sase

Executive Council Meeting 2021

Tuesday 29th June 2021, Virtual Meeting

Present

President: Sigrid Quack

President Elect: Jacqueline O'Reilly

Past President: Nitsan Chorev

Treasurer: Nina Bandelj

Executive Director: Annelies Fryberger

EC Members

- Zsuzsanna Vargha
- Sébastien Lechevalier
- Dorothee Bohle
- Virág Molnár
- Heather Haveman
- Elizabeth Gorman
- Timur Ergen
- Franklin Obeng-Odoom
- Chiara Benassi
- Emily Erikson
- Alya Guseva
- Katherine Chen
- Julimar Da Silva
- Michelle Hsieh
- Bruno Amable
- Caroline Arnold

SASE Group/Committee Members

- Dave Elder-Vass
- Jason Jackson
- Roberto Pedersini
- Gerhard Schnyder
- Mehmet Asutay

Virtual Organizers

- Matthias Schuler

Socio-Economic Review

- Gregory Jackson
- Jutta Becker-Ritterspach

SASE Staff

- Pat Zraidi
- Jacob Bromberg
- Shaun William Owen

MEETING OPENED AT 3PM CET BY SIGRID QUACK

1. Welcome and Introduction

Sigrid Quack opens the meeting by welcoming the members of the Executive Council, Virtual Organizers, and SASE Staff, and thanks everybody for their flexibility in making the virtual meeting work across different time zones.

Sigrid Quack continues by giving a brief opening statement where she explains that over 1,150 people have signed up to the 2021 SASE virtual conference, and that the organization is in a much better financial state than expected at the end of the previous year, noting that this will be explained in more detail later in the meeting. This is SASE's second year of running a virtual meeting due to the pandemic, and Quack hopes that 2022 will be back to an in-person conference.

2. Approval of 2020 Council Minutes

Proposal: Motion to approve the 2020 annual meeting minutes and the

2020 extraordinary meeting minutes.

Explanation: Members had received the 2020 annual meeting minutes and the

2020 extraordinary meeting minutes ahead of time via email, and the floor was opened for any questions relating to the contents of these minutes.

Discussion: No questions or comments were raised.

VOTE – MOTION: Motion to approve the 2020 annual meeting minutes and the

2020 extraordinary meeting minutes.

- **Yea - 14**
- **Nay - 0**
- **Abstain - 0**
- **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

3. Executive Director Report

Annelies Fryberger opened the Executive Director Report by thanking SASE President Sigrid Quack, the virtual local organizers, and the SASE staff for their work in preparation for the 2021 conference.

The new SASE blog was then introduced, and it was explained that it will be replacing the old SASE newsletter. Annelies Fryberger thanked the blog editors for their brilliant contributions so far.

This was followed up by the presentation of a new partnership with the University of Tübingen, where Early Career Workshop (ECW) participants can apply for the SASE "chair" in the Transdisciplinary Course Program. It is explained that 2 former ECW participants are currently teaching in this program.

Annelies Fryberger went on to reiterate the participation numbers expected for the upcoming conference, stating that it was possible for the number of paid participants to hit 1,250.

This led into an explanation of SASE's financial situation, with Annelies Fryberger stating that since 2016 SASE has been eating into reserves to pay overhead and conference expenses, and that had this trend continued it would have resulted in bankruptcy or severe changes to SASE's operation. Annelies Fryberger goes on to show that the projection for 2021 shows this trend being reversed, and the measures taken to achieve this were as follows:

- Raising conference registration fees compared to 2020
- Distribution of SASE's CfP far and wide
- Creation of an auditing option
- Donation campaign with former presidents and honorary fellows
- Co-Sponsorships

It was highlighted that co-sponsorships brought in the most money out of these options, and that to build on this some sponsorships have already been secured for 2022.

Proposals:

a. Motion to hold Executive Council meetings twice a year: once in December (virtual), once during or around the annual conference.

b. Motion to hold the SASE annual meeting on weekdays and not weekends.

Explanation:

a. The aim of having two executive council meetings a year would be to avoid having dense agendas, allowing for more focus on each discussion item. It

was also stated that having an interim meeting would allow for time-sensitive or ad-hoc items to be discussed by the executive council in a timely manner.

b.   The idea of holding the SASE annual meeting on weekdays has been requested multiple times by the SASE membership for work-life balance considerations, as well as childcare issues.

Discussion:

a.   A question of which items would be moved from the traditional yearly meeting to the December virtual meeting was raised. The response was that it would be open to debate, but initial ideas include the conference fee structure and finding locations for future SASE conferences – both of which would make more sense in December than in June/July.

Support was raised for this proposal by one committee member on the grounds that there is no in-depth discussion at the annual meeting, which could change if the discussions were spread across two meetings.

b.   It was noted that a lot of U.S. institutions hold summer sessions at the same time of year as the SASE conference, and it could be hard to book institutions/rooms during the week at these times. Concerns were also raised for academics, particularly those in Europe, who are still working at this time of year and may struggle to attend an in-person conference that is held during the week.

In response to these points, it was stated that SASE hopes to start booking conferences much further in advance than it has done previously, mitigating the booking and scheduling complications.

It was also raised that academic conferences are work, and as such should take place during the week. On the back of this it was noted that other academic conferences do not struggle to host during the week, so it should also be possible for SASE.

It was also asked if SASE currently has to be held on the weekend, it is clarified that nothing in the bylaws states that SASE must be held at the weekend and it is only a convention.

Multiple members stated that they felt it was too difficult to make a decision at this time based on a limited sample of responses and the proposal has been tabled for a more serious discussion, and possible polling of the SASE membership, at a future meeting.

VOTE – MOTION: a. Motion to hold Executive Council meetings twice a year: once in December (virtual), once during or around the annual conference

- **Yea - 15**

- **Nay - 0**

- **Abstain - 0**

- **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

NO VOTE WAS HELD ON MOTION B AT THIS TIME

4. Treasurer's report

SASE Treasurer Nina Bandelj opened the report by restating that SASE entered 2021 in a financially precarious situation and that the 2020 virtual conference resulted in a net loss of nearly $68,000 for the organization.

Nina Bandelj continued by commending the efforts of securing donation funding and sponsorships for both 2021 and 2022. She then went on to explain that the fixed costs for SASE are around $150,000 to $160,000 a year, and that the projected SASE Treasury for the end of 2021 is $198,000, which would cover only a year of overhead. This was followed by the explanation that an in-person conference in 2022, with around 1,000 participants, would project a deficit of around $15,000 based on current estimations (excluding external sponsorships).

a. Fundraising guidelines

Proposal: Adopt the proposed fundraising guidelines to guide SASE's future fundraising efforts.

Explanation: It is explained that the proposed guidelines will cover different types of fundraising that are not currently covered in the bylaws and allow SASE to pursue new avenues of fundraising within established parameters.

Discussion: The first question raised asks if there is a difference between fundraising and sponsorship and if the these are covered by the SASE bylaws – which currently only mention donations. It is then asked if there have been any issues with the first attempt at sponsorship, referencing the 2021 virtual organizers.

It is explained that the recent sponsorships are being treated in the same way as other local organizer co-sharing agreements in previous years, and as such are already accounted for in the way SASE operates. It is further explained that as this is money earmarked for academic purposes from an academic organization, that there are fewer conflicts of interest to consider.

Vote:

● **Yea - 19**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 0**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

b. Institutional memberships

Proposal: Include the institutional member category in a future revision of the SASE bylaws, for approval by SASE membership.

Explanation: It is clarified that due to differences between countries and even institutions, that this would not be replacing individual memberships as SASE's main source of income, but rather supplementing the classic membership system. It is revealed that one institution has already committed to purchasing institutional memberships once the framework is in place.

Discussion: No further questions were asked of this explanation.

Vote:

● **Yea - 19**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 1**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

c. Bolstering SASE's reserves

Proposal: SASE will aim to build up at least 2 years of overhead (= approx. $320,000) in reserves over the next 4 years. This would mean setting aside $46,750 annually.

Explanation: The difficulties of running a conference with financial concerns is given as the reason for this proposition. In addition to this, a reserve would allow SASE to be resilient in the face of unforeseen problems, with the COVID19 pandemic cited as an example.

Discussion: It is asked if SASE is exploring financial support from funding associations, and if publishers are paying to exhibit at SASE. It is confirmed that SASE has a financial relationship with publishers already and is looking to build on this even further. It is then clarified that the 2021 conference being virtual has not impacted on these relationships and that payments from publishers to exhibit at the conference are approximately the same as an in-person event.

It is explained that getting support for SASE's overhead from funding associations is very hard and although SASE has not yet secured funding of this type it will keep trying.

Vote:

- **Yea - 17**

- **Nay - 0**

- **Abstain - 3**

- **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

5. Ad-hoc finance committee report

Annelies Fryberger opened by explaining that the ad-hoc finance committee does not have a report, but rather a collection of minutes from a recent meeting that were made available to the Executive Council ahead of time.

Proposal: The President-Elect shall appoint an ad-hoc organizational review committee to evaluate SASE's business model in comparison with similar organizations, and make proposals for changes.

Explanation: It is explained that an ad-hoc committee would be charged with analysing the conference environment with regards to creating a sustainable business model.

Discussion: It is proposed that having an external person, and perhaps someone from Socio-Economic Review, on the committee could be beneficial.

Vote:

- **Yea - 19**

- **Nay - 0**

- **Abstain - 0**

- **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

6. Fee Schedule for 2022

Fee Schedule

Proposal: Fee schedule for Amsterdam 2022 will be the same as it would have been for Amsterdam 2020, however, the registration fee will not include the gala dinner or lunches (coffee breaks will be included). These fees are: Early bird – $235/$140 non-students/students; regular – $285/$165; non-OECD – $160/$80, non-students/students. Participants will RSVP for the gala dinner and lunches and pay accordingly (only to cover real costs; cost-efficient, green options will be ensured).

Explanation: It is made clear that this would be the interim solution for the next conference, while the Executive Director puts together ideas for future conferences.

Discussion:

It is highlighted that some universities will not pay for additional functions, such as gala dinners, and it is asked if the wording of this additional expense could be made more neutral to allow the fees to be paid for/back by institutions. It is agreed that SASE could be careful about how this is worded to ensure fees are paid by institutions.

Vote:

● **Yea - 17**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 2**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

Add an emeritus category

Proposal: Add an emeritus category, at an amount between the student and non-student rates: membership - $100, registration - $180/$225, early bird/regular.

Discussion: No discussion around this proposal.

Vote:

● **Yea - 18**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 1**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

Institutionalize the Hardship Category

Proposal: Institutionalize the "hardship" category: a low rate to allow individuals who cannot pay the standard membership and registration rates to participate: $50 registration (membership not required).

Explanation: It is explained that it is currently not explicit that SASE is willing to help those who are unable to pay the full conference fees, and that it currently works on an informal basis when members get in touch with the SASE office. It is suggested that institutionalizing this process would make it fairer for our members. It is also proposed that this category is renamed from 'hardship' to something else.

Discussion: It is asked what the criteria for applying for the hardship category would be, and the answer clarifies that it would be an honor system based around income, but with no formal checks in place.

Vote:

● **Yea - 18**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 1**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

7. SER Report

Socio-Economic Review (SER) editor-in-chief Gregory Jackson opened by stating that the number of submissions, which up until 2020 had been growing, had levelled off. It was also noted that a lot more reviewers were declining opportunities to review in the past year, causing the time it takes for a decision to be made on a paper to grow.

Gregory Jackson went on to explain that the journal had not yet received an updated impact factor for 2021, before finally discussing how the journal had made well-received contributions in digital spaces this year, with a more focused effort on social media and the release of the first dedicated virtual issue of SER.

Topic: The length of time it takes to have a decision on a paper submitted to SER is brought up (196 days average).

Discussion: It is asked what can be done to bring this number down. It is explained that the length of time to have a decision is down to a shortage of staff and problems related to COVID19.

Proposal: Confirm the nominations of Mari Sako and Neil Fligstein (terms beginning in January 2021, retroactive confirmation), Christina Ahmadjian (term to begin in January 2022), and Jens Beckert (second term to begin in January 2022), as members of the SER Advisory Committee.

Explanation: It is explained that for the January 2021 appointments that this is a retroactive vote based on a previous discussion due to the vote not taking place last time.

Discussion: No discussion around this proposal.

Vote:

● **Yea - 18**

● **Nay - 1**

● **Abstain - 0**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

8. SER Review Committee

Topic: The committee presented their findings from their review.

Discussion: The scholarly reputation and profile of the journal was mentioned as being a strong positive point, with an increasing impact factor since 2014, an increasing number of submissions, and a low acceptance rate cited as the reasons for this.

Diversity was highlighted as an area in need of improvement, due to the high number of authors from The United States and Western Europe. Despite this gender equality has seen huge progress in recent years.

While finance was also highlighted as an area of concern, it was noted that the new financial agreement between OUP and SASE should help to stabilize this situation. A transition to open access is cited as a key thing to monitor for the financial aspect moving forward.

9. SER nomination committee

Proposal: Akos Rona-Tas and Alya Guseva are approved as new Chief Editors of SER for an initial term of 4 years. They shall begin working with the current chief editor in the fall of 2021, and their term will officially begin in January 2022.

Explanation:

It is explained that 7 applications were received for the position of SER chief editor, which is noted to be a high number of applicants for an editor position compared to similar sized journals. It is further explained that the SER team put a lot of work into making sure the position was well advertised and that the hiring process avoided potential conflicts of interest – which was documented fully in the briefing that was sent to executive council members to review ahead of the meeting.

Discussion:

Due to the nature of this job advertisement, it is stated that anybody who was involved in the application process or has a close institutional relationship with the applicants should excuse themselves from this portion of the meeting.

It is stated that the process of selecting an applicant was very thorough. There was no further discussion.

Vote:

- **Yea - 13**

- **Nay - 1**

- **Abstain - 1**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

10. Future Conference Locations

Topic: SASE booking/announcing conference locations earlier.

Explanation: The arguments for this were presented as: people putting it in their diary earlier, there is a lot of competition for many of these locations so it would secure our booking, if it is a good location, we can build the hype.

Topic: Rio de Janeiro 2023

Discussion: It is decided that due to a lack of information, a further look at the financial implications of choosing Rio would need to be carried out before voting for this option and as such is tabled for the December meeting.

Topic: Limerick 2024

Explanation: Limerick 2024 was proposed as a strong choice due to the enthusiasm of the team for hosting SASE, they are committed to putting together a strong program of events. The financial situation is also described as detailed and robust.

Discussion: A question was raised about transport, as it is noted that it is an out-of-town campus. It is revealed that accommodation would be available on campus for every SASE member for approximately £60 (Approx. $82.50, €70) per night, it is also noted that the on-campus cafes and bars will be open during the conference. In addition to this, it is explained that the campus is 5km from the city centre with regular bus routes passing through.

It is also stated that the Irish tourism board will offer €10 for each person attending SASE, which could amount to around €10,000 for the conference based on recent trends.

Vote: Based on the recently passed motion of building up a reserve of cash within SASE, it is decided that the vote on Limerick should be delayed until the December meeting when all the financial aspects are known.

Topic: USA 2025

Explanation: It is said that SASE should return to the United States by 2025, and the South of the country is currently being considered due to previous SASE conferences being held in the North.

Discussion: It is mentioned in response to this that some Universities will not fund travel and conference fees to certain southern states in the US due to politically-motivated funding regulations, and this could potentially make it difficult for SASE members to attend, although this situation is in constant evolution.

Vote: This discussion is also moved to the December meeting.

Topic: Other Locations

Discussion: It is asked if Seoul, South Korea is still an option for a SASE meeting. The response is that there was not sufficient support inside the organisation at the time of contact for hosting a SASE meeting..

It is also asked if Canada has been considered. It is explained that Vancouver had been touted as a possible location but the dean of the business school had not been in favor of it. It is mentioned that McGill University was not being considered at the present time for infrastructure reasons. Finally, it is revealed that Toronto was also ruled out as the cost of local room rental was higher than a typical SASE conference.

The floor was then opened to the possibility of going to South Africa, as Cape Town is earmarked as a potential future SASE conference site. Discussion was generated from this about considering the distance of travel for SASE members, as well as the political situation in host countries. Both of these discussions were tabled for later.

11. Network Organizers Forum

Proposal: Give the Network Oversight Committee the explicit brief of determining a new process and criteria for the establishment of new networks, using the report by the Network Organizer's Forum of this year as a starting point.

Discussion: It is noted that polling the network representatives for their opinion on the proposal resulted in only around 1/3rd of them replying and that perhaps the vote should be postponed until more responses are available.

Vote: No vote took place.

12. Ad-hoc Greening Committee

Topic: Sustainability Principles

Proposal: Adopt the sustainability principles in the Greening Committee Report, *where possible*, which will be used to guide decisions by the SASE Staff and will be posted on the SASE website.

Explanation: The general sustainability principals in question are outlined, with a focus on increasing online access to future conferences and reducing the travel footprint of the organization.

Discussion: It is brought up that one line in the list of sustainability principals states that members would be encouraged to participate virtually where possible, to which the member bringing up this point expressed hesitancy. It was clarified that SASE would 'encourage' members to participate virtually by offering non in-person options, leaving the choice of whether or not to travel up to the individual member.

It is highlighted that SASE should be careful to not reproduce inequalities by being mindful of precarious workers, members from the global south and non-OECD countries, and caretakers with families – who all may be or feel "pushed" into accepting virtual options over in-person options.

Based on these comments, it is decided that the motion should be changed slightly to add in the text "where possible" *[already reflected in italics in this document]*.

Vote*:

● **Yea - 12**

● **Nay - 2**

● **Abstain - 3**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

*Please note that if comparing this data to the zoom records, this finally tally includes votes that were submitted in the text chat due to technical difficulties.

Topic: Dissolve the ad-hoc greening committee.

Proposal: Dissolve the ad-hoc greening committee.

Discussion: No further discussion was had on this subject.

Vote:

● **Yea - 14**

● **Nay - 1**

● **Abstain - 1**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

Topic: Encourage Executive Director to include a section on greening in their annual report.

Proposal: Encourage Executive Director to include a section on greening in their annual report.

Discussion: No further discussion was had on this subject.

Vote:

● **Yea - 15**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 1**

● **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

13. Membership and Diversity Committee

Proposal: Approve the revised Diversity statement, Privacy Policy, and Code of Conduct.

Explanation: The documents are introduced and it is stated that they are based on documents from other organizations similar to SASE. The changes to the diversity statement are highlighted, whereby it is revealed that it now makes reference to the SASE Women and Gender forum and the hardship fund.

A question is asked regarding where the web servers for the SASE website are based. Upon learning that they are based in the United States it is confirmed that the privacy policy being proposed is fit for this purpose.

It is noted that the ISA is the source for much of the code of conduct, and that their code of conduct has been tested legally on a couple of occasions and has held up in court – which is why it is important for SASE to have a similar document.

Vote:

- **Yea - 16**

- **Nay - 0**

- **Abstain - 1**

- **Absent – 0**

MOTION PASSED

14. Network Oversight Committee

Topic: Submission rates

Explanation: It was revealed that despite the 38% drop in submissions in the move from an in-person event to a virtual event in 2020, the submissions for 2021 were up compared to the 2020 virtual event.

Discussion: It is asked whether or not data is available regarding the geographic diversity of authors submitting to SASE and if this has changed for a virtual conference. Although the Network Oversight Committee does not hold this data it is agreed that they will liaise with SASE staff to see what can be done to find this.

The following agenda items did not have any planned motions, and as such each of the following sections will feature a summary of their general talking points.

15. SER Best Paper Prize Committee

The SER Best Paper Prize committee (Jeanne Lazarus (chair), Elizabeth Gorman, and Aldo Madariaga) reviewed 41 articles, before shortlisting 8. The winning article was "The Financialization of Policy Preferences: Financial Asset Ownership, Regulation and Crisis Management" by Stefano Pagliari, Lauren M. Phillips, and Kevin L. Young.

16. Early Career Workshop Committee

The number of submissions was significantly lower this year than in previous years (37 this year, compared to 74 in 2020). It is theorized that this is because one of the biggest selling points of the prize is the financial assistance to attend the conference, which is less necessary for a virtual conference.

It is noted that most applicants are from the United States and Western Europe, and on the back of this it is suggested that this could be changed by changing the award to not be awarded to the best papers, but to a range of papers – including those that need more help. Another suggestion is made regarding the possibility of a pre-application workshop that could take place so that every applicant is aware of the standards and expectations of formatting to offer the same chance to every potential applicant.

17. Nominations Committee

The main concern for the Nominations Committee is that they had just enough nominations this year to proceed, but we should think about how we can encourage participation in future years.

18. SASE Women and Gender Forum

The activities of the Women and Gender forum at the 2021 conference are read out, and it is explained that the women and gender forum have hosted successful webinars between SASE conferences and will continue to do so this year.

19. Social Sciences for the Real World

It is noted that the speakers for Social Sciences for the Real World at SASE 2021 have been booked and they will be giving a session on time management and the impact of capitalism on time.

20. SASE RISE V - Regional conference

It is explained that the fifth SASE RISE will be taking place virtually due to the COVID19 pandemic, and that submissions were now open.

21. Alice Amsden Award Committee

It is revealed that 23 eligible books were submitted for the Alice Amsden Award 2021. The winning book was revealed to be "Sorting Out the Mixed Economy: The Rise and Fall of Welfare and Developmental States in the Americas" by Amy Offner.

An honourable mention was also award to "Neoliberal Resilience: Lessons in Democracy and Development from Latin America and Eastern Europe" by Aldo Madariaga