

**ASOR CCC Meeting  
Detroit, MI Westin Airport Hotel  
May 17-18, 2014**

In attendance: Sharon Herbert (presiding), Susan Ackerman, Andy Vaughn, Danielle Fatkin, Geoff Emberling, Chuck Jones, Stephanie Elkin, Laura Mazow, Erin Darby, and LeeAnn Gordon

May 17<sup>th</sup>, 1:51pm Sharon called the meeting to order. There were no comments from the group on previous minutes, so they were approved as distributed.

Report from the Program Committee (Danielle and Geoff)

Notifications of abstract acceptances (482) and rejections (13) were recently sent. The meeting is full with 97 sessions. The co-chairs are beginning to make the schedule for the academic program. LeeAnn, Andy, and Susan are working on the Business Meeting Program. The CCC meeting at the annual meeting has been moved from Wednesday afternoon to Saturday. This change will allow the CCC to meet after all the committees have met.

There is an exciting group of sessions lined up for this year. LeeAnn reported that the American Institute for Iranian Studies has awarded a grant to 3 Iranian participants that will cover the expenses for attending the meeting. Andy pointed out that it takes a lot of ASOR staff time to coordinate these grants, but including these individuals in the meeting transforms what ASOR does and facilitates more exchange. Andy requested that measures be taken to assist the Iranian presenters to make sure that the English translations are high quality. Danielle and Geoff said that they would relay this request to the Session co-chairs.

Several other underrepresented groups will be present including Iraqi scholars and the Ebla team. It was mentioned that Danielle and Geoff would need to consider if the Academic Program is at a good length, or whether it should be expanded by another day. It was suggested that the committee could consider a policy more restrictive towards student papers, which could be rolled out gradually. A significant number of papers are student papers, and it would be interesting to know how many. Geoff and Danielle feel that they could reject more papers leading to higher quality overall. It was suggested that limiting the number of student papers at the annual meeting could rejuvenate the regional meetings. There are many factors involved, including Session Chairs who recruit and accept papers. All were in agreement that they don't want to see the evenings used for paper presentations. It was agreed that this would be a good topic for a future Program Committee meeting.

Report from the Junior Scholars Committee – Erin Darby

The committee has 2 student members and one post-doctoral member, Helen Dixon. The committee would like to address the jump in price for ASOR membership and meeting registration between the Student and Professional status. They propose thinking about another membership fee tier or ways to offset the costs. The group has put together a proposal of observations and action points. Discussion ensued, which included consideration of who should receive discounted rates (ex. recent graduates, adjuncts, non-tenured faculty, or persons not currently employed in the field). A scholarship or fellowship category was suggested, as was the ability for individuals to donate when they register. The emphasis would be that this is a positive thing and not a stigma. It was agreed that a new tier would create administrative problems.

The committee would like to put together a survey to collect data and generate statistics that could be the basis for further action. Erin believes that a scholarship for recent grads could be competitive if they use the Jr. Scholars mailing listserv. It was suggested that requesting a 30-page paper in advance (e.g., like the Aviram Prize in the past) is too much of a burden to make a successful scholarship competition. Many agreed that giving less money to more people is a better way to increase competition and help people. It was agreed that two immediate things can be done: create a donate “mini-campaign” for AM registration fees and the second thing is that we should have frequent flier miles that could be directed toward non-students to defray the travel expenses. The committee urges ASOR to consider all the options, including adding a donate link to the registration database. It was agreed that the committee will draft a survey that will be distributed through their listserv, on news@asor, and possibly the blog. It should be ready by September. The mini-campaign for funding could be in the fall. Susan suggested that we should take the idea to the executive committee.

#### Report from the Publications Committee (Chuck Jones)

The committee submitted an official report at the beginning of May. The journals are in good shape; transition to new the editorship of BASOR is going smoothly. A new third party editorial manager is being used for submissions for NEA and BASOR, and it appears to work well. The committee proposed to make the BASOR journal a digital only. Andy urged ASOR to move slowly here because printing and mailing are some of the lowest costs involved in producing, and typesetting where a lot of expense goes. Andy also pointed out that many of our institutional subscribers still prefer print versions.

The book series editors (Joe Greene and Kevin McGeough) are coming to the end of their terms, and new editors are needed. It’s agreed that there should be an open call for new editor. It is suggested that the monograph format should be reconsidered including long-term access to data and transition to digital formats. Chuck advocated ASOR making the journals available as open access but how would the costs be offset (grants?)?

A question was raised of whether co-editorships should have one or two votes in the committee, which led to the question of whether employees (editors) should be voting members of COP or non-voting ex-officio members. It was agreed that it is unusual to have editors vote on a policy that affects the direction of the publications. It was agreed that COP should self-analyze and generate their own guidelines for the committee, which would then be reviewed by the CCC. It was observed that the request to have COP develop guidelines for its committee had been requested by the EC and the CCC four or five times in the past.

#### Report from the Honors and Awards Committee (Laura Mazow)

Laura stated that recent goals include increasing the number of nominations and publicity. The committee plans to increase the number of members to 6 + the chair in order to allow them to split the load of reading the book nominations. They plan to vote them in temporarily for the fall and then permanently in November. There was no opposition to this change.

The award description for the Cross award was re-written to be less vague, and two new book awards have been proposed: a popular book award and another generic award. A Poster Award is also desired. Questions arose as to establishing a fair way to judge the posters, and it was agreed that new awards should be approved by the board. Questions were raised about how to name the awards and suggestions were made. It was asked if there should be a policy about

how new awards are created and named. Laura suggested waiting to see if there were enough nominations. She also suggested that the nomination process should be clarified, so that more thorough nominations are received. Andy requested that the committee members write the wording for the award plaques in order to make the statements more meaningful, and there was no opposition to this suggestion. Sharon suggested that the conversation about new awards should continue at a later time.

#### Membership and Outreach Committee (Stephanie Elkin sitting in for Randy Younker)

Stephanie began with an explanation of the outreach workshops that occur in conjunction with the Annual Meeting and explained that they need to occur at museums that are registered for continuing education for K12 teachers.

Stephanie brought up the potential Outreach Event to occur at the San Diego Annual Meeting with plans to tap into the Friends of ASOR resources and develop a viable marketing plan to attract people to the lectures. Suggested topics for the Outreach talks have been Archaeology in the Media, Movies set in the WW2 era, Archaeology Ten and Now, Hollywood's Take on the Past, & The Antiquities Market.

Andy explained that the proposal for an outreach event was part of the plan to make the FOA program sustainable. We need income-producing events to help with the FOA program. Previous Outreach events were discussed. Concerns were expressed including a desire not to compete with the Annual Meeting, potential conflict with the BAS event, pricing, selection of speakers and topics, staffing, & financial risk to ASOR. It was suggested that the Membership and Outreach committee should be in charge of the program. Several in attendance suggested starting small. It was considered how the event could be made attractive to the general public and if partnership(s) with other group(s) would be possible.

Andy said that he wants to explore the options and move forward with the seminar at the annual meeting or another time so that we can keep the FOA program sustainable. Susan expressed that this initiative addresses the strategic plan, which identified outreach as a priority. After much discussion, Sharon asked that Andy solidify the proposal with pricing data and an audience estimate so that ASOR could move forward under the guidance of the membership and outreach committee if everything seemed in order.

#### Discussion of the Ethics Policy Draft

Sharon opened the floor for comments on the Ethics Policy Draft. The draft is put forward by the task for response and feedback. She asked that the group consider what is the nature of the document (ex. best practices, rules, guidelines, standards of conduct), who is it for, and what will the ultimate purpose be?

A robust discussion of 1.9 and 1.10 ensued (parts mentioning the Second Hague Protocol and non-provenanced artifacts). Conversation ended at 6:50 pm with the decision to continue the following morning. It was agreed that the draft should be circulated among the members of the various committees.

Sunday, May 18, 2014: 8:50 am. Sharon called the meeting to order to carry on with the discussion of the Ethics Policy draft.

The Program Committee co-chairs stated that they would like firm guidance from this document. Geoff thinks that this document should contain ASOR-wide principles, and that the difference (between committees, etc.) should be a matter of enforcement. Discussion included a

potential tiered approach to implementation, as well as whether a special ad-hoc cultural heritage committee was necessary (would also provide oversight on grant work). Laura agreed that the Honors and Awards Committee would like standardized guidelines.

Consideration was given to how the Ethics Discussion at the Annual Meeting should be conducted. It was agreed that someone other than the chair of the task force should moderate, and that the document be available for public review at least 1 month ahead of time. It was also suggested that the audience members write down their questions, so that the comments/questions could be followed up with after the event.

Sharon urged the committee to comment on whether the statement on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Protocol was necessary. There was long and rigorous discussion about the 2<sup>nd</sup> Protocol. Most of those present agreed with the principles, but there were reservations whether the invocation of this would be appropriate or useful to this policy and whether it should be included within the document.

#### Recommendations:

- 1) Make sure that the words provenience and provenance are used correctly and consistently throughout the document (e.g., 1.18 seems to be a mistake).
- 2) The document needs a clear organization and sections
- 3) Consider arranging document into Principles and Policies sections
- 4) Additional organizational headers to consider: guidelines for field projects, guidelines for presentation and publication, and guidelines for cultural heritage/public
- 5) Consider replacing “should” with “aspire to” in some sections

#### Discussion about the Cultural Heritage Committee (Susan Ackerman)

Susan asked the group for recommendations for who should be on this committee and whether or not it should be a standing committee, advisory group, or an ad hoc committee. Several names of ASOR members were offered.

#### Strategic Plan

Susan mentioned that a new committee is needed to create a task force for a new Strategic Plan once the time period for the 2011-2015 plan concludes. Discussion was opened for key initiatives that could be added, where work still needs to be done, and other work that can be conveyed to the task force. Chuck suggested that we could do better with our books and raise more subscriptions. Tours for members and friends were suggested. There was general agreement that the re-organization from the previous plan and the creation of the CCC was productive. Sharon noted that the changes to the bylaws approved by the board in the fall still need to be posted on the website. The CCC members requested that a report/summary of the board meeting be sent via email to the CCC chairs, so that they can send it to their committee members. It was observed that a report had been sent to all members as part of News@ASOR, but a reminder of such reports would be sent to the CCC members in case the general posting was missed in the many emails that everyone receives. It was suggested that priorities for the Annual Meeting might include exploring ways to encourage new members and outreach and more public outreach. Educational opportunities and professional development for members were discussed.

The meeting concluded at 1:00 pm with thanks to all for their participation.