

ASOR Chairs Coordinating Council
ASOR Annual Meeting
11-17-18, Denver, 8:15-11:15 AM

Present: Susan Ackerman, Helen Dixon, Tiffany Earley, Geoff Emberling, Steve Falconer, Sharon Herbert, Felice Herman, Chuck Jones, Laura Mazow, Kevin McGeough, Marta Ostovich, Andy Vaughn, Eric Welch, Randy Younker

1. Approval of October minutes

Geoff changed “wide berth” in the Program Committee section to “wide latitude”. There were a couple of other typos to be changed.

2. Procedures for nominating CCC chairs

Three chairs (Awards, COM, and PC) are at the limit of their terms. Sharon spoke about term limits of chairs. Exceptions can be made. Laura is staying for one more year. Helen will do a second term so that only half the leadership of the program committee (Geoff) will turn over. As Vice President, Sharon chairs the Chairs Nominating Committee, which consists of three people. The Nominating Committee consults and gets recommendations from the committees. It is possible to bring back someone who has already served. The positions are not advertised because of the need for an experienced candidate. The Nominating Committee members serve two-year terms. Steve and Laura are currently on the Nominating Committee. Laura is staying on the committee and she pointed out that she cannot be part of the committee to replace herself as Awards Chair.

Sharon further elaborated on the process by saying that she asks nominees if they are willing, and if they are she asks for a vision statement for the committee. The Nominating Committee makes a decision, which is then brought to the CCC. If the CCC approves, then Susan takes the nomination to the Board of Trustees for approval. Chairs have lots of input into their successors, but they do not choose. It would be nice to have nominees set by April. Laura pointed out that both Sharon and Susan are reaching the end of their terms. Helen was concerned about losing continuity. Susan said that she will remain an officer as Past-President.

3. Committee Reports

Committee on Archaeological Policy

The chair (Steve) reported that the CAP meeting was productive and brief. Three committee members are at the end of their terms (D. Clark, M. Harrower, and Smith). Three new members have been selected (M. Vincent, B. Mullins, and S. Pilaar-Birch). Vincent and Mullins have accepted, and the committee is waiting on a response from Pilaar-Birch. Both T. Harrison and K. Grossman have been re-nominated.

The Fellowship Committee of CAP has proposed that after 2019, ASOR excavation fellowships be available only to AOR-affiliated excavation projects. The Fellowship

committee also intends to move the fellowship application deadline to January 15th for 2020 and thereafter.

The Code of Conduct for Fieldwork has been adopted and sent to Susan for consideration at the April Board of Trustees meeting. The chair is also presenting on the Code in a session this afternoon.

Committee on Membership and Outreach

The chair (Randy) stated that two new members have been found to replace G. Arbino and T. Burgh who have finished their terms. The new members are K. Keimer (from Australia, lots of energy) and C. Shafer-Elliott (from a small liberal arts community college). Shafer-Elliott is focused on making it easier for small colleges to enjoy ASOR. Three committee members have renewed their terms (R. Hunziker-Rodewald, E. Lesnes, and V. Juloux).

Andy stated that making a public call to serve on the committee was a good move in that it attracted new, motivated people, not just the same group. He asked that the chair send him and Marta the terms for the new committee members.

Susan said that the new appointments are on the Board agenda.

The chair next discussed the Friends of ASOR program and Steve Dana's efforts on this front. He wants professors and members to use their energy to recruit, say, students to join FOA, and there need to be options to encourage people. FOA can be a profitable venture, which not only generates excitement but also new donors and funding. Steve Dana would like ASOR to allocate more funding for FOA. While this is not currently possible as ASOR is focused on the new building, it might be in the future. FOA has the potential to be a good source of revenue.

The chair stated that the Program from the Paris conference is online. The feedback was excellent, though general opinion is that it would help to have more senior scholars in attendance. Helen pointed out that the Paris conference coincided with another major European archaeological summit and the date may have posed conflicts for people who wanted to attend.

The chair is working on the details for a conference in Palermo, Sicily to take place in April. The venue will be the Whitaker Mansion-the former home of an archaeological enthusiast who left his home to a foundation. There are lots of archaeological sites in the vicinity-

Sharon asked what the topic for the conference is and said that it needs to be approved by the CCC. The chair responded saying the topic is "Interconnections between the Central Mediterranean and the Levant," with a possible focus on the Phoenicians.

Sharon asked whether there is a draft program for Palermo and there is not. The committee needs to have a draft program by January.

Another potential conference in Strasbourg, proposed by Regine Hunziker-Rodewald, was discussed. Andy said that the Strasbourg conference has a clear proposal and is planning for an event 18-24 months in advance. Sharon asked what the topic is and the chair responded "Ritual Gestures in the Ancient Near East."

The chair also brought forth a proposal for an event in South Africa at a safari retreat that Vanessa Juloux is researching.

The chair discussed Teddy Burgh's proposal for an outreach program on ASOR site, which involves live streaming excavations, interviews with dig directors, etc. There is a formal proposal for this project forthcoming.

Laura asked about the status of the regional ASORs. They are not really happening anymore. Lots of resources seem to be directed towards international events, but what is being done about outreach on a domestic scale?

Sharon replied that there used to be more committees and these were combined during the committee restructuring process to a single committee for membership and outreach. Laura is correct in that there needs to be a rebalancing of international vs. domestic efforts. The regional committees disbanded because ASOR was not involved enough; they were mainly SBL. ASOR needs to turn its attention to local efforts, not necessarily through lecture series, but through other types of outreach.

The chair stated that the strategic plan had focused on international efforts, as regional groups were all doing their own thing. He said it is time to turn back to regional efforts and someone needs to be identified to devote time and energy to these efforts.

Sharon pointed out that the make-up of COM is very international, with Americans outnumbered. The chair said that more members are being added, but Sharon responded that only one of these is American. The chair replied that there will be more.

Andy weighed in here saying that from a legal standpoint ASOR stopped identifying the regional meetings as ASOR meetings because the regions were empowered to make their own decisions and having a decision made by the NW ASOR Region, for example, sounds like it was made by ASOR. Also, ASOR found itself without the financial capacity to support regional meetings, as there was only \$5000/year allocated to this effort. Regional efforts were thus not really successful; while financial support was appreciated, the ASOR office did not have the organization to fully benefit from these regional connections. He said that the shift should be made to ASOR sponsoring regional meetings with a focus on how to promote ASOR.

Susan stated that SBL has similar problems with the governing and decision-making process of regional organizations. For example the New England SBL is now required to have its own website, which is administered separately, so that SBL is not seen as responsible for the region's governance. SBL experienced problems with members and schools when a regional group went rogue.

The chair said that all proposals should be vetted by the CCC, with an awareness that unexpected costs arise from funding regional meetings. The Paris meeting cost ca. \$8,000 (not paid by ASOR) and provided good publicity through EPHE and the Sorbonne.

Sharon identified SCS as an organization with a healthy regional meeting system. Laura pointed out that the SE Regional Meeting is using the ASOR logo and Helen said that members think ASOR is directly involved because of the logo. Sharon said that we had never officially withdrawn and Andy talked about turnover in leadership in the regions.

Geoff asked about outreach. Who are our targets? Professors and students? How do you find potential targets? How do we draw on a broader community and include new scholars?

Randy replied that the committee targets those who are interested in the Ancient Near East. Regarding the Paris event, for example, Vanessa Juloux had sent out a call for papers.

Geoff asked if ASOR was hosting the event?

Andy said that ASOR is not a host, but should sponsor the events. He compared the Paris conference and proposed South Africa event to the Strasbourg event put forth by Regine-she already has a proposal and has solicited ASOR's involvement and participation. ASOR has not received that type of information for South Africa.

Committee on Publications

This is the chair's (Chuck) last CCC. Kevin McGeough is the incoming chair and will still consult with Chuck. The COP committee had a good meeting. The meeting began with a presentation from University of Chicago Press (UCP). The relationship with UCP has freed up space and time for ASOR staff and UCP brings skills that we do not have. Response to UCP has been positive, and many are impressed with services they are going to provide: for example, JCS will now have color images. We are pleased as well with the guaranteed income that partnering with UCP provides. UCP has been pleasantly surprised that ASOR's publications are in such good shape and they are happy.

Editors' reports in the meeting were short and through and pointed to a system that is healthy and up-to-date. Manuscripts are coming in almost too quickly. That is, we are in danger of developing a discouraging back log for potential contributors.

There is a new draft of procedures for COP. Since the old document was 40 pages long, the chair wrote a new draft to reflect the actual practice of the committee. It was put before COP, acted upon, and passed. It is now ready to go on the website.

Geoff commented that he likes the focus on practice.

Chuck said the procedures are always subject to change.

Sharon said that all committees should have procedures like these.

The chair next spoke about a joint digital publication project with the University of North Dakota. The data is open context and easy to link to, whereas the monograph itself contains only a small subset of data and the author needs to be asked for permission to use the material. Sarah and Eric Kansa are also pushing for open access. A MOU resulting from this project will be sent to Andy and the estimated cost is low.

The chair reported on the Levantine Ceramics Project. The LCP encourages coordinating with ASOR journals and is striving to get ASOR authors and editors to submit their ceramic data to the LCP.

COP voted to expand member classes from 2 to 3 and will now be comprised of 3 classes of 3 members. All members were in agreement.

S. Kansa and S. Birch are at the end of their terms and B. Caraher is becoming editor of the Annual. E. Kansa is taking over Bill's spot. Three new members have been confirmed. J. Lauinger was chosen as the committee wanted a representative Assyriologist, especially as the *JCS* editor is considering retiring. S. Wolff and C. Sauvage are the other new committee members.

NEA editor search: 2 candidates have been interviewed and a decision has been made. The choice needs to be presented to the committee before it is announced. The other candidate is also suitable.

COP also voted to structure the *ANEToday* editorship using same terms as other editors—a 3 year term, which can be renewed once. Current *ANEToday* editor Alex Joffe is happy with this arrangement and probably does not want to serve more than three more years. He puts in a great deal of effort considering his compensation.

There was a bit of discussion about what will happen when we search for a new *JCS* editor and the role that the Baghdad Committee will play. Chuck said that the relationship with the Baghdad Committee is improving and they have a list of names for the editorship.

The chair commented on Inda's departure saying that it was a sad occasion and lauding the work she had done with COP. Andy also spoke for Kari and UCP who said that Inda had been fabulous in providing them with everything they needed during the transition. There will be 9 people at UCP to handle ASOR journals, but ASOR will miss Inda.

Junior Scholars Committee

The co-chairs (Eric and Tiffany) reported that the Early Career Scholars Reception was a tremendous success and was attended by ca. 80-100 people. Everyone was happy and it was the committee's best event so far. The event was both fun and productive for networking. They even had someone hint they would contribute \$1000 for the Early Career Scholars reception in 2019 because it was so productive.

Feedback on the new Early Career Scholars rate for Annual Meeting registration has been positive.

The committee needs someone to replace Heather Dana Davis Parker and they are taking time to reflect on the decision. There are many people who want to be involved and the committee is interested in new ways to get people involved.

Upcoming goals/things to focus on for the committee include social media and using it to provide opportunities and creating value in Early Career Scholars Membership (especially for those who do not go the traditional academic route). ECS is growing and the committee is focusing on mentorship and professionalization.

Tiffany addressed the best way for the committee to be a resource for professionalization. Some options are sessions or webinars addressing topics such as building CVs, networking, and career trajectories.

Helen asked how present the committee is on social media and Eric responded that they are on Twitter and Facebook, but they need to be more active.

Helen asked who is considered Early Career? Do you self-identify as Early Career? How are people invited to take part in ECS events? There should be more focus on this at registration.

Eric said this is the first year that the reception has been in the program book.

It was generally agreed that the ECS category needs to be more and more inclusive and ECS needs to be advertised better.

Andy is thrilled at the response to the reception, but worried about undergraduates/those who are not of age attending. Next year, ASOR should pay to have the hotel staff the event in order to combat liability issues. Perhaps a sponsor can be found. An event of 80-100 people is also too large for the ASOR suite and raises fire-safety issues. Social media efforts should involve the ASOR office as well.

Undergraduates need to be made to feel welcome and included at upcoming meetings.

Honors & Awards Committee

In terms of finding new members, the chair (Laura) reports that this committee is not getting as strong a response as other committees. A call for committee members went out in News@ASOR. L. Monroe is now off the committee, and so there is a need for someone who can replace her in administering the Cross Award. Her replacement has been identified. Lawson Younger is serving a second term. A replacement for the chair (Laura) will need to be found soon as well.

This year the committee utilized an online submission form for awards. There were a couple of glitches at the start and people were concerned their submissions had not been received. Marta and Laura have discussed updates to the form including adding the institutional affiliation for the nominee.

Some of the issues encountered this year:

Oxford University Press nominated a bizarre assortment of books and had told one author that he needed to nominate himself. Limiting the Lapp Award to the Eastern Mediterranean and the Near East would help limit some of the non-relevant nominations.

There are still some books that do not fit the award categories. Could the Cross Award be expanded from its Hebrew Bible focus?

The committee does not want to add too many new awards, but they are considering an Early Career/First Book Award that would help support early career scholars as they moved toward tenure and a second book.

Candidates for Poster awards were submitted ahead of time and 8 posters were considered, which allowed the committee time to make a decision. There was one issue in that the poster award committee chair did not hear that the award was announced. There was discussion (Tiffany, Laura, Helen) about how to make sure people know to submit their posters for consideration. Andy suggested sending an email out to former poster presenters informing them of the judging system.

Laura raised the issue of diversity amongst the awards given. *ALL* three of the member service awards were given to men. While these were based on the nominations, it is not representative of the ASOR community.

Programs Committee

Co-chair Helen presented numbers for the 2018 meeting:

528 papers submitted, 9 rejected, 24 early withdrawals

495 papers accepted, 30 last-minute withdrawals

465 papers presented

Last-minute withdrawals seemed high, but Geoff pointed out they constituted 10% of the papers, while 15% is the norm. Randy suggested that there might have been transportation issues this year.

Geoff raised a process note about delegating work within the PC and noted, that despite best intentions, there was an unequal distribution of labor and recognition. There was a discussion of delegation, in particular delegating to women and how to make things balanced and fair.

Helen talked about the issues surrounding the ethically challenging papers this year. A paper about N. Cyprus alarmed CAARI, as it became clear that the political situation was such that it had become problematic even to acknowledge that north Cyprus exists. The other contentious paper involved an excavation with a salvage permit in the West Bank. While the ethics policy allowed both, they were still difficult to accept. A meeting with the Administrative Oversight Committee and talking to the directors of the American centers from the contested area papers allowed the PC to get off-the-record consulting. The result was the PC has given itself more discretion in rejecting problematic papers.

Geoff raised the issue of changing Ancient Near East to Ancient Middle East in the title of all ASOR standing sessions, as the former term severs the ancient from the modern and we are appropriating things for our own scholarship. He has reached out to the standing session chairs for their opinion, but at this point, the PC has not really discussed this issue and has certainly taken no action

Geoff announced there are two member-organized sessions that have been converted to standing sessions and approved based on attendance and number of papers submitted. These are: "Seals and Sealings" and "Career Options for ASOR Members."

The PC has received 12 applications for membership as there is one person rotating off (Bill Caraher). Three candidates were selected and asked to provide more information. There will be a large turnover next year as Geoff and three others are rotating off.

Geoff solicited reactions to the plenary address and thoughts on next year's address. Helen said that she was proud of the choice of H. Sader as the plenary speaker. She had heard a variety of feedback ranging from those who had not given Lebanon a lot of thought to those who felt there was nothing new (many of whom were cultural heritage specialists). The goal had been to get someone from the Middle East and Sader was a good choice as a Lebanese female scholar (as opposed to a diplomat) and her talk was not a political one.

Randy and Susan said they had heard mixed responses.

Helen reported that a common request from cultural heritage scholars is for more detailed information.

Andy stated that it is important to remember that the audience at the plenary includes both professionals in the field of ancient near east and "enthusiasts," whose professional expertise lies elsewhere -- and so, in considering the presentation of new versus old information in the plenary, this information must be taken into account.

Geoff said that in selecting the speaker the committee was thinking of what would be of interest to ASOR members, not necessarily the public.

Susan pointed out the diversity of ASOR members.

Tiffany had not heard comments about the plenary from Early Career Scholars; they were more concerned about the location of the meeting.

10-minute break (Felice, Kevin, and Tiffany left)

4. Where and when to meet in future (Susan)

Susan discussed the initial results from the straw poll at the Members' Forum on the future date and place of the annual meeting. There will also be an online survey in January put together by the Ad-Hoc Committee on the Future of the Annual Meeting. Ultimately, the decision lies with the Board. She solicited comments.

Geoff stated that this is a struggle for the soul of ASOR. Enthusiasm for diversity and interdisciplinary collaboration are driving the growth of the Annual Meeting. The numbers game is important. If ASOR splits from SBL, we should think about places we would like to go and how it would affect ASOR's numbers.

Laura suggested the process for choosing location/dates be made clear before people are next asked for input as many do not understand the process.

The question of earlier timing was raised. Susan pointed out the SBL now starts Saturday at 9 AM. Eric asked whether a Tuesday slot would free up hotel space and Susan replied that a proposal from SBL says that they would free up hotel space for ASOR if we would start on Tuesday instead of Wednesday night. Susan feels the Tuesday slot is not great as our members have jobs. Susan proposed to SBL that we start on Wednesday at 2PM with 2 afternoon sessions and finishing Saturday at 12:45. This would clear hotel space for Saturday night. SBL has rejected that proposal.

Andy was dubious that a Tues-Sat plan would work in terms of hotels and said starting Thursday would work better.

Sharon asked if we did a Thursday start would we have to split from SBL?

Andy discussed SBL's locations. Boston and San Diego are manageable in terms of meeting in conjunction with SBL, but we are 25 miles out in Denver. Washington DC has a number of hotels we can use, but Thursday and Friday offer better prices.

Susan suggested scheduling biblical papers by authors who want to move to SBL on Thursday.

Chuck: Move the Board meeting to Monday?

Helen: Choose cities with good collections (Boston, NY, DC, St. Louis, UCLA, Johns Hopkins, LA, Berkeley). SBL does not have same interest in museums/collections.

Chuck suggested partnering with local institutions.

Andy said there are ways to work the schedule out if we are in a different city than SBL and we would have more options for tours/events. Perhaps we should keep the dates and move to a new city?

Randy has a foot in both camps and said his loyalty is to ASOR but he has students who are conflicted. They are applying for jobs in religion departments and go back and forth between ASOR and SBL. -Steve asked what data we have on how many people attend both and Susan replied that 18-20% register for both (though others certainly attend

both). Susan and Eric pointed out that SBL wants archaeological speakers; particularly when it comes to ethics policies, SBL looks to ASOR for how we handle things.

Randy then asked why doesn't SBL treat us better? Susan said that SBL meets with AAR and they (AAR) are not interested in ASOR. Their booking is handled through a travel management company (Experient).

Randy suggested we get SBL to break from AAR but Susan replied that when SBL and AAR split previously, this ended up not working for those organizations, because it interfered with the career placement service: bible professors had to go to AAR to participate in job searches and then also to SBL. Steve asked what the upside of the status quo is. Susan said that the Israeli contingent (51 papers) is threatening to pull out should we split. Chuck said the Israelis believe meeting with SBL allows them a greater audience. Eric pointed out that some of the most well connected names in social networks are from biblical papers. Helen said this might be a generational divide. Randy acknowledged that in terms of regions, Israel and Jordan dominate. What if the Israeli contingent leaves? Helen replied that we would lose people but it is hard to quantify what we would gain. Randy asked if we have a contract for San Antonio and Susan said we have contracts for San Diego and Boston, but not San Antonio in 2021. Randy suggested we try to break then. Eric asked where we would try and Andy said we have asked for proposals from Houston, Dallas, Austin, New Orleans, and Fort Worth. There are no proposals for San Antonio as it might be impossible. These places were chosen for those who want to attend both as they are within striking distance of San Antonio.

5. Process for developing Annual meetings ethical guidelines (Susan)

Susan said that CAP's Code of Conduct for Fieldwork has spurred discussion about a code for the Annual Meeting. Other societies have done this. She solicited feedback on a code and said the process is well suited for the CCC.

(Andy left)

Helen motioned to have the CCC work on such a code. Randy seconded the motion. Chuck asked if grievances had been reported and Susan said they were mainly rumors. Randy referred to a report from a student about sexual harassment in a social context a couple of years ago. Susan also cited a report from a session about bullying of speakers. Laura asked how we wanted to deal with it.

Sharon said this is a worthy cause and the CCC is a great place to do it. Does the whole committee want to tackle it or should a subcommittee be developed?

Susan suggested an ad-hoc committee.

Steve said CAP had called for volunteers to work on their code.

Susan said we should recruit members from various committees. There was general approval.

Steve said the ad-hoc committee should be in touch with the CAP committee who put together the code for fieldwork.

There was discussion as to how the code should be enforced. Susan said that societies handle this differently. SBL is enforcement heavy while the Am. Phil. Society has the

virtually no focus on enforcement. Generally, ASOR members have indicated -- in developing the ASOR's Professional code of conduct -- that they prefer policies that are "aspirational, but not adjudicating."

Sharon suggested the ad-hoc committee be comprised of 2 reps from COM, EC, CAP, PC, COP and they need a chair.

Susan said the committee should elect its own chair or Sharon could appoint one.

Laura asked that representatives from Honors and Awards be included.

Susan advised that chairs ask their committees who would like to be involved and see how great of response we get.

Sharon called for a vote and all were in favor.

Susan is going to write a charge to distribute to committee members.

6. Report on status of central office and new building campaign (Susan and Andy)

Susan reported that over half the money for the new building has been raised.

There was discussion of the sale of reliefs from VTS.