

Chairs Coordinating Council
Conference Call
October 24, 2017, 1:00 PM EST

Present: Helen Dixon, Cynthia Rufo, Sharon Herbert, Chuck Jones, Andy Vaughn, Susan Ackerman, Heather Davis, Tom Levy, Geoff Emberling, Laura Mazow

Absent: Randy Younker

1. Approval of September Minutes

Andy offered a correction regarding the number of Annual Meeting registrations. Minutes approved with this correction. Geoff also subsequently reported that the reference to Goyko Barjamovic should be emended to Gojko Barjamovic.

2. Committee Reports

Committee on Archaeological Policy

The chair said he has supplied a list of all new approved projects for CAP. He and Matt Vincent and plan to hand over management of the application site to the ASOR staff prior to the Annual Meeting on the 15th. He asked if Andy planned to send out messages to researchers to ask them to apply to affiliation?

Andy said that the first priority was to get the updated list of affiliated digs on the website and then to talk with the current chair and Steve Falconer about other digs to contact. Cynthia is working on getting the website up-to-date.

Susan said she would be happy to go through the current list and compare it with past list to find people to contact for application. A good place to start would be non-North American digs, especially the digs she visited last summer.

The chair asked if Mohamed-Moin Sadek is a member of ASOR? He is working on protecting sites in the Gaza strip. His project would be a good affiliation. Andy said he would look into this. [Subsequent investigation shows Moin Sadek is not a member.]

Susan mentioned that Sarkis Khoury, the Director-General of Antiquities (Ministry of Culture of Lebanon), will be attending the Annual Meeting. He is scheduled to speak in one of the Lebanon sessions.

Sharon mentioned that since the current chair is stepping down, it would be good to invite Steve Falconer to the CCC meeting at the ASOR meeting to put names to faces.

Committee on Publications

Sharon informed the committee that even though the current chair is due to step down, but he has agreed to one more year as COP chair.

The chair reported that all of the journals are on schedule. *BASOR* now gets so many submissions, which is a positive indication of the stature of the journal. As a result, the editors have to advise authors on other venues of publication or turn them down.

The editors are producing their annual reports for the Annual Meeting. There will be much business to attend to at the meeting, including moving forward on Bill Caraher's publication of a digital book. COP also expects to approve the advisory board that Alex has collected for *ANEToday* and to move to officially put *ANEToday* under COP oversight. COP will also consider whether ASOR should explore joining with a publishing partner for production of our journals and fulfillment of journal subscriptions.

Andy explained further that after speaking with a member and past member of COP, both of whom has publishing experience, he contacted the chair about submitting a request for proposals to potential publishing partners. There are three reasons for this. First, we would like to have better dissemination and expand online access for our journals, but the staff has been very stretched trying to achieve these goals. The second reason is office space. If someone else took over production and storing of journals, we could save 500 square feet of space we currently dedicate for this purpose in our office. Third, revenue over the last five years have been increasing in membership but decreasing in institutional subscriptions and we would like to see if a publishing partner could help with marketing of our journals, especially institutional subscriptions. Overall, we would like to know if we could meet our mission better and still provide good editorial support, while reducing office space, if we entered into a publishing agreement.

Mitch Allen wrote a seven page RFP that has been circulated to potential publishing partners. Our goal is to give preliminary proposals from potential partners to the COP before the Annual Meeting so COP will have data to discuss at the Annual Meeting. If the committee feels that this is worth pursuing, the chair will be asked to present a preliminary report to the Executive Committee to discuss. The EC will discuss this at the January meeting. If we want to continue, COP will be asked for a more complete report that the board will see in March, to be discussed at the April board meeting.

The chair said that there has been controversy in the past about external production of journals, but we think it is worth revisiting in light of an evolving market and changes in the publishing industry.

It is also worth noting that Penn State UP has purchased Eisenbrauns. Eisenbrauns is ASOR's contractor for prepress work. The prepress work is something Penn State does not plan to continue in the long term. The publishing world is changing and this is a good time for us to be considering new possibilities.

Honors & Awards Committee

The committee is in the middle of the write ups for the awards. There is a nice group of awardees this year, but it is difficult to find information about people's past accomplishments.

Andy said that these records are kept in the office, and the staff would provide the information. The committee also has had questions about whether awards are supposed to be for what someone has done for ASOR vs. for the entire field. This will be a topic of further discussion.

Last year the committee worked predominately with Arlene, but her workload did not allow her to focus on the awards. This year, Britta took over a lot of the responsibilities and that has worked really well.

Judging the posters is difficult for the committee to handle. The committee has been trying to figure out the best way to do this. They considered a subcommittee for posters but did not get far on that. This year there are 75 posters. Susan suggested dividing them up in terms of geographic area. The committee is trying to figure out ways that make it less of a time commitment. Does anyone have suggestions?

A nomination process was suggested, whereby only certain posters would be nominated for the award, meaning fewer posters would need to be judged. However, there was concern that this might create an insider/outsider status, where only those "in the know" would nominate posters from their inner circle of friends and colleagues. It has also been suggested that Junior Scholars could take on judging the posters. However, there could be a big conflict of interest as many of the posters are authored by junior scholars.

Andy suggested having different categories and issuing multiple awards. Susan suggested that having multiple categories could be a problem, just in terms of the amount of time available in the Members' Meeting for giving awards, so a possibility might be having one category per year that is eligible for an award.

Arlene is going to send the committee the abstracts as soon as possible. Each committee member might take 25 posters and narrow things down that way.

The Programs Committee chair suggested that the PC could help. The committee's work is mostly done by the time the meeting starts, so we are actually available during that time.

The PC and Honors Committee will talk separately about how to go about this.

Junior Scholars Committee

The committee is gearing up for the Annual Meeting. The luncheon is all set. There will be a social in the ASOR suite. The senior scholars, donors, and friends from the Legacy

Dinner will be invited to mingle with the junior scholars toward the end of the social. The chair asked Susan and Andy if they should set up a time to talk about the logistics of that? It was agreed that Andy and Arlene would discuss this with the chair.

A possible name change for the Junior Scholars Committee has come up in various contexts. People feel that that “junior” carries a pejorative sense. Committee members have been working to come up with possible alternatives. In the next meeting, they will vote on whether we want to move forward with this and bring it to the board. If the name is going to change, the committee wants to do that now before rolling out other big changes they hope to make. The name that keeps coming up is “Early Career Scholars.”

The PC chair thinks this is a good idea. However, “Early Career” might exclude people who are many years out from receiving their terminal degree and are still post doc or have not secured a tenure track appointment.

Andy added that from an administrative standpoint, matching the name of the committee match with a membership level would be nice. The office staff has struggled with the same issue and arrived at “early career membership.”

Programs Committee

The committee had a meeting to discuss a more systematic ethics review for paper submissions. The committee approved the use of a new Google form for member organized session proposals for this year. In the past, these were submitted as PDFs. The committee is now in a lull after the program book revisions finished up.

Andy added that 1,070 people are registered for the meeting. The ASOR office, in conjunction with Geoff and Helen, is working with a pro bono law firm to assist incoming international attendees who may have issues coming to the meeting.

3. Office Search

Susan said that the lease for the office space at 650 Beacon, which only went through December, has been extended to June. We are in intense conversations with four different possibilities for places we might move. Andy is making site visits and meeting with administrators. We continue to look in Boston and also outside of Boston. We hope to bring some concrete proposals for two possibilities to the board in November, hopefully more. We hope to have a decision by the end of November.

4. Matters Arising

We have a November call scheduled in two weeks. Sharon will be polling the committee to see if that meeting is needed.