have significant reserves. This is for three main reasons:

1. The income of the society comes very largely from one source: the receipts from Oxford University Press for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume. The Society has little control over the extent of that income, and it could in theory dry up very quickly.

2. The commitments of the Society are fixed and stretch two to three years into the future. It is, for example, already committed to producing the material for publication in the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume of the Society for two years, and committed to a Joint Session for July 2020 in Oxford. Should the income dry up the Society would need, as far as possible, to be able to meet the commitments it has made and wind down its affairs in an orderly fashion.

The Society needs easily accessible reserves, beyond those of running costs for a short period because the responsibility of the Joint Session means that it faces, annually, the risk of having to make large 'rescue payments'. This can occur, if, for example, the accommodation arrangements fall through, the local organiser drops out and an organiser has to be bought in on a market salary, or if the local organiser makes a serious mistake on the budget.

3. Given the fixed nature and extent of its income, the Society is able to consider new worthwhile initiatives, such as switching to on-line publication of Proceedings, only if it is able to insulate itself against risk. Having significant reserves enables it to do this.

Statement of Trustees' Responsibilities

The Trustees are responsible for preparing the Trustees' Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

The law applicable to charities in England and Wales requires the Trustees to prepare financial statements for each financial year which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Charity and of the incoming resources and application of resources for that period.

In preparing those financial statements the Trustees are required to:

- Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- Observe the methods and principles in the Charities SORP;
- Make judgments and estimates that are reasonable and prudent;
- Prepare the financial statements on a going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the charity will continue in business.

The Trustees are responsible for keeping proper accounting records that disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the charity and to enable them to ensure the financial statements comply with the Charities Act 2011, the Charities SORP and the provisions of the trust deeds. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Charity and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

This report has been approved by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf


.....
Rory Madden
Honorary Director

Date: 22 March 2021
.....

Independent Examiner's Report to the Trustees of The Aristotelian Society

I report to the trustees on my examination of the accounts of The Aristotelian Society for the year ended 31 December 2020.

Responsibilities and basis of report

As the charity trustees of the Trust you are responsible for the preparation of the accounts in accordance with the requirements of the Charities Act 2011 ('the Act').

I report in respect of my examination of the Trust's accounts carried out under section 145 of the 2011 Act and in carrying out my examination I have followed all the applicable Directions given by the Charity Commission under section 145(5)(b) of the Act.

Independent examiner's statement

I have completed my examination. I confirm that no matters have come to my attention in connection with the examination giving me cause to believe:

- accounting records were not kept in respect of the Trust as required by section 130 of the Act; or
- the accounts do not accord with those records.
- the accounts do not comply with the applicable requirements concerning the form and content of accounts set out in the Charities (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 other than any requirement that the accounts give a 'true and fair view which is not a matter considered as part of an independent examination.

I have no concerns and have come across no other matters in connection with the examination to which attention should be drawn in this report in order to enable a proper understanding of the accounts to be reached.



Karen Wardell
Partner, Moore Kingston Smith LLP
For and on behalf of Moore Kingston Smith LLP
Chartered Accountants

Date: 24 March 2021

60 Goswell Road
London EC1M 7AD

The Aristotelian Society
Receipts and Payments Account
For the year ended 31st December 2020

	2020		2019	
	£	£	£	£
Income Receipts				
Membership Subscriptions		6,548		5,100
Receipts from publications				
JSTOR	13,609		12,561	
Permission fees received	-		31	
Joint session receipts	-		20	
OUP's sales of journals	88,497		87,278	
Net VAT movements	15,947		22,605	
Miscellaneous	-		1,353	
		118,053		123,848
Investment Income				
Interest income and sale of investments		270		291
Total Receipts		124,871		129,239
Direct Charitable Expenditure				
Conference grants	587		5,102	
Podcast expenses	500		677	
Printers charges	742		-	
Joint session expenses	1,886		7,100	
Speaker expenses	149		662	
Net salaries and editors' fees	32,452		32,319	
Presidents' costs	1,044		4,760	
PAYE and NI	2,734		963	
Pension	663		-	
Student Bursaries	15,000		15,000	
Postage	101		320	
		55,858		66,903
Other Expenditure				
Rent	8,341		9,054	
Stationery and postage	-		109	
Computer and IT costs	951		1,233	
Bank charges	6		52	
Audit, accountancy and payroll	3,980		6,333	
Catering	1,281		190	
Miscellaneous	158		2,644	
Subscription	32		-	
Committee	-		723	
VAT paid	23,505		13,417	
Travel	61		-	
Website	435		-	
Insurance	319		308	
		39,068		34,063
Total Payments		94,927		100,966
Net Income		29,944		28,273

All receipts and payments are Unrestricted funds movements. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Aristotelian Society
Cash and Reserves
For the year ended 31st December 2020

	2020	2019
	£	£
Net Receipts for the year	29,944	28,741
Net Transfers (to)/ from Reserves	(3,308)	(3,764)
Cash and bank balances at 1 January	<u>40,071</u>	<u>15,562</u>
Cash and bank balances at 31 December	<u><u>66,707</u></u>	<u><u>40,071</u></u>

The Aristotelian Society
Statement of Assets and Liabilities
at 31st December 2020

	2020		2019	
	£	£	£	£
Monetary Assets				
Bank and Cash balances:				
Bank deposit accounts	2,970		2,970	
Bank current account	50,749		29,674	
PayPal account	12,988		7,427	
		66,707		40,071
<i>- held for investment purposes</i>				
CAF Gold Account	96,832		96,719	
CAF 90 Day Account	70,758		70,601	
		167,590		167,320
Debtors:				
OUP sales	49,680		41,929	
Other debtors	3,038		3,528	
		52,718		45,457
Total Assets		287,015		252,848
Liabilities				
Creditors:				
Auditors' remuneration	3,050		3,050	
Accruals & deferred income	3,328		3,773	
Grants	900		1,205	
VAT	1,348		8,905	
		(8,626)		(16,933)
Total Liabilities		(8,626)		(16,933)
Net Assets		278,389		235,915

All assets and liabilities of the Charity are held in Unrestricted funds. The Charity holds no Restricted funds.

The Annual Report and Accounts were approved for issue by the Executive Committee and signed on their behalf by:



 Rory Madden
 Honorary Director

Date: 22 March 2021

The Aristotelian Society

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended 31st December 2020

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The financial statements have been prepared under the Charities Act 2011, on the receipts and payments basis, following the guidance issued by the Charities Commission.

Allocation of Expenditure

All expenditure in connection with the Society's meetings and publications, together with an appropriate proportion of travel and office costs, has been treated as direct charitable expenditure in the Receipts and Payments Account.

Going concern

The trustees have considered the impact of the ongoing coronavirus pandemic on the charity and its activities.

With regard to the annual financial statements as of 31 December 2020, the charity has been able to adapt and continued to operate effectively, primarily by holding online events in place of those usually held in person. Outside of the joint session, the remainder of the charity's operations have been largely unaffected.

While the spread of the coronavirus has had a limited impact on business activities, the trustees do not deem that this represents a threat to the charity's ability to continue as a going concern.

There are no further events after the balance sheet date that require disclosure.

2 Trustees and Employees

The Society had an average of two (2019: two) employees during the year, whose staff cost amounted to

3 Publishers' Sales

	2020	2019
	£	£
Sales of journals net of VAT for the year	93,013	85,263
Less advanced payments	(43,333)	(43,334)
Amount due at 31 December 2019	49,680	41,929

OUP's total sales for the year ended 31 December 2020 amounted to £93,013. An advance of £43,333 was received during 2020, leaving a sum of £49,680 due at the year end, which is to be received in 2021. In the prior year, OUP's gross sales amounted to £85,263 and similarly £43,334 was recognised as a debtor at year end and was paid during 2020.



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 27 April 2020
13.00-16.00

Meeting held remotely via Zoom video conference

PRESENT: Helen Steward (President), Guy Longworth (Editor), Rory Madden (Honorary Director and Secretary), Elinor Mason, David Owens, Nick Jones, Heather Logue, Barbara Sattler, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Clare Chambers, Jane MA (OUP- for items 1 and 2 only)

Apologies:

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

Action: de las Casas to correct Myles Burnyeat's name in the minutes from October 2019.

Matters arising:

Longworth reported that the issue of embargo periods has been absorbed into the wider discussion around open access publishing. Given this, the committee agreed to discuss embargo periods under item 2.

de las Casas reported that the reason the Joint Session expenditure appeared to decline so rapidly in 2018 was due to the fact that in 2017 the society lent a deposit of £10,023.75 to the local organisers at Oxford, and that this was paid back in 2018.

She also reported that the reason VAT payments rose in 2018 was due to the change of publisher from Wiley Blackwell to OUP. Whereas Wiley paid all VAT directly to HMRC before making payments to the society, OUP pay VAT to the society and we then pay it to HMRC.

de las Casas reported that the reserves policy would be on the agenda at the October meeting, because the Agenda for April was too full.

de las Casas confirmed that the accountants had fixed the error in the 2018 accounts document and that she had updated the local organisers guide.

de las Casas confirmed that she had written to the BPA to ask if they were developing any guidelines for supporting trans people within the philosophical community. They had confirmed that they were

organising a discussion about this. There was some further discussion within the society, and it was agreed that it should offer for one of its members (potentially Heather Logue) to take part in the discussions. de las Casas wrote to offer this but we have yet to hear back decisively on the matter.

Action: de las Casas to monitor progress on the society's involvement in formulating the BPA guidelines, and chase where necessary.

2. OUP

(i) OUP 2019 Publisher's Report

The committee considered the annual publishers reports for the Proceedings and Supplementary Volume, prepared by OUP. Steward noted that the reports look healthy for both journals at the moment, though open access may pose a threat to this.

Ma (OUP) highlighted that the total number of institutions with access to the journals has increased in the last year. She noted that marketing for SV has been particularly successful and, as a result, that 3 articles from SV that were included in their marketing received a 3rd of the journals usage for the year. Another paper from SV was on the OUP blog and received 900 views.

Chambers wondered whether it would be a good idea to inform authors when their papers were listed as successful in a given year. She asked Ma whether this would breach confidentiality and Ma confirmed that it is okay to share statistics about popular articles, but not subscriptions or other figures. Chambers suggested that the society might want to publish the lists of popular articles on its website so that authors could check the figures there. Madden noted

that there is already a list of most-read articles on the front page of the OUP website for the societies journals.

Ma volunteered to check if OUP could help by sending a standard email to authors on the most-read list, so that the society needn't email speakers individually.

Action: Ma to look into whether it is possible to update authors when their articles were featured on the top 10 lists.

(ii) Open access publishing review

Steward introduced the papers provided by OUP modelling how the society might be affected by changes to open access publishing. She summarised that the society might be set to lose around half of its income with the new model and that changes would effect papers accepted on or after 2022. She summarised that in the new model, income from the journal will be paid per full-length journal article multiplied by the set fee, rather than from institutional subscriptions. Access for each article will need to be green, and with no embargo period. Steward highlighted that - according to OUP - this is the only route that would work for the society going forward.

Ma reported that the changes to publishing are much broader than the UK, and that the new Read and Publish deals are getting interest internationally. She reported that some journals are already receiving money from these deals. She reported that all major publishers are beginning to negotiate these deals but that smaller ones have not been able to.

Ma reported that the changes outlined in the review are happening quickly. She added that OUP are looking at alternative models for journals - such as those of the society- which don't look good under the new deals, but that the current model is likely to be the best way

forward. She explained that because Proceedings and SV don't work like regular journals (with can have hundreds of submissions), and because it is not easy for us to simply publish more articles, it will be trickier for us to navigate the situation.

Owens raised the question about who will pay the publishing fee under the new deals and Ma clarified that institutional libraries will pay and that they will have their own pot of money to use for this.

Sattler asked what this would mean for independent scholars and Ma confirmed that there isn't a simple answer to this problem, though it has been raised by Mind and other journals too. Ma offered to look into this further and get back to the society. Sattler noted that articles independent scholars can be very good and that the society should make sure somehow not to discourage them from publishing in its journals.

Chambers raised a concern that it might be more difficult to secure invited speakers, if these individuals have to do the labour of checking whether funding was available to be able to publish in the society's journals. Ma commented that OUP are not sure exactly how everything will function, but that it may be universities would be able to let authors know in advance whether they have access to money for publishing. She offered to find out more and get back to the society on this.

Two broad options were then outlined for coping with the change:

1. The society preserves the activities of the proceedings but reduces other activities, such as postgraduate scholarships and conference funding in order to bring its expenditure into line with the substantially reduced income (a reduction of around half) from its journals.

2. the society thinks of ways in which it might increase the number of papers published in the journal. This could be, for example, through open submissions and peer review. It was noted that this would require more administrative support.

Brewer noted the importance of taking into account what would be good for the academic community as a whole. He raised a question of whether charging such a large sum in order to publish an article would be worth it, seeing as the society would only receive a small amount of this income to use for its activities.

Longworth agreed that it wouldn't make sense for the society to take £3000 from institutions to put into publishing, in order to fund institutional conferences. This would essentially be siphoning money from universities to publishing organisations, as a lot of money made from publishing the journals goes to OUP. It would be better, in this case, for the universities to fund conferences directly.

Sattler noted that the Scots Philosophical association have decided to reduce their funding activities.

Logue suggested that - if the society needs to reduce its grant-making capacities - then postgraduate funding should be a priority over conference grants. In support of this, she noted that because of the Covid-19 crisis there may be fewer expensive in-person conferences which require funding.

Ma suggested that the various philosophical societies might coordinate their funding such that one society would fund conference grants and the other student bursaries.

To help with these decisions, Ma offered to help with modelling what income the society itself would receive per paper. She noted that

things will work as with traditional subscriptions, such that OUP would take some money for the article and pass some to the society.

Chambers raised further questions about why the society's income should be so reduced if there is simply a shift where the funding originates from (from readers to writers). She wondered if the society could shift to open access and to bypass OUP. Ma explained that, in the shift to open access, the real beneficiaries will be science journals (not OUP) and that the humanities journals in general are set to suffer. Science journals will receive a bigger proportion of income in the new model, because they will publish more articles. She explained that the changes to publishing were initiated by the open access community and coalition S and that the publishing industry is just reacting to this change. Ma offered to follow-up and provide more information on the relation between the humanities and sciences in the current and new schemes.

Brewer suggested that the society consider whether it could publish its own journals. Madden agreed this was an option it was important to consider and noted that there are journals named as 'proceedings' of other societies that now function as prestigious peer review journals. He also noted that philosophy has a shortage of peer review journals. Although this would be a radical change, the societies journals would be at an advantage in already having a good name and reputation.

Owens wondered if the changes to the society's income structure proposed by OUP would require negotiating a new contract. He also asked whether the society might not be protected by its current contract, given the changes in circumstances and income structure were not in place when it was signed.

Ma clarified that the society has a 5 year contract which is due to end this year, so that 2021 will begin next 5 year period. This means that

the society would have needed to give notice end of 2019. She agreed with Owens that the change of circumstances may have implications for the contract and offered to raise this with the legal team at OUP and report back.

Longworth pointed out that the minimum payment from OUP in the contract would mean that the society will be secure for the next 5 years, and so that this will protect its activities for this period.

Sattler asked about what interests libraries had in paying for journals if they were to be open access. Ma clarified that, over time, things will change so that libraries will come to be paying to publish in journals rather than to read them. This is why the deals are called “read and publish” deals.

Longworth brought up the issue of embargo periods which was raised earlier under item 1. Ma confirmed that OUP were happy to move the society’s journals to 12-month embargo periods and clarified that there would be no negative financial impacts to this, given the changes that are currently happening. She added that many other philosophy societies are doing the same thing.

Steward and the committee thanked Ma for attending and for all her work with keeping the committee updated about the changes in response to open access publishing. The committee members then discussed amongst themselves how to respond to these changes, and to the new publishing model being developed by OUP.

Chambers suggested that the society might publish its own journals, but Longworth noted that – in order to do this- we would need to charge authors close to that which OUP are proposing to charge them. Given that the society don’t have the marketing reach of OUP, it is not clear that authors would be willing to pay such a fee.

Madden suggested the committee have a strategic planning discussion at the October meeting. He noted that - because of the society’s reserves - it would be possible for it to continue to function for a while, even with reduced income.

Owens suggested that the society should take legal advice about its contract with OUP and offered to come up with names of lawyers if needed. Madden noted that Lucy O’Brien was in charge when the contract with OUP was drawn up and that she gave us a good name for someone to consult.

Action: Ma to feedback to the committee on a number of matters:

- ***On how independent scholars would be financially able to publish in the society’s journals under the new deals.***
- ***On how authors might be informed about access to funds for publishing under the new open access Read and Publish deals.***
- ***On how much income the society itself would receive per paper and how much would go to OUP.***
- ***On the relation between the humanities and sciences in the current and new open access arrangements.***
- ***On whether the change in circumstances brought by the move to open access publishing would have implications for the status of the society’s contract with OUP.***

Action: Madden to ask Lucy O’Brien for the name of the legal advisor the society used when negotiating its contract with OUP, in view of seeking clarity on the status of this contract.

Action: de las Casas to add strategic planning for open access publishing the agenda for the October meeting.

3. ANNUAL ACCOUNTS FOR 2019

Steward presented the annual accounts for 2019 and asked if the committee had any questions or concerns. No concerns were raised.

4. THE PROCEEDINGS

(i) Update on speakers 2020/21

de las Casas noted that Jonardon Ganeri had been confirmed for the 2020/21 program but requested to move to the 21/22 program. She then presented the list of speakers for 2020/21, as follows:

First term

05-Oct-20	Professor Bill Brewer (KCL)
19-Oct-20	Professor Tommy Curry (Edinburgh)
02-Nov-20	Dr Adrian Haddock (Stirling)
16-Nov-20	Professor Leigh Jenco (LSE)
30-Nov-20	Professor Helga Varden (Illinois)

Second term

18-Jan-21	Dr Lee Walters (Southampton)
01-Feb-21	Dr Barbara Sattler (St Andrews)
22-Feb-21	Professor Mary-Louise Gill (Brown)
08-Mar-21	Professor Nicolas Cornell (Michigan)
22-Mar-21	Dr Julia Borcharding (Cambridge)

Third term

26-Apr-21	Dr Rachael Wiseman (Liverpool)
10-May-21	Professor Joseph Chan (Princeton)
24-May-21	Professor Kenny Easwaran (Texas)
07-Jun-21	Dr Corine Besson (Sussex)
21-Jun-21	Professor Michael Beaney (KCL)

(ii) Nomination of speakers 2021/22

The committee had proposed 75 nominations for speakers for the Proceedings and Joint Session onto a shared spreadsheet which was circulated before the meeting. Longworth noted again that Jonardon Ganeri was due to speak for the 2020/21 session but had asked to speak during the 21/22 session instead. He was added to the list.

The following shortlist of names was agreed for the Proceedings:

Dawn Wilson (Hull)
Jonardon Ganeri (NYU)
Eric Schliesser (Amsterdam)
Sam Scheffler (NYU)
Heather Widdows (Birmingham)
Cécile Fabre (Oxford)
Mazviita Chirimuuta (Pittsburgh)
Michael Della Rocca (Yale)
Miriam Schoenfeld (Austin)
Jack spencer (MIT)
Lavinia Picollo (UCL)
Emma Borg (Reading)
Ralf Bader (Fribourg)
Andrew Huddleston (Birkbeck)
Rachel Cristy (KCL)

Alexander Mourelatos (Austin) was named another possible speaker.

(iii) Presidents choice

Longworth noted that Steward has continued the tradition to put together 12 selected papers for a virtual issue, and that it is hoped

future presidents will continue this tradition. He commented that Steward had chosen a very interesting selection with a paper by a female author from every decade of the past 120 years of Proceedings. Steward reported that she had enjoyed compiling the selection, and Longworth reported that it would be up on the OUP website very soon.

5. THE JOINT SESSION

(i) 2020 Joint Session (Kent)

a. Update on Covid-19 and online Joint Session

Madden reported that the officers of the society had held a meeting with Daniel Whiting from Mind and Graeme Forbes from Kent to discuss what to do about the Joint Session this year, given the ongoing Covid-19 situation. Mind's attitude was similar to that of the society, in thinking that Kent should take the lead in making the decision about the form of the conference, as they would be the primary organisers. Graeme Forbes was enthusiastic about holding an asynchronous online conference and offered to organise this. The plan is that speakers will record short videos of their talks and these will be posted onto the Kent Joint Session website. Participants will be able to post written comments and questions in response. This virtual conference will take place over the exact time period of the original Joint Session (10-12 July 2020). It was noted that this will be an opportunity for the society to take the lead in organising a remote conference at a time when it is clear these will become more and more necessary.

de las Casas reported that only 3 main speakers were yet to confirm, and that everyone else was happy to take part and record a video. 6 of the 8 postgraduates had already confirmed. There would be no

registration fee for the conference as the expenses are to be greatly reduced.

de las Casas commented that it is hoped that there will be social events at the virtual conference, and that a quiz has already been planned. She asked for suggestions from the committee for further social events and Sattler suggested that St Andrews was running a coffee hour on Zoom.

Madden raised the question of dates for the committee meetings during the conference and suggested it could be a good idea to change or move these to a non-weekend date. de las Casas commented that she had emailed Daniel Whiting at Mind to ask for his suggestions about this issue. Daniel Whiting had suggested that, rather than have all members of each committee present, Mind and the AS each select two or three representatives to attend. He also suggested that the two joint meetings be held soon after the conference, rather than during, and that they might be held together in one block.

Steward asked for responses from the committee, herself agreeing that it might be a good idea to have a few representatives from the committee rather than ask everyone to be present. The committee agreed and Steward suggested that the officers of the society (Steward, Madden, Longworth and de las Casas) might be the ones present. This was also agreed.

Steward noted that members of the committee should let us know in advance if there is anything they would like to be heard at the joint meetings.

Chambers suggested that the society should consult with Mind on the subject of what to do about open access.

It was agreed that the joint meetings with Mind should be at a date to be decided during the week after the conference, but that the Friday executive committee meeting would go as planned at 13.00-14.30 on Friday 10th July.

It was noted that committee members should feel free to send apologies to executive committee meeting in July too, if needed.

Action: de las Casas to add open access review as an agenda item at the joint meeting with Mind.

b. Editors update on postgraduate papers and symposia program.

Longworth presented the list of symposiasts and postgraduate speakers as follows:

Symposiasts

Inaugural Address
Michael Morris
Art and Metaphysics

Imogen Dickie (Toronto/St Andrews) and Zoltan Szabo (Yale)
Reference and Communication

Alison Jaggar (Birmingham) and Lorna Finlayson (Essex)
The Politics of Immigration

Rachel Cooper (Lancaster) and Lisa Bortolotti (Birmingham)
The Nature of Disorder

Jennifer Lackey (Northwestern) and Liam Kofi Bright (LSE)
Group Belief

Robert Pasnau (Colorado, Boulder) and Arif Ahmed (Cambridge)
Medieval Modalities

Ruth Chang (Oxford) and Victor Tadros (Warwick)
Normative Powers

Postgraduate Sessions

Emilia Wilson (St Andrews)
Simone Gubler (Texas)
Christina Nick (Leeds)
Peter Faulconbridge (UCL)
James Skinner (St Andrews)
Chloé de Canson (LSE)
Annalisa Costella (Erasmus Amsterdam)
Ezra Rubenstein (Rutgers)

(ii) 2021 Joint Session (Hertfordshire) – editor’s update on symposia speakers

Longworth presented the symposium speakers for the 2021 Joint Session as follows:

Inaugural address- Brad Hooker (reading)
Nishiten Shah (Amherst) - Robert Simpson (UCL)
Yujin Nagasawa (Birmingham) - Keith Frankish
Lynne Tirrell (Connecticut) - Mari Mikkola (Currently oxford)
Agustin Rayo (MIT) - Penelope Mackie (Nottingham)
Catriona Mackenzie (Macquarie) - Maria Alvarez (KCL)
Constantine Sandis (Hertfordshire) - Sophie Grace Chappell (OU)

Longworth noted that Simon Kirchin at Kent had written to ask whether it was worth making an application to host a future Joint Session at Kent. They will host the 2020 Joint Session online, but will not have hosted a live conference. They said they were potentially interested in hosting at the next available slot. It was agreed that this is a welcome idea.

Action: de las Casas to write to Kent and let them know it would be possible to host a Joint Session there in one of the next available years.

- (iii) Preliminary nomination of speakers for 2022 (St Andrews)

Committee members had been asked to nominate Joint Session speakers ahead of the meeting on a shared spreadsheet. The following shortlist of names was agreed for the Joint Session 2022:

Arthur Ripstein (Toronto)
Lucy O' Brien (UCL) – potentially with Lea Salje (Leeds)
Victor Caston (Michigan)
Mark Schroeder (USC)
Peter Sullivan (Stirling)
Anna Marmodoro (Durham)
Angela Smith (Washington Lee)
Sara Uckelmann (Durham)

- (iv) Update on venue for 2023 and 2024

Madden reported that Alex Grzankowski has agreed to host the Joint Session at Bikbeck in 2023, which will be their centenary year. He noted that Barry Smith will help with hiring senate house rooms at a

good rate and that this should allay some of the concerns about the expense of hosting a Joint Session in London.

Steward noted her previous suggestions of Leeds, Lancaster and Hull, though reminded the committee that Lancaster had declined 2 years ago.

Madden reported that there isn't a fixed venue yet for 2024 or 2025. He highlighted that Kent have now put themselves forward and that Ben Coburn had asked for Glasgow to be in the pool of hosts. He added that Birmingham and Leeds have both said they would consult with their departments about the possibility of hosting. Madden had received an email from John Divers at Leeds in Sept which had said he was taking it to the Leeds research committee.

Jones noted that the idea of hosting had come up at a department meeting at Birmingham. His feeling was that if a request to host was made again now then Birmingham would likely to accept.

Madden concluded that there are plenty of possibilities and explained that the next step will be to agree on an order of preference in collaboration with Mind. The possibilities for hosts are Birmingham, Kent, Glasgow, Leeds, and Hull.

- (v) Venue nominations for 2025

Steward confirmed with Madden that there were enough venue nominations to cover 2024 and 2025.

6. CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATIONS & REPORTS

The Society had received 19 applications in total. Madden reminded the Committee that the grant budget for the meeting was £4000.

Steward reported that there had been a discussion before the meeting and it was agreed that the committee should consider funding for all conferences as normal, but that organisers should let the society know if conferences needed to be cancelled due to Covid-19. Any cancelled conferences would need to repay their funding. de las Casas reported that CG041925 and CG101904, from previous finding rounds, plan to postpone their conferences into the next academic year due to the Covid-19 situation, and would like to retain their funding. It was agreed that postponed conferences should be able to retain this funding.

Turning to the applications for the present meeting, Madden approved the society spending £4500 (so £500 extra in total) on funding all conferences apart from the four recurring conferences. This amounted to £300 each.

The grants for the present meeting were then awarded as follows:

Ref.	Institution	Requested	Approved
CG042001	Edinburgh	500	300
CG042002	Glasgow	400	300
CG042003	Kent	300	300
CG042004	Warwick	500	300
CG042005	Nottingham	500	300
CG042006	Birkbeck	500	300
CG042007	Nottingham	500	300
CG042008	Warwick	500	300
CG042009	Warwick	500	300

CG042010	Hertfordshire/Manchester	400	300
CG042011	Oxford	500	300
CG042012	Stirling	300	300
CG042013	Kent	500	300
CG042014	Sheffield	400	0
CG042015	Oxford	500	0
CG042016	Manchester	500	0
CG042017	St Andrews	500	0
CG042018	Royal Holloway/Russian Cultural Centre	500	300
CG042019	Warwick	500	300

7. COUNCIL MATTERS

(i) Update on new committee members for 2019/20

Madden reported that Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Sarah Fine and Alex Douglas had all accepted a position on the executive committee to begin in October 2020.

(ii) Update on 2022/23 presidency

Madden reported that Kathrine Hawley needed to decline the presidency for 22/23 due to health issues. In addition, Bob Stern wrote last week to ask that he take on the presidency in 2022/23 instead of 2021/22, due to the timing of the ref. Madden asked for nominations for 2021/22 to replace Bob Stern and it was decided that he would approach Rae Langton and then Lucy O'Brien in the first instance.

Action: Rory to ask Rae Langton and then Lucy O'Brien to take the presidency in 2021/22.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business and the meeting was concluded at 16.15.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Friday
10th July 2020 over Zoom video conference.



The Aristotelian Society

AGM

MINUTES

Friday 10 July 2020
14.30 – 14.45

Meeting held over Zoom due to Covid-19: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT: Rory Madden (Honorary Director and Secretary), Guy Longworth (Editor), Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Helen Steward (President), Bill Brewer (President-Elect), Barbara Sattler.

APOLOGIES: Due to Covid-19 the following members of the committee were not required to attend the meeting: David Owens, Nick Jones, Heather Logue, Clare Chambers, Elinor Mason.

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with no corrections.

There were no matters arising. de las Casas confirmed that the matters arising from the previous AGM had already been reviewed at the October 2019 committee meeting.

2. 2019 subscriptions

Steward reported on the subscriptions figures for 2019 noting that – apart from the publications subscriptions- the numbers had increased slightly. She commented that individual publication subscriptions would likely continue to decline over the coming years.

3. Future presidencies

Steward welcomed Brewer as incoming President for 2020/21. Madden referenced the discussion from the earlier executive committee meeting that he was working on securing a president for 2021/22 after Bob Stern had asked to delay taking on the role until 22/23. The reason Stern asked to delay was due to speculation that the ref would be put back a year due to the Covid-19 situation. It has turned out that the ref has not been put back this far, and so Madden felt that Stern may be willing to take the presidency after all. In the meantime he was waiting to hear from Langton whether she would be able to take the role. He reported that he may also be able to ask Lucy O’Brien.

4. Officers & executive committee members for 2019/20

Madden reported that three new committee members would be joining the Executive committee and council for 2020/21. The new members will be Sarah Fine (KCL), Alexander Douglas (St Andrews), and Komarine Romdenh-Romluc (Sheffield).

Madden reported that this meeting would have been the last meeting for Mason, Chambers and Owens. He took the opportunity to ask Sattler whether - given her change of location to Berlin - she would be able to continue to serve on the committee until July 2021. Sattler confirmed that she would be able to continue on the committee until then.

5. any other business*

de las Casas asked if anyone had questions about the online Joint Session and clarified how to access the speaker pages to view and comment on the recorded talks.

de las Casas brought up the threatened closure of the philosophy department at UWU and checked whether the committee wanted to act any further in support of the campaign to protect the department. Longworth clarified that Nikhil Venkatesh had tweeted in support of the campaign from the society’s twitter account, and Steward confirmed that she had signed her name- as president of the society- on an open letter from the BPA. de las Casas reported that she had written to Charlotte Alderwick at UWU to ask how the society might help, and that Charlotte had asked if the society could write a letter in further support of the campaign. It was agreed that Madden would draft a letter from the society and that de las Casas would forward the letter template and notes from UWU to help with this.

Action: de las Casas to forward the letter template from UWU to Madden. Madden to write a draft letter from the society in support of the campaign to protect the UWU philosophy department.

There was no further business.

The meeting was concluded at 14:09.



The Aristotelian Society

meeting of the executive committee

Friday 10 July 2020
13.00 – 14.30

Meeting to be held over Zoom due to Covid-19: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT: Rory Madden (Honorary Director and Secretary), Guy Longworth (Editor), Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes), Helen Steward (President), Bill Brewer (President-Elect), Barbara Sattler.

APOLOGIES: Due to Covid-19 the following members of the committee were not required to attend the meeting: David Owens, Nick Jones, Heather Logue, Clare Chambers, Elinor Mason.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

Matters arising:

Steward presented the matters arising from the minutes of the April 2020 meeting. de las Casas confirmed that she had written to Kent to let them know it would be possible to host a Joint Session in one of the next available years, and had corrected Myles Burnyeat's name in the minutes from October 2019. It was agreed that she would continue to monitor progress on the society's involvement in formulating the BPA guidelines. de las Casas also confirmed that she would add a strategic review on open access to the agenda for the October meeting.

Madden confirmed that he was working on securing a president for 2021/22 after Bob Stern had asked to delay taking on the role until 22/23. The reason Stern asked to delay was due to speculation that the ref would be put back a year due to the Covid-19 situation. It has turned out that the ref has not been put back this far, and so Madden felt that Stern may be willing to take the presidency after all. In the meantime he was waiting to hear from Rae Langton whether she would be able to take the role. He reported that he may also be able to ask Lucy O'Brien.

Action: Madden to correspond with Rae Langton, Bob Stern, and potentially Lucy O'Brien to finalise the president for 2021/22.

Steward then presented the responses from Jane MA (OUP) to her actions from the last meeting. Ma had emailed answers to a series of questions

posed during the April 2020 committee meeting about open access publishing. Steward noted that these responses could be found in the papers for the current meeting. The committee considered each of Ma's responses in turn:

1. Ma had been asked whether it would be okay for the society to update authors when their articles were featured on the OUP top 10 most-read lists. In her response she had confirmed that it is fine to share this information with authors, and that she is talking with the OUP marketing department to see if there is some automated way they can take care of this.

2. Ma had been asked about how independent scholars would be able - financially - to publish in the society's journals under the new deals. The committee felt that the response from MA was still unclear on this point. The committee felt that it would be good to see what the new contracts look like in more detail and what OUPs positive proposals are for enabling our journal to run.

Longworth reiterated his feeling from the previous meeting that the option to leave OUP would not solve the problem, as it would leave the society needing to charge authors to publish in the journals in a similar way to the way OUP were proposing to charge them.

Steward suggested that, in the short term, the society should exert some pressure on its publisher to keep in mind the fact that there will be many authors who come through the journals who won't have access to an institutional pot for open access publishing. She noted that- even for authors who were part of an institution- there may not be enough money to go around.

Brewer shared a concern that it will soon be required that all publicly funded research be published in journals that are 100 percent open access. Pressure on the journal to be fully open access might make it difficult for those not covered by a read and publish deal to publish in the society's journals.

Steward interpreted Ma's comments slightly differently, to be suggesting that there would be a mixed system until all authors are covered by read and publish deals. This would mean that there would remain other routes, other than open access, to publishing in the society's journals. Steward noted the different interpretations of Ma's feedback and suggested that the society seek clarification from Ma on this point.

3. Ma had been asked to comment on how authors might be informed about access to funds for publishing under the new open access deals. While the committee felt there was a clear answer to the question of how the authors would be informed (via email), it was agreed that there was more information needed. It was felt to be still unclear what would happen if- for example- there was an institutional pot available but it had insufficient funds for a particular paper. Steward also noted that funds might run out between the societies accepting a paper and it being finally published.

4. Ma had been asked to comment on how much income the society itself would receive per paper and how much would go to OUP. Ma was now in the process of preparing a new financial model for the society which would show the impact of read and publish deals on the society's income, and not just the overall income of the journals.

5. Ma had been asked about whether the change in circumstances bought by the move to open access publishing would have implications for the status of the society's contract with OUP. She was yet to provide feedback on this, but it was agreed that – in any case- the society's best course of action was to look into its contract with an independent legal advisor.

Longworth commented that the society should look into the legal situation around its contract. Madden noted that it was an action of his from the last meeting to look into finding a legal advisor to examine the society's contracts with OUP. He had asked Lucy O'Brien for the name of the friend of hers who had helped the society in negotiating its original contract. This friend had helped out as a favor and had not been a lawyer, so O'Brien was now looking for the name of a someone who may be able to help with contract law. Madden asked the committee to send any names of contract lawyers they might know, or tips for where to find them. He agreed to follow-up with O'Brien for a name and also, potentially, to check with Mind.

Action: Madden to take care of finding a contract lawyer to examine the society's contract with OUP. Members of the committee to let Madden know if they have names or ideas of where to find a contract lawyer and Madden to consult with O'Brien and, potentially, Mind.

6 Ma had been asked to comment on whether the sciences have been subsidizing the social sciences and humanities under the subscription model, on the basis the pot of money at libraries and consortia is staying the same, but the humanities and social sciences will be worse-off financially in the future. The committee read her response and agreed that there didn't seem to be cross subsidizing between the two but, rather, that the two business models are very different.

Action: de las Casas to keep in touch with Jane MA at OUP and chase the matters she had yet to respond to, in order to feedback to the committee at the October meeting. de las Casas to remind OUP that there will be many authors who come through our journal who won't have access to an institutional pot for open access publishing, and to ask further clarificatory questions as follows:

-Whether the society's journals could remain hybrid journals – with different routes for authors to publishing papers- until all authors are covered by a read and publish deal?

-How authors are to access institutional money for publishing open access, including what would happen if there was an institutional pot available but it had insufficient funds for a particular paper or if funds were to run out between the societies accepting a paper and it being finally published.

- Whether the change in circumstances bought by the move to open access publishing would have implications for the status of the society's contract with OUP.

- de las Casas also to ask Ma for an update on the new financial model she is preparing for the society which should show the impact of read and publish deals on the society's income, and not just the overall income of the journals.

2. 2022 JOINT SESSION – ST ANDREWS: REVIEW OF NOMINATION OF SPEAKERS FROM MIND

The preliminary nominations from the Aristotelian Society were as follows:

Arthur Ripstein (Toronto)

Lucy O' Brien (UCL) – potentially with Lea Salje (Leeds)
Victor Caston (Michigan)
Mark Schroeder (USC)
Peter Sullivan (Stirling)
Angela Smith (Washington Lee)
Sara Uckelmann (Durham)

The preliminary nominations from Mind were as follows:

Achille Varzi (Columbia)
Elisabeth Schellekens (Uppsala)
Jack Woods (Leeds)
Emily McTernan (UCL)
Katja Vogt (Columbia)
Michael Cholbi (Edinburgh)
Eric Marcus (Auburn)
Justin Snedegar (St Andrews)

Steward reported two other things Mind wanted to note about their nominations:

Daniel Whiting had noted that Wood's interests are very wide-ranging but that he might choose to speak in metaethics. In that event, their 'local' suggestion, Snedegar might be a candidate for the 'respondent', as he also works in metaethics. Whiting had also noted that Mind also have two candidates from the same institution - Columbia. Mind are not suggesting that they both appear in the final line-up but, since we couldn't decide between them, they thought they would re-consider them alongside and in light of the AS suggestions.

Steward asked for comments from the committee on the nominations from Mind.

de las Casas reported that Chambers had written ahead of the meeting to support Mind's suggestion of Emily McTernan as a speaker. Chambers wrote "[I] strongly endorse Mind's suggestion of Emily McTernan as a speaker. I know her work well (I was her second supervisor for her PhD) and she would be excellent".

Sattler commented that Katja Vogt (Columbia) would be excellent. Steward reported that she had looked at the past few years to see which of the nominated speakers worked on underrepresented areas. She reported that aesthetics was the only underrepresented area covered in the list of nominations, which would be a reason to favor Elisabeth Schellekens. Steward also spoke in favor of Erik Marcus.

Madden raised the suggestion that it would be possible to pair some of the Mind suggestions with those of the society. For example, Jack woods could be paired with Mark Schroeder.

Madden commented that he had raised Sullivan's name because there hasn't been a speaker on history of analytic philosophy for some time. Longworth spoke strongly in favor of Sullivan and Schroeder from the society's list.

Steward reported the other underrepresented areas as: Continental, history of analytic philosophy, legal, aesthetics, and philosophy of science. Sattler commented that a speaker on early modern was also needed.

A question was raised about whether it would be okay to consider an area of philosophy to have been fully represented if it had been recently covered by the Joint Session or the Proceedings, but not both. It was agreed that this would not be enough, particularly as the Joint Session is bigger and much more well attended. The committee agreed to try to represent all areas of philosophy separately within the Proceedings and within the Joint Session.

Madden asked the committee for names of anyone who would speak on continental philosophy. Brewer suggested Sacha Golob. Sattler suggested Dina Emundts, who works on Kant and Hegel. Sebastian Gardener was another suggestion as- although he had spoken at the Proceedings already- it may not have been for some time.

3. joint session venue nominations 2023 to 2025

Madden reported that Birkbeck had agreed to host the Joint Session in 2023.

He reported that Birmingham have expressed willingness to host 2024, or 2025, with a preference for 2025. Glasgow said they would host in future years and Kent are an option too. de las Casas confirmed that Simon Kirchin at Kent had asked whether it would be possible to host a Joint Session in person (as opposed to the 2020 Joint Session which they hosted online). He had suggested hosting in one of the next available slots, but had said he would need to check with the department before committing to this.

Madden commented that the final decision of which institution should host in each upcoming year would be made at the joint meeting with Mind.

4. any other business

Steward asked if she would be chairing the meeting for the joint session with Mind, and Madden confirmed that she would.

The meeting was concluded at 13.45.

*The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on 5 October
2020 over Zoom*



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 5 October 2020
13.00-16.00

Meeting held over Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5769972242>

PRESENT: Helen Steward (chair and outgoing president), Bill Brewer (president), Bob Stern (president elect), Guy Longworth (Editor), Heather Logue, Nicholas Jones, Barbara Sattler, Alexander Douglas, Sarah Fine, Komarine Romdenh-Romluc, Holly de las Casas (Managing Editor, minutes)

Apologies: Rory Madden (Honorary Director and Secretary)

1. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

Steward welcomed Brewer as upcoming president and Stern as president-elect.

Steward ran over the actions from the last meeting, noting that answers to the questions that de las casas had put to OUP from the committee were in the papers for the meeting.

Madden was not able to attend the meeting so de las Casas reported on his action to contact a lawyer with regard to the society's contract with OUP. It had been agreed to discuss the situation with open access publishing further before seeking legal advice. She also reported the good news that there was no longer a need for Madden to write a letter in support of the campaign against the closure of the UWU philosophy department because the department was no longer going to be closed.

2. Proceedings

i. Update on speakers for 2021/22

Longworth reported that the society were planning to invite Tommy Curry to speak during the 21/22 program but that he had asked to be moved to the current year's program. Rachel Wiseman needed to pull out of this year's program but asked if we would be willing to re-invite her for 21/22. The committee agreed they would be happy to re-invite her.

Longworth reported the following program of speakers for the 2021-22 Proceedings, noting that there were still some slots to be filled:

Term 1:

18-Oct-21 Heather Widdows

01-Nov-21 Eric Schliesser

15-Nov-21 Cecile Fabre

29-Nov-21

Term 2

17-Jan-22

31-Jan-22

21-Feb-22

07-Mar-22

21-Mar-22 Jack Spencer

Term 3

25-Apr-22 Emma Borg

09-May-22 Mazviita Chirimuuta

23-May-22 Miriam Schoenfield

06-Jun-22 Michael Della Rocca

20-Jun-22 Samuel Scheffler

Action: Longworth to confirm the remaining speakers for Proceedings 2021/22 and report back on this at the April meeting.

3. Joint Sessions

i. Report from 20120 Joint Session (Kent)

Steward introduced the report and accounts from the 2020 Joint Session from Kent university and asked for any comments from the committee.

Steward asked how the committee felt about the Recommendation from Kent to move or cancel the late session on Saturday. Longworth commented that the cost of this will be to introduce another parallel session during the conference. He reported that delegates sometimes don't like this, as it reduces the amount of talks they are able to attend, but that the cost seems worth it. He noted that it would be possible to add an optional social event in place of the late Saturday session, in case people would like to attend something then. The committee agreed with these sentiments. It was also agreed, following the recommendation from the Kent report, that it would be important to avoid beginning the conference earlier in the day on Saturday.

It was agreed that this recommendation might be added to the local organisers guide but only after consultation with Mind.

Steward asked the committee how they felt about the idea of a specific budget for mobility assistance but it was agreed that this was a problem of planning and not of finance. The problem at Durham had been that the accommodation needed to be moved at the last minute to premises that were a 15-20 minute walk away from the main conference venue.

The issue of conference childcare provision was then raised. It was discussed that most in-house university childcare is usually full, and that there were legal issues to arranging ad-hock childcare. Longworth noted that Agenda item 9, regarding a possible poll of whether to hold the Joint Session on weekdays or weekends, could help with the question of childcare provision.

Stern suggested that the committee think about what has been learned from running the first online Joint Session. He noted that the Proceedings had been working well online and that it was good for people to be able to attend without having to travel.

Sattler commented that she had been disappointed with the lack of real-time discussion at the Joint Session, because the conference was asynchronous. She felt, and others agreed, that it would be important to have live aspects to any further online conferences. Longworth noted that most delegates would want to attend in person, even if some parts of the conference were also online, because so a high proportion of delegates are Open Sessions speakers who tend to want to attend in person.

Steward commented that the online conference had been a good learning experience and that the ability to host online was important for many reasons, including climate change. Despite certain real advantages to holding it online, however, she also noted that the Joint Session held a special place in the calendar as the only conference of its type in the UK, and that it was important to preserve the opportunity for people to meet up annually.

It was largely agreed that it would be good, going forward, for the conference to incorporate some online aspects within an in-person frame. It was also noted, however, that the 2021 conference may need to be online because of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.

Longworth commented that asynchronous conferences were easier to organise but that synchronous sessions would also be possible. The main issue would be with facilitating live audience interactions. He also noted that the main cost of online conferences was the informal interactions that would normally happen in-person.

Longworth noted that the quiz and comedy at the 2020 online Joint Session went very well but that some of the spontaneous online events (like the philosophy dogs meeting or example) were less successful. These more unstructured events could fall flat and were generally less well attended because people didn't know what was expected of them or how much they would need to interact. The committee agreed a preference for the more structured online social events.

Douglas asked if the effects of the online conference in terms of inclusivity had been tracked. Steward confirmed that it had only been possible to track visits to the different sessions of the conference. There was no further or more fine-grained breakdown.

Action: de las Casas to add consultation on the recommendation from Kent to remove the late Saturday session and replace it with an extra parallel session to the agenda for the Joint Meeting with Mind. If mind agree to the change then this should be added to the local organisers guide.

ii. Update on arrangements for 2021 (Hertfordshire)

de las Casas reminded the committee that the local organisers for next year's conference are Constantine Sandis and Danièle Moyal-Sharrock. Constantine Sandis is the main organiser and correspondent. Arrangements are reported to be going well. Their website is live and our first CFP will go out today.

Sandis had reported over email that while they want the conference to happen in person, Hertfordshire are being very prudent with regard to any large-scale events occurring before a vaccine. He reported that for now they are happy to assume it will take place in person, but that at some point their conference and accommodation centre will require quite high deposits for bookings (he will be requesting loans from both societies for this) and it's not clear whether they will be refundable if the conference were to go online. He suggested the societies should make a decision about whether to hold the conference online or in person by the start of the Spring term in January 2021.

Steward noted that if a decision needed to be made in January then it is likely that the decision will be to go online. There was a question about whether it would be possible to find some more time to decide. Logue wondered if it might be possible to pay the deposit in order to have the chance for an online conference, with the understanding that the money might not be repaid.

Stern raised the idea that a hybrid model would work well. Longworth commented that, even if the conference were to go ahead in person, there will need an option for symposia speakers to attend remotely if they were unable to travel. It was agreed that there would need to be at least some online aspects to the conference. Brewer added that making sure there could be real-time discussion of the talks would improve the experience a lot.

Steward suggested that there is a strong argument in favour of knowing whether the conference will be online or in person sooner rather than later. Amongst other things it allows the organisers time to plan things well. Fine noted that the Forum for Philosophy had been online for 2 terms already and that there were substantial unanticipated preparations needed for this, so it would good to begin planning early.

It was agreed to make the decision about whether to hold the conference online in January as suggested by the organisers. Longworth noted that any decision will need to be made in conjunction with Mind and will have to be decided largely over email, as there will not be another committee meeting until April.

Action: de las Casas to wait until January to facilitate a conversation about the decision whether to go online for the Joint Session 2021. The decision should be made after discussion with Mind and the local organisers.

iii. Update on speakers for 2022 (St Andrews)

Longworth reported on developments in the program for 2022. He confirmed a full set of first speakers and three respondents:

Arthur Ripstein (Toronto)
Peter Sullivan (Stirling) – Rob Truman (York)
Rob Trueman (York)
Elisabeth Schellekens (Uppsala)
Katja Vogt (Columbia) – Tamer Nawar (Groningen)
Mark Schroeder (USC) - Marya Schechtman (Illinois)
Lucy O' Brien (UCL)

i. Update on venue for 2023 and 2024

Confirmed future venues were reported as follows:

2021- Hertfordshire
2022- St Andrews
2023- Birkbeck
2024- Birmingham

Steward reported there had been positive developments at Leeds in terms of their potentially hosting the Joint Session in 2025. A group from the department had discussed this and the idea is now with the school management group, who are looking at getting some financial support. Steward let the committee know that the SMG doesn't want to make a commitment yet, but that there is a good chance.

Brewer noted that there had been a request from Kent to host another Joint Session, as their turn to host had been moved online. Steward mentioned Glasgow as another possibility that had been mentioned.

Action: de las Casas to ask Madden about the possibility of Glasgow and Kent hosting a future Joint Session and Madden to follow up with the universities.

4. Conference funding applications and reports

Steward reported that, due to the pandemic, there was only one conference grant application. The application number for the conference is CG102001 from York University, and for £300. The committee agreed to fund the application.

5. Student Bursaries

Longworth reported on the Student Bursary outcome for 20/21. There were eighty-seven applications received this year. Madden and Longworth had each ranked the applications, before jointly choosing the top five.

The successful applicants, who would each receive £3000 from the Society in 2020/21, were:

Farbod Akhlaghi (Oxford)
Jessica Fischer (UCL)
Hannah Laurens (St Andrews)
Benjamin Marschall (Cambridge)
Xintong Wei (Stirling)

6. Website statistics

de las Casas reported that most of the twitter numbers are slight increases on the previous year, though impressions are slightly down and the follower count is significantly up. Facebook figures represent a levelling off after years

of increase, which may have to do with a general decline in Facebook use. Website views are roughly the same as last year.

7. Society nominations

i. Committee member and Honorary Director roles

Longworth reported that Madden would be stepping down from the role of honorary director in September 2021 and that the society will need to find a replacement. Longworth let the committee know that there would need to be some crossover period for the Honorary Director role with the new person starting into the role before the summer 2021. The role is for a period of at least 5 years. He noted that the society also need to hire 3 new committee members for the October 2021 meeting. All committee members should serve a 3 year term and the members leaving next year will be Sattler, Logue, and Jones.

Longworth reported that it had been agreed at previous committee meetings that the society should advertise for the roles of Honorary Director and the Committee Member roles. This was to update the previous practice of simply nominating new people during meetings. Jones commented that the idea had been raised by Jo Wolff during his presidency.

Longworth noted that there was a helpful template from Mind for this, as they had already begun advertising for their committee member roles. He also raised the issue of a potential honorarium for the Hon director role to make it more attractive to potential applicants. He clarified that it is important that whoever takes on the role be able to put time into it, including helping with regularly attending meetings and speaker dinners.

Stern noted that it will be important to make sure it is still possible for the committee to secure the kind of people it needs for both roles, including subject area specialisms. He suggested that there be enough time in the hiring process for a plan B in case advertising doesn't work as hoped. Romdenh-Romluc agreed that it will be important to make sure the society has a balance of perspectives and suggested that the committee encourage certain people to apply.

Steward noted that it will be important to streamline the process so that administering it doesn't become too onerous or time consuming, particularly if there are many applications. Logue suggested that the committee might institute a lottery process for all applicants that pass a certain set of requirements. Steward noted that if appointments were to be made by lottery this would also save people feeling disappointed if they weren't successful in a given year.

Stern noted that the Honorary Director post is very important and should not be agreed by lottery. This was agreed. Jones asked how important it is that the Director attend the Proceedings talks and Longworth confirmed it is very important. Longworth confirmed that he would himself need to step down in a year, so having someone to share the responsibility for meetings was crucial. It was noted that the fact of the director needing to attend most meetings might add some geographical limitations to the role.

Stern suggested that the society might offer committee member applicants a slot in future openings, if they do not make it through selection the first time. A list of reserves could make the process less time consuming.

Longworth suggested that instead of asking for full applications, the society could ask for expressions of interest. It was agreed that expressions of interest or applications would be needed by January or February 2021 and so advertising should be in the current Autumn term 2020.

Steward noted that the two application tracks, for committee members and for the Director, should be managed as somewhat separate processes.

Jones commented that it would be important for the committee to decide on the criteria they needed before advertising, rather than deciding along the way. He noted that in the past subject area has been the biggest consideration, followed by other criteria. It was agreed that for the member roles the committee would need to consider ethnic diversity, subject area, gender, and geographical spread. Steward agreed with Jones that subject area

would be the most important but noted that the committee should always examine its procedures, rather than rely on past criteria.

It was agreed that deciding on criteria for the Honorary Director role would require Madden's input. It was suggested that Madden write something about his role to help with the hiring process, such as a summary of requirements for the role and a list of the tasks it involves. It was also suggested that he- or otherwise de las Casas or Longworth- might approach Directors of other society's in order to research how much a potential honorarium might be.

The committee then discussed how to advertise for the roles. It was agreed that there should be advertising for both roles on Philos-L, social media, and perhaps on the website too. Stern added it might be an idea to advertise on the BPA distribution list. It was decided that these advertisements should be for expressions of interest and would require applicants to send a one-page CV and cover letter with information about what they have done and why they are interested in the role. There could always then be a more detailed request for information later. The committee would be asked to encourage people to apply to ensure a good spread of applicants and subject areas.

The committee roles could be filtered and then potentially decided by lottery, but the honorary Director Role should be decided with greater scrutiny.

Action: Madden to write a list of the tasks of the Honorary Director role. Madden to consider liaising with Mind and British Society for Philosophy of Science to research the specific amount of the honorarium.

Action: de las Casas to advertise for expressions of interest in the committee member and honorary director roles. Advertisements should be placed on Philos-L, social media and potentially on the website. Applicants should be required to send a one-page CV and cover letter. de las Casas to consult with committee members and officers over email where needed.

Action: de las Casas to take the nominations for the 23/24 president made at the October meeting forward to the April meeting where nominations will be decided.

ii. Update on Council members

Steward will now pass from Executive Committee to the Council. There were no further updates.

iii. Update on President for 2022/23 and 2023/24

Confirmed future presidents were reported as follows:

Bill Brewer 20/21
Bob Stern 21/22
Rae Langton 22/23

The committee then considered nominations for 23/24.

de las Casas reported Madden's suggestions as follows: Ian Rumfitt, Samir Okasha, Huw Price, Crispin Wright, Gregory Curry, Andy Clark, Ursula Coope, Alexander Bird, John Hyman. Madden had also noted that he had asked Katharine Hawley recently but that she had needed to decline for health reasons. Stern and Sattler commented that she was getting better and that it would be worth asking her again in a year or two.

Brewer added Lucy O'Brien to the list and commented that in 23/24 she may no longer be with Mind and so could have more flexibility.

It was then confirmed that a decision need not be made at the current meeting as it would be properly discussed at the April 2021 meeting.

iv. Honorary member nominations

No nominations for honorary membership were received this time.

8. Strategic planning for open access publishing

Steward introduced the discussion around the society's response to changes in open access publishing. She noted that there was nothing to decide immediately but that it was important to make a plan in response to warnings from OUP about an upcoming decrease in subscriptions income. She asked for the committee to offer any thoughts or ideas.

Sattler noted that the society would be saving some money in the current year because of the Covid-19 pandemic and that it might be possible to build up some reserve. She wondered if it would be possible to increase the prices of individual subscriptions via the website but it was clarified that the society made the majority of its income through institutional subscriptions and not through individual subscribers.

Longworth outlined that one option would be to make cost savings, for example cutting back on office costs and on funding students and grants. It was agreed that the society should compile a set of figures of how much it spends per year on various things and so how much could be saved in this way.

Steward noted that one of the suggestions OUP had for the society to deal with the changes was for it to publish more papers by expanding editors and inviting more papers, as well as expanding geographically.

Sattler suggested that the Proceedings might begin to publish replies to each of its invited papers. These papers would not need to be presented live but could serve to double the publications per year.

Jones suggested more radically expanding the papers published by disconnecting them from the proceedings meetings and Joint Session. The rationale for this would be that it would provide another prestigious journal through which to publish philosophy. He argued this could be a service to the discipline as a whole as well as solving a financial problem.

Steward noted that during a previous meeting it had been thought that the extra editorial and administrative expense involved in this might significantly detract from the income gain. Longworth agreed that this would need to be carefully modelled to see if it would work.

Stern expressed sympathy with the idea of expanding to a larger peer review journal because it would be good for young researchers, but questioned the need for more journals in the field. He asked if the changes to publishing were definite or whether the society might lobby to stop them. Steward reported that the changes were in progress and the society would have to adapt in some form.

Douglas noted that expanding the journal in the ways suggested by OUP would involve moving into areas that are already crowded, and that other journals will likely also be trying to publish more too. He suggested that if the society were to move into new areas then it should be doing something innovative. It might be possible, for example, to use the AS brand to produce publications that were peer reviewed but relatively inexpensive.

Brewer agreed that a problem with simply increasing publications would be that others will be doing the same thing and so quality will be reduced. He suggested that the society might publish the journals itself, rather than go through OUP.

Longworth agreed that it would be good to look into this but noted that it might not be feasible because the society would still need an income from somewhere such as taking open access fees from authors. This would involve doing some of the work that OUP currently do for us, such as liaising with libraries, marketing, legal work and accountancy. Losing OUP as the journal publisher may also cost the journal some prestige. Ultimately the decision

would rest on how much the society would save by self-publishing and how much it would stand to lose.

Stern wondered if the society might be able to delegate editorial responsibilities for extra papers published to members of the committee or to academics from particular areas. People may, in this case, be pleased to do the work for free. He suggested a special issue or special addendum might be a way to increase publication and that- if done in this way- it might not be too costly.

Action: de las Casas to model possible cost savings the society could make. de las Casas and the officers of the society to model the projected number of extra papers the society would need to publish in order to maintain its current activities.

9. Joint Session poll

Longworth explained that, during the July 2020 Joint Meeting with Mind, it was suggested that both committees run a poll of their members to ask whether people would prefer to attend Joint Sessions on the weekend or during the week. This was primarily to see if it might help those with childcare responsibilities to attend. It was suggested that the committees might either consult amongst themselves, consult heads of departments, or run a poll to their members.

Romdenh-Romluc commented that this was worth pursuing, in particular because those who find weekends more difficult to attend might be structurally disadvantaged.

Fine commented that whether or not the conference is online or not could make a difference to the decision, because children might be present at home where delegates are attending remotely.

The committee discussed whether to poll heads of departments or whether to poll the membership directly. There was also a suggestion to do a combination

of both. It was agreed that - if polling heads of departments- the idea would be that they then each take it to departmental meetings, have a discussion, and then feedback to the society. It was agreed there were problems with approaching heads of departments such as lack of response or bias, and the fact that not all departments have such meetings anymore. It was also noted that contacting people this way might be unnecessarily complicated.

Jones suggested the poll might be directed to regular attendees, because a significant portion of these people return each year.

Logue suggested publicising a poll on Philos-L so that it would not be restricted to society members. One advantage of this would be to reach people who could not previously attend Joint Sessions because they were not held on weekends. It was felt, however, that those responding may not be indicative of the general feeling. There was then a suggestion also to ask the Philos-L respondents whether they were a member or a regular attendee, in order to get a more fine-grained response. There was a further concern, however, that many may not respond to a Philos-L poll.

Steward summarised the discussion and concluded that a poll should be sent via the society's usual call for papers and advertising for the Joint Session. It should be noted that the decision of the poll would not affect the next two Joint Sessions because these dates have already been set. The options should be a weekend, a weekday, or dates that straddle both.

Action: de las Casas to institute a poll about whether the Joint Session should be held on the weekend, weekdays or both. The poll should be advertised with the next call for papers for the Joint Session. de las Casas to report back at the April meeting.

10. Any other business

Longworth reported that Madden had some feedback on the 20/21 proceedings program. The committee had asked Michael Beaney to speak and he had chosen to speak on something in Chinese philosophy. This caused some

bad feeling amongst community of Chinese philosophers. Rory explained that the society do invite particular people to speak but that the general policy is that the speakers chose the subject of their own talks. This seemed as if it may have helped, but it was agreed that the criticism was fair and that the committee should bear it in mind for the future.

The committee thanked Steward for her work as president of the society in 2019/20.

The meeting was concluded at 15.45

The next meeting of the Executive Committee & Council will be held on 26 April 2019 at 13.00 at Senate House, Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HU