

CCC Retreat
4/26-27/2013
Hudson Room
Sheraton Fourpoints Detroit Airport

1. Media Relations Committee

It was reported that this committee was currently an ad hoc committee, and it had been formed by Tim Harrison to address some immediate needs about four years ago. Sharon Herbert reported that the current chair of the committee (Bob Cargill) had resigned because of other commitments and that Bob had recommended that the committee had accomplished its initial task and should be disbanded or folded into another committee. It was the consensus view to accept this recommendation and to assign the tasks of media relations to other committees.

2. Program Committee

The Program Committee chairs (Elise Friedland and Andrew Smith) discussed the PC guidelines and the recent appointments to the committee. They also announced that they would be stepping down as chairs of the PC at the end of the calendar year (the end of their 5th year as chairs) because they will be on sabbatical the following year. There was discussion about whether it was better to have co-chairs or one person. There was also much discussion about ways to make the position of PC chair(s) more manageable and not a part-time job.

The conversation turned to a discussion of the transition in the ASOR office staff with the departure of Kelley Herlihy effective mid-July. Andy Vaughn reported that he had made a change for both financial considerations and to better support the long-term growth of the annual meeting in terms of meeting the goals laid out in the strategic plan. He also reported that he had determined that a change in the staff was needed to better support the academic program and to meet criticisms that had been raised in the past. There was considerable disagreement about whether or not this had been a good decision. Elise and Andrew (joined by others) expressed appreciation for the work of Kelley. Andy concurred with that appreciation but explained his reasons for making the change.

Conversation then turned to what the PC chairs and the CCC wanted from the new staff person for meetings and events. The discussion focused on the need to support the annual meeting academic program and the need to support the PC chair(s). Andy commented that he was hearing a call for much greater support of the program committee, and he said that he would keep that in mind when filling the opening and when assigning other office assignments.

3. CAP

Sten presented an action plan of 10 items that he wanted CAP to address this year. One of the highest priorities was to make the application process available online through a PHP driven website. This would also include a snapshot page of CAP affiliated projects. Andy explained (and Sten concurred) that there had been quite a few technical challenges in bringing this goal to reality. Sten reported that he hoped to have something functioning by the time of the fall annual meeting. He demonstrated the prototype that is already available on the ASOR server (3rd party server—not BU server), and he asked if this information should be available publically or just to CAP members and the dig directors. There were many views, and quite a few people had reservations about making everything available. There were also reservations about making the

CAP applications themselves available, but there were fewer reservations about that. It was agreed that this topic should be discussed in the committee and then by the CCC.

There was also considerable discussion about the scholarship program(s). Everyone agreed that the quantity of scholarships was excellent and should be a priority for ASOR. There were problems this year with the review process of the applications, and Sten explained that these problems would be addressed next year. The CCC strongly encouraged Sten to take leadership as chair of CAP to ensure that scholarship applications were evaluated promptly. Andy explained that new steps were being put in place to make the process easier for the grants committee, and he agreed that this was an important issue to fix for next year.

The issue of whether or not non-North Americans could apply for CAP affiliation was discussed. Other chairs expressed the need for equity in this area because ASOR has many international members. This is an issue for the membership committee and other committees as well.

Several members of the CCC raised the question about whether or not CAP could accomplish all 10 action-steps. It was a consensus view that there should be a prioritization of the 10 goals.

4. Membership Committee:

Jennie Ebeling distributed a document with guidelines for the membership committee and its composition. According to the bylaws, the Membership Committee represents individual and institutional Members of ASOR and reports on the needs of the membership to the board. The Membership Committee holds open business meetings at the ASOR Annual Meeting where individual and institutional members can share information and voice concerns. The Membership Committee also works with the Executive Committee and staff to establish an agenda for the Members' Meeting held at the Annual Meeting of ASOR. The Chair of the Membership Committee serves as the chair the Members' Meeting. The Membership Committee also works with ASOR staff on initiatives aimed at increasing membership, disseminating news and information about ASOR members and their projects, and more.

Proposal: The Membership Committee will be composed of one Chair, who will sit on the Chairs Coordinating Council; two institutional members; two individual members; and ASOR's President (ex-officio), Executive Director (ex-officio, nv) and Director of Membership (ex-officio, nv). It is proposed that committee members serve three-year terms that may be renewed once. The chair will be nominated by the chairs nominating committee starting January 1, 2014 (for a term to end 2016). The committee will meet at least once per year at the annual meeting. It was the consensus view that this proposal was a good one.

Discussion took place about the role of the membership committee. Some expressed the view that the chair of the membership committee should do more in the organization than be a figurehead and chair the annual membership meeting. Another person opined that the president should chair the membership meeting, but that the membership chair should be more active in making decisions and setting direction. There was also discussion on whether ASOR should focus on developing professional membership or outreach membership. Discussion then turned to the relationship of the membership committee to the outreach committee, lectures committee, and the media relations committee. It was decided that we should wait until tomorrow (Sunday)

to discussion the future role of the membership committee when outreach and regional affiliations committees were discussed.

5. Publications Committee

Chuck identified problems with the previous guidelines (they are 12 years old and were superseded by the by-laws 7-8 years ago). He said that he wanted to start over with new guidelines that were consistent with the bylaws.

Chuck described the search to replace the editor of NEA. That was successful, and now COP is searching for a new editor of BASOR. He also summarized the other publication series (Archaeological Reports, ASOR Annual, and JCS).

Sten raised the question about Academia and other websites that make articles available for free. There was much discussion about the future of online articles. It seemed to be a consensus that this area is changing and that ASOR publications should continue to consider ways to be involved online.

Chuck pointed out that ASOR does not have an employee who functions as “publisher” the way other academic presses have such a position. Tim pointed out that we have a midsize press that is run with the help of volunteers. Discussion then turned to where the oversight for online publications should reside (i.e., which committee should have oversight of the website, the ASOR Blog, ANE Today, etc.).

6. Honors and Awards Committee

The group discussed the distributed document and responded to the highlight questions. It was decided the vice president (Sharon Herbert) would communicate with the chair of the Honors and Awards Committee (Laura Mazow) about nominating new members to the committee. It was decided that voting by email should be done privately rather than CCing all other members of the committee.

The following are the specific questions asked the feedback provided by the CCC

- Mechanism for nominating new committee members. This question was covered in the general discussion about the composition of all committees (see below).
- Voting by email: votes should be sent privately—that is directly to the chair of the committee without CCs to other members of the committee. The CCC felt that the CCing might influence other votes.
- The need for an email discussion about candidates or conference call: it was recommended that such a discussion or conference call should be held if the chair felt it would be helpful. Additionally, if any member of the committee made a request, such a discussion should be accommodated if feasible.
- Should the committee be able to nominate people for awards (especially if there is a shortage of nominations)? It was the consensus view that the committee members could nominate people privately (that is, not letting the rest of the committee members know). It was also agreed that the committee should be proactive in encouraging others in ASOR to make nominations. It was a consensus view that service awards should be given every year and that the committee should be proactive in nominating people or encouraging others to nominate candidates.
- Policy about books containing so-called “chance finds.” It was agreed that there should be a clear policy and that the committee should work on the policy and be in conversation with the ethics committee chaired by Lynn Dodd. It was also suggested

that the committee develop protocols for developing new awards so that there were guidelines for this.

7. Outreach Committee

There two main topics that were discussed: a) the proposal distributed previously by Stefanie Elkins (past chair of the committee) about ways to accomplish broader outreach; and b) the current focus of the committee, which is on educational outreach for teachers. Neil explained that there while the current committee found the goals of larger outreach were laudable, that was not their focus. The present committee considered itself the “Educational Outreach Committee” and was interested in focusing on that area. He felt that another committee or group should address the large issue raised by Stefanie’s proposal.

It was the consensus view that the education outreach was important and should be continued if feasible. Andy raised financial limitations about how much ASOR could support the programs and expressed the desire that they be self-supporting apart from staff time (i.e., staff time could be devoted as appropriate, but it would be hard to allocate subventions of the events on top of staff time).

It was the consensus view that the broader work of outreach should be undertaken by one of ASOR committee’s and that the work of the education outreach committee would fall as a subcommittee of a larger, broader committee (see decision below for the process to establish a broader committee addressing outreach, regions, and lectures).

8. Regional Affiliation Committee

We discussed the history of the Regional Affiliation—originally set up as a sub-committee of CAMP in 2001 and ably chaired by Suzanne Richard since then. The original goal was to foster communication between ASOR and the 11 loosely affiliated regional societies with the intent of broadening ASOR membership. It was noted that the regional societies and their conventions are today more strongly connected with SBL than with ASOR. Discussion ensued about overlaps between the goals of the Regional Affiliation and Lecture Committees as well as the Media Relations, Education and Membership committees, all of which are concerned with bringing attention of ASORs activities to a wider population and thereby increasing membership. There was a discussion of whether some of these committees should be made sub committees of the Membership Committee. It was decided that Sharon Herbert as chair of the CCC should discuss this with the chairs of the relevant committees and Tim Harrison and come up with a recommendation to be presented to the CCC in the fall.

9. Junior Scholars Committee

Erin asked for affirmation of the committee’s existence. The question was raised about whether or not it should be a sub-committee or an independent committee. The consensus decision was that the Jr. Scholars Committee should be an independent, free-standing committee. There was a vote taken, and it was unanimous that the Jr. Scholars Committee should be an independent committee and a standing committee.

Another question was raised about how well ASOR did at including student in our governance (both at the board level at committee levels). There was discussion about whether there should be a lower level of expected for trustees who were jr. scholars. There was also discussion about ways to include students, jr. scholars, and non-tenured faculty on committees. Examples were shared about how other learned societies include students and pre-tenure faculty.

Everyone agreed that it was desirable for ASOR to be proactive about including jr. scholars and students, but there was not a consensus on how to go about this goal. It was decided that there was not time to decide and that the committee should discuss this topic and come back with some recommendations.

- A. Discussion of overall committee governance procedures. To what extent can/should they be standardized?

It was agreed that committees should have three-year terms with rotation of committee members. It was agreed that members of committee could serve two complete terms before rotating off the committee. Election to committees is by the board (who has the final say), but in most cases recommendations for committee membership will come from the committees themselves. Committee chairs are to be nominated by the Chairs Nominating Committee. Everyone agreed that the CNC should take into account recommendations and suggestions from the committees, but the CNC need not be bound by those suggestions or recommendations. It was also agreed that there should be public announcements or calls (whenever feasible) for committee chair vacancies.

It was the consensus of the CCC that the chair of the CCC (Sharon Herbert) would develop protocols to accomplish the goal laid out above and bring these protocols back to the CCC for discussion in conference calls in the Fall.

- B. Discussion of changing methods of outreach—webinars, Friends of ASOR, electronic newsletter. How should or if our committee structure should change to oversee and encourage these efforts? [everything below was inserted by Andy on Sept 12]

Sharon shared the resolution from the Board of Trustees that charged the CCC with the following: “That the CC put into place the structures and functions necessary to get a webinar program up and running by September 10, 2013.”

The discussion began with a presentation by Andy Vaughn on the Friends of ASOR program and how it relates to a webinar program that is being funded by an ASOR trustee. Andy shared screen shots of the ASOR Blog, the ASOR Facebook page, the Friends of ASOR page, and other social media and internet initiatives. He explained that ASOR has 30,000+ people visiting the ASOR Blog each quarter and more than 5,500 “likes” of our Facebook page. However, most of these people have no formal connection to ASOR. The Friends of ASOR program was developed as a free type of affiliation so that these people could feel an affiliation with ASOR. The hope is that a certain percentage will subsequently participate in an ASOR program or join ASOR.

The two main benefits of being a Friend of ASOR was receiving the monthly e-newsletter, *The Ancient Near East Today*, and having access to the Friends of ASOR Resource webpages. Another e-newsletter (News@ASOR) has been launched as a vehicle to reach traditional ASOR members with membership news. Members of the CCC reacted positively to these outreach initiatives and the efforts to broaden ASOR membership and interest bases. At the same time, several members of the CCC expressed concerns about quality control and the topics covered in these e-newsletters. A concern was raised about whether *ANE Today* would be too biblical. Several other people were concerned that ASOR might not attract popular articles and or have

adequate quality-control of those articles.

Following Andy's presentation, Sharon explained that an ASOR trustee had also offered to fund a webinar initiative that might provide ASOR and the Friends of ASOR with a revenue-producing program. She explained that the board had charged the CCC with putting the academic side of this program into place. She further shared that Eric and Carol Meyers had agreed to be the moderators of the program and to oversee the academic content. Much discussion ensued about the academic content of the webinars, a title for the series, and the pragmatics about making decisions for speakers over the summer months. The title "Archaeology of the Holy Lands" was presented as one possibility and other alternatives were discussed. It was decided that Sharon Herbert as VP and chair of the CCC would be given the authority to work with Eric and Carol Meyers (as moderators) and the ASOR trustee on developing the titles of the webinars and the finalizing the academic content. It was agreed that Sharon would check with other members of the CCC as necessary.