



The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth

COMMITTEE MEETING

29 June 2010,

Room 109, Deptford Town Hall, Goldsmiths, University of London,

13.30hrs

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies**
- 2. Minutes of 12-03.2010**
- 3. Matters arising**
- 4. Reports (Written reports to be circulated in advance, please, minimal and urgent verbal reports only at the meeting)**
 - a. Chair**
 - b. Administrator**
 - c. Treasurer**
 - d. Ethics**
 - e. Networks**
 - f. Publications**
 - g. Media**
- 5. ASA conferences - review and plans**
 - a. Proposal for conference guidelines**
 - b. Firth Lecture 2010**
 - c. ASA 2010**
 - d. ASA 2011**
 - e. ASA 2012**
- 6. Dates of meetings 2010.**

Chair's Report

It has been relatively quiet since the AGM in Belfast in April.

1. Research councils

New ESRC boards are now operating. ESRC is preparing for RCUK cuts that will be announced in the Autumn, and will be significant. Some changes in policy are already apparent (no new 10 year centres; 5-year centres and large grants considered under the same call). When DTC/DTU results are announced, this will be without the numbers of doctoral quotas allocated to them.

2. REF consultation

The ASA orchestrated an anthropology response to the call for consultation by the Research Evaluation Framework office at HEFCE.

They wrote to us, with a second round of consultation. I discussed our reply with HODS, the former Chair of the RAE panel (Hastings Donnan); the Chair of Development Studies Association, and others, and liaised with the ACSS to get out points over.

Their letter, below, is followed by our response.

Dear Professor Fairhead,

I am writing to invite the Association of Social Anthropologists to comment upon a prospective change to the proposed panel configuration for the Research Excellence Framework (REF).

We have now consulted widely on our new proposals for the assessment of university research and have issued some initial decisions based upon the significant volume of responses we received (http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/circlets/2010/cl04_10/). We have confirmed that there will be 30 to 40 sub-panels working under the guidance of four main panels. However, before confirming the final configuration, we would like to extend our dialogue in this area due to certain changes we may make as a result of the consultation outcomes. It is in this regard that I am contacting organisations, such as yourselves, for their comments.

We received a significant amount of feedback on our configuration of the panels to assess area studies and languages (I have included the originally proposed structure as an attachment). In the responses to the consultation, it was noted in particular that European studies was not well-placed within the European Languages and Studies Unit of Assessment (UOA); and that the location of the Area Studies UOA in main panel D was problematic due to the significant amount of social science work that would be returned to this UOA.

To address some of the issues arising from the originally proposed configuration, we are considering restructuring these UOAs. We propose to create an interdisciplinary social sciences UOA, located in main panel C, to which social sciences research in area and development studies, linguistics, anthropology and possibly archaeology could be returned. In main panel D, we propose to create a languages and literature UOA, to

which humanities and language-based research in area studies, modern languages and linguistics could be returned. We do not intend that these should be directly mapped from the previous RAE UOAs, but instead we would need to develop new descriptors that would ensure all fields of research in these areas are covered.

We would like to invite you to comment on this proposal. In particular, we would welcome the view of your organisation on the potential range and coherence of each proposed UOA. We would be grateful if you could respond to this invitation by Friday 30 April.

Kind regards,
Kim Hackett

Kim Hackett
Higher Education Policy Adviser
Research Policy

0117 931 7267
k.hackett@hefce.ac.uk<<mailto:k.hackett@hefce.ac.uk>>
<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

Dear Kim Hackett,

Many thanks for your kind invitation to comment on the new HEFCE proposal on panel composition.

Anthropology has long been a small but extremely successful discipline in the UK. We are very concerned that a unit of assessment called 'Interdisciplinary Social Sciences' misrepresents our disciplinary nature. Anthropology is the discipline of anthropology in the UK and has been a discipline for good reason for more than a century. In the recent International Benchmarking of the discipline, anthropology in the UK was considered to be extremely powerful in a range of core areas in this discipline globally.

It is true that we work across an extremely wide variety of interdisciplinary engagements given the holistic nature of our discipline, but these engagements are with the natural sciences, the social sciences and the arts and humanities - and not just the ad hoc grouping of small social sciences gathered in this suggested grouping. We would therefore suggest that the name of the sub-panel must be changed. This is not an 'interdisciplinary social science panel' and should not be represented as such. Anthropology should be named in the title of the Sub Panel.

Given the many potential disciplines with which anthropology might be placed, whichever option is eventually chosen will inevitably be ad hoc and yet it will also have some meaning. The proposed association of anthropology (including, we suppose, biological anthropology) with linguistics, archaeology and 'area and development studies' certainly has merits. Nevertheless, it should be recalled that we also have equally strong links with sociology (as your earlier choice of partner acknowledged) and with environmental sciences, history, philosophy etc. etc.. The eventual choice of partners in a panel thus risks introducing damaging biases into the discipline's future. Measures need to be taken to

prevent this.

In particular, the sub-panel structure now proposed, like the sub-panel structure proposed before, brings together disciplines which in many HEIs do not work together as 'coherent research units' and which have different methodological protocols and different patterns of publication and impact. This will make it enormously difficult for any such panel to devise and agree equitable working methods when the exercise eventually begins. It does not make academic sense (and risks being extremely damaging) for this ad hoc grouping of subjects to have a merged descriptor.

HEFCE also risks introducing illegitimate biases into research evaluation, favouring work in anthropology that relates to the other disciplines in the sub-panel, at the expense of anthropological research that does not. We are acutely worried that anthropological research conducted in universities which do not share the partner disciplines of this particular grouping and which engage with other interdisciplinary areas, will risk being submitted under other panels (of those other interdisciplinary areas), thus rendering a very large proportion of anthropological research invisible. Our second recommendation is therefore that if this grouping is to be maintained, it is essential that Anthropology (and other disciplinary components of this panel) should remain visible as a subject with its own descriptor and own quality profile.

Third, leaving the evaluation of a discipline to an informal grouping (an informal sub sub panel) of such an ad hoc constituted sub-panel is unacceptable. We suggest in the strongest possible terms that the constitution and operation of sub-sub panels be formalised. As we suggested in our original submission to the consultation exercise, HEFCE's brief is the selective allocation of funding, not the reshaping of disciplines or HEI structures. Leaving the constitution of 'sub sub panels' as informal within an ad hoc grouping of disciplines goes beyond this brief in both ways, and risks damaging the disciplines nationally and internationally.

The question of panel configuration cannot be addressed aside from questions of whether single or multiple submissions will be permissible and visible. In HEFCE's recent published response to the REF consultation, HEFCE suggested that multiple submissions to the same unit might be made in exceptional circumstances. We would expect that it would be more normal for universities to make multiple submissions to this panel. It would be wholly improper, if, following an ad hoc decision to locate anthropology within this particular disciplinary mix, universities are required to submit anthropology as a single unit with those partners. Requiring HEIs to put together composite submissions for groups of disciplines that have been joined for essentially bureaucratic reasons would seriously compromise our confidence in the REF process. This would also make the provision of a coherent statement about the environment problematic in universities with two or more of the composite disciplines, but not for universities which by fate alone only had one of the constituent disciplines.

To sum up, as an association we welcome the thought that HEFCE have put into this vexing question. There is no easy solution. Our association is not able to endorse or suggest any particular sub-panel combinations, although we see merits in the one proposed. Given the current informality of sub-sub panels, any particular combination will be seen to favour some UK anthropology departments over others for ad hoc reasons, because different departments support different specialisms. Our concern is not

which combination is most appropriate, but how to prevent in any combination the evaluation biases and the damaging consequences on the breadth of the discipline.

We are concerned that if HEFCE does not address these concerns that they are putting a highly successful discipline at great risk for no reason other than administrative convenience and (possibly) a small financial saving.

We would note that our association speaks for social anthropology. A third of anthropology submissions to RAE 2008 included biological anthropology either exclusively or as a component of a combined submission, and this needs to be factored into decisions concerning sub-panel composition and operation.

Yours sincerely

Professor James Fairhead

Academy of Social Sciences

ACSS have welcomed us back into the fold following our AGM decision to rejoin. They have presented a bill.

World Council of Anthropological Associations

This continues to expand and is fast becoming the important 'Association of Associations'. It is perhaps not surprising to find that many of the issues we face in the UK (concerning the visibility of anthropology) are faced by colleagues in other countries.

ASA Treasurer's Report

1. The current balances are:

Main/subscriptions account - 14,299

Conference - 20,312 [some invoices yet to be paid]

Reserves - 30,036 [£22 accrued in interest so far this year!]

Firth bond - 29,665 [£349 accrued in interest at a higher rate so far]

(Note that the balances cited in March report were from the end of year accounts 2009, not the actual balance at the time).

2. Of the £18,000 in subs that have been invoiced this year, approx £14,000 has been collected. Approximately £9,000 of subscriptions and previous arrears is still to be collected off 141 members. There are 584 members at present of which approximately a half would be eligible for Direct Debit, out of which 200 have been arranged. Ro plans to send termination threats in early July, which may result in the loss of about 20 members (approx £2,000 of the forecasted income).

3. Administration charges have now changed from a per hour rate to a more transparent product-based matrix – that is, paying for specific things at specific rates based upon the number of members. The total for this year will come to £7,300. In comparison, last year's estimate was £7,000, of which Ro had billed for £6,500. He will be monitoring how this matrix works and may look to revise it in 2011.

4. The ASA conference in Belfast 2010 came in at a loss of approx £1,500. James (Fairhead) and I have agreed to split the loss with the university so long as the £500 ASA seed money is also taken into account as part of the share of loss. However an agreement has not been reached on this proposal.

5. The Committee needs to come to a firm decision on to what extent, if at all, the ASA are prepared to share a loss for ASA conferences and whether this calculation should include the conference seed money (which the ASA normally retrieves). The decision should be made clear to conference organisers in the UK and an agreement made in writing before the seed money is issued. A template ought to be agreed by the Committee for Atreyee to send to conference organisers in the UK.

6. The online members' directory will be launched when an introductory note has been written with an £800 set-up fee, and approx £700 annual costs for licensing the service.

7. Overall, the financial position of the ASA is healthy with annual subscription income covering the main costs and enabling a surplus. This surplus is of increasing importance if we are to uphold our commitment to help with conference attendance for students and scholars from the 'south' as well as support a conference in India in 2012.

Admin report

Membership admin

Raminder has given the stats on this. Basically subs collection proceeds positively, and we are slowly reducing the arrears and are increasing the number collected by Direct debit. One way to reduce the arrears will be to axe some non-payers (this year and last year outstanding), and I will be sending a list to the Treasurer shortly, with a suggested final email. She can then email them informing them that their membership will be terminated. We haven't mailed them books, so we have only incurred admin costs. This should reduce arrears by 2k and member numbers by about 20.

Membership directory

We are ready to launch this to members. I have sent a suggested email to the Chair and await confirmation of that. That email will then launch the online directory to our members.

ASA10

The accounts are more or less reconciled, but I am waiting on clarification regarding the venue bill (which I am seeking to reduce). Once that is in, I can provide a closing balance. It is likely that there will be a loss of 1.5k, which isn't bad considering the size of the conference.

ASA11

No idea: haven't heard from Penny. Will chase.

ASA12

I submitted the WGF application largely written by Atreyee. I was then asked to update the budget and did so. I assume it is now in process. I remain concerned at the nature of communication with Susan in India, and think that maybe a visit to her in October, as suggested by Nayanika, is a good idea. It would also allow me to size up the venue, etc. I would seek funding for my ticket from the ASA, but would pay my own costs once there.

Ethics report

- 1) Belfast ethics of reconciliation panel was well attended (~30); plan to submit contributions for publication
- 2) All members have been emailed regarding amendments to ethics code, which will be updated over summer/autumn, whereupon it will be sent to Comm for approval, then members, before taking it to 2011 AGM.

Network report

AOB held its annual general meeting in Belfast at the ASA10 with about 15 members attending.

C-SAP Report

C-SAP/HEA Funding Situation

The funding squeeze is continuing and has had dramatic effects across the Higher Education Academy. Most people are hopeful that the Academy will continue to exist, but realistically it is likely to be in a different form. Several scenarios are being discussed, but no definite announcements have been made. All I can say is that there does appear to be a commitment to working directly with disciplinary communities, but we may well be looking at a reduction in the number of subject centres (currently 24) and those that remain will have to serve more disciplines with less staff. C-SAP is preparing for this by restructuring to demonstrate its effectiveness. I have attached a consultation document from the director entitled 'Working Differently, Working Better'. This will be discussed with the reference groups on July 9th, but I am happy to take the committee's views back to C-SAP about this.

My 0.4 FTE contract as anthropology coordinator will end on July 31st this year and not be renewed but I hope to continue working with CSAP on a consultancy basis. This will include working with the anthropology DIG (see below). This raises a question about my role on this committee which we could discuss at the meeting.

ASA/C-SAP teaching prize

The teaching prize has been advertised again this year so please draw colleagues attention to it and encourage any suitable applicants. Since C-SAP will not be holding an annual conference in November 2010 we need to think about a suitable occasion to present the award.

C-SAP Reference Group

The C-SAP reference group has grown considerably in the last 12 months. However you will see from the attached consultation document that reference groups are to be replaced by DIG's (Disciplinary Interest Groups). This is the way in which C-SAP proposes to maintain its close links with disciplinary communities given that in the current situation we cannot employ 3 separate disciplinary coordinators. The main difference is that rather than simply meeting biannually to hear the coordinator's report and express disciplinary concerns the DIGs will be more flexible and autonomous. They can meet as often or as little as they like and organize themselves to access HEA funding opportunities and articulate disciplinary concerns via C-SAP. Each DIG will have a consultant paid by C-SAP who works in the discipline and has experience of working with c-sap. The consultation document describes this person as the Chair, but in discussions that have already taken place there seems to be a strong feeling that in order to maintain autonomy the chair should be independent of C-SAP. The consultant would therefore be more like a paid officer responsible for facilitating meetings and liaising with C-Sap and the HEA.

Early Career Lecturers Events

The event preceding the Belfast conference was successful and received good feedback, but suffered from low attendance. This raises a question about whether to proceed with a similar event attached to ASA 2011 or whether to look at other ways of offering this kind of provision. The ASA offered 10 funded places this year which will not have been taken up. The ASA can invoice C-SAP for the return of the remaining moneys. Two delegates who missed the event have asked C-SAP for a refund. It appears they paid themselves for the event even though as ASA members they would have been entitled to free ASA places!

C-SAP: Working differently, working better

Context

This paper is written in response to the changing funding and priority environment facing the national higher education academy subject centre for sociology, anthropology and politics (C-SAP). The higher education sector as a whole is under closer scrutiny and is in a period of rapid change and movement. The HEA and in turn our centre needs to respond to the public call for accountability and benefit by showing how we are impacting on the student learning experience. As a centre we need to be able to show how our disciplines are relevant not only to academia but also to our external stakeholders; employers, government and students. In real terms this must take into account the national economic circumstances, the UK funding councils have asked us to respond with a 30% reduction in core funds to be achieved by 2012/13. This reduction will inevitably lead to a re-structure of the HEA but provides us with an opportunity to reassess the needs of the sector and respond in an imaginative and forward facing way. C-SAP's management team would like to take this opportunity to engage with you in this process through clarifying our role, functions and purpose.

Consultation

The Advisory Group meeting held in January 2010 gave the opportunity to discuss the Academy's future and potential barriers and enablers to change. Information on the need to respond to the reduction in funding in the next operational year (2010/11) by 10-15% has been communicated by email to our host institution, and reference groups. The current C-SAP team (academic and administrative staff) held an extremely useful away day in February 2010 to discuss our current strengths, weaknesses and ways of enhancing our activities.

The Academy has encouraged input into the review and re-focusing of our work through, the Advisory Boards Chairs meeting (Feb.2010); the Academy Forum; the values survey and the Institutional Partnership Programme (IPP). The future financial restraints will mean that we must offer clear consistent messages on what we do and how we work. As a result of current consultation up to this point we will be aligning our work under the themes of:

- Continuing and Professional Development of Teaching
 - **NSS**
 - Reward and recognition
 - OER
 - Islamic Studies
 - **External Examiners**
 - Innovative practice
- Enhancing the Student learning experience
 - Assessment

- ELT
 - Inclusion
 - Student Awards
 - HE in FE
 - Teaching International Students (TIS) **ESD**
 - EEL
 - Postgraduate work
 - **Student Engagement**
- Building the Network & Disseminating Good Practice
 - Departmental support
 - Institutional support
 - Host Institutional support
 - Professional association engagement

Working better

We offer the following recommendations as a way of taking this agenda forward in a transparent way in the reduced funding context:

1. C-SAP wants to continue to work closely with its distinct disciplinary groups. We believe we can make more of this disciplinary engagement through broader and more inclusive disciplinary meetings than are currently afforded through the reference group structure. We recommend the creation of Disciplinary Interest Groups (DIG) that will have broader membership to include academics and students. DIGs will have opportunities to bid for funds for both individual discipline and cross disciplinary engagement. Each DIG will have a Chair who will act as a paid consultant for C-SAP and will be responsible for the strategic development of the DIG, and for developing closer relations with professional associations and individual departments. The Chair will also be a member of the C-SAP Advisory Group.
2. We recommend the Advisory Group take a more pro-active role in the strategic management of C-SAP and provide an auditing role for activities and spending of the Center. We envisage a broader membership for the Advisory Group to include stakeholder groups currently unrepresented such as students, alumni and employers. The Advisory Group will receive and review current priorities and spending and assist the Co-Directors in strategic decision-making and planning.
3. We recommend we review the current role and practice of the thematic Specialist Interest Groups (SIGs) and academic funded project awards.
4. Engagement with and critique of national priorities needs to be ensured through continued distinct work in Scotland, Wales, England and Northern

Ireland. We recommend that this be done through greater emphasis on departmental and institutional engagement.

5. We recommend that we continue collaboration across the Networks. This may take the form of engagement with other Subject Centres, professional associations or University departments to enable wide participation with pedagogic practice across the disciplines. We have already clearly seen that collaborative activity has been beneficial in supporting new and emergent disciplines such as criminology but we need to explore the opportunities for income generation and co-sponsoring of activity.
6. We recommend that we explore how we can improve the effectiveness and impact of our publications and in particular review current costings for *ELISS*. We will explore the possibility of working with commercial publishers to enable us to continue to publish *ELISS* and monographs. We will also explore the development of our web pages to enable us to continue to offer wide and sustainable dissemination of published resources and in particular further develop guides on study skills and teaching skills.
7. We recommend replacing the annual conference with a series of focused events. Such events will endeavour to appeal to staff and students and the wider community, engage with professional development, policy and practice and where possible will seek to lead on debates in social sciences learning and teaching.
8. We recommend focused attention on engagement and support activities with departments through activities such as workshops and seminars on themes and issues of interest and concern such as, for instance, student feedback.

Each of the above recommendations is designed to enhance the ability of C-SAP to deliver its core business in the context of what will be a 30% reduction in funding. We are also hoping to develop a much more inclusive and transparent way of working with our stakeholders.

This is an intense period of change within which we hope you will continue to engage with and support C-SAP. This truly is an opportunity to develop the concepts of student engagement with our disciplines.

Helen Howard & Donna Lee
Co-Directors
C-SAP

April 2010.

*Cross Academy priorities are in bold



The Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth

COMMITTEE MEETING

12 March 2010. 1.30-4.30 pm Online meeting: <http://fm.ea-tel.eu/fm/4d4329-20317>

Minutes

Present: James Fairhead, Simone Abram, Raminder Kaur, James Staples, Kate Degnen, Ian Fairweather, Ro Jackson, Garry Marvin

7. Apologies

Nayanika (maternity leave, but reported submitted)

8. Minutes of 20-11-09

Were accepted as a true record of the meeting.

9. Matters arising

In response to action points on the minutes of 20.11.09:

- 1 – James has not circulated the AHRC document on impact.
- 2 – JS does not remember talking to Garry about reality TV ethics
- 3 – Ro started to prepare info about WCAA membership, but **will circulate info** once the website is finalised.
- 4 – JF doesn't have a great deal of info about the Sage handbook. **JS will contact RF directly.**
- 5 – Ro has archived last year's annals. There are still some missing depts this year. **Ro requested that committee members remind HoDs to submit if they haven't already.**
- 6 – Ro has made a note to **circulate networks with invitation to contribute to annals.**
- 7 – report on consultation over REF appended to chair's report to this meeting
- 8 – **IF still intending to circulate a-level curriculum.**
- 9 – SA has been in touch with Nafisa who is working on raising the profile of the A-level on the RAI website, and we have added a link to our ASA website.
- 10 – **JF still aims to have a paper on rejoining ACSS for the AGM.**
- 11 – Ro and SA did discuss automating ASAonline but have delayed for now. JF suggested asking HoDs to encourage people to submit to ASAonline.
- 12 – Proposal to bring together conference organisers to elaborate guidelines: Ro has been unable to get a response from Penny Dransart; Indian organiser won't be available. But the guidelines another look, so **it would be useful for Ro to revise the guidelines and circulate the committee** for comments to be suitable for the way we currently run confs. JF would like to see clarity over guidelines and welcomed the suggestion. Garry noted that Piers Locke has moved to New Zealand, and wondered whether there were implications for the conference. SA emailed Penny Dransart this morning. She will forward any reply that comes. JF has heard from Edinburgh that they are keen to develop an ASA conference proposal, but that's looking towards 2013.
- 13 – Ian was in touch with Ro about the early careers event.
- 14 – This item on enabling mass-mailing was not ready for action yet but will come up in the future – **Ro will notify James after all the DD's have come in.**

15 – Ro couldn't remember whether he had **invited bloggers via AM but will do it again** anyway.

16 – **Ro will add a note to the blog indicating views are not those of ASA asap.**

17 – NM has indicated that she is going to host an ethics event.

18 – According to JS's report it looks unlikely that a joint mailing of monographs in 2010 makes sense as they will be some time apart. It will also look better to get 09 out asap.

19 – no action required. NM is forwarding ethics issues as required.

20 – Ro has contacted Penny about ASA2011 but had no response. SA now chasing.

21 – don't know whether committee have emailed Easter vac dates to NM. **ALL: Please email easter dates to NM.**

22 – JF not sure whether NM sent a letter to send to JNU. **JF will contact NM** on this. RK having some delays in getting responses to requests to update abstract. Chris Pinney has not responded to blurb suggestions. But he did send a list of suggested speakers. **JS will circulate various proposals for discussion among committee.**

23 – JS suggested revisiting this issue in light of conference concerns under agenda item 7.

24 – moved to agenda item 7 too.

25. ditto

26 – JF did write to the sociology group about their India conference but has not had a response. RK reminded the committee that they were also organising a conference and we were hesitant about applying for funds in competition with them. Has also not had any update. **JF will try to catch up again on this.**

27, 28 – IF received the requested feedback except for the request for a speaker on external examining. Decided that a stand was unnecessary and it would be sufficient to put out publicity materials out at the conference.

29. JF and SA were both in touch with CA about taking over as secretary, which she was delighted to accept. They will brief her before the next meeting.

10. subsidising student travel

The question arose at the last meeting. In general we seem to agree that we should have a fund to help students or lower-income delegates to attend meetings. The questions are whether we put particular amounts aside for students or for commonwealth scholars, and whether we fund all expenses or just part fund, and how we keep the admin to a minimum. We could have a set of rules for international delegates and one for UK conferences. JS proposed two tracks: one for people to apply for the full amount (approx £1000 to fully fund two candidates per conference) and a second £1000 divided up as contributions part-funding (e.g. £100 each for speakers without other funding). We could develop details by email discussion. RK suggested putting this to AGM. CD thought that if we link the funding to the acceptance of abstracts, the timing might get very compressed. JF suggested the fund could go instead to the conference organisers to distribute. SA suggested offering this with a set of guidelines about what we think the purpose of the funds are. Committee agreed that this would be part of the conference guidelines/package. All applications should include one reference as a guarantor to the application. The first round of funding should be administered for the Lampeter conference 2011 as it is too late for 2010 now.

11. replacement for Trevor on ASA film competition

Trevor requested that the film competition be handed back to the committee. Garry would be interested in taking over. JF suggested Garry contacted Trevor directly. *[NB: reminder to JF to thank TM for his efforts at the AGM]*

12. Reports (Written reports to be circulated in advance, please, minimal and urgent verbal reports only at the meeting)

a. Publications – online publications strategy?

Was accepted.

b. C-SAP

IF wanted to know if ASA would sponsor teaching prize again this year, who would want to be on the committee, and whether a prize could be presented at ASA2011. JF thought the prize was a good thing that we should support. We will have to ask Lampeter to find a good space/time for presenting. **Kate volunteered to be on the prize committee and was thanked!** The prize will be £150 each from ASA and RAI. JF thanked CD and looked forward to meeting the networks in Belfast.

c. Media – media strategy?

GM noted lots of enquiries received and responded to. He has been working with the writer and producer for what looks likely to be a 6 part drama series featuring an anthropologist, which seems to be going quite well, first script almost ready. This could be significant for the profile of anthropology. It is a drama that involves crime, Morse-style anthropology, serious but light hearted, producers taking it extremely seriously. What is gratifying about the new drama is that it avoids the sensational but looks quite sensible and interesting.

He has also arranged to meet someone from the independent producers' association.

JF was very pleased to hear that tv producers were liaising with the ASA.

SA asked if there have been any queries from radio, and whether anyone heard the biography of Malinowski recently on radio3. GM has had requests from radio, of which he's weeded out very trivial ones.

d. Networks

CD apologised for not submitting a report. She thanked Ro for helping get AM up and running again. Amy Pollard, Gemma John and Rebecca Marsland are rejuvenating the committee.

Apply network is still active but unable to make Belfast. AoB also active, had a meeting in Sheffield recently and will be holding a meeting at ASA Belfast.

e. Ethics

NM submitted a report. JF was very happy with NM's participation in various ethics committees as per her report. SA asked whether anyone understood what the correspondence with Pnina had been about. Kate thought that Pnina's ethics committee might have been giving her a hard time on how to get consent for studying public meetings. Garry thought there were some issues on ethics but cannot see anything particular about filming public events. **JF suggested following this up on email where NM could help explain what the email exchange was about.** This is also not necessarily the same issue as the update of the guidelines. Go back to NM and ask for clarification and discuss it via email. Blog: JF does think that Ian Harper will get involved in the blog, but is a little delayed.

f. Treasurer

RK reported: 1. chasing up approx 6.5k in DD subscriptions - incentive of monograph would help. Point 4 concerned whether we should close the Lloyds account. Ro noted that we have moved all of our money into the Coop. We currently have about £85,000 in the coop.

Although we might be concerned about the financial crisis, Ro thinks that the Coop is less of a risk because it does not have a city section, and it has an ethical policy. For ease of use we could have all our money in one place. Kate noted that up to 50k is guaranteed by the govt if

a bank fails and suggested that we should be risk averse and put the balance over £50k into another institution. Raminder suggested putting the Firth account into another bank. JF suggested keeping the Lloyds account for now until we are sure about the position.

g. Chair

Reported on the REF consultation. No news as yet.

ESRC board membership has been vexing as we did not have enough time to respond to a request for applications to the new board structure. We are not well represented so we must pay attention to this. Only Marcus Banks is representing Anthropology on the peer review panel – Jonathan Spencer raised a concern. ESRC have not responded to JF's query about this.

h. Administrator

RJ reported that the direct debit system is now working well, and we have recently received about 60% of this year's subscriptions in one swoop. Invoices will go out for remaining amounts next week. The online directory should be ready to be announced at the AGM. Committee should be able to see a version within the next couple of weeks.

13. ASA conferences - review and plans

a. Proposal for conference guidelines

Discussed above.

b. Firth Lecture 2010

Crapanzano is booked in, will arrive Tuesday morning and no doubt spend time recovering from the journey. Wednesday is the Firth lecture. Wednesday evening we could take him out to dinner. James F, James S, Kate, possibly Garry. Ian would like to come too. **Ro will book a table.** (NB Kate is allergic to peanuts, so not Thai restaurant please).

c. ASA 2010

Everything is in place, panels, papers, an additional round table to include more people, about 60 registrations so far, but very few of the convenors or paper givers have registered yet. Ro expects about 100 people min. Budget would balance on 130 people, so we must push as hard as possible to get people to register.

In general, JF agrees that we should stick with the principle that ASA doesn't share losses. SA suggested ASA cover expenses of principal officers as a contribution rather than agree to cover any losses per se. Ro noted that their costs are already not in the budget. With 135 delegates, the profit would be £14. If there are only 100 delegates, there may be a 2.5k loss and Belfast will be pushing for us to share that loss.

In general, SA felt there may be legal issues about how far we can be liable for losses and that it would be better to deal with things on an issue by issue basis. Raminder suggested that we could set limits to the losses we can accept. JF thought it would be more appropriate and risk-averse to leave any financial negotiations to particular instances. Because we are a small organisation, we cannot afford to put ourselves in a position of liability.

In conclusion, we address issues with Belfast, and can be flexible in some form, to help them out this time. But we retain the position that we do not, in principle, become liable for losses from any conferences. The new guidelines should reflect this position and we must be clearer with future conference organisers.

d. ASA 2011

The situation in Lampeter has been somewhat unstable, as we are aware from having sent a letter of support recently. JF asked whether we have any **planB**. We do not appear to have one at present.

CD seconded Raminder's point that we should have a written agreements with conference organisers. SA suggested that we should retrieve the role of conference liaison, so that this does not remain with Ro, which is rather unfair on him, and is rather ambiguous in relation to his position as offering a commercial service. JF proposed having an additional committee member as conference liaison, proposing this to the AGM.

Suggestions of people to ask: Julie Scott, Jeanette Edwards, Matthew Engelke, Mukulika Banerjee, Pete Wade, Laura Bear, Lisette Josephides. Jeanette is becoming HoD. Jo Vergunst. Andrew Irving, Gillian Evans and Atreyee Sen are all on RCUK fellowships.

Committee agreed to **discuss these names via email and then approach them in order of pref to see who would consider standing. NB Before AGM!**

e. **ASA 2012**

JS has been asking whether there is anything needed for 2012. They are waiting for some feedback from Chris Pinney. He suggested the following speakers: Rosalind Morris, Taussig, Patsy Spyer, Erhard Schutplez. Ro has not really turned to 2012 yet, but thinks that Susan in Delhi doesn't understand how we run our conferences and the open proposal structure. Ro needs to clarify with her. She also needs to understand that all the info about Belfast is on the website, so that shows how we deliver information. It's probably too late for her to get to Belfast now. Perhaps she could come to Lampeter. Ro thinks it will have to wait until after Belfast now, from his perspective. JF suggested discussing it at the conference in April. The 2012 conference must be confirmed at this year's AGM. CD suggested that the proposal should come from Susan and JNU if they are the host organisers. JS will write to Susan and ask her to respond to the blurb for the AGM. She seems to give the impression that she thinks she's hosting our conference rather than organising it herself. CD reiterated that it is then particularly important to have clarification. **JS will email Susan on Monday and would appreciate comments on the blurb he circulated by email.** We can also try to confirm Wenner Gren funding.

2013 would have to be agreed at the next year's AGM (ie in Lampeter).

14.AOB

IF asked if anyone could recommend any senior staff who could contribute to the early career event in Belfast. Ro suggested looking at the programme for someone already attending the conference.

JF asked who will introduce the Firth lecture. SA indicated that JF should do this. SA also reminded him that the ASA chair usually gives a speech at dinner. JF will liaise with conference organisers about after dinner speech.

15.Dates of meetings 2010.

To be organised by email with the new secretary.

JF thanked SA for her sterling work as secretary over the past 5 years.