

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
	<u>118,053</u>		<u>123,848</u>
Investment Income			
Interest income and sale of investments	<u>270</u>		<u>291</u>
Total Receipts	<u>124,871</u>		<u>129,239</u>
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	<u>101</u>		<u>320</u>
	<u>55,858</u>		<u>66,903</u>
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	<u>319</u>		<u>308</u>
	<u>39,068</u>		<u>34,063</u>
Total Payments	<u>94,927</u>		<u>100,966</u>
Net Income	<u>29,944</u>		<u>28,273</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 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
- held for investment purposes				
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	
Total Liabilities		(8,626)		(16,933)
Net Assets		<u>278,389</u>		<u>235,915</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:



 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	<u>49,680</u>	<u>41,929</u>

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 bought 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 Birkbeck 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 brought 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-hoc 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