

**MINUTES for the Regional Affiliations Committee
ASOR Chicago Friday, Nov. 16, 2012, 1:00-1:45 pm**

Present: Suzanne Richard (EGL), Jesse C. Long, Jr. (SW), Ralph Hawkins (SE), Barry Gittlin (Mid-Atlantic), Jeff Chadwick (Rocky Mt), Mark Schuler (Upper Midwest), Michael Homan (SW), Roger Anderson (PNW). Suzanne Richard chaired the first part of the meeting, but left to chair a session, at which time Jesse C. Long, Jr., took over as chair.

Agenda:

1. Discuss the recent SBL and AAR change in official relationship with the regions and impact on ASOR's relationship with the regions.
 2. Discuss problem concerning availability of ASOR email lists to the regions
 3. Discuss the funding available to the regions from ASOR
 4. Discuss CCC charge (Nov. 14, 2012 meeting) to each of the committee chairs to provide an action plan by April 1, 2013, to include: a) Agreement on Term Limits, b) Self-Study of the Committee, and c) Guidelines and/or objectives/mandate for the Regional Affiliations Committee and its various regional associations (vis-à-vis the ASOR Strategic Plan).
-
1. SBL/regions/ASOR. The Chair reported that due to fear of liability, both AAR and SBL had recently altered their relationships with the regions, the AAR requiring each region to incorporate itself, the SBL appointing a committee of representatives as the institutional link to the regions. The concern here was that ASOR's relationship with the regions was impacted by the aforesaid changes. There was discussion about the PNW region in particular, and Roger Anderson explained that he raised the issue to the chair to alert her to the changes and potential for some action to be required by ASOR national. After much discussion, it became clear that the AAR/SBL institutional changes did not impact ASOR. Also, the chair reported that at the recent CCC meeting, the question of liability was discussed and, given the less official relationship of ASOR to the regions, the CCC did not consider that any institutional changes were necessary. This topic was thus resolved.
 2. Email Lists. Ralph Hawkins raised the issue that ASOR members in the SE region had not been receiving notices of the meetings for a couple of years, since SBL sent out the notices. The reason became clear: each year the ASOR representative must request the email list from the Boston office. Some discussion ensued concerning the rules for using the list, e.g., the list can only be used once, etc. The chair clarified this rule by saying that the intention was to use the list over one cycle of conferences. Thus, it was fine to send several notices to the members concerning the meeting. Ralph Hawkins noted that the SBL automatically switches a member's regional affiliation when a move to a different area has occurred. Could ASOR do this? Also, SBL includes the member's regional affiliation on all correspondence and they mention the dates and times of the meetings in emails. Such information is also available on the SBL Facebook page. It was

decided that the chair should discuss this issue with Boston in order to streamline the use of email lists for the regions in order to enhance participation.

3. Funding. The chair summarized the collaboration of the Regional Affiliation and Lecture Committees, as agreed upon by the CCC, to jointly sponsor a call and deadline for submissions for funding, to be sent out 3 times a year in an email blast by ASOR Boston. She also announced that there remained \$1000 of funding from ASOR. She encouraged representatives to still send in proposals for funding, even if the amount was for less than \$500. [This extension of the deadlines for submitting proposals was extended since this first year the 3 submission dates were not met]. The sense of the group, once again, seemed to be that regular funding (even if small) would be helpful and would greatly enhance their asymmetrical relationship with SBL. The chair indicated she would once again raise this issue to the CCC.
4. ASOR Action Plan.

- a. Term Limits- As reported by Jesse Long, the discussion of term limits resolved that term limits were only possible to enforce for the chair of the committee. The reason is that each region either has one dedicated person available to represent ASOR or has its own by-laws and varying term limits for the officers, including the ASOR representative. The committee was open to determining term limits for the chair and would continue discussion on this topic. With respect to term limits for the chair, the chair of the committee should be an active member of a region.

b-c. Self-Study/Mandate. The Strategic Plan's mandate for the committee ["charged with strengthening ASOR's relations with its affiliated regional societies and with building local awareness, lay membership, and 'grass-roots' support for ASOR and its programs"] opened up discussion of the need for a mandate arrived at by the Committee. Since each region is independent and there is no official institutional link with ASOR national, it was agreed by all that no unilateral mandate would be possible. Thus, as a preliminary step towards arriving at guidelines and an action plan, the committee unanimously agreed that a self-study was necessary. Every representative should develop and send to the chair a short overview/summary of the way their particular region operates, its connection with their partners, funding, if there are by-laws and officers, and whether their region focuses on scholars, students, or public outreach. In other words, how does each region currently meet (or could meet) any of the Strategic Plan's charges to the committee? Since ASOR is very interested in public outreach, please be sure to emphasize this aspect if you region is so involved (examples from the past, etc.). If you believe that (more) public outreach would be possible with funding, please be sure to address that issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Richard
Chair