

NAPS Board Meeting Minutes
May 23, 2012
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

Attendees: Dennis Trout (Pres), Ken Steinhauser (VPres), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas), Virginia Burrus (Immed. Past Pres.), Luke Dysinger (MatL), Wendy Mayer (MatL), Carrie Schroeder (MatL), Geoffrey Dunn (MatL), David Brakke (JECS Ed.), Kyle Smith (MatL-GradStudent).
Absent: Christopher Beeley (PMS Ed.)

Trout called the meeting to order at 2:07.

- I. Report of Summit Meetings, Inc. D. Trout welcomed D. Cowen and C. Cowen of Summit Meetings to present on the status of the conference.
 - A. Registration down at this point, but it is expected to rise with walk-ins. 313 registrants now (compared to 357 in 2010). 179 are regular members; 134 are students. Same number of exhibitors as before. [Secretary's note: At the Thursday Board meeting, we were given an update from SMI that this year's registrations will now probably meet or exceed the 2010 number due to heavier-than-expected walk-in registrations on Thursday].
 - B. Estimated financial contribution from NAPS for this year's meeting is >\$20k. Audio-visual increased by \$3,700.
 - C. Exhibitor income up, but sponsorship income slightly down. U of KY agreed to co-sponsor Thursday night reception (in conjunction with honor of L. Swift).
 - D. More advertising sales this year than last year.
 - E. V. Burrus asks if percentage of student registrants is the same as prior year. C. Cowen responds yes. V. Burrus also asked if it is technically possible to link our member database with the proposal database. Burrus suggests this would make it easier to screen paper proposals for membership status. The answer is no. But, D. Cowen said a review of all proposals for membership status would be done manually this year and would be billed at regular support services rate (currently ~ \$30/hr).
- II. Review/Approval of the 2011 Board Meeting Minutes
 - A. No discussion.
 - B. L. Dysinger moved to accept the Minutes. G. Dunn seconded. All approved.
- III. Officer Reports
 - A. Secretary-Treasurer
 1. Financial report
 - B. Matz reviews the financial report of the society from FY 2011. [A copy of the financial report is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office]. B. Matz points out membership income was down in 2011, and this was likely due to members not renewing during the Oxford year. Indications from recent membership reports suggest the membership income number will rebound a bit in 2012. Also noteworthy is the ever-increasing revenue from JECS profit, which also means it is becoming an ever-increasing percentage of our income stream. Finally, B. Matz informed the Board he transferred \$60k from checking to investments

during 2011. This was possible because of so few expenses in 2011 due to no annual meeting.

C. Schroeder asks about the viability of our finances with respect to the relying so heavily on the journal. B. Matz pointed out that, indeed, institutional print subscriptions to the journal have fallen (slightly) over the past several years. But, the fact the JECs profit continues to rise suggests we are experiencing growth in electronic subscriptions through Project MUSE. Discussion amongst Board members continues over whether or not we ought to be concerned about this. The sense is no.

L. Dysinger asks about the possibility of having online collections of papers presented at the meeting. C. Schroeder suggests leveraging something like academic.edu for infrastructure for that type of thing. L. Dysinger suggested it could be done on the NAPS website. V. Burrus says this issue is separate from journal, and so it should be considered separately at a later time. D. Trout tables the discussion for later.

2. Secretary report

B. Matz briefly reviewed the membership health of the society. The numbers are found at the bottom of the financial report. Membership numbers are mostly rebounding from last year, which was anticipated since many had dropped membership last year during the Oxford year. JECs subscription numbers were also discussed. Institutional numbers continue to decline for print subscriptions. B. Matz mentions he will look into before next year's Board meeting what are the numbers for electronic subscriptions. The suspicion is print subscriptions are being replaced with electronic subscriptions. Finally, B. Matz proposes raising membership dues. This has not been done for well over a decade, and it would help offset some increased costs coming from use of A/V at the annual meeting.

K. Steinhauser agrees it is better to raise dues gradually over time than to have a large one-time bump to cover ever-increasing expenses. Discussion ensues among Board of raising dues for all members or just for regular members. B. Matz moved to retain student and retired member fees at \$25 and raise regular member fees to \$60, which is an increase of \$10. Since we have about 500 regular members, this should generate about \$5k in extra income, which would, in fact, offset the increase in A/V costs.

3. W. Mayer moved to accept the Secretary-Treasurer report, including the proposal to raise regular member dues by \$10 to \$60. D. Trout seconded. All approved.

B. Immediate Past President Report (V. Burrus)

[Secretary's note: although the Immediate Past President is not, technically, an Officer of the Society, the report was included at this point in the meeting to accommodate the main, scheduled topic for discussion at this Board meeting, which is about how to use Society's investment funds to support graduate students and other members of the society. This report is directly related to this initiative.]

Grad Student Paper Prize

The main duty of the Immediate Past President this past year was to organize the Grad Student Paper Prize Committee and to assist in reviewing submitted papers for the prize. V. Burrus reports there were twenty-two submissions from a range of schools (17 – all in U.S.) Most came in on the due date itself, which was April 10. V. Burrus reports that one slightly troubling statistic is that twenty were from men and only two from women.

Reports the process this year was the Past President convenes a committee to review papers. V. Burrus elected to ask the two MatL's who rotated off last year, which were Beth Digeser and Jeff Bingham. V. Burrus said that, since the way the Nominations Committee does its work in selecting MatLs, this is a good way to ensure there is balance on the paper prize committee.

V. Burrus reports members of the committee did not necessarily agree on the first-round cut. There was much back-and-forth discussion about how properly to rank the papers. In any case, five winners were selected: Maria Doerfler, Courtney Friesen, Jason Linn, Benjamin Wayman, and Ryan Woods. V. Burrus read aloud also their paper titles on this year's program.

V. Burrus raises the question what to do when a student submits whose director is one of the committee members. V. Burrus said she asked her students not to submit for this award because of her role, but she questions now that decision. K. Smith asks if it is possible to do this blind to authors. V. Burrus said she would like that, but she would be disappointed if it turned out the winners were all or mostly from the same institution. B. Matz asked if it was possible to have two layers of review: one on quality of paper as it is; another on diversity considerations. D. Trout asks if we can have categories of papers and so ensure a certain balance. V. Burrus said this is a good suggestion for next year's committee. V. Burrus also acknowledged that there was a desire to give some extra push for some papers to win the prize to ensure diversity.

V. Burrus said papers varied tremendously in length. She suggests that next year's committee specify they submit at "conference length." The longer papers submitted this past year did better in the competition because they could more richly develop the argument, but this was probably not entirely fair to those who interpreted the paper prize competition description as already conference length. About 2,500 words is proposed for next year. Bottom line: the committee should see only what the grad students plan to present at the annual meeting itself.

V. Burrus said she had hoped this prize competition would be a mentoring opportunity. Only one paper ended up being one that was totally inappropriate for the competition and for the conference, anyway. Another one was really inaccurate. In retrospect, V. Burrus now says she does not see this as a mentoring opportunity. There is just too much work to do with some of the papers, and that this really should be done by those students' directors.

Finally, V. Burrus reports the other two committee members also recommend that we reiterate the criteria by which the committee will judge submissions. The biggest problem with the papers was the contextualization of their arguments with respect to existing, scholarly discussions.

K. Smith asks what was the due date for the papers. K. Steinhauser replied it was April 10. D. Trout asked if the time frame – the due date of Apr 10 – was sufficient. V. Burrus says that it would be hard to ask grad students to turn it in earlier. This led to a discussion about whether or not it is necessary to announce prizes at the business meeting, or if it could be announced a month later, or if it would be better to announce the winners in advance and so highlight the winning papers on the printed program. In any case, would an earlier deadline or a later announcement alleviate

some time pressures for everyone? V. Burrus says that she prefers the business meeting announcement because it's when we do all of our announcements. She also reports that most of the papers were not half-baked. They really had been worked over in a seminar or some other class earlier in their studies. Then, V. Burrus proposes that, if we set the deadline earlier, we probably should highlight the winning papers in the program while still also announcing the winners and giving them their prize awards at the business meeting. Everyone agrees this is a good proposal.

The question now turns to what that earlier date should be. K. Smith thinks students, if they want to compete, should be able to get the paper done by whatever date is set. So, a February date, e.g., would not be all that bad. D. Trout proposes Mar 15. V. Burrus says April 1 would be enough time.

B. Matz asks if five awards is a good number. V. Burrus says more would be nice, but five was appropriate.

D. Trout summarizes the discussion: V. Burrus recommends we continue the process. The committee is Past President and two MatLs rotating off. Date of submission moves to Apr 1. Submissions should be 2,500 words and a full bibliography. Call for submissions would include details about criteria for reviewing the paper. V. Burrus adds also that we can look in future years about whether or not to have categories for papers. V. Burrus asks what we decided on how to handle submissions by students whose directors are on the committee. Discussion revolved around just how problematic this really would be. The committee member could simply recuse himself/herself in such a circumstance.

V. Burrus also asked about the anonymity of the review committee. B. Matz ensured the letters to the winners say the paper prizes come from the Board.

C. Schroeder moves to approve the proposal from V. Burrus. K. Smith seconded. All approved. C. Schroeder also moved we thank V. Burrus and other members of the committee. All agreed.

Break is taken from 3:25 until 3:32. D. Brakke arrives during this break.

C. President

1. Report of the Task Force. [A printed report of the Task Force is on file in the Secretary's office].

D.T. reviews the report. He acknowledges NAPS has not been negligent in doing some of the things other societies also do, and so we do help grad students in some ways now. He then points everyone to the list of topics for discussion on page two of the report. W. Mayer congratulates the task force members for their work in preparing the report.

V. Burrus asks if we should add to this discussion Gillian's request for money to help offset the Oxford conference. B. Matz says that is a separate issue, and so we should consider it separately. Discussion now turns to several, proposed initiatives:

(1) Best First Book prize. W. Mayer likes this. K. Steinhauser asks if this is for first book after dissertation or revised dissertation. D. Brakke, V. Burrus and D. Trout say "first book" no matter what it was beforehand. W. Mayer asks if we also have a dissertation grant, could the person who wins that also win the book award later? Board discussion leans towards accepting this as a genuine possibility, and that it would be okay.

(2) Dissertation grant –Discussion for a while revolves around what the award will require of the grad student, especially with respect to what are acceptable budget items for the request. C. Schroeder asks what is an acceptable budget item for this request. G. Dunn says we need to decide what the award is really about, and this would help us know what budget items we need to include. V. Burrus says the proposed, \$5k is a good amount such that every grad student in their last year will apply. D. Trout says the award not necessarily only for students in last year. Maybe one award each year given for a last year student; the other award could be for a student needing startup funds to investigate a topic more in depth.

INTERJECTION: W. Mayer says it should be added into the formal details of the prizes announcement that the number of prizes and amount of awards is subject to annual review by the Board. This is to ensure the Board is not committed to funding indefinitely every initiative. All agree.

(3) Back to First Book prize – discussion returns to discussing item (1) and discussion revolves around how we acquire the books for review and what exactly is required for the reviewers. Publishers will be asked to send reviewers each one copy. Also, how often should we do this – every year? Every other year? B. Matz asks if we really want to do this, or if this really is a meaningful support for junior faculty. Better to support junior faculty in ways that fund their research while working on a book, not just an award after book is published. Discussion continues with the value of the book award both for the author, for his/her employment/tenure prospects, and for the press that published the book. Decision is to keep the book award and to consider as a separate initiative the funding of junior faculty research.

Discussion then revolves around how all of this will be done. K. Steinhauser says we need a Prize Committee, like the Nominating Committee with rotating membership. The committee would then decide awards for all of our categories.

(4) Research support grants – Board segues from book prize discussion to research support grants discussion. D. Brakke proposes the book award be given bi-annually and that a “research support” fund be created and awarded annually. That pool will start at \$3k per year, and would allow people to apply for up to \$1k. Discussion revolves around how much time after Ph.D. someone may apply for money from the research fund. 5 years? 7 years? Decision was for 5 years.

G. Dunn suggests have a Paper Prize Committee formalize the process and then, if in their judgment it is necessary, the various vetting of proposals could be done by multiple committees. V. Burrus says we are a bit further down the road than that. We already have developed the program; the task force at this point could just write down further details about the mechanics of the process. W. Mayer says the Task Force report indicates a two-year phase-in, and that this would be good for thoughtfully laying the groundwork for this. V. Burrus says the Nominating Committee should be responsible for identifying the members of this Paper Prize Committee.

The Task Force will now continue for 12 more months to prepare the mechanics of the whole process and bring a proposal to the Board in 2013.

(5) Grad student caucus at annual meeting – C. Schroeder now asks if we still need to talk about the grad student caucus idea mentioned in the Task Force report. K. Smith responds he had added in this proposal based on what other societies do. He also proposes that this caucus elect a member to the Board rather than have the Student Rep chosen by the Nom Cmte. V. Burrus said we had tried to create a space in past meetings for students to organize this, but the Board had run into several logistical issues. C. Schroeder says, with or without the formal space, grad students find each other and create their own mutual support. K. Smith reports there's no channel for students even to communicate to him their concerns. A caucus could do that. V. Burrus proposes an email distribution list of students.

D. Brakke says we should announce the nominee for student rep at the Friday morning grad student breakfast. This would allow for feedback to the new student rep. Discussion revolved around whether or not this spoils the surprise of announcing the person's name at the business meeting. D. Trout says the NAPS Constitution and By-Laws stipulate we are supposed to announce the names of nominees at least three weeks before the meeting. So, we're not following our own rules with current practice for any of the elected positions, let alone the student rep. So, if we follow that rule, it would not, in fact, be spoiling a surprise to announce the name of the nominee at the grad student breakfast. K. Steinhauser says this has never been done as long as he has attended meetings. V. Burrus agrees. D. Trout goes on to point out that, since nominations can still be made from the floor during the business meeting, we really cannot announce the nominee at the Friday grad student breakfast because everyone has a right to nominate others for that position at the later business meeting. K. Smith says he should be at the breakfast and then he can report what he hears from students at that, or at another meeting time during the conference, to the next Student Rep and to the Board. Discussion then continues on whether or not we can create another space on the schedule for students to have a business meeting. Everyone agrees the Thu 5-6pm time slot will work best.

V. Burrus concludes the discussion saying that, in her now seven years attending Board meetings, she has seen a marked increase in grad student support, and anything we do more will really continue to strengthen that important part of the society.

2. Maintain Wednesday Board meeting?

D. Trout asks if we want to continue the Wednesday afternoon Board meeting idea? C. Schroeder asks if we really have much to discuss to make this kind of additional meeting permanent. D. Brakke and V. Burrus both say that it is difficult to get through the agenda every year. The Wednesday Board meeting is essential, as is evidenced by how much got done today. Also, D. Brakke noted that, since we have no employees, the Board really has to deliberate over every decision. Discussion then continues about whether or not it is better to formalize

the process of meeting for a longer time on Thursday. D. Brakke says we should discuss this tomorrow after seeing how the meeting tomorrow goes. Decision is made to retain the Wednesday Board meeting for 2013.

Meeting is adjourned at 5:07pm.

NAPS Board Meeting Minutes
May 24, 2012
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

Attendees: Dennis Trout (Pres), Ken Steinhauser (VPres), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas), Virginia Burrus (Immed. Past Pres.), Luke Dysinger (MatL), Carrie Schroeder (MatL), Wendy Mayer (MatL), Geoffrey Dunn (MatL), Kyle Smith (MatL-GradStudent), David Brakke (JECS Ed.), Christopher Beeley (PMS Ed.), and William Harmless (Nom Cmte Chair).

Trout called the meeting to order at 9:02.

I. Officer Reports (continued from yesterday's Board meeting)

A. Vice President

1. Distributes a printed report [on file in the Secretary's office].
2. He reviewed the registration numbers discussed at yesterday's meeting. He then reviewed the deadlines followed the past year. He asked if the Board wanted to keep it the same for next year. C. Schroeder asked how things went with the pre-arranged session. K. Steinhauser points to his report, page 2, in which he outlined the one issue he had with them and a proposed solution. The Board members agreed with this proposed change. V. Burrus asked if there were any problems with pre-arranged session proposals where they included members from one institution. K. Steinhauser said no.
3. Membership check on the system. Board wants the SMI to have a box on the proposal submission form that requests the NAPS member ID and a link to the JHU Press website for those who do not know their number or need to register.
4. Space problems at the meeting. K. Steinhauser addressed the problem for this year by having a room split into two. Unfortunately, it means the room is still pretty small – no more than 30 people. He reports one more room could be split, and so next year's VP could add up to seven more sessions if you split this additional room. However, if you put A/V in the room, you would get even 12 less people in the room. So, space is getting tighter and tighter. That is the main point.
5. D.T. asked if anyone is doing two papers. K. Steinhauser reports none. There are some doing a paper and a workshop, but no persons doing more than one paper.
6. C. Schroeder wants to acknowledge Ken's work on this and praise him for trying to accept as many papers as possible because this helps people get funding from their institutions for attending the meeting. C. Schroeder adds she and Geoff and Ken were concerned about space, and so they were being even more critical of papers. In the end, though, there was only one paper rejected. C. Beeley wondered if rejecting only one makes the conference any less rigorous. K. Steinhauser responded that each paper is only 20 minutes. The audience should be tolerant even of a bad paper for 20 minutes. He thinks we should let the presenters even of bad papers have their opportunity to learn from mistakes. V. Burrus also noted that she was unaware of any year in the

past several years in which any more than two or three paper proposals were rejected.

7. A/V equipment costs. Demand for this outstripped initially budgeted supply. So, Ken, in consultation with D. Trout and B. Matz had agreed to raise the number of rooms with A/V. But, he now proposes we budget for five or six rooms with A/V next year. Several Board members expressed how much of an outlier NAPS is in having so little A/V usage by presenters. This will only grow. K. Smith offers to investigate lower expenses for hiring a local contractor to bring in A/V equipment for next year's meeting. V. Burrus says we need to do a bit of two approaches: ask presenters if they really *need* to use A/V for their paper, and we should be ready to pay for more rooms. K. Steinhauser says we should probably not try to pressure people not to use A/V. It seems we would just be fighting the inevitable trend going on in the wider culture. K. Steinhauser consulted with SMI's representatives to find out about the funding issues with respect to A/V to determine whether or not it makes sense to raise registration fees. A printed report of A/V costs was given to the Board [on file in the Secretary's office]. A/V costs this year are \$8,495. It is projected we'll spend at least \$2-4k more next year. Proposal is to raise registration fee \$10 to cover this difference. With 325 attendees, this would be close to covering that. K. Steinhauser also said that, since we agreed to raise member dues by \$10, this may be a non-issue. Several Board members added that we should make members aware of the A/V costs. Maybe just the information of costs would encourage some to decide they do not really need A/V. K. Steinhauser now withdraws his proposal to raise registration fee and see what happens with the dues increase and whether or not any increased A/V costs for next and future years are covered by that.

8. K. Steinhauser congratulates D. Trout, B. Matz, Summit Meetings, and his research assistant at SLU for all their support in putting together this year's program.

B. Return to President's Report – additional items

1. Reminds Board that the matter of Gillian Clark's funding request will be discussed under our New Business.
2. Reports he was invited, as NAPS' President, to speak at a conference in Jerusalem on the state of patristic studies in North America.
3. Necrology: asks for names of anyone that Board members know? Just one added to D. Trout's known list of names.

II. Committee Reports

A. Nominating Committee (Bill Harmless)

1. Bill Harmless reports that many names came in right after Oxford Conf and then right after the two emails B.M. sent to membership.
2. On Apr 1, he organized all the submissions and whatever C.V. information he could find online and forwarded them to the Blake and Catherine on the cmte. Then, they vetted the proposals. He also reports they worked through some criteria for different positions. Catherine wanted someone for VP who had "standing" among other academics. Bill wanted someone who had published at least a second major book. Also, the person needed to be an active member of the society.

3. Criteria for MatL: a number of nominees for current, assistant professors. The MatL represents the diverse constituency of the Board. They decided at least one should be an associate professor and one an assistant professor.
 4. One criteria for Student Rep was that the person represent one of the big programs in the field. Also, it was considered how many times the person has attended/presented at NAPS.
 5. Nominees:
VP: Robin Jensen. Eight total nominees.
MatL: Khaled Anatolios and Kristina Sessa. Ten total nominees.
Sec-Treas: Brian Matz. Four total nominees.
Student Rep: Albertus Horsting. Six total nominees.
 6. D. Brakke moved to accept the report. W. Mayer seconded. All approved. Board reminds K. Steinhauser of his responsibility to appoint a new member to the Nominating Committee.
- B. Journal of Early Christian Studies
1. D. Brakke distributed a printed report [copy is on file in the Secretary's office]. He reported the number of submissions has climbed dramatically. Nearly 70 submissions last year. He reports this is likely due to a move towards accepting PDF versions of papers sent via email. More grad students are sending in papers from their seminars. This is getting to be a problem with workload for the JECS Editor and, more importantly, for finding more external reviewers (two for each submission).
 2. Page counts and backlog issues limit the number of accepted papers, anyway.
 3. Announces change in editorial assistant. Hannah Ewing, a doctoral candidate in Byzantine history, at Ohio State will take over for Brad Storin in August.
 4. Best First Article Prize – 12 entries. Andrew Jacobs managed the prize competition this year. [Secretary's note: winner of this prize was later announced at the business meeting on Friday, which was Maria Doerfler].
 5. Associate editors. Paul Blowers' and Paula Frederickson's terms are up this year, but both are eligible for renewal. D. Brakke proposes to renew their terms. The Board approved this proposal.
 6. D. Brakke also noted there was an inquiry from a NAPS member to consider offer tiered pricing for different formats for receiving the journal: maybe instead of downloading individual articles from the website, members could download whole issues of the journal in something like a Kindle format. This is something that the Board may want to consider in the years ahead. It is not a substantial issue right now.
 7. B. Matz moved to accept the report. D. Trout seconded. All approved.
- C. Patristic Monograph Series
1. C. Beeley recaps from last year's Board meeting. Goal is to re-launch the series and see if there is a new market for it. He is finding there are three phases to his work. Phase 1: re-thinking the series and planning for what the series can and should be. Phase 2: will be the organizing of the series with the Press and identifying great manuscripts for some

- early releases in the series from some really great scholars. Phase 3 is the public marketing campaign of the series.
2. C. Beeley reports Phase 1 is pretty much where things are now. It involves identifying associate editors. He proposes we follow the same system of rotating associate editors such as JECS [see NAPS By-Laws Art II.4.B]. He proposes Elizabeth Clark and Robin Darling-Young. Board discusses the terms of their service. Three years, following the JECS model? C. Beeley proposes five years, and that we consider the term issues of associate editors in four years' time. The Board agrees to review the matter of terms and rotation of associate editors at its meeting in 2016. D.T. moves we accept the proposed associate editors for a five-year term and that the Board re-consider the matter of terms for the series' associate editors in 2016. W.M. seconded. All approved.
 3. In terms of Phase 2, C. Beeley would also like to identify some great scholars' monographs for the series. He has one already in the works, and he would like one more. He also reports he, Elizabeth and Robin would like to change the name from PMS to something else. The name change should be something that is good for marketing purposes and premiere branding. He proposes as a working title "Studies in Early Christianity." He is aware CUA Press has that title already, but they put CUA in front of it. So, he would like to work with this and let the (eventual) Press offer some suggestions for distinguishing it from CUA's name. D. Brakke speaks in favor of keeping the same Christian focus as JECS does and as is the whole purpose of the NAPS. D. Brakke and V. Burrus note other series exist for studies of late antiquity that are not explicitly interested in Christianity. Board agrees C. Beeley should continue to explore with the associate editors and potential presses the series' name. V. Burrus asked that C. Beeley consult with the Board before deciding finally on the name and rolling it out publicly. She notes that name changes do impact members and members would want some input on this.
 4. C. Beeley asks the Board if it is willing to work with non-university presses for the series. On the business side of things, trade presses are faster and the books are lower-priced. Some Board members note there would be a change in who submits to the series if it is at a non-university press. If it is the stated vision of the series to be an outstanding series, it would be better to stay with a university press. B. Matz reminds the Board that subventions to CUA for our PMS is \$3,500 plus our payments to our own external reviewers. Members of the Board express shock at the high costs; several recommend moving away from CUA Press unless these costs can come down. Part of the problem is the fact CUA does its own round of external review on top of NAPS' review. Board wants this changed or move to a new press.
 5. Board thanks C. Beeley for his work on all of this.

III. New Business

- A. Gillian Clark's request: for NAPS to pay speakers' costs for quadrennial Oxford conference. This is a cost of about \$1,700 per speaker. Currently, there are 17 speakers invited for each conference. C. Schroeder asks how many attendees of the conference are NAPS members. Generally, Board feels the

conference is largely a European affair, so there is not much support for paying money to help fund this. K. Steinhauser notes that they have set the dates of this meeting to accommodate North Americans, not Europeans, who are generally on summer vacation at that time. B. Matz discusses the financial situation and points out that these funds would come out of operational budget. We have the capacity to fund \$10-15k without jeopardizing our budget or investments, since in the Oxford year we do not pay SMI about \$20k for planning this meeting. B. Matz moves we offer them \$15k per year. D. Brakke seconded. Most Board members express a desire to review this level of support prior to the 2019 Oxford year, recognizing that, since we are contributing for 2015, we will no doubt again be asked to contribute to the 2019 meeting. Board sentiment is that we will support \$15k this time, but probably no desire to go above that in the future unless they make a conscious attempt to lower the overall registration and costs of attending the Oxford meeting. All approved.

- B. Indemnity insurance. B. Matz will investigate costs of this and report to the Board at the next annual meeting.
- C. Next year's meeting time? D.T. notes that we are already running about one hour late at this meeting. Board discussion reinforces the decision to maintain the Wednesday meeting next year. But, the proposal is to start later and shorten the break before the Board dinner. Decision is to meet from 3:30-6:30 next year on Wednesday and then go straight to dinner.
- D. D. Brakke congratulates our departing members: V. Burrus, W. Mayer, K. Smith, W. Harmless and L. Dysinger.

Meeting adjourned at 11:53.

General Business Meeting Minutes
May 25, 2012
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

Trout called the meeting to order at 5:30.

- I. Moment of silence
Deceased members of the society who were honored are Thomas Sizgorich, Harry Rosenberg and Robert Markus.

- II. Vote on Constitution and By-Laws Amendments
D. Trout explained the history of the Board's practice of retaining the service of the Immediate Past President to the Board for one year after their service as President. These amendments would bring the Constitution and By-Laws into conformity with existing practice. One member asked if the Immediate Past President will be a voting member. The answer was yes.

Voice vote taken. Resounding yes vote. No nay votes.

- III. Officer Reports
 - A. Report of the President (D. Trout)
 1. Task Force report. Members of the Task Force were named. Purpose of the task force was explained, which is to explore better ways to support graduate students. The types of prizes/awards proposed by the task force were described. The Task Force is now charged with planning out the details of the prize categories, submission guidelines, criteria, etc. One member asked if this includes independent scholars. The answer was yes. All people five years after Ph.D. will be considered for research support award and first book award.
 2. Graduate students will be given a time slot on next year's program for a caucus/organizing meeting. It is likely to be Thursday from 5-6pm.
 3. Oxford conference. Reports Board's decision to underwrite some expenses for the Oxford conference. The proposal is to support the Oxford conference at the level of \$15,000 for 2015. This amount is subject to change for future years. D. Trout explains this money would come from what we would otherwise spend as a subsidy for our annual conference.
 4. Announces increase in regular member dues by \$10 to \$60 annually. Student and retired member dues will remain at \$25.

 - B. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer (B. Matz)
B. Matz reported the membership statistics and the financial status of the Society. A formal report of these numbers was distributed to the membership. [This report is on file in the Secretary's office]. The floor was opened for questions. One person asked for clarification on conference income – why we have income when we also have expenses. It was explained this is really an adjustment of income minus expenses after SMI pays all hotel bills. There were no additional questions.

 - C. Report of the Vice President (K. Steinhauser)

1. Registration is good this year. 350 this year compared to 357 in 2010.
2. 2012 meeting had 72 sessions. K. Steinhauser reports on deadlines and the decision to use SMI to double-check membership status before accepting proposals in the Fall. Also discussed A/V equipment costs. NAPS budgeted \$4,775 for A/V, but we had to spend over \$8,500 due to extra demand. Encouraged membership to use handouts as much as possible for text-based information and to use A/V for images. One member asked for clarification about how A/V equipment is charged. Answer is a flat fee per room, per day.
3. Encouraged everyone to turn in a survey about the meeting before leaving.
4. Announced that the banquet tonight is in the Wolfe Point Ballroom. Tonight, the program will pay honor to Louis Swift.
5. One person asked if the Vice President could post the registration cost earlier than April to help those who apply for funding. It was agreed this can and will be done.
6. Audience thanked K. Steinhauser for his planning of this year's great conference.

IV. Editor and Committee Reports

A. Report of the JECS Editor (D. Brakke)

1. 65 submissions came in last year.
2. Thanks Rick Layton for continued service as JECS Book Review editor.
3. Thanks the anonymous reviewers and associate editors of the JECS for all their work during the year.
4. Thanks Brad Storin, whose term as assistant editor is ending and announces his completion of dissertation. Announces that Hannah Ewing will be the new assistant editor.
5. Andrew Jacobs is invited to the podium to announce Best First Article prize. Maria Doerfler and her paper in *Le Museon* was the winning paper.

No questions from the floor.

B. Report of the PMS Editor (C. Beeley)

1. Reports on the changes coming to the series. Goal is to re-invigorate the series by re-launching it as the premiere outlet in the field of early Christian studies.
2. Will invite topics in theology, social history, eastern traditions.
3. Two associate editors will be Elizabeth Clark and Robin Darling-Young.
4. Announces the editorial board is considering changing the name of the series and possibly changing presses. Members with suggestions in either of these matters are encouraged to speak with the editorial board.
5. Invites manuscripts from senior scholars to help re-launch the series under a new name.

No questions from the floor.

C. Report of the Nominating Committee (W. Harmless)

1. Announces the names of the other two members of the Nominating Cmte.
 2. Announces there were eight nominees for VP, ten for MatL and six for Stud Rep.
 3. The committee formally nominated Robin Jensen (VP), Khaled Anatolios and Kristina Sessa (for MatL), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas) and Albertus Horsting (Student Rep). A summary of remarks about each candidate sent to the nominating committee is read aloud to the business meeting. [Report of these remarks is in the personal files of W. Harmless].
 4. D. Trout thanks the work of the Nom. Cmte. Then, he asks for nominations from the floor. A member moves the Nominations be closed. Another member seconded. All approved. No nay votes.
- D. Student Paper Prize Committee (V. Burrus)
1. V. Burrus mentions this is the first year of the award. She thanks the other members of the paper prize review committee: Jeff Bingham and Beth Digeser.
 2. Names of winners are announced. Those in attendance come forward to receive their award.
 3. Announces next year's deadline will be April 1 for paper prizes.

V. New Business? No new business.

D. Trout thanks the NAPS for being such a wonderful group with whom to work and to conference. Thanks the work of the Board and the work of the editors.

D. Trout thanks the work of retiring members of the Board and Nominating Committee: V. Burrus, W. Mayer, K. Smith, W. Harmless and L. Dysinger.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30.