

ASOR Chairs Coordinating Council
Conference Call, October 8, 2015 10:00am

Present: Sharon Herbert, Chuck Jones, Cynthia Rufo, Susan Ackerman, Laura Mazow, Geoff Emberling, Erin Darby, Andy Vaughn, Danielle Fatkin

Absent: Tom Levy, Randy Younker

1. Welcome (Sharon)

Sharon welcomed everyone back after the summer hiatus, and thanked the committee members for their continuing service to ASOR.

2. Approval of May minutes

Minutes approved.

3. Brief Committee Reports

The Publications Committee reported that things are running smoothly and on schedule, with no complaints from the committee or the editors. Toward the end of the spring, the 65 ASOR volumes available in Hathi Trust were made available though open access. A publications subcommittee has been discussing ways to integrate data with publications.

The Honors and Awards Committee reported that the committee is in the midst of voting on the book and service awards. There are 13 nominations for the Cross Award, 11 for the Wright Award, and a full slate for all the other awards. The Cross nominations are the best quality of books ever received for that award. At the Annual Meeting, the names for the popular book award and poster award will be announced. For the service awards, there was only one nomination in each category. These nominations were the result of the committee chair encouraging people to submit nominations. It would be great if, in the future, people brought the names to the committee of their own accord. The committee raised the questions of whether ASOR publications can be considered for the book awards, which we will discuss in November.

The Junior Scholars Committee reported that it has elected its first new member since it became a standing committee. They are compiling questions for a survey that will be made available at the Annual Meeting, related to the ASOR fee structure for junior scholars after they are no longer students. The committee is gathering panelists for the junior scholars panel, and receiving feedback from

younger scholars about how well ASOR is integrating undergrads and younger graduate students.

The Annual Meeting Program Committee reported that the Program Book is in its final stages and almost ready to print. The final count for the meeting program is 433 papers in 92 sessions. There are four blank spots on the schedule to consider for capacity for growth. This year, there were 26 paper withdrawals. Last year we had 40 at this time. In the poster session, there are 43 posters, with one withdrawal.

We had two papers in the Ancient Inscriptions session that were in violation of the Professional Conduct Policy because they were the first presentation of unprovenanced antiquities. Unfortunately, one of these papers had been proposed by the session chair. He withdrew it, but continues to have complaints. Another paper was withdrawn because the author did not have permission from their dig director to present. We continue to have regular issues with people wanting to present on excavations in occupied territories. We don't allow presentations unless they are clearly about salvage excavations.

Michael Danti has stepped down from the PC because of other commitments. Caraher will renew for another term. Morag will be rotating off the committee.

The committee has also reviewed the appearance policy, and would like to separate out the role of author vs. the role of presenter. This is to accommodate the fact that some people contribute to many papers, but are not actually presenting at the meeting.

4. Update on Cultural Heritage Initiative

Andy has circulated a memo summarizing recent developments with CHI and requested clarifying questions from the committee.

It seems like there are competing projects that are doing similar work? What's the status of collaboration?

Andy replied that as ASOR enters the second year of this project, we are looking for ways to collaborate with organizations that were competitors in year one; Penn, the Oriental Institute, and the Getty, to name a few. We have had a good relationship with some of these organizations. The Smithsonian, for example, is helping us plan the summit in December. The American groups are all doing different things, so there's no need to compete. Penn is more interested in theory than documentation. The Oriental Institute is more focused on Afghanistan.

Is the summit going to be live streamed?

That will depend on if the National Geographic Society has the capacity and willingness to do that.

Are there CHI events open to the public?

The public events we have coming up include the Sunday event at the Annual Meeting, then the DC summit on December 11. The board meeting in spring will meet in Washington, because April 18th will be a public event in conjunction with World Monuments Day.

5. Strategic Plan

The last time the CCC visited the strategic plan was in May, in the form of a working document that was a summary of discussions from the EC and the Strategic Planning Task Force. For this meeting, Susan provided a document that incorporates feedback from the CCC, and is much closer to a draft of a new strategic plan. The Strategic Planning Task Force met again in Washington, and received feedback from the EC on the document you are looking at today. The main thing that came out of these conversations is that the draft was modeled on our last strategic plan, which was written in a moment when some of the core functions and priorities of ASOR were being identified - things like publications, and the Annual Meeting. This past weekend, the conversations acknowledged that, while there is still work to be done on these areas, we need more vision. For example, how we might make ASOR more international, how ASOR might foster the next generation of archaeologists, advocacy work, outreach, and cultural heritage.

The chair of the Program Committee drew attention to the goal of making the Annual Meeting financially self-sustaining. He asked how specific do we want this strategic plan to be? Are we going to be setting number goals? Who would be responsible for making this happen?

Susan replied that the strategic plan would only be as specific as saying “we want a 10% growth,” which would be carried out incrementally, so we would stop at certain points and ask if we **want** the meeting to get bigger and be able to pay for itself, or if we want to maintain the intimacy of the size of meeting we have. Marketing the meeting would be the responsibility of the Boston office.

The question was raised as to whether the Annual Meeting should decouple from SBL, which result in a significant hit to attendance.

Susan replied that nothing will change in the immediate future since we have hotel contracts signed through 2018. We’ll learn more about how things will play

out in San Anotnio, where the ASOR meeting site will not be connected by public transit to the SBL meeting.

The CHI project was supposed to be a two or three year project. We are now considering whether we want this to be a permanent part of the organization. We have doubled the number of people working for ASOR. The budget has been doubled in the last year and a half. Susan asked if committee chairs felt that the work of other committees has been neglected as ASOR has focused on this new, huge project.

The Program Committee feels completely supported and stated that involvement in the field of cultural heritage preservation is a good move for ASOR.

The Awards Committee also feels completely supported, particularly by the Manager of Meetings, Arlene Press. Though, the chair does feel very disconnected form what is happening in the office and the general activities of CHI.

The Junior Scholars Committee chair has found that the heritage initiative is helpful with institutional contacts and wonders if this isn't a resource we could offer to people.

The Publications Committee chair stated that he thinks it would be good for this project not to be dependent on government funding. The political climate is changing in that area of the world, and the likely survivors will probably be less friendly to our government.