

ASOR Chairs Coordinating Council  
Conference Call, October 26, 2016, 1:30 PM EDT

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

Absent: Chuck Jones, Tom Levy, Randy Younker

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes approved with Susan's corrections.

**2. Committee Reports as Needed and/or Available**

*a. Awards and Honors Committee*

The committee is still working on selecting winners from the book nominees. It has become clear that a "conflict of interest" policy is necessary. There are members of the Awards Committee who have written chapters in nominated books, and others who have been thanked in the acknowledgments. This will be discussed in November.

*b. Committee on Publications*

All is going well.

*c. Jr. Scholars Committee*

The chairs had considered Heather Parker as a co-chair, but noticed that she is on the ballot for the board member election. The chairs wonder if there are runner up nominees for the co-chair position, or if Parker's place on the ballot is even an issue.

Susan said there is no legal reason why Parker could not take both positions. As far as her professional workload, she is teaching at Hopkins in an adjunct capacity.

Parker has a long history with ASOR. Jeremy Smoak might be another good option for a co-chair. It is believed that he is on a post doc, or is a lecturer at UCLA. It is challenging to find someone who is not too senior, who is not too far removed from being a student.

Sharon said that as the chair of the Chairs Nominations Committee, she will contact Parker and let her know that if she is considering this position, she should talk to the current chairs to see if the work load would fit in with her teaching.

Regarding registration and membership fees, it has been almost a year since SBL changed their fee structure for membership based on income level. The chair would like to keep this in front of the committee as a possibility for ASOR. The chair said that if Andy could provide details as to what sort of data would be helpful for ASOR, she could bring this information to the November meeting.

The Membership & Outreach Committee has been tasked with this, so the chair will give a report in November.

Susan said SBL has a graduated fee for membership, and meeting registrations vary only as member, student, early bird, etc. The cheapest (earliest) rate is about half for a student what it would be for a professional.

It was agreed that this is an issue that is important and will continue to be looked at.

*d. Annual Meeting Program Committee*

The chairs stated that the program book has gone to print and we are in the home stretch to getting to the meeting. The office is still receiving some cancellations, and these people being offered the option to have someone else read their paper. The session chairs are being reviewed, and the chairs are preparing to thank those who have been chair s of ASOR sessions for two terms and asking new people to step into those sessions, and asking those who have chaired for one term if they want to come back.

Susan mentioned that the Annual Meeting mobile app will be the soft roll out of the new logo. The meeting will be the official roll out. A new website should be up and running early next year.

*e. Chairs' Nominating Committee*

The Junior Scholars chair nominees have already been discussed.

### **3. Discussion Items**

*a. What constitutes a prior publication for the Professional Conduct Policy?*

According to the policy, ASOR will not be the first place of publication or presentation for unprovenanced materials. The question is what qualifies as an authoritative place for items to be published or presented.

The most complicated part of this has been whether a popular periodical or book is sufficient. Additionally, there is agreement that presentation at a learned society can be considered a prior presentation, but the question is which learned societies qualify as authoritative. What if the society is a religious society, a private museum, etc.

It was suggested that the publication be peer reviewed. That could circumvent the issue of what kind of publication or learned society.

The PC chair said peer review was at the root of his concerns. He wondered, as a practical concern, how would we establish that a popular publication had been peer reviewed?

As an example, there is a papyrus inscription that is being presented at an academic conference, "Innovations of the Archaeology of Jerusalem and Its Region." It has been described in a press release. Would we call that an authoritative presentation/publication? The PC chair asked if the conference is run by a learned society. It is believed that the conference is being presented by the Israeli Antiquities Authority or Hebrew University. Presumably, someone at the university is vetting the abstracts.

Susan said she would consider this an initial presentation. If someone wanted to talk about it at ASOR, it would go through the ASOR vetting process. However, she is not sure this would survive the ASOR process because the press coverage of the materials in question has called the authenticity of the papyrus into question. The PC chair pointed out that that would make the session chair the ultimate subjective authority.

We have said that nothing would be presented at the meeting that wouldn't go in *BASOR*. How would *BASOR* approach this? *BASOR* would send it out for peer review. Though in this case, the editors might have a problem with it before it was sent out for review.

The question was posed that if we go with peer review as the ultimate authority, do we get rid of differentiation between types of publications?

It was also mentioned that Eisenbrauns did not send out their latest ostraca volume for peer review, but as a scholarly press, we would consider that an authoritative publication.

It was suggested that, under the "Vehicle and Venue" section, the language "ideally peer reviewed" was added to the popular periodical and publication section.

Sharon raised an issue with scholarly catalogs, as all museums are not equal, and some museums have "hot items." This section said materials must be in compliance with the UNESCO conference of 1970. However, this compliance is already implied by the statement that the materials must be in compliance with the ASOR ethics policy.

Susan will incorporate this feedback and give it to committees so that it can be discussed face to face among the committees in November.

The PC chair asked if there is a real need to keep the “popular publication” category in the document. Andy has made the biggest argument for this. Andy would consider the papyrus published because it has a press release, a blog post, and the image is widely available.

Others disagreed, because the venues were not authoritative. Andy argued that the materials have been published because they have been presented and interpreted.

The PC chair posed the question of whether we *want* to include popular publications regardless of how well they can provide all of these details that fit our publications definition. We are trying to be scholarly, not journalistic.

Andy pointed out that if someone cannot present unprovenanced work at ASOR, there are other places they could go that will publish it. If “popular publications,” are removed from the ASOR document as a publication option, this is not to say that the scholar could not choose to publish the work somewhere else first. Then they could do the work of getting peer review, etc., and get it published in *BASOR* later on. ASOR is not in the business of telling people they can’t publish things wherever they want.