

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

Date: 11.04.22

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

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	<u>44,439</u>	<u>49,680</u>

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 Shroeder 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. 20223 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 Beebe (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