

CCC report on Committees: Guidelines and Action Plan  
Regional Affiliations Committee  
April 1, 2013

**Overview of the Regional Affiliations Committee**

**History:** The Regional Affiliations Committee began as a consultation (Committee on ASOR Regions) among regional ASOR leaders at the ASOR Boulder 2001 annual meeting. Doug Clark, as Chair of CAMP, set up the meeting in order to (1) discuss the status of ASOR participation at Regional Meetings, (2) improve links between the Regionals and ASOR National; (3) consider instituting a new subcommittee of CAMP to open lines of communication with ASOR Regionals; and (4) nominate a chair to the new subcommittee. Part of the rationale to encourage regions to be officially affiliated with ASOR was to open up lines for financial support for the regions, which was a major concern of committee members from the beginning. Suzanne Richard was chosen to chair the subcommittee with a directive to research the status of and to write a summary of ASOR representation in the 11 regions. In the process, more of the regions opted for affiliation with ASOR, new reps were appointed, and at one point there was a full complement of 11 ASOR representatives. It was discovered that there was great diversity among the regions. Although the larger groups were organized with by-laws, a set of officers, and rules for nominations, other groups were more informally organized, often with only one person serving as the ASOR representative. At each of the regions, ASOR partnered with SBL and other organizations, such as CBA, AOS, AAR. There were no stand-alone ASOR regions. From the beginning, the intent was to strengthen relations among the various regions in order to have a forum to exchange ideas, to promote a more active role for ASOR at the local level, to enhance ASOR's visibility, membership, attendance at the Annual Meeting, etc. The formation of the committee helped to recognize local (and tireless) ASOR supporters who were working to maintain an ASOR presence at the regional meetings. The ASOR reps were delighted to hear that ASOR was trying to organize, coordinate, and help the Regions. With an official time slot at the annual meeting, the subcommittee was able to all meet together once a year to compare notes, discuss concerns, exchange ideas about how to improve the regions. When CAMP was dissolved, the Regional Affiliations Committee became an official ASOR committee (although not a standing committee) and later a member of the Chairs Coordinating Council. Suzanne Richard has served as chair from the beginning.

Geographical areas encompassed by the various Regional Groups

1. PNW region (defined as Alaska, Western Canada, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho)
2. Pacific Coast region (defined as California and Arizona)
3. SW region (defined as Texas, New Mexico, Louisiana, Arkansas, Kansas, and Missouri)
4. Rocky Mountain/Great Plains region (defined as Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, and Montana.)

5. Central region (defined as those states contiguous with the state of Missouri).
6. Upper Midwest region (defined as Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Northwest Territory, and Nunavut).
7. Midwest region (defined as Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana)
8. EGLBS region (defined as Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.)
9. SE region (defined as Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina)
10. Mid-Atlantic region (defined as West Virginia, Virginia, District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey.)
11. New England/Eastern Canada region (defined as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Quebec, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia.)

**Current Status:** The Regional Affiliations Committee serves as an outreach “arm” of ASOR National to the regions, reporting to the Chair of the CCC and working with the Executive Director and the ASOR office in Boston. The committee consists of one representative from each of the regions where ASOR has a presence. The principal activity of each of the regions is to organize an annual regional meeting in the spring. The committee’s purpose is to coordinate the activities, as much as possible, of the various regions, trying to promote a unified vision of ASOR as it strives for consistently well-organized and professional scholarly conferences on the model of the ASOR annual meeting. The regions provide a significant service for ASOR members in affording senior and junior scholars, as well as students, the opportunity to present their work to colleagues in the field; the regions likewise draw participants to the regions that would normally not go to the annual meeting. As at its founding, the Committee’s purpose remains to support the ASOR reps who are primarily responsible for maintaining the presence of ASOR at the local level, to aid them in various ways (securing email lists, access to funding, protocols and procedures), and to encourage them to promote ASOR visibility at the local level with the hope of enhancing membership and participation at the regional meetings. The committee facilitates communication between the ASOR regions and ASOR national. The regions have access to additional publicity about their programs through advertising on the ASOR website. The committee shares ideas and experiences about successful and less successful conferences, about ideas for sessions, speakers, and finances, and about ways to improve relations between ASOR and the host organization (usually SBL), which, for the most part, is tasked with the organization of the annual regional conference. As a committee, it has been possible to open up lines of financial support for the regions, which, again, either rely totally on their partners or, in the case of the larger regions, receive moneys from the consortium and/or registration fees. Funding has varied over the years, but usually \$1500 was earmarked for the regions. More recently, the Regional Affiliation committee and Lectures Committee have combined their funding to try a new approach by announcing the availability of ASOR funding

on the website to attract a wider array of proposals, with preference given to proposals for special programming that may enhance ASOR visibility and membership at the regional meetings as well as other forums.

Several years ago, the Strategic Plan set forth a new mandate for the committee. In The Strategic Plan's mandate and "charged the committee with strengthening ASOR's relations with its affiliated regional societies and with building local awareness, lay membership, and 'grass-roots' support for ASOR and its programs." Much discussion of the new charge from ASOR has ensued over the past several years. Since each region is independent and there is no official institutional link with ASOR national (for liability reasons), the committee declared unanimously that no unilateral mandate would be possible for the 11 disparate and independent regional entities, with the exception of the provision to strengthen ASOR's relations with its affiliated regional societies. Although several regions are experimenting with outreach to local lay audiences, overall, the committee believes the mandate to build "grass-roots" support for ASOR and its programs is an unrealistic goal. To determine a broader mandate based on the particular strengths and purposes of each region, the committee agreed that a self-study was necessary. The charge to the committee reps was to "submit a short summary of the way their particular region operates, its connection with their partners, funding, if there are by-laws and officers, and whether their region focuses on scholars, students, or public outreach. In other words, how does each region currently meet (or could meet) any of the Strategic Plan's mandate? Since ASOR is very interested in public outreach, please be sure to emphasize this aspect if your region is so involved. If you believe that (more) public outreach would be possible with funding, please be sure to address that issue." The attached regional summaries illustrate the similarities and dissimilarities among the regions, as well as the direction each is currently taking in order to not just keep ASOR alive at the local level, but to promote the organization.

### **Current Regional Groups**

Groups in which ASOR is a full partner (with SBL or other), with by-laws and slate of officers.

1. Southeastern Commission for the Study of Religion (SECSOR or Southeast Region) SBL/AAR/ASOR
2. Southwest Commission of Religious Studies (Southwest Region)- SBL, AAR, ASSR, ASOR
3. Pacific Northwest Region (PNW)-AAR/SBL/ASOR
4. Central States Region- SBL/ASOR

Affiliated Groups in which ASOR is an official partner at a regional meeting, but does not have its own by-laws or slate of officers, although often plenary speakers rotate among the groups.

5. Midwest Region-SBL/AOS/ASOR
6. Eastern Great Lakes Region (EGLBS)—SBL/CBA/ASOR.
7. Upper Midwest Region –SBL/AAR/ASOR
8. Rocky Mountain/Great Plains Region – SBL/ASOR
9. Pacific Coast Region AAR/SBL/ASOR

Although attempts have been made to find representatives to revitalize ASOR participation in the New England and Mid-Atlantic Regions, currently there is no ASOR presence in those two regions.

### Action Plan/Vision/Expectations

As demonstrated by the attached reports, the Committee reps are working hard to maintain an ASOR presence in their respective regions. All the regions focus on scholars (as at the annual ASOR meeting), but several are intent to draw in more student participation, while one of the regions is experimenting with outreach to local audiences. All are attempting to offer joint sessions with SBL partners in order to grow their numbers of participants at the regional meetings. Several of the smaller regions do not have a critical mass of ASOR members who attend the meetings and thus sometimes fail to offer an ASOR session due to lack of submissions. It is becoming more difficult to construct good programming for the ASOR sessions at some of the regions, often involving intense work by the ASOR rep to solicit papers in order to have at least one small archaeology session. All the reps agree that with funding it has been possible to invite big name lecturers who have helped to raise the profile of the ASOR region and to increase attendance. Expectations for future are that ASOR participation at the regions will not improve dramatically, given the trend of ASOR national to draw more non-Biblical archaeology scholars. The regions are decidedly biblical by virtue of the major sponsorship and financial support of the regions by the SBL (and/or AAR). In smaller regions, without a critical mass of ASOR members attending the meetings, it may be necessary to offer joint sessions in order to keep alive the ASOR presence. That being the case, and given the absence of regular funding, ASOR really has little power at the regions to influence the type of activities, i.e., toward grass-roots appeals, or public outreach. Thus, aside from some general principles about the purpose of the ASOR regions, each region will have to work on its own individual action plan to keep ASOR alive and well at the regions. The expectation is that the Committee would endeavor to assist the regions in whatever way possible to help them achieve their separate goals of attracting scholars, attracting students, attracting the public, whatever their particular niche might be. It is possible that ASOR National would decide to work with (and fund) the larger, more established regions, where there are greater opportunities to highlight the organization. If ASOR were to sponsor and provide well-known speakers at low cost, this measure could spark more interest in the regions among the members. In general, strong support for the regions from ASOR national would be necessary to influence members to attend the regional meetings.

### **Guidelines for the Regional Affiliations Committee**

#### **General Responsibilities of the Regional Affiliations Committee**

The Regional Affiliations Committee is responsible for coordinating ASOR national with the regional groups. Through the committee, the objectives of ASOR for the regions are disseminated. Although the committee is more ad-hoc and has no authority over the regions, through open channels and coordination, it is possible for ASOR national to monitor the use of the ASOR logo, the use of its mailing lists and types of correspondence to members/donors, etc. Each region is independent, although letters of affiliation were originally submitted to ASOR National. The real responsibility of the committee is to energize ASOR membership by offering

solid ASOR programming at annual regional meetings (as at the annual ASOR meetings). The committee chair is responsible for vetting applications for funding requests (along with the lecture committee chair). The committee is responsible for providing a link between the regions and the main office. The Committee reps have responsibilities in their respective regions for developing good programming and opportunities to scholars, junior scholars, students. The individual reps are responsible for fund-raising for their region if special programming is planned (although funding possibilities with ASOR exist). The committee itself has no say in determining the types of sessions or papers accepted by the regions or the general organization of the regional conferences. The committee is responsible for keeping the web site updated with correct information and providing conference dates and details.

### **Service of Chair and Members**

The committee will include a chair and a representative from each of the regions, although all interested regional members may attend the meeting. The committee has no authority over the selection of service of representatives or the slate of officers in the various regions. Each region selects its own representative. In the regions in which there is no slate of officers, one person may remain as the ASOR rep indefinitely. The President and Executive Director can sit on the committee as ex-officio, non-voting members.

The chair must be a professional member of ASOR and have the appropriate terminal degree. Regional Affiliation Committee members must be professional members of ASOR and have a terminal degree or (in rare cases) be advanced doctoral candidates.

The Chair of the Regional Affiliation Committee will be selected by the Chairs Nominating Committee and his/her name will be forwarded to the Executive Committee for approval. No appointment is confirmed unless approved by the Executive Committee.

The Term of Office for the Chair of the Regional Affiliation committee will be 3 years, with the possibility of a second 3-year term. If the Chair is asked to stay on by the committee members/Nominating Committee, that person may stay on for one additional term until a suitable candidate can be found. After a hiatus of two years, the individual may return to service as Chair of the Committee. There is no set term for the committee members, as they are selected by their respective regions to serve as ASOR reps.

The Chair of the Regional Affiliations Committee will solicit names of potential appointees from the members of the Regional Affiliations Committee as well as from the Chairs Coordinating Council. The Chair will forward a list of candidates and recommendations along with a summary of their experience to the Chairs Nominating Committee for their review and appointment of a candidate. The name of the potential candidate will then be forwarded to the CCC for review before being forward to the Executive Committee for final approval

### **Termination of Service**

Because membership on the Regional Affiliation Committee is voluntary, the individual members of the committee may terminate their service in writing at any time during their

terms. If the individual is replaced as ASOR rep by his/her region, it is the responsibility of that individual to inform the Chair of the Committee as to the newly appointed representative, so that such information can be updated at ASOR.

The Chair of the Regional Affiliation Committee may be asked by the Chair of the Chairs Coordinating Council to step down from service to the committee at any point during his/her terms, if the Chair of the Chairs Coordinating Council in consultation with the President, the Executive Director, and the Director of Meetings and Events, find that the Chair has neglected their duties to the Regional Affiliations Committee and to ASOR. If a committee member fails to attend meetings and neglects to work on developing the local ASOR region, the Chair has the right to request that that person step down and that another rep be appointed.

### **Meetings of the Regional Affiliations Committee**

The Regional Affiliations Committee will meet at least once a year (normally for at least one hour) at the ASOR Annual Meeting to discuss pressing issues for the following year. During the course of the year, the Regional Affiliations Committee should be prepared to discuss pressing matters and concerns via email and/or phone conversation.

## **ASOR REGIONS REPORTS**

### **ASOR SW REPORT FOR CCC**

Ralph Hawkins report

1. **Constitution and By-Laws.** We do have a Constitution and By-laws, which I have attached here for your perusal.
2. **Officers.** According to the by-laws, the past president and the current officers form an Executive Committee that makes decisions for the group in between meetings. The way we have typically operated is that each year, at our business meeting, we elect a new Vice President, who is in charge of developing the program for the next year. After serving in that role for one year, the Vice President becomes the President and a new Vice President is chosen. The leadership has tended to be shared by a small number of interested participants.
3. **Focus.** In the past, the focus of ASOR Southeast has been on scholars, but, in recent years our numbers have declined, and so we have recently been reconsidering our focus. In recognition of the national organization's desire to see the regional affiliates increase public outreach and contribute to the increase of membership in the national organization, we have sought to incorporate these focal points into our planning. In 2010, we held a special session designed to garner public interest, which was entitled "Jesus and the Galilean Economy." We held two sessions that revolved around the theories of archaeologist Mordechai Aviam, who is especially known for his work at Tel Yodfat and the portrait of the Galilee during the age of Jesus that he has developed based on this archaeological work. During the first session, Mordechai Aviam presented his views on Jesus and the Galilean economy. The second session was a panel session, during which panelists responded and reacted to Mordechai's presentation and presented their own views. Mordechai briefly responded to the panelists' presentations at the end of the panel.

session. The panelists included David Fiensy (Kentucky Christian University), Tom McCollough (Centre College), Doug Oakman (Pacific Lutheran University), and Mordechai Aviam (The Institute for Galilean Archaeology – Kinneret College, in collaboration with the Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies, University of Miami). While we had a higher attendance that year, the program was still largely attended by scholars. It did result in a forthcoming proceedings volume, edited by David Fiensy and myself, which will be entitled *The Galilean Economy in the Time of Jesus*, and which will be published later this year as a part of the Society of Biblical Literature's series on Early Christianity and Its Literature.

This year, we are seeking to extend our reach to a broader constituency by holding a special "public" session focused on James Tabor's new book, *The Jesus Discovery*. Dr. Tabor will present his findings, and Chris Rollston and Mark Goodacre will respond. We have sent a blurb for inclusion in the winter ASOR newsletter about this, and we are sending posters about it to colleges and museums near the location of our upcoming meeting. Our goal is to draw in some of the interested public to this meeting and expose them to the work of ASOR.

Once we have held the 2013 regional, with its special "public" session on The Jesus Discovery, we will consider whether our shift in focus yielded any measurable results. If we see that we have had some response from the public, we will explore possibilities for future programs that might further engage the public. Funding for these kinds of events is certainly a must. For the 2010 meeting with Mordechai Aviam, we spent well over \$1000 (which had accumulated in our treasury over a long period of time), and we'll be paying James Tabor a \$500 honorarium to be our featured speaker at this public event. For both the 2010 and the 2013 meetings, we have received funding from ASOR, for which we are grateful. Such funding makes it possible to put together terrific events.

## **The Southwest Region**

Eric Mitchell report

In the Southwest Region our annual meeting is based at the annual SWCRS (Southwest Commission of Religious Studies) meeting in March of each year near the Dallas/Fort Worth international airport. We have members from Texas and the surrounding states (as far away as southwest Missouri). We have three officers elected by the membership (Secretary, Vice-president, President). We elect the secretary every other year to a two-year term. The secretary serves for two-years (taking attendance, notes at business meetings, assisting the vice-president during the meeting). The secretary moves up and serves a two-year term as vice-president (program-chair for our annual March meeting) and then two-years as president. The president handles any financial payouts and/or monies given for supporting our annual meeting. In this way we rotate elected officers through. Our current officers are: President, Eric Mitchell (Tandy Institute of Archaeology, Southwestern Seminary); Vice-President, Lourdes Rincon (Xavier University), and Secretary, Tom Davis (Tandy Institute of Archaeology, Southwestern Seminary). We have no regular annual support – though we save money by having members bring power cords, projectors, stands, and screens to the meeting (mostly from the Tandy Archaeological Institute at Southwestern Seminary). When we have been granted funds from ASOR on occasion, we have been able to invite nationally known ASOR scholars to give highlighted papers at our meeting.

In order to grow our numbers, we have been focusing in two areas: Student involvement and scholarly interaction with the SBL. We have initiated a student paper award with the help of Eisenbrauns (The Eisenbrauns student paper award). College, Masters, and Doctoral level students may submit a paper, powerpoint, and recommendation by their professor. If accepted, the student will give their paper at our regional meeting. Our officers review the submissions and pick a winner. Eisenbrauns donates \$100 in books to the winning student. The SWCRS publishes the winning student's name as well as the name of their professor. We have had two student winners and have increased student participation from 1-3 papers to 6-7 papers each year in the last two years. Much of our student involvement comes from doctoral and masters students at the Tandy Institute of Archeology at Southwestern Seminary, from Baylor University, and from St. Edwards University (Austin, Tx). The students at Southwestern have organized a campus Archeology Society which encourages student ASOR involvement and attendance at both the regional and national ASOR meetings.

Several years ago we initiated a joint ASOR/SBL paper session on a given topic. We have one ASOR scholar and one SBL scholar each give the state of the field in their area on a given topic. We have had topics Archaeology of the United Monarchy, Agriculture in Ancient Israel, the Archaeology of Paul, and this year the Gospels/Galilee. We have had good attendance but it has not been as successful as we had hoped – due to competing regional SBL events.

We consistently ask our members to sign up for our regional meeting as ASOR members even if dually aligned with another society. We also give a call for papers and have members giving papers and presiding over sessions annually. Our average attendance at our regular paper sessions was 19 in 2009, 22 in 2010, 21 in 2011 (with a high of 34 at the joint ASOR/SBL session); and in 2012 we had an average attendance of 22 (with a high of 29).

If we had funds, we could invite nationally known speakers regularly, which might raise our profile within the SWCRS meeting and likely increase attendance.

### **Central States Regional Meeting**

David Chapman report

The ASOR Central States region is structured to have a single ASOR regional coordinator, who consults each year with an ad hoc committee of those scholars who regularly attend the ASOR Regional Meeting. This year that coordinator was Dr. John Strong of Missouri State University. Our main program each year is the annual Regional Meeting (held in March each year), which we conduct jointly with SBL Central States. The structure and administration of that meeting is largely determined by the SBL Central States organization (whose president is Dr. Bradley Chance). The boundaries of those invited to the meeting are determined by SBL (for whom the Central State region includes Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Tennessee). The announcement, call for papers, and program information for this regional gathering is housed by SBL at [http://www.sbl-site.org/meetings/rm\\_central.aspx](http://www.sbl-site.org/meetings/rm_central.aspx). The plenary speaker for this SBL/ASOR regional meeting rotates between the OT, NT, and ASOR committees of the regional meeting. This year ASOR was responsible for inviting and hosting the speaker (Dr. Mark S. Smith of New York University). At this year's regional meeting, ASOR



also sponsored two paper sessions, with six papers delivered. Our future mission will be to continue sponsoring ASOR sessions at the annual Regional Meeting, with the goal of incorporating more scholars and students into ASOR (both regionally and for sake of national membership). We also seek to provide further avenues to link scholars of archaeology in these contiguous states.

### **Pacific Northwest Region**

Roger Anderson report

The Pacific Northwest AAR/SBL/ASOR is a professional organization established in 1971 that meets annually either the last weekend of April or the first weekend of May. The purpose of the region is to share research and explore new ideas by faculty and students – to meet and share ideas. The main emphasis is on faculty, especially junior faculty, and graduate students, but undergraduate students are welcome. Few institutions have undergraduate students so the number is small. AAR and SBL began the region and ASOR as its own entity was added in the 1990s. There are, however, very few ASOR members in the region.

The region covered is Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, British Columbia, and Alberta. The meeting is held at a college or university, as a cost savings measure. The schools are asked to consider hosting a meeting as per the schedule approved in the By-laws. The meeting schedule is on a four year cycle: year 1 – the Puget Sound region of Washington; Year 2 – western Oregon; year 3 – east of the Cascade Mountains, usually in Washington; year 4 – Canada.

The region has an executive secretary/regionally elected director who serves a three year term. One renewal is possible, so a six year term is the norm. This position alternates between AAR and SBL. The position, in conjunction with the executive committee, plans the annual meeting.

An executive committee is established in the By-laws. This group consists of the President and Vice President (alternating between AAR/SBL annually), Past President, Secretary-Treasurer (elected for a three year term), and the ASOR representative (elected for a three year term by those ASOR members attending the meeting). Program unit chairs are elected by the program units for a three year term. The executive committee makes decisions about program units – adding or deleting units based on participation.

AAR and SBL give a set amount of money to the region each year. The remaining funds come from registrations which are kept low to cover costs of the meeting.

The President's address is given each year by the current President (alternating between AAR and SBL) on Friday night. The Saturday dinner speaker is chosen by the past President. An ASOR plenary speaker time is allotted on Saturday morning. No other sessions are active at the time.

Each program unit, including ASOR (Near Eastern Archaeology), is allocated at least one session. Multiple sessions are possible depending on the number of submissions

## **Rocky Mountain/Great Plains (RMGP) Region**

Nicolae Roddy report

ASOR involvement at the Rocky Mountain/Great Plains Regional Meeting has been minimal but consistently active over the past decade, with at least one ASOR section or panel meeting nearly every year. Meeting jointly with the AAR and SBL in a single program, ASOR is almost always mentioned publically along with these other organizations (AAR/SBL/ASOR). Papers on archaeology or related topics are assigned to ASOR sections and go through a process of peer review. Graduate student papers are welcome and eligible for inclusion in the program.

ASOR membership in the RMGP region remains relatively low compared to other areas of the country and representation over the past few years has been somewhat sporadic; nevertheless, ASOR members Nicolae Roddy and Rick Hess have undertaken to maintain an active ASOR presence there. ASOR member Jeffrey Chadwick organized a combined meeting in 2012. Rick Hess is currently coordinating the 2013 RMGP Regional Meeting, which will be held at Denver Seminary, April 5-6, 2013, while Nicolae Roddy has secured a subvention from the national office to supplement an ASOR section at this year's meeting and will chair a section comprising four papers. In addition, ASOR materials and posters will be made available at the meeting and Roddy will make a formal pitch for membership at the start of the ASOR section. Finally, ASOR members Dana Pike and Dan Fleming will be honored as 2013 Regional Senior Scholar and keynote speaker respectively, with the ASOR subvention applied toward their travel expenses. It is hoped that 2013 will be the start of greater participation in ASOR throughout the RMGP region.

## **Upper Midwest Region**

Mark Schuler report

The upper Midwest regional meeting of the AAR, SBL, and ASOR is governed by a committee of four reps from AAR, four reps from SBL, and one (myself) from ASOR. The meeting primarily serves the AAR and SBL and does receive financial support from both national bodies. We do offer a section on archaeological topics in the call for papers, but have had only a few offers of papers. Nonetheless, there is interest in archaeology in the Upper Midwest. The SBL rotates their plenary speakers between Hebrew Bible, Christian Scriptures and Archaeology on a three-year cycle. I believe Bill Dever is coming next year. I delivered a plenary two years ago on behalf of ASOR on the excavations at Hippos of the Decapolis. There are no ASOR sections next week at the 2013 meeting. But the SBL plenary is "On the Market (in Roman Corinth): Economics, Archeology and Theology in Biblical Studies" Laura S. Nasrallah, Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity, Harvard Divinity.

## **Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society**

Suzanne Richard report

As its web site states the, EGLBS "is a learned society of scholars of the Bible, cognate literature, and Ancient Near Eastern archaeology & culture. EGLBS fosters scientific study of the biblical materials in their historical-cultural contexts and facilitates scholarly exchange among individuals of various faith traditions who share a mutual interest in the critical

investigation of the Bible and its influences.” The EGLBS is the “oldest ecumenical regional association in the area of biblical studies.” Although the region is exploring more ways to include students in the program, the region has primarily a scholarly focus. The Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society meets with the SBL and CBA for a two-day conference usually late March or early April. The SBL is the major sponsor of the region and its officers organize the annual regional meetings against the backdrop of established by-laws. The organization receives a set amount of funding from SBL National which, along with registration moneys, is generally sufficient to sponsor an annual meeting with anywhere from 40-70 attendees. Although it does not provide regular funding, ASOR is given equal billing in the region in all published materials. There is one person who represents ASOR (Suzanne Richard) and she normally chairs the ASOR sessions. In the past, sessions on Archaeology of the ANE & Mediterranean World/ Archaeology & the Bible have drawn enough submissions for 1-2 sessions. However, recently, the region has seen a drop-off of people submitting papers on archaeology. The 2013 conference will have no Archaeology Session. Although the presidency usually rotated between an SBL OT and NT member, in 2011 Suzanne Richard was nominated as ASOR Vice President for the region. In 2012 she served as President of the Region, which gave her the responsibility of choosing the plenary speaker, as well as giving the Presidential Address. With the support of ASOR, it was possible to bring Professor Jodi Magness to give a plenary talk on the archaeology of Jerusalem.

**Other Regions.** The Midwest Region meets jointly with the AOS and ASOR, although there is no ASOR rep at the moment (C. Lawson Younger had been the ASOR rep for many years). This year’s conference includes several AOS/ASOR joint sessions. The Pacific Coast Region meets jointly with the SBL and ASOR, although there is no ASOR rep at the moment (Beth Albert Nakhai had been the ASOR rep for some time). This region, as several others sometimes could not offer an ASOR sessions due to lack of submissions. This year there will be one ASOR session.