



# Australasian Association of Philosophy

aap.org.au

## POSTGRADUATE CONFERENCE FUND POLICY

Policy number	PRI 008	Version	003
Responsible person	Executive Officer	Scheduled review date	April 2020

### INTRODUCTION

The AAP resolved in July 2015 to create a fund to support postgraduate-organised conferences, as part of its membership offerings to postgraduates. The Postgraduate Conference Fund also furthers the Association's mission of promoting the exchange of philosophical ideas and promoting philosophical activities.

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to outline

- Which sorts of activities are eligible for funding by the Postgraduate Conference Fund;
- Who may apply for such funding;
- The reporting requirements for successful applicants; and
- When and on what basis funding allocated by the AAP to the Fund is to be dispersed.

### POLICY

The AAP Postgraduate Conference Fund is created to support conferences, workshops, seminars, and other similar events (henceforth, 'conferences') on philosophical topics that are organised by postgraduate members of the Association. Any applicant to the fund must be a research postgraduate and an ordinary member of the Association in good standing at the time of application. The Association will make an annual call for proposals. Applicants seeking support from the Fund must submit a proposal to the Association which will include at least a description of the proposed conference and a draft budget. Applications will be evaluated and ranked by an Evaluation Panel on their philosophical merits, and funding from the Fund will be distributed in line with these rankings. No successful proposal will be allocated more than 50% of the Fund. Applicants whose proposals are successful will need to

Operational policies & procedures can be established or altered by the Executive.

Australasian Association of Philosophy  
ACN 152 892 272 ABN 29 152 892 272

agree to any conditions the Association places on funding, and will also need to submit a brief report on the conference at the conclusion of their event.

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.

Australasian Association of Philosophy  
ACN 152 892 272 ABN 29 152 892 272



# Australasian Association of Philosophy

aap.org.au

## POSTGRADUATE CONFERENCE FUND PROCEDURES

Procedures number	PRI 008	Version	003
Responsible person	Executive Officer	Scheduled review date	April 2020

### RESPONSIBILITIES

It is the responsibility of the Executive to oversee the running of the Postgraduate Conference Fund in accordance with this policy, and in particular to recruit the Convenor of a panel to evaluate proposals for funding ('Evaluation Panel'), to check that sufficient further members are empaneled, and to provide advice to the Panel if needed.

It is the responsibility of the Evaluation Panel and the Executive to ensure that the operation of the Fund conforms to this policy.

It is the responsibility of the Executive Officer to ensure that all members of the Board, Executive, and Convenor's of Operating Committees are aware of this policy.

It is the responsibility of the Treasurer to ensure the Fund is appropriately supported in the Association's budget and that funds are disbursed in accordance with this policy.

### PROCEDURES

#### Evaluation Panel

The evaluation panel will contain either 3 or 5 members in total. Panels with 3 members must have one postgraduate member, and panels with 5 members must have 2 postgraduate members. The remaining panel members should be professional philosophers. The panel should have an odd number of members, though this may be varied in exceptional cases (for example, when a member of a five-membered panel is unable to carry out their duties and it is too late to recruit a replacement member).

At around the end of March, the Executive should appoint a Convenor for the Evaluation Panel, and notify the Executive and Administrative Officers of the appointment. The Convenor, with the assistance of the Chief Executive Officer/Executive Officer if needed, will

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.

Australasian Association of Philosophy  
ACN 152 892 272 ABN 29 152 892 272

then appoint 1 or 2 additional members to the panel. The Convenor of the panel, and the panel members appointed by the Convenor, should be professional philosophers working in Australasia, though they need not be members of the Association. Members of the panel, including the Convenor, are appointed for a one year term.

The postgraduate members of the evaluation panel are to be nominated by the Postgraduate Committee prior to the appointment of the panel convenor. The postgraduate representative should, after ensuring that the nominees are interested in serving on the panel, provide the names of two nominees to the Executive Officer. The postgraduate members should be postgraduates in philosophy in an Australasian university, though they need not be members of the Association.

The Convenor will then form the panel by appointing one or both nominees from the Postgraduate Committee to serve alongside the Convenor's appointees, as appropriate. Postgraduate nominees are appointed for a one year term.

At least one panel member must be female and one male; a 5-membered panel must have at least two male and two female members. The panel members should be chosen so as to be representative of the strengths and diversity of philosophy in Australasia. The Executive should, over time, monitor the constitution of the panel to ensure that the panel is representative of the regions and traditions embraced by the Association.

Individuals who have served on an evaluation panel in one year are ineligible to serve on the panel in the immediately subsequent year, but may serve again after their period of ineligibility has lapsed.

### **Call for proposals**

At the beginning of June of each year, the Convenor of the Evaluation Panel, through the Administrative Officer, will publicise a call for applicants to submit conference proposals for funding from the Postgraduate Conference Fund.

The call for proposals will be broadcast via an email to AAP members, the monthly AAP member newsletter, emails to Australasian philosophy mailing lists (e.g. aphil, NZAP and sydphil) and through the official AAP social media channels, namely Facebook and Twitter. The Administrative Officer on instruction from the Convenor of the Evaluation Panel is responsible for the call for proposals as well as any reminders through all channels listed above.

The closing date for such proposals should be set no earlier than 1 month and no later than 3 months after the call for proposals is made. The deadline for proposals should in any case be no later than 31st August in each year; and the Evaluation Panel should decide on successful proposals by November 15. Any funded conference should occur within 12 months of the Panel's decision.

The call for proposals should provide a link to this policy, and should also specify what an application to the Fund should contain.

### **Applications to the Fund**

The Postgraduate Conference Fund is created to support Australasian postgraduate students who wish to organise public philosophical events, such as conferences, workshops, and seminars, whether directed at an audience of philosophers or the wider public. In this policy,

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.

all such events will be termed 'conferences', but no indication is thereby given that the Fund prefers to support one kind of philosophical event over any other.

Applications must be submitted through the online application form on the AAP website which will be open from the first announcement of the fund until 6:00pm AEST on the decided closing date.

At a minimum, any application to the Fund should contain the following details:

1. Name(s) and affiliation(s) of applicant(s);
2. A title for the proposed conference;
3. Proposed date and location for the conference;
4. Names of any invited and/or confirmed speakers;
5. A description of the proposed theme and expected activities at the conference (up to 1 page);
6. A draft budget, including indicative quotations for any significant expenses (such as travel, accommodation, or catering). The budget should note any funds to be provided from other sources, and whether there will be any fee for registration. The budget should also indicate how much is sought from the Fund;
7. The name and email address of a faculty sponsor of the applicant(s). The faculty sponsor will be contacted by email by the Administrative Officer to complete an additional online confidential evaluation of the proposed conference. This evaluation should address the philosophical significance and importance of the proposed conference, the feasibility of the proposed conference, and the suitability of the applicant as an organiser. The evaluation should also include an undertaking that the sponsor will provide guidance and advice to the organizer. The faculty sponsor will often be the applicant's supervisor, but need not be. This form must be completed before the application can be assessed.
8. The name and email address of the Head of Department (or equivalent). The Head of Department (or equivalent) will be contacted by email by the Administrative Officer to complete an additional online declaration form stating that the applicant's department (or equivalent) is supportive of the application to the fund and will contribute the resources outlined in the application if the application is successful. This form must be completed before the application can be assessed.

Applications are checked for eligibility by the Administrative Officer and once complete, the Administrative Officer will email a link to the Convenor of the Evaluation Panel containing the eligible applications ready for the Convenor to circulate to the Evaluation panel.

The Evaluation Panel in a given round is to decide, as their first order of business on being constituted whether they wish to solicit any additional information in a given year. The Evaluation panel will be expected to return a result no later than November 15 each year.

## **Evaluation of Proposals**

The Evaluation Panel should consider all complete applications received by the closing date as a gathered field. The Panel is to use its expert philosophical judgement to evaluate and rank

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.

Australasian Association of Philosophy  
ACN 152 892 272 ABN 29 152 892 272

the proposals received. The Panel may, at its discretion, call upon the expertise of philosophers who are not members of the Panel to help in this process, though only members of the Panel will have a vote in the final determination of which proposals are to be funded.

The Convenor of the Evaluation Panel must schedule a panel meeting to make funding decisions before the November 15 of each year, unless no applications for funding are received. The panel will typically meet via video conference.

All members of the Panel should independently review and evaluate each proposal received prior to the funding meeting. The purpose of the funding meeting is for the Panel to come up with an overall ranking of proposals, through the discussion of the merits of individual proposals. The Panel should also note which, if any, of the proposals received are not suitable for support.

The Panel is charged with identifying the best proposals, in terms of philosophical significance and feasibility. The following factors should be considered by the Panel:

- Funded conferences should, over time, represent accurately the profession in Australasia, so that the profile of successful applications should reflect the diversity of the profession (including geographical and ideological diversity), but should also be sensitive to and be representative of the discipline in Australasia as practiced in departments of philosophy. The CLO will provide guidance on the profile of previous recipients of funding to the Convenor of the Panel on appointment.
- Other things being equal, proposals which intend to combine AAP funds with other funding sources, and which therefore leverage the AAP's contribution, should be favoured over proposals which intend the AAP to be the sole funding source. (For example, an applicant might propose to use institutional funds as well as AAP funds; or they might piggyback on an existing philosophical activity, such as an AAP or NZAP conference, to run an additional workshop or stream.)
- Other things being equal, proposals for conferences which explicitly and plausibly aim to further the Association's mission to promote philosophy in Australasia should be favoured.
- Where possible and appropriate, proposals should include measures to support postgraduate participation in the conference, through the provision of reduced or waived registration fees, travel bursaries, or similar.
- Where possible and appropriate, proposals should include measures to encourage attendance of members of the public at the conference, e.g., through scheduling a special public session, provision of reduced or waived registration fees, or the support of appropriate advertising.
- The Panel must consider whether the proposed budget is realistic and the intended activities of the conference are achievable given constraints of budget and other resources.

Members of the Panel must declare any conflict of interest with respect to any applicant or proposal to the Panel at the beginning of the funding meeting. The Panel should vote on whether a disclosed conflict of interest may either impair a Panel member's independence, or give rise to an impression of impaired independence. If the majority vote is that the disclosed conflict of interest is problematic, the Panel member making the disclosure should recuse

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.

Australasian Association of Philosophy  
ACN 152 892 272 ABN 29 152 892 272

themselves from the evaluation of that proposal. It is a conflict of interest where; a member of the panel is the supervisor of an applicant or a panel member has a close, personal relationship with the applicant. The panel member should continue to participate in the evaluation of other proposals.

The Panel is to determine its own procedure for constructing an overall ranking of projects. However, the Panel must ensure that the procedure is transparent in construction and fair to all submitted applications. The Panel must keep adequate minutes of its deliberations, and must also provide a report on the selection process to the Executive at its conclusion. The report may contain any observations on the process that the Panel wishes to make, including suggestions to increase the funds disbursed or to modify this policy. The deliberations of the Panel are confidential to the Panel and to the persons and committees to whom the Panel reports, the Executive and the Board.

### **Funding Allocation**

The current allocation to the Postgraduate Conference Fund in 2018–19 is AUD 4000.00, and the Association aims to adjust that allocation by at least the amount of inflation (as measured by the change in the consumer price index in the prior calendar year) in each year's budget. The AAP budget will contain the exact allocation for each year, and the Executive Officer will ensure that the Convenor is aware of the total amount for disbursement in any given year. A case from the Panel for an increase in the fund over CPI will be considered as part of the Association's budget planning process.

The Panel should allocate all of the Fund in each year, in accordance with its rankings, assuming that sufficiently many applications of sufficient quality to be suitable to fund are received. How much each successful project should be awarded is up to the Panel, and successful applicants may be awarded less than the amount they requested. The Association aims to fund as much worthwhile philosophical activity as possible; accordingly, no one successful proposal would normally be awarded more than 50% of the value of the fund allocation in any given year.

If the Panel finds that there are two projects which are ranked equally, one should be funded only if the other is. If funding neither would mean that the conference fund is not entirely allocated, and funding both would mean that the conference fund is over-allocated, an application can be made by the Convenor to the Executive for an *ad hoc* increase in that year's Fund allocation.

All applicants should be notified of the outcome of the funding decision and allocated funds as soon as possible after the Panel has made the decision, and certainly within 2 weeks of the decision. The Convenor of the Panel should notify the Administrative Officer who will notify applicants and coordinate with the Treasurer and the successful applicants the disbursement of funds.

### **Accepting Funding**

The Panel, in deciding to allocate funding, may also make suggestions to applicants about their proposed conference activities or propose adjustments to the budget. The Panel may, if it wishes, make acceptance of such suggested changes a condition of funding. In suggesting any changes, the Panel must be mindful of the aims of this fund and of the Association.

The Association also has some conditions on funding through the Postgraduate Conference Fund:

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.

1. In the event that the proposed conference does not go ahead, the AAP's contribution will be returned to the Association.
2. In the event that the conference makes a surplus, the AAP will be entitled to claim 50% of the surplus. This proportion may be varied by agreement between the organisers and the AAP Executive.
3. The contribution of the AAP to the conference should be acknowledged in any public conference material such as posters, advertising material, or programs.

Upon receipt by the Administrative Officer of a declaration of agreement to the conditions in this policy and any conditions the Panel or Association makes on the grant of funds, signed by the applicant and the Head of Department (or equivalent), the Treasurer will ensure that the funds are directed to the applicant's nominated account. The Association prefers to make payments to institutional accounts on receipt of an invoice from the applicant's institution, but will work with successful applicants to ensure that funds are available for the use of conference organisers.

### **Reporting**

Within one month of the conclusion of any AAP-supported conference, the organiser should provide a report on the conference to the Association, via the Administrative Officer. This should include data on attendance and registrations, a description of the activities at the conference, and a financial report noting the final profit and loss status of the conference. The report should also include a discussion of the measures organisers put in place to meet any conditions imposed by the Panel or Association in awarding the funding.

The report is to be considered by the Executive. In the event of an unsatisfactory report, for example, one indicating that some or all of the conditions imposed on funding were not met without reasonable excuse, the AAP will claim back part or all of the funding disbursed from the applicant or the applicant's department as appropriate. In very extreme cases, the Association may also choose to impose sanctions on the applicant's host department (or equivalent) – for example, refusal to fund further applications from that department for some period. Any such sanction must be approved by the Board on consideration of a recommendation from the Executive.

### **RELATED DOCUMENTS**

Prizes & Sponsorship; Advertising & Sponsorship; AJP Best Paper Prize; AAP Media Prize; AAP Media Professionals' Award; AAP Inclusive Curriculum Prize; Annette Baier Prize; AAP Postgraduate Presentation Prize

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.



## DOCUMENT VERSION HISTORY

### Policy Amendments

Version #	Date Approved	Approved by	Brief Description
003	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2018	Executive	Minor editing
002	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2017	Executive	Changes to timing and removal of CLO from the policy
001	23 <sup>rd</sup> December 2016	Executive	New prize

### Procedures Amendments

Version #	Date Approved	Approved by	Brief Description
003	7 <sup>th</sup> May 2018	Executive	Updated to reflect online submission process & \$4000 funding
002	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2017	Executive	Changes to timing and removal of CLO from the policy
001	23 <sup>rd</sup> December 2016	Executive	New prize

**Operational policies & procedures** can be established or altered by the Executive.