

ASOR Chairs Coordinating Council
Conference Call
October 25, 2012

Present: Bob Cargill, Stefanie Elkins, Elise Friedland, Tim Harrison, Sharon Herbert, Chuck Jones, Sten LaBianca, Laura Mazow, Suzanne Richard, Andrew Smith, Andy Vaughn, Jacob Wright

I. Approval of minutes

- a. April 2012 minutes. Elise asked that two corrections be made to Section III (strikeout means delete and underline means add):
“Program Committee was asked to create a guidelines for the goals, selection, and administration of the Plenary Session.” AND “section of the ~~meeting~~ Plenary Session.” AND “the CCC would ~~approve~~ consider those themes
- i. Bob proposed to approve the April minutes pending the changes to be received from Elise. Motion seconded and passed unanimously. Minutes from October were subsequently modified as listed above.
- b. August 2012 minutes. Bob moved to approve the August minutes and Sten seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- c. September 2012 minutes. Suzanne Richard noted that she was present at the September call, but not marked as present. Chuck moved to approve the minutes pending the addition of Suzanne’s name, and Bob seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Roll call of those present.

III. Report from PC (Elise/Andrew)

Elise reported that for the 2012 Annual Meeting there were 463 papers and 90 sessions including the plenary address. Andy added that there were 809 registrants so far and that last year there were 822 total. [Update after Annual Meeting: there were 923 registrants not counting exhibitors].

Elise highlighted two initiatives at this year’s meeting: 1) the redesigned program book and 2) the session chair’s breakfast on Saturday, November 17th designed to solicit feedback and give information including ASOR policies.

Because the CCC approved these goals for the plenary session, the PC worked on ideas for upcoming meetings, and the proposal was distributed. The PC proposes the plenary consist of a speaker to be followed by a panel discussion with a carefully selected moderator. The desire was to have a dynamic session.

Sharon asked for thoughts from the council. It was noted that the topic was a great suggestion and the protection of cultural heritage topic was timely. It was also suggested that since it will be Tim’s last year perhaps he could

ASOR Chairs Coordinating Council
Conference Call
October 25, 2012

Speak on his vision for ASOR and his experiences, either as the plenary address or at another time.

There was discussion about how to decide which speaker to invite and whether or not there should be a panel. It was suggested that if there were just a plenary speaker and no panel, the topic could be picked up in other areas of the meeting. Some expressed concerns about the panel format.

Elise shared that some people in the PC felt that a shortened plenary address followed by a short panel discussion would be more dynamic but that view was not unanimous. Several members felt strongly that this would be extremely effective. It was noted that having a speaker and a panel did not preclude having a session on the plenary topic later in the meeting and the CCC could encourage someone to chair a session on cultural heritage to give the topic continuity; it would be great to get many people involved in multiple things.

Sharon asked the council 1) if they wanted a speaker and a panel or just a speaker and 2) how to rank the speakers. It was noted that the CCC should also approve the topic of protection of cultural heritage.

It was noted that it is impossible to have a lecture on cultural heritage without being political; this might make people upset which maybe is not the best idea before a reception. Another person suggested that the topic be embedded throughout the program instead of the first item. It was also noted that with the plenary address, it might sound like there is a single view that ASOR is supporting.

It was noted that ASOR needs to confront controversial topics, but maybe not in the opening night, rather the morning after that. It was noted that the blog addresses controversial topics and the response was that the bloggers should not be the only ones while ASOR avoids controversy.

It was decided that since some seemed to have reservations about the topic, there should be a poll on whether or not cultural heritage should be the topic of the plenary address.

Question: Should the plenary speaker's topic be preservation of cultural heritage? Yes means you want the speaker's topic to be preservation. No means you do not want the topic to be preservation of cultural heritage on Wednesday night with one speaker. There was a non-binding straw vote: Yes – 2 votes; No – 6 votes; Abstain – 3

Sharon observed that in the discussion following the straw vote that a number of people appeared to be changing their minds. Sharon observed that many members of the CCC want this topic addressed, but as far as addressing it during the plenary session, the vote was mixed, and the majority said no.

ASOR Chairs Coordinating Council
Conference Call
October 25, 2012

Further discussion raised the possibility of having this topic if the speaker was selected carefully to avoid the possible problems.

It was suggested that when asking a potential speaker to speak, the CCC could frame it in such a way as to address the topic in the broadest way and if they disagree they can decline. It was asked if the CCC wanted to keep the topic if it was framed to potential speakers not as a watered down version, but as a less inflammatory talk. At this point in the phone call, many participants had to leave the meeting.

It was suggested that Sharon and Chuck take the comments that had been made and submit a proposal to the CCC by email so that there could be an email vote on the plenary for 2013.

III. Sharon thanked Laura Mazow for joining the CCC call.

Laura asked if the Awards Committee should do something differently for the Cross Award this year given his recent death. It was suggested that someone say a few sentences about him; someone suggested Sidnie White Crawford as a good person to do that.

Laura also asked about term limits and it was answered that all committees are charged with working on this topic and that perhaps it should be brought up at the meeting. It was noted that there were not a lot of nominations for some of the awards this year while other awards had quite a few nominations. It was noted that this is something for the committee action plan.

IV. Webinar discussion

This discussed was postponed because of lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned.