

THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY

Registered Charity Number: 254021

ANNUAL REPORT AND ACCOUNTS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED

31st DECEMBER 2022

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2022

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

Legal and Administrative Information

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

The officers of the Society are as follows:

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

Aims and Organisation

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

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

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

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

Review of Progress

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

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

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

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2022

Review of Financial Position

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

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

Statement of Executive Committee's Responsibilities

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

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

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

Statement of Public Benefit

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

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

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

The Aristotelian Society

Executive Committee's Annual Report

For the year ended 31st December 2022

Reserves Policy

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

Reasons for Policy

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

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

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

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

Statement of Trustees' Responsibilities

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


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

In preparing those financial statements the Trustees are required to:

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

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

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


.....
Dr Michael Hannon
Honorary Director

Date: 24 March 2023
.....

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

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

Responsibilities and basis of report

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

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

Independent examiner's statement

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

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

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

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

Date:
9 Appold Street
London EC2A 2AP

The Aristotelian Society

Receipts and Payments Account

For the year ended 31st December 2022

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

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

The Aristotelian Society


Statement of Assets and Liabilities

at 31st December 2022

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

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

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



 Dr Michael Hannon
 Honorary Director

Date: 24 March 2023

The Aristotelian Society

Notes to the Financial Statements

For the year ended 31st December 2022

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

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

Allocation of Expenditure

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

Going concern

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

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

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

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

2 Trustees and Employees

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

3 Publishers' Sales

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

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



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 3 October 2022
13.00-16.00

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

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

Apologies: Lee Walters, Mona Simion.

1. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were discussed and approved.

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

2. Proceedings

i. Update on speakers for 2023/24

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

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

3. Joint Sessions

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

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

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

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

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

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

ii. Update on arrangements for 2023 (Birkbeck)

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

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

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

iii. Update on speakers for 2024 (Birmingham)

Longworth reported on developments in the program for 2024.

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

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

iv. Update on venue for 2027

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

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

v. Venue nominations for 2028

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

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

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

vi. Potential data collection- open sessions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Conference funding applications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Student Bursaries

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Website statistics

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

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

7. Society nominations

i. Committee member update

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

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

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

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

ii. Editor Position update

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

iii. Update on Council members

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

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

Hannon confirmed future presidents of the society as follows:

Scott Sturgeon 23/24

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

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

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

v. Honorary member nominations

No nominations for honorary membership were received this time.

8. Any other business

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

The meeting was concluded at 15.00

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



The Aristotelian Society

Meeting of the Executive Committee & Council

Monday 25 April 2022
13.00-16.00

Meeting held remotely via Zoom video conference

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

Apologies:

1. OUP

i. OUP 2022 PUBLISHERS REPORT

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

ii. PRODUCTION ISSUES FEEDBACK

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

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

iii. CHANGES IN PUBLISHING UPDATE

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

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

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

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

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

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

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

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

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

Matters arising:

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

3. ANNUAL ACCOUNTS FOR 2020

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

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

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

4. THE PROCEEDINGS

(i) Update on speakers 2022/23

Longworth reported the program of speakers as follows:

First term

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

Second term

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

Third term

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

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

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

(ii) Nomination of speakers 2023/24

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

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

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

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

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

UK speakers

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

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

Non-UK speakers

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

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

(iii) Presidents choice

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

(iv) Dinners 2022/23 Proceedings

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

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

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

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

5. THE JOINT SESSION

(i) 2022 Joint Session (St Andrews)

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

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

Symposiasts

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

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

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

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

Aesthetics and intellect

Katja Vogt (Columbia) and Tamer Nawar (Groningen)

Kataleptic impressions

Mark Schroeder (USC) and Marya Schechtman (Illinois)

Narrative and personal identity

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

Sneering

Postgraduate Sessions

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

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

b. Registration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (iv) Update on venue for 2025 and 2026

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

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

- (v) Venue nominations for 2027

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

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

- (vi) Lex Academic Essay Prize

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATIONS & REPORTS

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

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

The grants for the present meeting were awarded as follows:

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

7. CHANGES TO PUBLISHING AND HOW TO RESPOND

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

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

8. BARCELONA PRINCIPLES

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. COUNCIL MATTERS

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

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

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

(ii) Update on 2024/25 presidency

Hannon confirmed the future presidents of the society as follows:

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

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

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

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

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



The Aristotelian Society
meeting of the executive committee

Friday 08 July 2022
12.30 – 14.00

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

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

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

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

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

The minutes of the last meeting were then approved.

Matters arising:

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

2. 2024 JOINT SESSION – BIRMINGHAM:

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

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

From Mind:

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

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

From the AS:

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

(ii) SPEAKER NOMINATIONS PROCEDURE REVIEW

Hannon

From Mind:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The provisionally agreed upon list of speakers:

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. joint session venue nominations 2025 to 2027

Hannon:

| | |
|-----------------------|------|
| Birkbeck College, UOL | 2023 |
| Birmingham | 2024 |
| Glasgow | 2025 |
| Leeds | 2026 |

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

The committee was happy with these nominations.

4. additional nominations for Proceedings 2023/24

Longworth confirmed that these would be decided via email.

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

5. student bursaries: 2021/22 recipients

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

6. Staff salary review

Hannon:

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

Four issues were outlined:

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

Several options were outlined. In sum:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The committee members were happy with these pay increases.

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

7. hybrid talks

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. any other business

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

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

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

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

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

The meeting was concluded at 14.00

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



The Aristotelian Society
meeting of the executive committee

Friday 08 July 2022

14.00 – 14.15

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

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

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

1. Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising

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

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

2. 2021 subscriptions

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

3. Future presidencies

Hannon reported on the following future appointments:

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

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

4. Officers & executive committee members for 2022/23

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

5. Any other business?

There was no further business.

The meeting was concluded at 14.17.