

Chairs Coordinating Council
November 18, 2017, 8:15am
Boston, MA

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

Absent: Heather Parker

Approval of October Minutes

Minutes approved, with an emendation regarding the spelling of Gojko Barjamovic's name under "Approval of September Minutes."

Committee Updates

Programs Committee

The 2017 meeting has gone well. There was one ethics complaint. The poster session needed some help with judging. The PC stepped in to help with this, and it went relatively well, but some tweaking in terms of the judging process is still needed.

The committee discussed how to handle the increasing size of the meeting. The fact that the content of the meeting is becoming more diverse, and of greater breadth, means that the issue of overlap and multiple sessions is not as big of a problem as it might seem. The bigger question is the logistical issue of how to pack in extra sessions across. This year, two additional sessions across were added because there was not a method in place for rejecting papers. In one case, a paper given, even though the chairs had not been satisfied with the quality of the abstract. The chairs wanted to reject it but did not feel like they had the framework to do this. If we need to start rejecting 25% of abstract submissions, we need to help session chairs know how to say "no" and help them feel empowered to say "no." In general, this meeting has not been more overwhelming than normal even though it is much larger than past meetings.

Susan said she talked to attendees who were very happy with the size and options at this meeting.

The Honors & Awards chair said she had heard people mention that there were conflicts and they could not get to everything, but this was not phrased as a complaint. She has heard complaints about session chairs who did not keep to their times and their session ran over. She went to a session with AV issues, so they started late but there was enough padding in the schedule to get back on track. Session chairs need to be on top of that.

The Publications chair said he had noticed that people did not really come and go during sessions, which is something typically seen at other meetings. People seemed to come to a session and stay for the duration.

Andy encouraged the committee to think about having more concurrent sessions for mission and quality reasons. People remain members because they feel engaged in the organization. If they want to present and are not able to, they will not feel as engaged. The only complaints he has heard about size have been from people who want a much more intimate meeting, like the meetings of the late 1990s and early 2000s, but ASOR is not the same organization it was a decade ago.

The CAP chair said he was impressed by the number of Israelis in attendance, and the internationalism of this conference.

Andy said about 50 people from SBL came to the joint ASOR/SBL session but did not register for the ASOR meeting. There were people who had registered for ASOR who did not have seats. One possibility is to have hotel security check name badges. His main concern was not whether registration fees could be collected from the SBL people, more that the people who had paid could not get a seat, and some of them left. This is a concern for ASOR as we continue to grow.

The Programs Committee chair said that there were problems with this issue of cross-listing sessions, as the PC has not figured out a consistent way to do that, so SBL people might not be aware that they were to register.

Andy said a note was sent to SBL saying that registration was required for the joint session. Addition by Susan after the fact (on December 4, 2017): in the listing for the joint SBL/ASOR session in the SBL Program book, there is no indication that registration was required, and, in fact, the session is listed as "co-sponsored by SBL," which might well imply to SBL members that they were welcome to attend without registering.

The Honors & Awards chair asked if we have a joint session at SBL?

Andy said no. As we grow, how do we feel about the staff or hotel staff asking people to leave without an ASOR badge?

The committee did not arrive at a solution for this issue.

Sharon said that a colleague commented that she wanted a more interventionist PC. She wondered if the Phoenician workshop and the Lebanon session should have been combined to make them talk to one another. This has not been the role of the PC. Other organizations do this as a way to facilitate conversation and deal with many sessions. Should the PC be trying to achieve cross-pollination?

The Honors & Awards chair asked how the PC could know the content of the sessions and how they would interact? It depends on the papers. This should come more from the people who suggest workshops.

Andy said that a lot of this is a capacity issue. Other organizations have two people creating the program: someone with a PhD in the field organizing the academic program, and someone else dealing with the logistics. We have Arlene and the volunteer PC.

The Programs chair said that when the committee evaluates session proposals, they evaluate overlaps with existing sessions and other proposals. It is hard to do that with more general topics like Phoenicia and Lebanon. Some of these decisions are made by the session proposers, and some of them are made by the PC. This is within our abilities, but other things are slipping through the cracks. For example, last year we never saw session chair feedback. We are at capacity.

The Honors & Awards chair pointed out that the region we work in is complicated, and we are not the UN. It is not ASOR's job to force people to talk to each other if they do not want to.

Andy said he would imagine some of our Lebanese colleagues might get in trouble if they were on the program with Israelis.

Susan suggested the committee discuss about the plenary talk.

The consensus was that it was an excellent lecture, and it was especially well received by ASOR's public members. Everyone agreed that it was one of the best lectures in recent memory. A discussion ensued about whether the plenary event in future years should be addressed primarily to public members or to scholarly members.

Other comments about this year's plenary included a complaint that people in the back could not hear and a complaint that it was impossible to look both at the speaker and the images, given how the screens were positioned far to the side of the room.

Susan said she was asked what kind of guidelines are given to the plenary speaker. It was suggested that the PC develop guidelines that we share consistently with the speakers year to year rather than only her idiosyncratic coaching.

The PC chair said the committee has started thinking about nominations for next year. The committee was thinking of someone from the Middle East, outside of Israel. The PC would welcome suggestions along those lines.

Andy asked if anyone had immigration issues at the airport?

The PC chair said no one from Turkey or Lebanon have had issues.

Andy said that a concern about choosing a Middle Eastern speaker is that they could get stuck on the way here.

The Publications chair asked if it is known how many people pre-registered but did not attend.

Andy said it is usually about 10%. Other organizations have a more aggressive cancellation policy than we have, so we might consider changing that a little. We retained more papers this year because we made people pay back in May. In the past we have had a lot of people drop out when the pay date is closer to the meeting.

Susan mentioned that it is a priority in the strategic plan to raise funds for people to travel to the meeting from the Middle East.

Andy said it would be nice to do the meeting for free, but it is very expensive for the organization and costs are going up. We try to make it more affordable. This year we offered a big discount for early career members. However, the registration fee is a fairly small percentage of the total cost of travel.

Sharon said that registration is the cost we can control. We cannot control the plane or hotel fees. This is off topic for this meeting.

Membership and Outreach

The Membership chair said his committee discussed the European outreach initiative. Steve Dana gave a report on Friends of ASOR. FOA enrollment is slowing down a little bit. FOA raised money this year to fund one of ASOR's excavation fellowship. The fellowship recipient sent in a report that has been stared with Steve and will be published in a future issue of *The ANE Today*. Two slots are opening up in the committee so they are seeking nominations for replacements. Let Randy know if you have any ideas. Most of our discussion dealt with the initiative in Paris.

The committee is trying to set up three events in Europe to raise the ASOR flag to engage European scholars to join as individual members and get their institutions to become institutional members. The first is a two-day event running from September 4-5 at the Sorbonne. Much of the event has been planned and the plan was approved by Membership, but the CCC needs to approve it. The chair would like to get a contingency approval so we can continue to work on this and get final approval in December. We have a lot of people who would like to participate but are reluctant to write abstracts until the event is approved.

Sharon said the CCC has not seen the planning materials, so everyone should look at them during the meeting break.

The Membership chair said the materials contain financial information about the Paris event. Another event the committee is working on is at Palermo. The venue is secured, and the committee has the support of the antiquities people. The topics would be (1) paleo-Christianity and (2) Mediterranean connections to the Levant. The chair will supply a proposal for that later. The third event is in Strasbourg, with papers on a theme. It would be mainly a recruitment event. Nothing has been planned for this one yet.

Sharon asked about the CCC's thoughts on the general concept of international events?

The PC chair asked how participation is determined. Is the Membership Committee soliciting proposals from ASOR members?

The Membership chair said his committee is trying to recruit members for ASOR, so all are welcome and that he is particularly trying to recruit Europeans to speak. ASOR would have representatives such as Susan and Andy, selling the organization to people. The participants would not be ASOR members. One of the time-sensitive issues in question is that two of our administrative contacts will be retiring at the end of the year, and we want to get things committed before they are out of office.

Additionally Teddy Burgh proposed the idea of creating a virtual dig, in which participants could engage through live streaming or video. This idea needs more exploration and Teddy will create a proposal.

Publications Committee

Chuck Jones is continuing as chair for one more year. The editors report that everything is going well, sometimes too well. BASOR is full 18 months out, so they have to start turning papers away, which is hard because it can be difficult to get those authors back when you need them. Andrea Berlin is now formally on the committee, representing the Levantine Ceramics Project. Alex Joffe reported on *Ancient Near East Today*. He has ideas about reorganization. COP voted to take *ANET* under the Publications umbrella formally. Also, COP will no longer bring editorial board memberships to the Board of Trustees, we will keep these within the committee. *ANET* also has an editorial board now. Bill Caraher put forth a proposal for high resolution images of sculptures from Cyprus to be published digitally. This would be done by University of North Dakota in partnership with OpenContext and ASOR. A memorandum of understanding is being drafted to outline the partnership. COP will draft something and bring this back to the CCC.

COP needs to fill two positions on the Publications committee. The chair thinks it would be a good idea to have someone from the publishing industry to bring a sense of reality.

The PC chair asked if committee openings are being publicly broadcast.

Susan said it is now suggested that committees put a notice in *News@ASOR*. This gets new blood into the committees and casts a wider net.

The Publications chair thinks his committee could use more members, so new ways of recruiting committee members would help diversify the committee.

Susan said the bylaws don't dictate the size of committees. CAP has five people per class. PC has three per class. If Publications needs more people, that can happen.

The Publications chair said COP had approved ASOR putting out a request for proposals for a publishing partner that would take on the production and distribution of the journals. We have the proposals, but the committee did not have enough time to work through them. The editors want the possibility in-house production to stay on the table during these discussions. However, there are issues of capacity in the central office. There are good reasons to think we would save or make money by using a vendor, but there might be issues of losing the level of control we have now. The consultant who helped write the RFP said we are the healthiest learned society he knows of as far as the success of our publications.

Andy said the content of our journals is great, but we have not succeeded in disseminating those journals to institutions. With the publication world changing in the last ten years, he does not think the staff has the capacity and resources to keep up with marketing initiatives. Also, a publishing partner should be able to help us with the dissemination of online versions of our journals. That said, the proposals are complicated. Susan will ask the Board to authorize the continuation of this conversation. Andy would like to hire a consultant to read through the proposals as we move forward and he will produce reports that analyze the bids.

The Publications chair said that Eisenbrauns and Penn State University Press have merged, and Penn State has put in a proposal for our journals. Eisenbrauns will no longer be doing our pre-press, but Penn State would have a vested interest in our publications.

Break from 9:50-9:55

Awards & Honors Committee

The chair said that the award presentations went well. This year we told book authors that they were getting awards. Some of them made an effort to come to get their award, which was nice. We did run into the issue where some of the authors are not ASOR members, and the question arose of whether they needed to register for the meeting. Sara Milstein was the only one who could make it and she was given a complimentary one-day rate. Some of the authors asked about acceptance speeches, a request that we

deflected. For example, the Chair suggested that the winner of the Nancy Lapp award send his acceptance speech to Nancy and that we could put it in *News@ASOR*. Regarding Glenn Schwartz' book, it is the second time Cotsen Press has won an award. We need to make sure that the books from fancy glossy presses are not the ones getting awards simply because the books themselves are so polished. For the service awards, we did not tell the recipients, but we did spread the word discreetly, which led more people to come by and support the recipients. The Chair thought this was a good way to play it and we will do this again next year.

One question that came up regards the frequency with which an author can receive a book award: for service awards, there is a "only once every seven years" rule, but should the same apply to book awards? The committee decided "no," because it penalizes prolific authors.

We have someone rotating off the committee and will be putting out a call. For the book awards we need someone with a specific background.

Andy suggested the chair send an email to the staff and we will help the chair figure out how to solicit nominations. The staff will figure out a Google form that can be used for all committees.

The Awards chair said that her committee has been doing everything in the fall right before the meeting, but this can be problematic in terms of things getting rushed. The committee has thus decided to seek nominations for service awards in the spring, but still seek nominations for book awards in the fall, as this fits better with publishers' timetables. Still, the committee wants to push up the book awards nomination date slightly, so they have time to read the books.

The CAP chair asked whether there should be different awards for single author versus edited monographs?

The Awards chair said the committee has looked at this, and feels that there are awards that address many types of books right now.

The PC chair said that it would help nominators if the nomination guidelines were more fleshed out. Right now the suggestion is just to "write an email to the office."

The Awards chair said that her committee has been discussing whether service awards should be intended to honor service to ASOR, or service to the field?

Andy suggested that the committee consider updating the award descriptions. Many of them specify "ASOR" rather than "the field." These award descriptions were written decades ago, and might not reflect the intentions of the awards now.

Susan said the committee would need to look back at how the awards were created. If the board came up with those descriptions, the board would have to discuss this, not the Awards committee. This should be easy enough for the Scheuer medal, because we know what year the medal was established and it should be in the board minutes.

The PC chair suggested that it would be a strong move for ASOR to take ownership of "the field."

The Publications chair has served on the AIA awards committee, the book awards are nominated in June, and each award has its own committee.

The Awards chair said her committee missed ASOR having a social media specialist to publicize social media about the awards.

Andy said that Cynthia has taken over much of the social media responsibilities. The staff has keenly felt Kaitlynn's absence over the past two months gearing up for this meeting. We have not replaced her, which has been a question of capacity, finances, and office space.

The Awards chair said that the poster session has been a little overwhelming this year. Do we want the poster session to be as big as they were this year? If so, we need better coordination and communication. The numbers on the posters were covered this year, which made judging difficult. Numbers need to be prominently displayed next year and people cannot move their poster out of order. If we want to make a big commitment to posters, we need to figure out a more intentional way to go about organizing the session and the judging. In terms of judging, doing it on the spot does not quite work.

The PC chair asked if the chair could reach out to other organizations to get a sense of how they judge posters? The rubric used this year was scientifically based, based on research methodology and design, which does not quite work for some posters. Also, the people presenting the posters did not know the points on which they were being judged. One suggestion was that instead of having just one poster award, we give multiple "Awards of Excellence," to every poster that met a certain standard in terms of quality.

The Awards chair suggested that the Awards Committee and the PC set up a separate meeting to discuss this in January or February.

The Publications chair said that it was lucky that we had a huge room this year for the posters, but if there will be this many posters in future years, that needs to be considered in space negotiations.

Sharon said that we all agree that posters are important, as is having awards for the posters, and we need to figure out guidelines for moving forward.

Committee on Archaeological Policy

This is Tom Levy's last meeting as CAP chair. Steve Falconer will be the next chair of CAP.

The CAP chair said that for his three year appointment, he was tasked to internationalize CAP, which was a huge shift from the old paradigm. We democratized CAP and encouraged non-North American ASOR members to join and affiliate. As we move into the future, CAP will need to continue to reach out to our friends around the world.

A big part of the shift was getting our affiliates to accept the ethical principles of ASOR. Having a large CAP committee is valuable for this evaluation process. The institutional memory of people who have worked within these countries is important. It has become easier for people to affiliate because we now have an online submission system. Matt Vincent, who built the submission system, has left the field of archaeology. He will clean up the system before we hand this over to Steve Falconer. Steve will be encouraged to find someone to help maintain this system.

The Membership chair suggested that there are a few grad students at his institution that would be helpful for this if he needs names.

Susan said she and Andy need to discuss this because there are financial implications.

The CAP chair said five of the committee members rotated off. We rotated in five more. Sturt Manning Patricia Fall, Assaf Yasur-Landau, Kent Bramlett, Jimmy Hardin. Kate Grossman did an excellent job with fellowships this year. The committee gave out \$50,000 for student travel grants. There are a couple new awards as well.

The committee has had discussions about addressing the general topics of harassment prevention (sexual harassment, bullying, etc.) and developing an ASOR Code of Conduct for Fieldwork Projects. Susan said this sort of conversation had been happening in a few different venues, especially the Initiative on the Status of Women. But because the matter seemed to be an archaeological policy issue, she asked CAP -- the Committee on Archaeological Research and Policy -- to take up a conversation about this. CAP formed a subcommittee to address this. Virginia Hermann, Emily Hammer, Catherine Kerns, formed the subcommittee. They will tap legal council and people within ASOR to serve as resources.

The PC chair asked why there were no men on the subcommittee. For these kinds of things to be effective, men need to be involved.

Susan said that this proposal came in from Beth Alpert Nakhai, chair of the Initiative on the Status of Women. Beth wanted this work to be done out of that initiative but Susan

felt it was more appropriate for CAP to do this work as it is an issue of archaeological policy and should not be perceived as an “women’s issue.”

The CAP chair said that the person who was initially most vocal about this was Tim Harrison. Perhaps he should be involved in this committee.

Susan said perhaps we should look into expanding this committee. She has admired the degree to which CAP has thought about prevention, statements that can be put out there as far as policy and best practices, rather than writing a reactive policy.

The PC chair asked if there is a grievance process? Can you a dig have its affiliation removed if there are complaints?

The CAP chair said that his gut feeling is yes. If a dig had a reputation, it would be discussed by CAP. It has not come up.

Andy said there is more professional training than ever on this topic. He has heard that in the absence of a policy that defines due process, it would be hard for ASOR to take any sort of disciplinary action.

The CAP chair said that it would be difficult to make every dig director take an online harassment course. Is that the road we want to go down? When a director applies for affiliation, they have to agree with the ethics principles and the harassment statement.

The Publications chair said there is real liability and the only real protection for the organization is to have a clear statement.

The Membership chair said that this kind of policy would be attractive to present to people at the international events, it would be a unique outreach tool. He would like to see the CAP material become part of our package.

Junior Scholars’ Committee

In the absence of the committee chair, a written report was distributed.

Membership International Event in Paris

The Membership chair said there are time sensitive issues for the planned event for which he needs conditional approval from the CCC. The event will be billed as a 150th anniversary celebration of the EPHE (École Pratique des Hautes Études). The two major partners would be ASOR and the EPHP. Speakers have been recruited on the topic of violence in the ancient Near East and on the digital humanities. If the CCC gives a

preliminary green light, the chair can supply everything down to the abstracts shortly. The symposium will be financially independent from ASOR. There will be sponsors and participation fees. Any institution that chooses to become an institutional member of ASOR because of this event will receive a discount. This is a pilot venture.

The Awards chair asked how this event will encourage people to join ASOR.

The Membership chair said that he and Susan will be at the event promoting ASOR, sharing the benefits.

The PC chair said that he does not see any grounds for objection. It doesn't cost ASOR anything.

Andy said that it has been his experience that having people visit one of our research centers does not result in them joining ASOR, so he does not think that someone attending this conference will be effective in getting people to join. He does not object to the event, but he does not think this will result in joining unless we incentivize it somehow. It would be effective if the conference fee included a membership.

The Membership chair said that one of the challenges is the cost. We could try this and tweak things for the other events we hope to put on. We will also be promoting Friends of ASOR.

Sharon: All in favor?

All in favor.