



Executive Council Meeting December 2021

Monday 13th December 2021, Virtual Meeting

Present

President: Jacqueline O'Reilly

President Elect: Santos Ruesga

Past President: Sigrid Quack

Treasurer: Nina Bandelj

Executive Director: Annelies Fryberger

EC Members

- Zsuzsanna Vargha
- Heather Haveman
- Elizabeth Gorman
- Timur Ergen
- Franklin Obeng-Odoom
- Chiara Benassi
- Emily Erikson
- Katherine Chen
- Michelle Hsieh
- Jeanne Lazarus
- Marta Castilho
- Eunmi Mun
- Kim Pernel
- Nana De Graaff
- Ying Chen
- Monika Krause
- Virag Molnar
- Karen Shire

Local Organizers

- Tony Dundon (Limerick)
- Caroline Murphy (Limerick)
- Noreen Heraty (Limerick)
- Marta dos Reis Castilho (Rio)
- Daniel Mügge (Amsterdam)

SASE Staff

- Pat Zraidi
- Jacob Bromberg
- Shaun William Owen

MEETING OPENED AT 3PM CET BY JACQUELINE O'REILLY

1. Welcome and Introduction

Jacqueline O'Reilly opened the meeting by thanking and welcoming those present. Jacqueline O'Reilly goes on to explain that the purpose of having a meeting in December is to reduce the strain on the executive council meeting at the SASE annual meeting in Amsterdam, and to allow members to have their opinions heard earlier on in the decision-making process.

It is explained by Jacqueline O'Reilly that the meeting is open to the 24 elected members of the executive council, who all have voting rights, as well SASE officers, SASE staff, local organizing teams, and honorary members.

Jacqueline O'Reilly introduces SASE Executive Director Annelies Fryberger, who adds that the network forum organiser representative is another member of executive council with the right to access the executive council meeting, but they do not have voting rights.

Annelies Fryberger then clarifies some procedural points for the meeting, stating that a quorum of 13 voting members is needed to vote on motions (out of the 24 eligible executive council members). It is further stated that in order to be voted on, motions need to be proposed by a voting member and seconded by a different voting member and that motions will pass with a simple majority.

Jacqueline O'Reilly wraps this section up by thanking Annelies Fryberger and the SASE staff for their work and introduces the first section of the meeting – the approval of the minutes from the previous executive council meeting on June 29th 2021

2. Approval of June 2021 Council Minutes

Proposal: Motion to approve the June 29th 2021 executive council meeting minutes.

Explanation: Members had received the June 29th 2021 executive council meeting minutes ahead of time via email, and the floor was opened for any questions relating to the contents of these minutes.

Discussion: A question was raised as to whether or not the minutes from the June 2021 executive council meeting were available only to members or to the general public. It was clarified that these minutes would be available to everybody, including the general public.

With this clarified, four points were raised regarding the minutes from the June 2021 executive council meeting and the motion was altered to reflect that members were voting on approval of these minutes subject to the following four points being changed:

- 1) The explanation for point 9 (SER nomination committee) to be expanded to explain the motion being proposed, as it presently only covers the procedure of the vote.
- 2) Clarification on page 15 regarding potential future conferences sites to better explain the point that was raised regarding Toronto.
- 3) Also regarding potential future conference sites, it is explained that for the University of Seoul, there was not sufficient support inside the organisation at the time of contact for hosting a SASE meeting and the minutes from the June 2021 Executive Council Meeting should reflect this.
- 4) Regarding childcare, the more inclusive term 'caretakers' should be used rather than 'women' to reflect those with childcare duties.

VOTE – MOTION: Motion to approve the June 2021 executive council meeting minutes pending the four listed changes.

- Yea - 14
- Nay - 0
- Abstain - 1

MOTION PASSED

3. SASE in Limerick 2024

On the back of the June 2021 executive council meeting, where it was decided that a vote on holding the 2024 SASE conference in Limerick should wait until more financial details were available, the local organizing team was invited to give a presentation on their proposal for the 2024 conference.

Proposal: Motion to approve SASE in Limerick 2024

Explanation:

The local organizing team from Limerick (Tony Dundon, Caroline Murphy, and Noreen Heraty) opened with a powerpoint presentation. This presentation outlined that:

- The host institution is committed to diversity, inclusion, and environmentalism.
- 90+ breakout rooms are available, each seating 30 – 375 delegates.
- The concert hall seats up to 1,000 delegates.
- All rooms have AV equipment and technical support can be on hand.
- All conference centres are close to each other and the on-site accommodation.
- On-site accommodation consists of 1,500 en-suite and 1,000 non en-suite bedrooms in residential villages of individual 6/4 room apartments. Continental breakfast is provided daily.
- Off-site accommodation consists of 3 hotels, which differ in quality and price point, very close to campus. Limerick city centre is 4km away and has a range of accommodation options.
- Limerick is linked directly to Europe and North America via Shannon Airport, with Dublin and Cork also providing access from many locations.
- Ferries to the East of Ireland are available from the UK, France, The Netherlands, and Spain.
- The local organizers have a wide range of social and touristic activities to recommend.
- Both the campus and the local organizers have a lot of experience hosting large international events

Finally, the local organizing team gave the provisional draft budget provided to SASE, which varied based on the number of delegates.

Jaqueline O'Reilly and Annelies Fryberger thanked the local organizers for their co-operation and attention to detail in putting the draft budget proposal together. It is explained that the conference dates would be the 27th to the 29th June 2024.

The floor is opened to questions.

Discussion:

The issue of childcare at the conference is raised and it is revealed that childcare facilities do exist on the Limerick campus for staff, but that this has not been accounted for organizationally for the SASE conference or costed in the draft budget. The local organizers will make enquiries and feed their results back to SASE.

It is asked whether SASE organizers were aware of other similar conference dates around the same time in 2024, with EGOS and CES being of particular interest, so as not to cause a clash. The response is that SASE organizers are taking other major conference dates into account, however with regards to EGOS their dates have not yet been set for 2024. SASE Organizers will follow up with both EGOS and CES regarding their dates.

It is asked of SASE organizers how the cost per person for the Limerick proposal compares to other SASE conferences. The explanation reveals that the cost per person is on the higher end of the scale, but still reflects very good value for the proposal – particularly in light of the accommodation possibilities for attendees. This is followed up by an explanation that the catering costs for Limerick 2024 would be offset by a separate opt-in charge for attendees who wish to have lunch provided, and those not wishing to participate will have the option of going to local cafes and restaurants.

It is also noted at this stage that the Irish tourist board would offer €10 per attendee, which could see another €10,000 towards the conference based on 1,000 members attending.

VOTE –Motion to approve SASE in Limerick 2024

- Yea - 15
- Nay - 0
- Abstain – 0

MOTION PASSED

SASE in Rio 2023

As with Limerick 2024, it was decided at the June 2021 executive council meeting that a vote on holding the 2023 SASE conference in Rio should wait until more details were available. The local organizing team for Rio was invited to give a presentation on their proposal for the 2023 conference.

Proposal: Motion to approve SASE in Rio 2023

Explanation: The local organizer for Rio (Marta dos Reis Castilho) opened with a powerpoint presentation. This presentation outlined that:

- Rio is served internationally by two airports, and local flights from nearby Sao Paulo are readily accessible.
- The conference would be held at the Praia Vermelha campus in the Urca district of Rio where a range of accommodations at a range of price points are available.
- SASE will have access to a range of rooms, including 4 auditoria, with high quality Wi-Fi available everywhere.
- A fully costed budget is provided by the local organizers, with the assurance that despite recent economic problems they will be seeking external funding for the conference as the economic climate is expected to improve in 2022 and 2023
- The 20th – 22nd July 2023 is given as the conference dates, as classrooms will not be available until this time.

Discussion: Annelies Fryberger opened the discussion by clarifying that although SASE would be working on the assumption of fewer attendees than for a conference in Europe or North America (the figure of 800, similar to Kyoto was given), the cost for items such as catering is much lower in Rio than in these continents, and as such Rio is an attractive proposal.

Both Annelies Fryberger and Santos Ruesga highlighted that SASE has a large contingent of South American members, as evidenced by the attendance at the biennial SASE RISE Conference, which could work in favor of choosing Rio as a conference site.

The floor was then opened for questions.

The question of safety in Rio is brought up by multiple members, and it is explained that the conference site is very secure and all the amenities needed are nearby. With regards to the Coronavirus pandemic, travel distance, and security, many members discussed the possibility of running a hybrid

conference. These questions were noted to be revisited during a later portion of the meeting when hybrid issues would be discussed in relation to Amsterdam.

The local organizing staff assured that they would be available to help find and disseminate information regarding healthcare and insurance, especially in the event that the COVID-19 pandemic would still be a problem.

Concerns were raised regarding the carbon footprint of a meeting so far away from SASE's core member bases in Europe and North America, but this point was offset by a discussion highlighting the benefits for the membership and the organization of bringing the conference to other parts of the world.

The question of whether or not a RISE conference would also take place in the same year was put to the SASE organising staff, the answer was that yes a RISE conference would take place but it would be in another location in South America.

One last clarification was made stating that although the hotels are accessible by bicycle, bus, or taxi, they are not within walking distance to the campus.

Vote: Motion to approve SASE in Rio 2023

- **Yea - 13**
- **Nay - 0**
- **Abstain – 3**

MOTION PASSED

4. SASE in USA (/North America) 2025

Annelies Fryberger opened this segment by explaining that normally the search for a conference site is the role of the President-Elect, however they are often aided by the SASE Staff and executive council members. Annelies Fryberger then made it explicitly clear that SASE is looking for leads or ideas for conference sites located in North America for the 2025 conference and would encourage any executive council members who have ideas to come forward.

No vote was tabled for this section of the meeting so the following is an outline of the discussion that was generated from the call for ideas from Annelies Fryberger.

The first question proposed was whether or not Canada had been considered as an option for SASE 2025 with Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver given as possible sites of interest to the SASE community.

It was explained that SASE had previously contacted the University of Montreal, but there was a lack of support and concerns over the lack of transport between university buildings. SASE was advised to follow up again in a few years and it was stated that it may be possible to go back to this university in 2025.

University of Massachusetts Amherst was proposed as a more rural location, but with a solid infrastructure for hosting a SASE conference. It is further explained that this university is seen as one of the epicentres of heterodox economics and as such would be a good fit for a SASE conference, however concerns are raised regarding accommodation due to the small size of the town.

Yale was brought up as an option for hosting SASE 2025, although concerns are raised about the lack of large amphitheatres and the lack of hotels in the area.

Jacqueline O'Reilly explains that a form is available for prospective host universities that outlines SASE's needs for a venue hosting a SASE conference. This form will be distributed to the executive council members, who can use it to follow up a lead to test viability.

The University of Virginia, Missouri, and Kansas City are all mentioned briefly as possible options to explore.

The question of whether North American universities typically have the capability of hosting conferences of this size was raised, with multiple members stating that they usually attend conferences similar to this in dedicated conference venues or hotels.

The response from SASE staff is that this is something that has been looked into previously, the example given was a hotel in Portland, Oregon that had provided a 'good' quote based on SASE occupying 34 seminar rooms, a larger keynote room, having audio-visual capability, and hosting 600 members overnight (with other members having the separate option of staying elsewhere in the local area).

Finally, Jacqueline O'Reilly asked if she should follow up with a contact at the University of West Indies in Jamaica. The responses are that it would be a good idea to follow this lead up and that it is within the remit of finding a conference site in North America.

As there is no vote scheduled, it is decided that SASE Staff would forward the SASE conference form to the executive council members and that those with leads should follow them up and bring their findings to the executive council meeting in Amsterdam.

5. SASE RISE V

No vote was tabled for this section of the meeting

SASE President-Elect Santos Ruesga was invited to give a rundown on the fifth SASE RISE conference that had been held between the 1st and 3rd of December 2021.

Santos Ruesga opened by explaining that due to complications surrounding the Coronavirus Pandemic the meeting had to be moved online and was not hosted in Lima, Peru as had been planned. He further noted that this had an impact on the number of participants, which was down from estimations.

It was further reported that the first day suffered from a few technical glitches which were able to be ironed out for the subsequent days of the conference. Despite this, it was noted that the conference proved to be a great opportunity to exchange ideas, suggestions, and to aid in publishing work for the SASE members that attended.

Looking towards the future, Santos Ruesga explained that the frontrunner for the next SASE RISE Conference is a university in Ecuador, but it is stated that negotiations are in the early stages.

7. Changes to bylaws

Annelies Fryberger introduced this section by explaining that changes to the bylaws need to be approved by the executive council before being ratified by at least 2/3rds of the membership. It is proposed that this vote be enabled on-site at the 2022 SASE conference, as well as online at www.sase.org to increase accessibility.

It is further explained that there will be three votes, with each motion being voted on individually. The exact wording of each proposed change was supplied to members of the executive council in advance of the meeting and any changes made live were communicated.

Proposal 1: Include SER governance rules in by-laws, and specify the role of SER editors in the Executive Council.

Explanation: Previously, the only reference to the Socio-Economic Review in the SASE by-laws was a line stating that SASE would maintain and support the journal. This by-law change proposition would see the creation of a new Article VII that would reference the fact that SER will be governed in accordance to the SER Governance rules that were adopted by the SASE Executive Council in 2018, and that changes to these rules must be approved by the SASE Executive Council.

Discussion: The first proposition is that the sentence stating that SASE would maintain and support the journal be left in Article II where it currently resides, as it is more fitting of a section entitled 'Purposes and Guiding Philosophy'. This point was taken into account, and the sentence was taken out of the proposed Article VII by-law change.

It is asked whether or not the wording should be so specific to the Socio-Economic Review, or whether it would be more beneficial in the long term to use more generic language to allow the support of other journals. The response to this question was that as SASE is currently only supporting SER, and as supporting other journals is something that would have to go through an approval process regardless, then it makes more sense for the time being to refer only to SER in the by-laws.

Vote: Motion to add Article VII: SER Governance to the by-laws

- **Yea - 16**
- **Nay - 0**
- **Abstain - 0**

MOTION PASSED

Proposal 2: Include the category of 'institutional members' and require members to acknowledge SASE's Diversity and anti-harassment statement and code of conduct.

Explanation: This proposed change would change the language in Article V to add institutional memberships alongside individual memberships, to allow SASE to offer institutional membership.

It would also be specified that while individual members all have equal voting power, institutional members do not have voting rights.

The final addition to Article V would see SASE publish a code of conduct and make explicit acknowledgment and acceptance of it a condition of SASE membership, which would allow SASE to have a procedural course of action to follow in the event a grievance is brought against a member.

Discussion: The first question raised was related to the pricing of institutional membership, and how it would differ from individual membership. It was explained that this had been decided upon during the last executive council meeting.

A second point was raised about clarifying the language surrounding the definition of membership to clearly include all due-paying individuals and institutions. This point was incorporated into the proposed change to the bylaw.

It was proposed that the system that distinguishes individual members from institutional members be named 'categories' (instead of 'classes'). This change was incorporated into the proposed change to the bylaw.

Vote: Motion to revise Article V of the by-laws per discussion

- Yea - 15
- Nay - 0
- Abstain – 0

MOTION PASSED

Proposal 3: Update Article XII of the by-laws so that the language refers to the latest version of the by-laws. Also, in light of the new Article VII, all subsequent by-laws would be renumbered to reflect their correct position.

Explanation: This change would ensure that the proposed changes and the SASE governance model that was adopted in 2019 would form the current SASE bylaws. It would also ensure a clear numbering system for articles within the by-laws.

Discussion: There were no questions regarding this proposal.

Vote: Motion to remaining proposed changes to Bylaws.

- Yea - 16
- Nay - 0
- Abstain – 0

MOTION PASSED

8. Storage of personal data on SASE's website

Annelies Fryberger began this section by talking about SASE's efforts to remove contact details from the www.sase.org website in light of a spate of phishing attacks against Executive Council Members. The proposal is to remove all contact details for all SASE members that are held in SASE's online membership database 'Suave'. This would be for both security reasons and to comply with GDPR laws.

Proposal: Motion to remove all member contact information and obtain informed consent at registration for Amsterdam.

Explanation: It is explained that in addition to GDPR compliance and security, the recent SASE member Survey revealed that most SASE members are unaware of the membership database, meaning that it is also not serving its intended purpose to members currently.

Discussion: The first question posed to the Executive council is whether not they have used the Suave database. The feedback from this question is that the database has only been used by a handful of Executive Council members.

It is questioned what data is used in the Suave database, and the answer for this explains that all user data is stored and presented in this database.

It is then asked that the current proposition be clarified, as to whether the discussion is to make Suave GDPR compliant, or to close it down entirely. It is explained that both options are currently on the table and it is an open discussion for the Executive Council.

The opinion that there is the possibility that Suave could be a benefit to members if it were more well-known and advertised is raised.

The possibility of looking for an alternative database system is raised; however, the vote is simplified to reflect the immediate GDPR and security concerns with a view to fixing these after the 2022 SASE conference in Amsterdam.

Vote: Motion to remove all member contact information and obtain informed consent for inclusion in the SuAVE database at registration for Amsterdam.

● **Yea - 14**

● **Nay - 0**

● **Abstain - 0**

MOTION PASSED

9. SASE in Amsterdam 2022

Local organizer Daniel Mügge of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) opens the conversation by giving a brief overview of SASE 2022, noting that the in-person portion of the conference remains on track organizationally.

Daniel Mügge then followed up by discussing the proposed hybrid conference formats. It was explained that at the University of Amsterdam, a unidirectional

hybrid format in the form of livestreaming prominent sessions would be possible for SASE 2022, but a more interactive two-way hybrid format involving interaction between those in person and online would not be possible without involving an external company at great cost.

Annelies Fryberger clarified that there is also the possibility for fully multi-directional interactive hybrid sessions once per session slot (for a total of 11), using the Virtual Learning Theatre at UvA.

The first feedback given was to express a lack of confidence in hybrid formats, with the idea of fully in person or fully online sessions proposed as a better alternative.

It is then proposed that if some sessions were to take place fully virtually, would there be a benefit in having them at the same time as the in-person conference or could these online sessions be held at a different time?

Members who had recently attended a different academic conference were critical of the hybrid format used at that particular conference, stating that it added to a feeling of disconnectedness as well as increasing the price of the conference – with many attendees choosing to log on to the online portion from their hotel rooms in the host city.

The 'Owl' conferencing hardware was brought up by a number of members as a possibility for running hybrid sessions, with the consensus being that it is not suitable for a conference of SASE's size as the sound becomes distorted and the cost per unit is \$1,000. However, some members reported that it does work well in a smaller, boardroom context.

It was reiterated from earlier in the meeting that the recent SASE RISE event experienced some difficulties due to its online format, and it was suggested that many conference benefits no longer existed in a virtual format, such as informal discussions and networking.

A question regarding whether it would be possible to broadcast smaller sessions unidirectionally was raised, to at least offer some of the in-person experience to virtual attendees. This question was answered directly by Daniel Mügge who responded by saying that while it was technically possible, it was not advisable due to the fact that each session would require technical input to stream which would increase the complication and likelihood of problems. Daniel Mügge did however restate that due to the existing infrastructure this is something that is possible to do more easily in the larger amphitheatre for the more prominent sessions.

Jacqueline O'Reilly agreed with Daniel Mügge and added that keeping things simple on a technical level would give SASE the best chance of running a successful conference. The point was then raised that while this philosophy is sensible, SASE took a large risk that paid off in running the 2020 virtual

conference by experimenting with different formats and that the organization should be open to new ideas.

One member raised the issue of the pandemic and how global health concerns mean that many members could be forbidden or unable to travel to the conference, potentially at the last minute, and that plans should be put in place to accommodate this. Another member added on to this that even when possible, strict quarantine restrictions on return could make traveling for a conference an unattractive proposition.

Having a conference held over a certain number of days in-person followed by a certain number of days virtually (or vice-versa) was raised as a potential solution, however it was highlighted that whether to apply for the virtual conference or not is a decision that would have to have a deadline and thus would not necessarily catch all the cases of members being unable to travel at the last minute. It is also noted that some conferences have suffered from member inertia from being presented with too many choices, resulting in the members not submitting at all.

The concept of charging different fees for different participation methods was discussed, with some members being of the opinion that virtual attendees will be receiving less of an experience and should pay less, and others believing that the members still have access to the main benefits of the conference and should be charged the same price. There is also a concern raised that if virtual attendance was cheaper then universities that fund conference attendance could potentially only offer funding for the cheaper format.

Annelies Fryberger thanked the Executive council for the wide range of opinions and suggestions, and put the final decision to a vote based on the feedback received.

Vote: Option 1 in-person with limited on-site hybrid - 'Hybrid Lite'

In person conference with streamed keynote speakers and up to 11 hybrid sessions in a dedicated room.

- Yea - 8
- Nay - 2
- Abstain - 3

Vote: Option 2 - 3 days in Amsterdam and 1 day Zoom

- Yea - 5
- Nay - 6
- Abstain - 2

OPTION 1 MOTION PASSED.

MEETING BROUGHT TO A CLOSE.