

Committee on Publications meeting
ASOR office, Boston
April 25 and 26, 2002

PRESENT: Billie Jean Collins (ex officio), Rudy Dornemann (ex officio), Al Leonard, Piotr Michalowski, Joe Seger (ex officio), Jim Weinstein

VIA PHONE: Ted Lewis, Andy Vaughn, Gloria London, Ann Killebrew,

VISITING: Britt Hartenberger (staff), Larry Herr, Selma Omerefendic (staff), Richard Scheuer, Charles Watkinson (David Brown books)

6:00pm Call to order by Leonard.

After a welcome by Al Leonard, the meeting was passed over to Larry Herr, incoming Chair of COP. The Agenda was re-arranged, with discussion on fulfillment moved forward. Herr thanked those assembled.

1. David Brown Books

Charles Watkinson, our contact with David Brown (our distributor), discussed the services that they provide for us. They are a branch of Oxbow Books of the UK, and provide marketing and distribution of our books, as well as being a publisher of others' books. Watkinson passed around a handout listing their benefits and charges and an example of a customer list of several recent ASOR publications. They mail a quarterly catalog to 15,000 customers and sell at conferences such as AIA, AOS, SAA, and others. They hold ASOR's inventory on consignment, store and insure our stock of books and back issues, fulfill orders, and market our books. They send out some review copies of our books, while the Publications office sends out others. Orders for our books can be made directly through David Brown on their website (15-20% of their business), by mail, or by phone, or through our Publications office.

Their charges to us are as a percentage of value of sales, and this percentage level depends on marketing. They take 38% of most sales and 20% of standing orders. Other charges to us include fees for long-term storage and sending out missed issues.

They provide three major benefits: specialist marketing, the Oxbow connection makes international orders easier, and an independent identity, since they promote **our** identity instead of theirs.

Killebrew asked if Institutional representatives were ever sent letters encouraging them to take out standing orders? Collins reported that the Publications office has done this in the past. Watkinson reported that the person replacing him (Ian Stephens) will be quite interested in promoting standing orders.

2. Agenda. Herr summarized his goals for the meeting: hold a regular COP meeting, explain Larry's agenda in Chairing COP, and teaching all committee members about COP's activities and finances. He would like to see an active, educated committee that operates smoothly and effectively by itself and in cooperation with the ASOR office.

3. Presentation of COP budget and finances by Collins.

Collins reported that we have switched to a fully accrued accounting system in the last year, after some fears that Publications was operating with a deficit. An accrual basis means that revenue is recorded when it is earned, not when it is collected. For example, a check payment is not booked as income right away but is counted when the income is earned. Similarly, we record expenses only when we incur them in producing the product. For example, if we produce a book, we now record the expenses only once the book is completed, and this process may spread beyond one fiscal year. Deferrals are revenues for products we've committed to, but not yet produced.

In FY01, we began to defer revenues, releasing them only in the periods to which they applied. Normally, money is released in one period, deferred into the next, and these amounts will cancel each other out. We deferred income and expenses last year, and so this year, we have to deal with those additional expenses.

Journals and books are the two main activities of Publications. Other activities include income from advertisements, offprints, book royalties, T-shirt sales, and Annual Meeting book sale revenues and expenses.

Third Quarter Report handout

Refers to page 6 of third quarter report, general and administrative statement. Emory charges 4% of the office expenses and salaries' activity, to pay for the account they maintain for us. There is some over-expenditure in this part of the budget, since we didn't plan on paying half of Selma's salary and for help from the auditor.

Page 5, Annual Meeting statement. Expenses include the Call for Papers and Program Book printing, and charges for processing credit cards for registration payments. The two publications used to be in Newsletter, though these are getting larger and harder to fit into it. Herr asked if we can put these up on web, although there would still be the labor costs of producing the items. He will talk to Doug Clark about whether CAMP can help with funding these activities in the future.

Page 4, Books and Other Products. Royalties are growing – we receive them from Eisenbrauns, UMI, Oxford U. Press, and electronic distribution agreements. Book production expense was low for the year, because we used a “cost per goods sold” basis to record this. Book production expenses are counted when the books are sold. Sales projections were dependent on a volume of the Annual coming out, though it did not. Sales for books that did appear are meeting expectations.

Book Sales Report. Life sales by calendar year. Vaughn notes that if we sell many copies early on, the expenses are spent early on. He worries about holding onto expenses for many years for a book that doesn't sell. If we have a book that does not sell well, are we waiting too long to defer expenses? Is there a way to change this, release some after 3 or 5 years? Collins says that the Balance sheet always shows deferred book production expense, and we will only defer expenses to a maximum of five years. Sometimes books can sell even five years after their production date.

Page 3, Journals statement. Revenues come from membership dues and institutional subscriptions. Fulfillment costs so far are \$22,904 for three quarters, probably \$27,500 for the full year. They charge us a per-record fee for membership and mailings. Payments from the Nies bequest are likely to be regular.

Discussion of late issues. If we haven't provided a product, revenues for this period have to be deferred. For example, one NEA makes \$25,000. If it doesn't come out, we can't count it. We do get to defer its expenses. There will probably be three late issues again this year. Lewis reports that there is more material in the pipeline now for NEA.

Page 2, Publications Profit & Loss. Collins reports that the bottom line for Publications is \$12,000 in the red. If we add Nies and Torch funds that were transferred in, then we are only \$3,700 in the red. Weinstein asked if Development is asking for funds for Publications. Seger commented that this is included with its other objectives, but if we want a Publications focus, COP should initiate this. Killebrew asks that people specify these donations as towards Publications, not just the Torch Campaign. She suggests that we advertise more in journals to attract donations from subscribers who could give directly to Publications.

Page 1, Assets and Liabilities (this is not a balance sheet). The temporarily restricted fund is the Publications "opportunity fund." Depreciation and some expenses are not included on this sheet. Cash flow has not been a problem this year, so we have not tapped into the opportunity fund. Accounts Receivable includes those people/institutions billed but whose money we have not yet received. Academic Services reports to us what has been billed. As we receive money, it is then counted as income and is taken out of Accounts Receivable. Michalowski noted that in Europe, people can set up a system whereby regular yearly payments (such as for memberships) are made directly from their bank account, though he has not seen this in U.S. Clark reported that SBL has an arrangement like this.

Collins defined some of the terms used on this sheet. Deferred book production means expenses on books that we have produced that we have not yet counted. As books are sold, this amount decreases. Deferred income includes items like income for late issues on NEA. This is listed as \$22,000 now though it should be about \$75,000. Pre-paids are deferred revenues, for new people who were not billed, or people we stopped billing who have joined or subscribed again on their own.

Publications FY03 Projections handout

Pages 13 & 14 Membership and subscription allocated costs. Collins would like to eliminate the Associate Discounted category (for retired people and students) (categories C0 and C1 on page 14). She suggests we lower the Associate dues to \$50 from \$60.

MOTION: Michalowski moves that we eliminate the Associate discounted category and moves that we change the dues from \$60 to \$50. All yeas, none opposed. PASSED UNIMOUSLY with no abstentions.

Collins suggests that we increase institutional subscription rates for BASOR from \$110 to \$120 beginning Jan. 1, 2003. NEA could increase from \$75 to \$80. A typical industry increase is 10% per year, and we haven't had any increase for two years. There was discussion about whether we will lose libraries by raising these rates. There are already concerns about NEA since it has not been coming out on time. It was suggested that we raise BASOR rates only until NEA is back on track. Some libraries cut journals when they fall far behind, and we don't want to give them another reason to cancel their NEA subscriptions.

MOTION: Vaughn moves that we raise subscription rates for BASOR from \$110 to \$120 but not rates for NEA. Seconded by Killebrew. Motion carried with one vote against.

Is it COP's prerogative to establish membership rates? Seger says that this is the Board's decision. Dornemann suggests raising some of the rates by at least \$5. Vaughn warns that it might be hard to bring in new people if the basic member rate of \$110 is raised. Herr suggests that the COP Executive Committee examine this issue and make a recommendation to COP.

Pages 10-12 Issues on cost of production.

NEA was projected on the assumption it will get caught up this year (seven issues). Unit cost equals the print run divided by the cost of production.

There was discussion on whether we should allocate greater funds in order to increase the page count of BASOR. It could go from 96 pages to 112. Collins suggests yes.

Pages 8-9 On page 9, revenue is low for FY00 because that year included the move from Scholars Press to Academic Services. FY02 numbers are low because they only represent three quarters. Page 8 allocates overhead from income based on time spent – 60% on membership/subscriptions, 25% on books. 'Contribution' tells the net amount each journal contributes to the overall publications effort. 'G & A' category tells how much overhead applies to each journal.

Page 7. Cost of goods sold (cogs).

Using a cogs basis allows one to determine those books "most likely to succeed:" their production costs and how they might sell. Archaeological Sources for the History of Palestine (ASHP) is a collection of articles from Biblical Archaeologist that have been updated, and may be presented in a single volume for institutions and split up into fascicles for individuals. Editor Hopkins is currently lacking the Persian period chapter. Should we move ahead with at least one fascicle? Scheuer suggests asking Gitin. Herr says that we could try to find someone to do it since the other articles are all ready. Killebrew asks if we can market it as a textbook and suggests Jeff Zorn for the Persian period chapter. She would push for one hardcover with all the articles. This is also recommended by Weinstein. There was discussion on whether to put it into one book or several fascicles. The whole book would be quite large and we could alternatively make it smaller like a BA reader, more suitable for a textbook. Killebrew could tell Hopkins we suggest Zorn, and communicate to him COP's concern and hope that he can resolve how to publish the book, possibly in two volumes.

The issue of number of books we can handle in a year was raised, and Collins indicated we produced five or six this year, depending on the book and whether we are typesetting it in-house. Weinstein recommends professional copyediting for some books and suggests that we need to be firmer in future with scheduling in terms of setting dates and deadlines. Weinstein suggests a terminal date beyond which we no longer accept a book.

Page 6. General and administrative (G & A). Collins proposes to give a raise to Madell in FY03 and hire him as a regular employee. He doesn't get the benefits that we currently pay for via Emory. Herr suggests that we look at other jobs Madell might do in addition (membership/subscription fulfillment). If we hired him full-time for membership/subscriptions, then our G&A will go up about \$7-\$10,000. But we are also paying Academic Services (AS) about \$20,675 already for frustrating fulfillment service. Software costs for starting up these services are about \$12,000, and we must also give Academic Services three months' notice to cancel our contract. Herr indicates that we are too small for more sophisticated fulfillment companies. We could also hire a student for part-time data entry work. Collins noted that Jim Henderson of AS treats our membership unprofessionally (doesn't return their calls). Michalowski suggests someone presents us with a detailed statement of pros and cons before we make a final decision. He worries about problems of attrition like there were in the Scholars Press to Academic Services transition. It was asked whether a review of software, what other societies do etc., could be completed by the end of May so that we can make a decision by then. Henderson's assistant leaves in June, so we should move before September. It was decided to vote yes unless the move was not cost-effective.

MOTION that we agree on moving to in-house fulfillment in principle and authorize Collins to explore and report to us on the various parameters involved by May 15th. SECONDED by Lewis. AGREED UNANIMOUSLY.

Michalowski suggests we approve \$15/hour for Madell. The ASOR Personnel committee should be involved with developing a job description for the permanent position.

MOTION that effective with the beginning of the next pay period at Emory, Madell's salary be raised to \$15 an hour based on 37.5 hours. Michalowski seconds. AGREED UNANIMOUSLY.

Page 2. Publications Profit and Loss.

This sheet represents the same figures plus administration expenses, and shows that we are about \$46,000 in the black. If we defer \$75,000 for NEA and the BASOR rate increase takes effect, we will be about \$35,000 in the black.

Herr commended Collins for her hard work in preparing the detailed, clear handouts.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30pm.

Meeting resumed on Friday morning

PRESENT: Collins (ex officio), Dornemann (ex officio), Feinman, Leonard, Michalowski, Seger (ex officio), Weinstein,
VIA PHONE: Killebrew, Lewis, London, Vaughn,
VISITING: Clark, Frederick, Geraty, Hartenberger (staff), Herr, Ritterspach, Scheuer

4. Membership / Subscription separation

Seger suggested we review separating membership and subscription. How do we account for ourselves? Memberships are tied in with subscriptions, so it is difficult to tell the full range of ASOR 'members.' Several other organizations have moved to strictly membership, with subscriptions tacked on to membership categories, so that members get discounted subscriptions but it is possible to separate members and subscribers. Herr said that some people come into ASOR via Annual Meetings, and that a few Board members have suggested that we try to increase membership in ASOR among laypeople. MacAllister had suggested that laypeople would be attracted to the archaeology in NEA more than BASOR.

Collins indicated that SBL has made this change, instituting a flat membership rate of \$50 for professional members. This change has raised their membership income. They also created an associate rate, which we already have. Membership includes electronic access to journals with printed copies available for an extra fee. SBL's individual subscriptions went from 7500 to 3000, though it would not affect the institutional subscribers (such as libraries). This meant a considerable savings for them in printing costs. We would not save as much on printing and mailing costs because our circulation is much smaller than theirs. Currently, though, the journals are a benefit of membership. If we were to separate and raise membership to \$50 and all present members rejoined and re-subscribed (100% 'rollover'), we would have \$17,000 more a year. If we had only 80% rollover, we would only break even.

Weinstein notes that we have already lost non-academics (those more interested in NEA) to Shanks and BAS. Killebrew points out that the membership fee doesn't make a huge difference to non-academics, and if the fee were raised we probably wouldn't lose them. Seger noted that we need a way to create a list of people we can go to for lay support, such as a 'friends' group, and use this as a way to find potential Trustees. We need to remain a source of more in-depth information for those who are already Biblical Archaeology Society members. Herr indicated that the journals were originally added to membership categories to make membership more attractive. Scheuer recommended that we keep lay people interested. We should offer trips to members once in a while.

Michalowski suggests that we lost our opportunity to reach the public to Hershel Shanks. We can't compete with his appeal to a populist audience. Ritterspach noted that a recent lecture in Indianapolis by William Dever reached 300 people, all non-specialists, so lecture events are part of Development plans and will bring in the public. London asks how we bring people into our Annual Meetings. Clark replies that we don't do public relations well and that CAMP will be addressing this in the future.

5. ASOR Manual and Guidelines

The entire ASOR Manual is an Executive Committee document, and any changes made to it should be recommended to the Board. Frederick noted that the COP Guidelines should be consistent with the ASOR Manual, and indicated that they can be an annex to it, annex F in the current Manual. Seger noted that we need to separate the duties of COP and ASOR. Only major changes in the COP Guidelines, once adopted, need go before the Board. Frederick suggested that COP decide that it will have guidelines and procedures that it will use, and that it can change these later.

London moved that the COP guidelines and ASOR manual be worked out to conform with each other. **SECONDED** by Feinman. **APPROVED** with one abstention.

6. COP Guidelines and Procedures

Re: 4.1.2. of COP Guidelines

Scheuer indicated that Arab nations are involved in the UN, and if ASOR follows UN regulations, people will begin to leave ASOR in protest. He is concerned that UNESCO is political, and that we should remain apolitical. Seger noted that previous work done by Glock and on Shechem is ok, and that all antiquities authorities are agreed on this. This section of the COP guidelines applies to later activities, such as those in Northern Cyprus, after June of 1976.

Re: 5.2.2.

Michalowski comments that the JCS Board only has 4 people on it and suggests we change this section to read an ‘appropriate number of individuals’ serving terms. He also questioned the need for ‘assessments of journal quality’ for the Annual Meeting every year as burdensome on editors. It was suggested that the word ‘quality’ be replaced with ‘state’ of the journal.

Re: 2.2.1.

Seger indicated that the “corporation” term of ASOR should be removed.

Re: 2.3.1.

Michalowski asks about the phrase ‘sole responsibility for academic publication of the organization.’ Seger notes that we can change this to “academic and educational.”

Page 2: Ex-officio does not mean non-voting.

Re: 4.1.1. on illicit materials – Michalowski says that editors “can’t always tell” if artifacts are illicitly excavated since people manufacture artifact histories with fake pedigrees. He agrees with the policy, but wants an editorial policy. He suggests we add “to the best of our knowledge/ability” instead of “rigorously follow.” Even museums won’t always tell details of an artifact’s accession to editors. Herr notes that the policy is meant to protect us and is not an attempt to legislate editorial decisions.

Re: 4.1.2. Herr notes that this section was written in consultation with Patty Gerstenblith and Sy Gitin. ASOR has traditionally followed these laws, and Article 9 of the Hague Convention in particular is international law. Current ASOR policy on preservation refers to UNESCO and “urges U.S., UN, and UNESCO to play a leadership role in preservation.”

Re: 4.1.1. COP guidelines refer to BASOR 309:2.

Frederick says that the ASOR policy on Preservation is appendix E to the Manual. Feinman suggests that 4.1.1 just refer to published policy.

Re: 4.1.2. It is commented that the Hague Convention is not UNESCO. There was discussion over whether the sentence “UNESCO supervises both” should be dropped. This was suggested by legal people, remind Herr and Frederick, but only as a comment. Frederick says that this is document to be used by COP, and thinks that there would be very few memberships dropped because of our following this policy. Article 9 includes the open ended statement: “strictly required to safeguard, record or preserve cultural property.”

Re: 4.8.1. Herr warns that our editors are liable if they publish some illustrations without permission. Authors must sign a contract saying that they have obtained the appropriate permissions, and editors can ask for copies of these permissions. Editors should add to their acceptance letter a request that the author “provide written documentation of permissions.”

Re: 4.9.2. The phrase “attempt to think creatively” was replaced by “attempt to be creative.”

Re: 5.5 COP Executive Committee.

Herr notes that COP could meet 2 or 4 times a year, but it is hard to get people together. We could use a smaller committee that could do conference calls, consult, and make decisions without needing to call everyone together between Annual Meetings. It would be able to make decisions on everyday matters, but would need to decide where to draw the line. Larger issues like moving the Publications office would involve the whole committee. Killebrew asks if the other COP members would become a rubber stamp. She suggests that we have one more regular member on committee too, so that they are involved. Vaughn notes that the editors and chair could be more narrow in focus, and that we need others involved too.

Herr suggests that the COP Exec. Committee meet in Spring and November and primarily review budgetary issues, submit proposals for the larger committee after review, and prepare and analyze quarterly budgetary reports and propose changes to COP. Minutes would go to the whole COP. Vaughn suggested that we find funding to help at-large people attend. Herr said that we would need a list of its duties; we should add one ad-hoc voting member. Two or three year terms for its members were suggested.

Re: 5.6.6. Funding for the COP Development committee. Section was deleted.

Re: 11.8.1 Dismissal. It was asked whether there was an appeals process in the event of dismissal of an editor. Frederick noted that that process is detailed in the ASOR Manual.

Re: 6.1.2 It was questioned whether “two confirmed candidates” were necessary. This was changed to “if possible, at least two candidates” would be sought. The phrase citing “offensive language” was removed.

Re: 6.8.3. Replace “all ASOR” with “consistent overall with ASOR Manual.” ADD: agreements with other entities shall we negotiated with COP chair.

MOTION to accept these Draft Guidelines and recommend them to the ASOR Exec. Committee and Board to be adopted subject to minor emendations which will be worked out in the next two weeks. SECONDED by Vaughn. APPROVED UNIMOUSLY with no abstentions.

7. New editorial appointments

The agenda lists the effective dates.

ASOR Annual editor from Lapp to Nancy Serwint.

Archae. Reports Series editor from London to Joe Greene.

ASOR Book Series editor from vacant to Brian Schmidt (as of Sept. 1, 2003) with Stuart Swiny for the next year (with Collins) until Schmidt begins.

BASOR editor remains Weinstein. Herr would like him to continue, though he might need a sabbatical.

Michalowski MOVES to accept these four names as editor appointments. SECONDED by Feinman. APPROVED UNIMOUSLY with no abstentions.

8. COP Executive Committee

It is suggested that the members of this new committee be negotiated later over email in order to include everyone in the discussion.

9. COP Development Committee

The committee could help implement ideas such as free issues of NEA to CAP dig volunteers, etc., that the Publications office doesn't have time for currently. London has lots of ideas. Any fund raising activities would go through ASOR Development committee. Herr proposes London as Chair of the COP Development committee.

Feinman MOVED that London be chair of the COP Development committee. SECONDED by Lewis. APPROVED UNIMOUSLY.

10. Move of Publications office

Herr recommends Publications office stay in Atlanta until the ASOR office arrangement is clarified. We do not want to enter into serious consideration of a move until such time as the situation in Boston is clarified, such as how staffing will change when Dornemann retires and when the lease is up (in 2006). It was also noted that we need a guarantee for the Atlanta staff, especially since Madell's position may be changed soon. For the foreseeable future, it is agreed that the office will not move.

Michalowski MOVES that the Publications office stay in Atlanta. SECONDED by London. Discussion will continue until such time as the ASOR situation changes. APPROVED UNIMOUSLY.

It was suggested that editors write down their editorial policies.

11. Discussion on contracts was put off until the November COP meeting.

12. Facilitating publication and marketing of CAP-approved excavations

Sten LaBianca has asked if projects approved by CAP but publishing with another press could advertise their ASOR affiliation. This was seen as a new benefit for CAP affiliated projects. We could help them market their books while spreading our name. They could include a page with ASOR's name and logo, a listing of CAP and COP chairs, and the words "ASOR-Affiliated excavation." They can advertise their publications as "similar to other ASOR books," and we could recommend that David Brown market them. It was agreed that the Executive Committee of COP should review applications. Agreed that LaBianca and other CAP-Affiliated projects could do this.

13. Electronic dissemination instead of offprints

Michalowski noted that authors can put up their own article on the web as an offprint in pdf format before it is even published in JCS. He suggests that we need to publish on-line and develop a system where these articles can be bought through ASOR. This will be discussed further in November. It was suggested that only electronic offprints be sent automatically, and paper copies if requested by the author. Currently, Collins works with editors to see if they would like to do this.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Britt Hartenberger