

Chairs Coordinating Council  
Conference Call  
February 23, 2017, 3:00 PM EST

Present: Sharon Herbert, Tom Levy, Laura Mazow, Andy Vaughn, Susan Ackerman, Chuck Jones, Heather Parker, Randy Younker, Cynthia Rufo

Absent: Geoff Emberling, Helen Dixon

### **1. Approval of January Minutes**

Approved.

### **2. Discussion and Action on Prior Publication Definition**

According to ASOR's ethics policy, ASOR will not be the first place of publication or presentation for unprovenanced artifacts acquired by an individual or institution after April 24, 1972. This has required ASOR to define what qualifies as a prior publication of such materials. A document attempting to define this has been circulated to the committees for feedback.

Publications Committee: Two issues came up when reviewing the document. The first is that the editors feel confident that they can make these decisions, except when there are grey areas. They want to know who they should consult with. The practice has been that they consult the other Publications Committee members, the chair, the executive director, or an ad hoc group. They would like to have this more formalized. What body in ASOR do they go to, to say, "We have made this decision, do you endorse it?"

Sharon suggested that each committee with these concerns could add to their guidelines that said committee is the authority on determining how the ethics policy applies to that committee's area of expertise.

Susan – This would work for many of the committees. For example, decisions about presentations at the AM are going to be made by the Program Committee. What is different about publications is there are layers; editors, the editorial board, and the Publications Committee. It might make sense to say that the final decision lies with the Publications Committee.

The Publications chair said he would run that by the committee and propose that this is written into the committee guidelines.

Susan said she will add an item to the document stating that final decisions lie with the respective committees.

The Publications chair said that there was a second issue that came up as his committee reviewed the prior publication document: peer review. A lot of scholarship goes through editorial review, not peer review. He suggested that the editors need to be able to make a judgment call about whether an article is authoritative.

Susan agreed, mentioning that she could think of European journals that are not peer reviewed, but are certainly considered authoritative.

Susan said that the Program Committee brought up the question of whether to include publications in press. She is not excited about this unless it was much more rigorously defined. Publications can be under contract, but not a word has been written. If we were going to accept things in press, she would want a far more rigorous definition that says that the article is in page proof or copy edit – something concrete.

She then posed a theoretical scenario in which an author wants to publish something about unprovenanced ostraca in an ASOR journal. The volume with the initial publication of the ostraca has not been published yet, but it is in page proof. Does this count as a prior publication? It's in a volume that will be out in June, but the author has submitted this article to go in the May BASOR.

The chair of the Membership Committee said that would still give the appearance that ASOR published it first. That would have people wondering if ASOR is consistent with its own policy.

Other committee members agreed. After both the article and book are out, it would still look like ASOR was the first place of publication.

Susan found this persuasive, stating that five years down the line, no one will remember that the book manuscript was in press when the BASOR issue came out.

Sharon felt the committee was in agreement about this. Published means published. Are there other changes to the draft we should be focusing on?

Susan brought to the committee's attention that the section titled, "Form," Item 2, has been amended to say that there should be commentary specific to the object. The revised language gives a little more leeway rather than defining a rigorous checklist that all must to adhere to.

Susan said that it sounded like the committee was in general agreement about the items discussed. She will add language about which committees are the final point of decision if there are grey areas or unresolved discussions. The next step is for her to send the revised document to the Subcommittee on the Policy on

Professional Conduct. They need to endorse it and send it to the board to be voted on in April.

### **3. Committee Reports**

#### *Committee on Archaeological Policy*

The committee almost has the online system for applying for CAP-affiliation ironed out. They really want to hand it over to ASOR to manage. There are a number of things that require input from ASOR, including integrating the ASOR website design into the CAP system. CAP also wants to integrate an email system so they can automatically notify someone.

There are some issues with this that would make it more productive Tom to talk with the staff separately about how to do this. We are in the process of designing a new ASOR website, so we can talk about the logistics of that.

#### *Committee on Membership and Outreach*

The committee has discussed having scholarly meetings overseas. These meetings would not compete with the Annual Meeting; they would instead be symposia focused on specific topics. They are hoping in a year or so to have an ASOR-sponsored meeting in Paris. Another meeting might be in Sicily. We could use these as recruiting occasions to attract international institutional members. We would want to make these events financially self-supporting.

The committee chair also mentioned a question that was raised through the Initiative on the Status of Women, regarding raising money through crowd-sourced funding. Does this violate any beliefs or policies we might have about fundraising?

Susan said that she and Andy have discussed this. We would be supportive of the Initiative on the Status of Women raising money, especially to bring people to the Annual Meeting. In terms of how that would work with our tax deductible status, we may need that to go through ASOR's donation system.

Andy pointed out that March Fellowship Madness is scheduled to begin soon, and it would be good not to conflict with this. We have a donor who has pledged matching funds, particularly for a scholarship. April or May might be a good time to have a campaign for an initiative (women's or junior scholars) for early career scholars to get funding to attend the Annual Meeting. Andy or Susan will write to these initiatives in the coming week.

Andy reported that the office staff has done a good job of recruiting new

members and in getting lapsed members to rejoin. We tried something new this year. We gave people a \$25 coupon if they rejoined before February 15. We had ~53 people rejoin. Our membership is higher than its ever been right now. We are hoping to get as high as 1,800.

The Membership chair said would be happy to help with this type of thing. Andy suggested that the next membership drive could include a letter from the Membership chair instead of him.

### *Committee on Publication*

This month, a linked version of Bill Caraher's book has been made available. The text links with the excavation data in OpenContext. This has been an interesting experiment. It has been a great way to have the narrative engaged with the full corpus of data it represents.

### *Honors and Awards Committee*

The committee has recently discussed the conflict of interest issue – wherein a committee member has reviewed a book in which they are thanked in the acknowledgements, or they have an article in the volume, etc. The committee drafted a statement that covers this. The bigger issue is what happens to the committee when someone has to be excused because of a conflict. The committee is only seven people, and it divides in half to address certain awards. The committee talked about finding alternates if the majority of the review committee has to be excused. Once a policy has been decided upon, it will be added to the committee guidelines.

Posters have become a very large burden on the committee. The committee talked to the Junior Scholars Committee about taking this over, but that did not seem to work. The committee still considering this.

### *Junior Scholars Committee*

A call will go out on social media to recruit three committee members to populate the committee. Everyone ended up rotating off at the same time, so new members is the first priority. In the meantime, the committee has not yet chosen a speaker for Junior Scholars luncheon. The committee will also have a panel at the Annual Meeting on putting together an academic and alt-ac dossier for the job market.