

<b>SOCIAL POLICY ASSOCIATION</b> <b>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING</b> 27 <sup>th</sup> September 2010 CASE, LSE		
Item		Action
<b>Present</b>	Chris Blunkell, Kate Bradley, Alex Collis, Alan Deacon, Hartley Dean, Caroline Glendinning, Tina Haux, Chris Holden, Majella Kilkey, Karen Rowlingson, Adam Whitworth , Nicola Yeates	
<b>Introductions</b>	CG welcomed everyone to the meeting, and explained that some members were elected at the AGM, some are ex-officio because of their responsibilities within the SPA such as Journal Editors, and some are co-opted on an ad hoc basis. Members introduced themselves.	
<b>1. Apologies</b>	Hugh Bochel, Tania Burchardt, Rachel Dobson, Rebecca Johnson, Rana Jawad, Simon Pemberton, Nicola Moran	
<b>2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b>	The minutes from the short meeting in July consisted mostly of immediate feedback from the Conference. The minutes were accepted as a correct record.	
<b>3. Matters arising from previous meetings</b>	<p>a. Conference to be discussed under the appropriate Agenda item.</p> <p>b. CG reported that the Association had been considering the request from British Sociological Association for a joint Sociology/Social Policy/Social Work REF Panel. There was considerable concern among some members, and the balance of views was against. NY noted that our deliberations had helped HEFCE to think through the implications of a joint Panel, which are very complicated. AD took the view that the SPA came out of the exercise very well because of the way it conducted the discussions with BSA and HEFCE. CG said that Peter Taylor-Gooby, Chair of the last RAE Panel, had been very helpful.</p> <p>c. The mailbase issue is sorted. AW said that now that the heavy website work was completed he can manage both, but it would be helpful to have a second person to as a back-up. <b>AW to register TH as second administrator for mailbase.</b></p> <p>d. The question of the SPA President will be dealt with under the appropriate Agenda item.</p> <p>e. Roles will be decided under Item 5.</p> <p>CG raised a couple of issues that had been raised at previous meetings but not followed through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members Directory – at the meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> April there was a discussion about whether to revive the Members Directory. HD had said it would be very useful to him and Tania for identifying possible Journal referees, and CB for media interest. CG added that it could also be useful for developing links with the Government Social Research Unit. HD reiterated that he was keen that it should be taken forward. It would need free-text entry, which requires someone with technical expertise to do it. There should be two components: (i) research interests, and (ii) areas of expertise. Members should be invited to log in occasionally to provide about 50 words in both areas, which should be searchable. CB agreed with this structure.</li> </ol> <p><b>CG proposed that this should be proceeded with, employing someone to do it as a one-off task. AGREED.</b> There should be links from the Directory to the website, although this is a secondary consideration. AW said it was doable, but he is not able to take it on. HD noted that several universities have such Directories. CG suggested HD and CB should write a short spec, then the Committee should look for someone. CB offered to create a brief by writing a summary of the exchange between himself and HD. KR pointed out that input should be restricted to SPA members, and suggested that it would be ideal to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>AW</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">CB</p>

	<p>have it ready for membership renewal in November. HD said it could be restricted using membership numbers, and reiterated that it is important to differentiate between interest and expertise. CH wondered if it would be possible to create links to members' individual websites from the Directory.</p> <p>AW and CG offered to approach people for quotes for the work, once the spec is available. AW suggested the spec should provide an image of how an entry would look, and CB noted that the Directory should be compatible with the membership website, managed by Lavenham. KB said that the Social History Association has such a database, she will put AW in touch with them.</p> <p>2. JUC – HD identified two issues following the decision to disband JUC-SP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation for Departments</li> <li>• Funding – the JUC has been a funding stream delivering about £5,000 pa.</li> </ul> <p>He suggested that Departments could be invited to transfer their JUC subscriptions to the SPA, they could be given a form of membership, then a sub-committee created for them. The Public Administration Committee of the JUC functions like the SPA, the SP Committee was an oddity. He pointed out that departmental subscriptions (billed just before Christmas) are specifically for SP, so there would be no difficulty in them being transferred. Proposals and letters to Departments are needed early in 2011.</p> <p>CG suggested this should be discussed again at the next meeting, which was agreed.</p> <p><b>CG confirmed the co-options to the Exec: AD for a third year, as a senior presence within the SPA; and NY as Vice-Chair. These were AGREED.</b></p>	<p>CG, AW</p> <p>KB</p> <p>TH</p>
<p><b>4. Chair's report</b></p>	<p><u>SPA President</u>: the President has in the past been either a senior academic or a journalist. The current President, Nick Timmins, is a journalist, and presents awards at Conference. The end of his term is approaching, and it will take time to find a new one. He has said it was undemanding, and CG felt it should be made more so, for example by asking him to write for Policy World.</p> <p>The question now is whether to ask him to stand for a further three years, and if not who to approach, whether it should be a journalist or an academic. Sue Duncan is one possibility. KR proposed Nick Timmins should be asked to serve for one more year, and agreed that Sue Duncan would be good, probably more engaged with the SPA. AW agreed that Nick Timmins should be invited for one more year.</p> <p>TH suggested that what the SPA gets out of the President depends on what it puts in, and agreed with KR and AW.</p> <p><b>CG proposed that Nick Timmins should be asked to continue as President for one more year, during which he should be encouraged to be more engaged; and that Sue Duncan should be approached to ask her to stand. AGREED. CG to approach Nick Timmins.</b></p> <p>AD suggested that another possible candidate is Nial <b>Dickson</b>.</p> <p><u>SPA Chair</u>: This is CG's third year as Chair, and as she is moving towards retirement she has decided not to stand for a further three years but is prepared to stay on for one more year to enable a new Chair to be elected and shadow her for a year. TH will set up a search group to find someone to act as Shadow from next July.</p> <p><u>REF Panel Chair</u>: It was AGREED to endorse Peter Taylor-Gooby.</p> <p><u>REF Sub-Panel Nominations Group</u>: CG suggested that the list of applicants for nomination should be circulated. There are 16 applications, but HD felt <b>only seven or eight should be nominated. AGREED.</b> KR and NY pointed out that other people can stand through other Learned Societies. TH pointed out that some of the 16 places on the 2008 RAE Panel were for social work academics; some SPA nominations might also cover social work. TH will ask Tess Ridge and Jane Millar for guidance.</p>	<p>CG</p> <p>TH</p> <p>TH</p>

	CG confirmed that she has signed a contract with Lavenham for the coming year. The price has not increased.	
<b>5. Vacancies – Exec responsibilities</b>	<p>CH reported that RJ has agreed to shadow the International Comparative Social Policy Group, but TH pointed out that RJ has already served two terms on the Executive, and the constitution suggests that members should stand down at that point. CG suggested this doesn't need a decision till this time next year. NY took the view that there must be a long-term commitment to International Relations.</p> <p>KR asked if the ESRC liaison role should be widened to include other funders – HD agreed. NY will attend the ESRC meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> October, commitments allowing.</p> <p>The following roles were agreed:</p> <p>ESRC liaison : KR  National relations : KR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BSA Council</li> <li>- BS Criminology :</li> <li>- Sociolegal Studies Association :</li> <li>- Social Research Association : KR</li> </ul> <p>Festival of Science: TH suggested <b>Hedley Bashforth</b> from Bath, TH to take forward</p> <p>International Relations: AC</p> <p>New members and Chair for Teaching and Learning Committee: members to suggest people to co-opt</p> <p>Small and Large Grants: KB, to be inducted by MK over the next year</p> <p>Treasurer: RJ is approaching people to see who might be interested</p> <p>Academy of Social Sciences: NY</p>	<p>NY</p> <p>TH</p> <p>All</p> <p>KB, MK</p>
<b>6. Secretary's report</b>	<p>a. Next meeting is on 8<sup>th</sup> April at the LSE</p> <p>b. SPA's recruitment/nomination process for prospective Academicians is now accredited with the Academy. The next deadline for nominations is March 2011. This will be on the agenda for the next meeting.</p> <p>c. AD, NY, <b>AW</b> and TH volunteered to serve on the search committee to find the next Chair. A decision is needed by April so that the prospective Chair can stand at the AGM.</p>	<p>AD, TH, NY, <b>AW</b></p>
<b>6. Treasurer's report</b>	<p>RJ had submitted a report. CG noted that the Association is still in a healthy financial situation, with about £70,000 in savings and reserves.</p> <p>Conference usually generates a surplus, which is reduced this year because of subsidies to P/Gs. Lincoln has asked if they can retain the surplus as a float for next year. It was unclear whether this is acceptable, and TH offered to check with the guidelines and with RJ.</p>	<p>TH</p>
<b>8. SPA Conference 2010 and 2011</b>	<p>CG referred the meeting to HB's report, and asked if there were any queries. In response to the questions raised by the Conference organisers, the following decisions and comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PG activities went very well (CG), and <b>it was AGREED that they should continue to be integrated.</b></li> <li>• It was felt that the proposed theme was very anglo-centric (NY). <b>It was AGREED that the theme should be 'Big Societies, Small States? – the Future of Social Policy'</b>. TH thought this would be good for making links with Tory-leaning think-tanks.</li> </ul> <p>- Should there be a cap on subsidies: TH asked how many PGs were subsidised in 2010. KR reminded the Exec that it is important to remember that the Association needs to spend some of its money. Since there is always a concern about running out of money, TH reminded the meeting that PG subsidies can be flexible, in case the financial situation changes. <b>It was AGREED that no cap is needed.</b></p>	<p>HB</p> <p>HB</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plenary speakers: CH said an international speaker should be found, not Anglo/European. Suggestions made were: Matthew Taylor, Philip Blond, Pete Alcock, Nancy Fraser. Other suggestions should be made by email. NY proposed that Nick Timmins should chair a plenary session – CG will approach him to suggest it.</li> <li>• ‘Meet the funders’ session: MK felt that given the current climate of cuts it will be important to discuss funding. <b>It was AGREED that there should be a session on funding and funding implications</b>, possibly involving someone from the Academy. It could include the ESRC. MK suggested it could be internationalised, for example by including the European Commission.</li> </ul> <p>CG reported that it isn’t possible to hold Conference later in 2011 than in 2010, although the second week in July would be ideal in the future. TH reported that she is in discussion with York and Leeds as potential conference venues for 2012 and 2013.</p> <p>CG raised the issue of the videos made at Conference, which still haven’t been made available.</p>	<p>All CG</p> <p>HB</p> <p>TH HB</p>
<p><b>9. Policy World/ Press &amp; Media strategy</b></p>	<p><u>Press</u>. CB reported that at Conference he was committed to focus on plenary speakers. The division of labour did not work well in general, there wasn’t much coverage, although it worked well with the speakers. Communication with the Lincoln Press Office proved difficult, CB’s suggestions of journalists to contact were not taken up. CB had discussed this with HB, who suggested that someone from the Exec should be on site to keep an eye on things, or to find an alternative route for the distribution of materials.</p> <p>CB also worked on publicising the awards, which went better. Winners’ Universities often ran the material on their own websites.</p> <p>HD and CB worked on a JSP article on childcentric ICT, for CUP. This got some coverage. The majority of journalists who received the press release clicked on the article, which was encouraging, and CUP are good to work with.</p> <p>The Guardian contact hasn’t worked very well, and CB is trying to find who to discuss this with. In response from a question by NY, CB said Anna Bawden had received a number of responses to the call she made. HB and CB selected a number of papers to put to Anna but the outcome is not known.</p> <p>CB has a reliable contact at the Public Servant magazine. The Journal has a readership of about 12,000. CG commented that it is a good targeted publication if we want to increase our profile with policy-makers. She asked what kind of information they would want from SPA members in the first instance. CB replied that he has suggested that he liaise with the Editor . She wants relatively short case studies, about 800 words. They shouldn’t be academic, but accessible to the informed lay person.</p> <p>TH stressed that it is important to focus on Conference for press coverage. MK suggested targeting individuals – Laurie Taylor, for example, attends the main BSA and Criminology Conferences, and interviews participants later in his Radio 4 programme. CB agreed with the suggestion, saying people should be approached well in advance.</p> <p>CG reiterated that she will definitely ask Nick Timmins to chair a plenary session, and that other media people should be identified to contact/take part.</p> <p><u>Policy World</u>. The next issue copy deadline is 24<sup>th</sup> September for publication on 1<sup>st</sup> November. The international feature that CB had been hoping to run on Overseas Development Aid is now not happening. The issue will include some material worked up for Conference, including the Small Grants report. He was not sure yet whether it would be possible to include something from Peter Saunders re the fire in Australia.</p> <p>CB is proposing a new section on people – new appointments etc. HD proposed it should include people who were around ‘back in the days’.</p>	<p>CB All</p> <p>CB</p> <p>CG</p>



	<p><b>websites. AGREED, with a degree of caution.</b> CG stressed that the posting of the data needs publicising via the SPA mailing list. .</p>	
<p><b>13. SPA Awards</b></p>	<p>MK spoke to her paper and reported that members are concerned about the Lifetime Achievement Award. The recommendations in the report are based on an attempt to address those concerns, and on her experience.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MK will approach the Exec in January for proposals for judges.</li> <li>2. AD had suggested that nomination was for most awards an award in itself, so perhaps nominations should be publicised . CG expressed surprise that sometimes people don't know they've been nominated. AW pointed out that there was a difficulty here with Lifetime Achievements Awards, as making it a benchmark award could be viewed as a criticism of a person's career if they didn't achieve it.</li> <li>3. CH commented that the awards scheme was started mainly for publicity purposes. However it has become more complicated as it introduces an element of competition. AW felt that it doesn't need to be competitive, but NY asked what then is the cut-off point.HD also rejected the idea of 'guidance' on criteria for Lifetime Awards– there should be rules or nothing. CG asked MK to think about rewording the guidelines.</li> <li>4. There was a long discussion, with the following comments made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the rules should be clearer, so 'about to retire' should be taken out, as that is difficult to define(CH)</li> <li>- the issue of making the Lifetime Achievement Award a benchmark award is a big decision, and MK was making no recommendation on it. The proposals address some of the concerns, and changing the rule about more than one award leaves the decision to the judges (MK)</li> <li>- the Executive should decide(CG)</li> <li>- there should be one winner, OR the model should be the Academy, and the Executive should decide (AD).</li> <li>- the proposal re benchmarking has been raised only in relation to the Lifetime Achievement Award, and if it is decided to benchmark then it means different criteria apply for this award than those for the other awards (CG)</li> <li>- make more than one award if necessary, but it shouldn't be a benchmark award (CG)</li> <li>- there should be one winner OR it should be a benchmark (TH)</li> <li>- this year the awards were followed up with letters to nominees, which pleases everyone (MK)</li> <li>- the nominations should be published in Policy World just before Conference (CB)</li> <li>- if nominees are publicised then they can't be nominated again (AD)</li> <li>- publicising it is part of the whole process, and aids publicity for SPA (CH)</li> </ul> <p>In the end it was decided that the Lifetime Achievement Award would be a competitive award, i.e. it can only be received by one person. All nominees would be publicised afterwards with their permission and the guidelines to the judges will therefore stay minimal.</p> </li> </ol>	<p>MK</p>
<p><b>14. Small and Large Grants</b></p>	<p>MK reported that two Small Grants have just been made, and spoke to her proposal for a Large Grant scheme. The Executive were asked to decide whether to agree to such a scheme, and if so what sort of event should be funded. During discussion the following points were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Eligible events:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We should consider privileging applications which have clear policymaker/practitioner links (CG)</li> <li>- it should be specified not that events should take place in the UK, but that they be 'of benefit to members' (AW)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>MK</p>

	<p>2. <u>Eligible applications</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- add 'in liaison with the Large Grants Co-ordinator' (CG)</li> </ul> <p>3. <u>Value of Awards</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- £3,000 maximum per event is acceptable</li> <li>- costs should not be specified (CG)</li> <li>- there should be a limit of two events per year</li> </ul> <p>4. <u>Terms and conditions</u>: (these are the same as for Small Grants)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this section should deal with the eventuality of a conference making a profit (CG)</li> </ul> <p>5. <u>Application procedure</u>: no further comments</p> <p>6. <u>Assessment procedure</u>: the Grants Officer will screen applications before passing on to the Executive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- an announcement about the new scheme will be made in Policy World (MK)</li> <li>- there should be deadlines for applications for each round (TH)</li> </ul>	<p>MK</p> <p>MK</p> <p>MK</p> <p>MK</p> <p>MK</p>
<b>15. ESRC</b>	Nominations are invited	All
<b>16. Teaching, Learning &amp; Recruitment</b>	Volunteers to be members of and to chair this group are urgently needed .	
<b>17. Publications</b>	<p>a. <u>SPR</u>: CH reported that the format has changed slightly, with both Sections 1 and 2 on the new government. CG asked if any papers from SPR could be showcased at the <u>Festival of Science</u>.</p> <p>b. <u>SP&amp;S</u>: nothing to report</p> <p>c. HD reported that Tania is back from Maternity Leave, and they have decided to be tougher about sending papers out for peer review, and want people to know that. There will be an additional 32 pages for Vol 40. The editors are trying to get a grip on lead times. The excellent administrator currently working for the editors wants to stop doing it, and the editors are considering splitting the job so that an assistant can be allocated the pre-editing (which the current administrator does very well). This may persuade the administrator to continue in the job.</p>	
<b>18. External international relations</b>	<p>CH spoke to his and NY's paper. The aim is to improve international links, by supporting/subsidising SPA members in the UK to go to conferences abroad and vice versa, and also to improve publicity. There would be a limit of one person to each conference, and the aim would be to create links.</p> <p>The ensuing discussion included the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- there should be an annual deadline (MK)</li> <li>- applicants should demonstrate that they have exhausted all other sources of financial help (CG)</li> <li>- there will be co-funding, and no travel costs available – this could dissuade people from travelling too far. (HD)</li> <li>- the aim had been to limit costs, but the money isn't adequate (CH)</li> <li>- there should be different levels of funding depending on the distance (TH)</li> <li>- beware complications – there would now be three sets of grants with three sets of rules, though it's a good idea (CG)</li> <li>- the scheme allows the International Officer a great deal of discretion; it's not the same as grants, and the purpose is to build international links</li> <li>- more detail is needed – RJ should be consulted on amounts, which should be greater (CG, TH)</li> <li>- proposers should think about how the sums available should be divided up between applicants (CG)</li> </ul>	<p>CH, NY</p>

<b>19. Internal</b>	No further comments	
<b>20. Domestic relations/ Learned Societies/ Festival of Science etc.</b>	No report or further comments	
<b>21. Website</b>	<p>AW reported that the main tasks are now completed, but the content is becoming a bit stale. He urged people to update their pages. Also, news items are needed for the News Box. CG suggested he contact people regularly to remind them.</p> <p>AW is currently researching how to obtain statistics of downloads etc.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the students who did the videos at Conference have been paid. AW is disappointed that the videos are not yet available, as he had hoped to have them online by now.</p> <p>AW asked if the Executive want a separate area on the website, but it was decided against.</p>	<p>AW</p> <p>AW</p>
<b>22. Any other business</b>	CG suggested the Executive minutes be put on the website. <b>AGREED, starting with the current minutes when they have been agreed at the next meeting.</b>	AW
<b>25. Date and location of next meeting</b>	14 <sup>th</sup> January 2011, Birmingham	