

NAPS Board Meeting Minutes
May 22, 2013
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

Attendees: Ken Steinhauser (Pres), Robin Jensen (VPres), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas), Dennis Trout (Immediate Past Pres), Carrie Schroeder (MatL), Geoffrey Dunn (MatL), Tina Sessa (MatL), Khaled Anatolios (MatL), Albertus Horsting (MatL-GradStudent), David Brakke (JECS Ed.), Christopher Beeley (PMS Ed.).

R. Jensen called the meeting to order at 2:33. [Secretary note: K. Steinhauser not chairing yet due to delayed arrival in Chicago]

- I. Review/Approval of the 2012 Board Meeting Minutes
 - A. No discussion.
 - B. D. Brakke moved to accept the Minutes. T.S. seconded. All approved.

- II. Officer Reports
 - A. Secretary-Treasurer
 1. Financial report

B. Matz reviews the financial report of the society from FY 2012. [A copy of the financial report is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office]. B. Matz points out membership numbers (and, consequently, membership income) is on the rise since 2011 as had been anticipated last year. This was likely due to members not renewing during the Oxford year (2011) but renewing in years in which we have an annual meeting. 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 \$20k from checking to investments during 2012. This was possible because of excess revenue compared to expenses.
 2. Secretary report
 - a. B. Matz pointed out there is a discrepancy in what the by-laws/constitution say and what has been assumed by the Board in terms of whether or not a presenter at the annual meeting ought also to be a member of the society. The society's documents do not explicitly require membership for anything other than voting at the annual business meeting. But, the Board has more or less operated for many years under the assumption all presenters are either student or regular members. Discussion followed as to whether or not a by-law/constitution change is needed. Discussion centered around whether or not a date for renewing membership should be set and adhered to for conference planning purposes. All agreed this was important. Also proposed was an idea to add a hefty late registration fee for late registrants, as late dropouts of those scheduled to deliver a paper creates additional problems for the conference planner. This latter item was set aside as a matter for the Sec-Treas and VPRES next year to work out. D. Brakke moved B. Matz and R. Jensen draft a by-law that can potentially be voted on at next

year's annual meeting that requires membership of all presenters. All approved.

- b. Journal subscription and all membership numbers were reviewed. This data is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office.
- c. B. Matz discussed RFPs received from meeting management companies, since NAPS' contract with SMI was up for renewal. B. Matz summarized the different proposals (SMI's and four others from Chicago-based companies) and asked for the Board's authority to select one after meeting with corporate representatives from those companies in the coming days while in Chicago. Board discussion about what switching to a new company might mean in terms of hotel location and meeting costs. R. Jensen asked that we look into the possibility of returning to a university conference center location. T. Sessa wondered whether Chicago is the preferred city for every meeting. D. Trout responded people like Chicago because of the familiarity. G. Dunn agreed that it's nice not to have to think about where you're going when you're here, so staying with Chicago is good. Discussion about costs followed. Nothing suggests costs would be cheaper in an equally attractive city to Chicago. Board agreed the meeting will remain in Chicago, but that hotel location is an open question. Board authorized B. Matz to select a meeting planning company and to arrange a site visit with hotels in Chicago at a later date. Board asked B. Matz to ensure additional options for grad student housing are considered in any site location decisions.

- 3. A. Horsting moved to accept the Secretary-Treasurer report. All approved.

B. Immediate Past President

- 1. Grad Student Paper Prize. [D. Trout submitted a written report, which includes the names of the award recipients. This is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].

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. D. Trout elected to ask the two MatL's who rotated off last year, which were W. Mayer and L. Dysinger. But, L. Dysinger did not serve. D. Trout reports he and W. Mayer had good agreement on how properly to rank the papers. In any case, five winners were selected. He said they had a submission from a previous winner. Last year there were 20 submissions. This year 15 submissions. He said they wanted to share the wealth of the award, but it turned out the repeat submitter was not a top contender for the award this year, anyway. D. Brakke said we should want to give multiple people a shot, but this does limit the meritocracy aspect. A. Horsting says that, with five awards, it should not be a problem to spread around the wealth with choosing one or two repeat winners.

[Secretary's note: K. Steinhauser arrives at this point: 3:30. He takes over as Chair of the meeting.]

T. Sessa asked are the papers reviewed anonymously? She notes the current year's recipients are a good mix of institutional representation. D. Trout responded there was not blind review. D. Brakke and R. Jensen propose the leader of the committee knows the identity, but the other two members don't. D. Trout accepts this proposal, and says it should be implemented next year. Repeat submissions are okay. B. Matz agrees to draft a cover form that is to be submitted with each paper in subsequent years. B. Matz asked whether or not we want the winners highlighted in the program. Sense of Board is yes, if feasible for the paper review committee. D. Trout proposes setting the deadline two weeks earlier, to allow for time to review. K. Steinhauser says he will set next year's deadline for March 15. B. Matz moved we thank D. Trout and Wendy Mayer for their service. All agreed.

2. Award Task Force. [D. Trout submitted a written report, which includes the details of the awards and criteria. This is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].

A. *Student paper prizes*. This should continue. D. Trout says we should use people we already have on the board who are available and at the board meeting to adjudicate awards.

B. *Best first article prize*. This should continue. Adjudication is handled by JECS editorial board, and this should continue.

C. *Best first book award*. Given every even-numbered year. Adjudication committee be formed by editor and associate editors of PMS and the previous prize winner (except in year one). K. Steinhauser inquires about status of individual who is eligible to be a winner. Should we restrict it to people who are within 6 years of receiving Ph.D.? T. Sessa says it should be just "first book" and not discriminate against people who do things in a different time period. K. Steinhauser then asks about co-authored monographs. Report says these are okay. D. Brakke says a person could publish a translation first and then a first monograph on that text later. T. Sessa and R. Jensen say the report indicates "first monograph" is specified, so any other type of book previously published is okay. R. Jensen says we should also keep the co-authorship possibility. That supports the interdisciplinary move that she suggests humanities scholarship should embrace. D. Trout says we'll let the adjudication committee to figure out how they want the review process to go.

D. *Dissertation progress award* - \$5k each. D. Trout explains we take one adjudication committee and divide it into two. The adjudication committee will be a senior MatL and two members of the society appointed by the President for two-year (staggered) terms. One award could be for research expenses. Another could be for writing expenses. A. Horsting asks how D. Trout envisions the second award working. D. Trout says committee would be asking in the proposal for a summary of other funding available to the applicant. G. Dunn asks what is the criteria for adjudicating the "writing" award. What distinguishes one winner from other applicants? D. Trout says something like this is done in his department now. One criteria would be who is closest to being done. The second criteria would be the quality of the proposal. T. Sessa

asks is this really merit-based or need-based? A good proposal from a person with lots of institutional support already...do they get passed over here? D. Trout says this sounds like a decision for the committee. D. Brakke says we should decide this now and not leave it to the committee. D. Brakke says this is going to be perceived and advertised on the C.V. of the winners as a prestigious award. He proposes this is for the "best dissertation in early Christian studies to be completed this year." In terms of what is to be submitted for the award application, D. Trout says we should leave it up to the committee to figure out what they want. R. Jensen returns to the merit vs. need-based status of this award. T. Sessa says she likes the idea of making money available to people at places like public universities, because lots of funding is not available. D. Brakke says he is ambivalent about it. He says the award recipient could turn out a poor quality dissertation even after being given the award, so merit-based award only may not be best. K. Steinhauser says need-based is not best way of talking about it, since then it's an income question. Sense of Board is that there really should be an award for research travel at an early stage and an award for writing stage. It is clarified now also by the board that both awards are henceforth to be referred to as "Grants", not "Awards".

D. Brakke moves "The best first book award is administered by the monograph series editor and that person's editorial staff/committee". D. Brakke moves "All awards to be termed Research Grant and Final Year (or Completion) Grant. First grant is "up to \$5k" and the second grant is "up to \$10k". All other matters are to be left up to the Committee."

C. Beeley interjects a question about earlier discussion, re: co-authored book for best first book prize. Discussion is about whether or not it needs to be the first book for both authors, or if a first-book author joins a senior scholar to co-write the book. Sense of board is that it needs to be first book for both.

E. Small grants/awards – D. Trout says these are intended for "junior scholars." Within five years of doctorate awarded. Can be for independent scholars, too. Applicants may apply for "up to \$1k." G. Dunn asks who is on the adjudication committee for this. D. Trout says the committee is the same as for dissertation grants, but this is why the committee is split into two. Some board discussion follows. It is decided the adjudication committee will be a senior MatL and two members of the society appointed by the President for two-year (staggered) terms.

B. Matz proposes we create a "Grants and Awards Committee" for administering all of this. D. Trout and D. Brakke agree. D. Trout thinks this should be Stage 2 to the process. Let's do for next year what we have now. This will get the whole program off the ground. Sense of Board is that over the Oxford year, this should be worked out by the President during that time. All agree to this proposal.

B. Matz explains that the amount available to award in last two categories will vary depending on endowment draw, so we should tell applicants in each of these categories that "the number of grantees may vary from year to year."

The following synopsis of positions and duties was later compiled and sent to the Secretary for inclusion in the Minutes by D. Trout:

President	Appoint members to Committee D/E
Past President	Chair Committee A
Senior MAL	Committee D or E
Senior MAL	Committee D or E
Retiring MAL	Committee A
Retiring MAL	Committee A
Editor JECS	Chair Committee B
Editor PMS Editors)	Committee C (with Associate
Previous book award winner	Committee C
4 presidential appointees	Committee D/E

Each committee will determine the details of its announcement and assessment criteria and procedures between May 2013 and September 2013 so that the award competitions can be announced in October 2013 (for the 2014 competition).

- C. Vice President and President reports will be given at the next day's Board meeting.

K. Steinhauser adjourns at 5:10.

**NAPS Board Meeting Minutes
May 23, 2013
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)**

Attendees: Ken Steinhauser (Pres), Robin Jensen (VPres), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas), Dennis Trout (Immediate Past Pres), Carrie Schroeder (MatL), Geoffrey Dunn (MatL), Tina Sessa (MatL), Khaled Anatolios (MatL), Albertus Horsting (MatL-GradStudent), David Brakke (JECS Ed.), Christopher Beeley (PMS Ed.), C. Chin (Nom. Cmte. Chair), M. Tilley (Society Member), J. Kalvesmaki (Society Member).

K. Steinhauser called the meeting to order at 9:05. He also announces a temporary suspension in the continuation of officer reports in order to allow C. Chin to give her report now and so not to have to sit through the entire meeting.

III. Nominating Cmte (C.Chin)

[The committee's written report was submitted to the Board. It is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].

C. Chin thanked her fellow committee members and then introduced her committee's nominees for each position:

VP: 8 nominations total. Committee selected Susanna Elm (UC-Berkeley)

MatL: 13 nominations total. Committee selected Stephen Cooper (Franklin and Marshall Coll) and Ellen Muehlberger (U of Michigan).

Student MatL: 4 nominees total. Committee selected Sandy Haney (Temple U). Nominators described her as energetic and up-and-coming member. B.Matz moves we accept the report. R.Jensen seconded. All approved. D. Brakke thanks C. Chin for her service as Nom Cmte chair.

K. Steinhauser interjects with a thanks also to R. Jensen for chairing the meeting in his absence during the first part of yesterday's meeting.

IV. Report of SMI. None given by SMI staff. B. Matz reported 304 registrants as of 5/21. Late payers and walk-in registrations will push the total likely to 350-365, which is fairly consistent with other years. Positively, we are running ahead by 17 on hotel room nights compared to last year.

V. Officer Reports (continued)

A. Vice President

[Printed report of the VP is on file in the Secretary's office].

1. Discusses the numbers of paper proposals, the number accepted and then returns to yesterday's discussion about the problem of presenters not maintaining member status and/or not registering for the conference on-time. The problem is the attrition that results from cancellations at the last-minute. R. Jensen suggests the next VP have a cut-off date for program changes.
2. R. Jensen proposes a new structure for program development. She proposes a program committee that will vet the papers. She asks for Board input: should we be leaner and meaner? M. Tilley says we should not do blind review, because when you know the quality of the presenter, you can determine whether or not they will turn their paper proposal into a good quality presentation. R. Jensen proposes the Pres sits on the program committee to help the VP with the program work. She further proposes a face-to-face meeting for members of the program committee to work out the program. C. Schroeder agrees we need a program committee. C. Beeley agrees, too, since the society is growing and we need more formal structures. K. Steinhauser says that, since most people need to be on the program to get funding, we should not be so quick to cut people from the program. C. Schroeder says the program committee would help alleviate a number of concerns, but it wouldn't reduce the problem of late registrants. M. Tilley suggests asking cancellées to send their paper to the session Chair for someone else to read. K. Steinhauser proposes R. Jensen and new VP work out the policies of a new program committee. D. Trout adds the perspective that we have not experienced the problem we anticipated a couple years ago of running out of room space, but we have plateaued on submissions. So, we can work with the space we have. B. Matz says this has been achieved by splitting rooms. Developing a program where there is room flexibility rather than maxing out the space will alleviate some concerns R. Jensen also has about creating sessions that make thematic sense.
3. R. Jensen re-affirms the usefulness of the Open Call and Pre-Arranged Session.

- B. President
No report given. B. Matz asked if Gillian Clark has yet submitted an invoice for \$5k for funds we approved last year to help support the Oxford conference. Neither D. Trout nor K. Steinhauser has heard from anyone about this. Not yet, at least.

VI. Report of the JECS Editor

- A. D. Brakke reports the work of the editor has increased a good bit in the 8 years he has served as editor. The number of submissions and papers accepted continues to climb. This year, he reports he will accept 20 papers. D. Brakke indicates he has added new advisory board members since the need for readers of papers continues to grow. D. Brakke notes he has appointed a new book review editor, David Eastman, since Rick Layton has stepped down. He also asks the board accept his nomination of G. Dunn and Stephen Shoemaker to the posts of associate editor. D. Brakke moves we accept the two nominees. C. Schroeder seconded. 9 approved. No nays. 1 abstention (G. Dunn)
- B. D. Brakke also announces the Board needs to find a new editor to begin in July 2015. R. Jensen is informed of her need to appoint two members to this search committee, who serve in addition to the Pres, VP and Immediate Past Pres. C. Schroeder asks when will we have as a Board a discussion about the search process. R. Jensen suggests the search committee meet to discuss the process, and then it can seek input once it knows what it is supposed to do. C. Schroeder follows up with what is the process for working with an associate editor (i.e., grad student). Is this person supposed to be at the same institution as the editor? D. Brakke says it would be helpful, but not necessary for the assistant to be at the same institution. But, the institution at which the student works should be supported with technology and room space for the assistant. K. Steinhauser interjects and proposes to terminate the discussion and to turn this over to the search cmte, as R. Jensen had proposed. K. Steinhauser moves we charge R. Jensen, as the incoming president, to form the search committee and to report back to the Board at next year's meeting the results of their search. All approved.

Meeting takes a break. 9:53am. Meeting resumes at 10:02.

VII. Report of the PMS Editor

- A. C. Beeley summarizes his history with the position since the board appointed him nearly three years ago. His mandate is to make the series a world-class series. C. Beeley reviews the history of the series going back to 1975 with the Philadelphia Patristics Foundation. 12 volumes published from then to 1981, when they managed it. NAPS took on series in 1986. C. Beeley says his last year was spent negotiating with a new publisher.
- B. He reports receiving four submissions in the past year. One was invited. Three were unsolicited. The books are under review.
- C. Update on search for a possible, new publisher. Positioning in the marketplace suggests we should probably move to a new university press. Oxford – New York was quite interested, but their head editorial board in Oxford turned down the proposal because they have a similar monograph series already. He has

now engaged discussion with U Cambridge and Cornell U. The commissioning editors of both presses have said they want also academic references for the series, but then they are ready to sign with us for this. C. Beeley wants feedback now from Board on what they want to do. C. Beeley also says he is working with a possible new series name, "Christianity in Late Antiquity". C. Beeley distributed a handout with a comparison of the pros/cons of each publisher. This is available in the office of the series editor.

One of the main issues is pricing. Another is the desire for a single-tier review process for each book. There is a two-tier process now with CUA Press, but the new arrangement will be at least NAPS picks one or both reviewers, the press may pick the second reviewer. Cambridge's pricing model is such that it does not matter where the book is produced, the list price for hard cover will be \$99, which is standard across their markets. They do report, however, the paperback version lag time is 18 months, so that may help with pricing if series moves to Cambridge. Cornell's pricing model is such that prices for volumes would be substantially cheaper.

C. Beeley asks for input. D. Brakke says Cornell is his preference, since they will be more collaborative with us than Cambridge. R. Jensen asks what response we got from other American university presses. C. Beeley reported he spoke with all the top university presses, but they all indicated no interest. Some already have series.

- D. K. Steinhauer raises now two questions, which he received by email from Liz Clark and Robin Darling-Young: (1) what is the aim of the series (i.e., what types of books should we be publishing), and (2) how does the editorial procedure work? These two editorial board members express there exists disagreement about the whole process. K. Steinhauer says there is a problem saying "top quality". If this is the standard, then we would only publish one book – the "top book." C. Beeley asks for D. Brakke.'s input on process, especially concerning when there may arise disagreements between himself and associate editors. D. Brakke says the editor makes the final decision, even after a disagreement with the associate editors. C. Beeley says the email is really about what he's interested in, too: what does the Board want for this series? C. Schroeder expresses a need for a good editorial board so that the university press will be happy to work with us.
- E. Board expresses positive support for Cornell. Good pricing. Good flexibility. Board also expresses lack of desire to publish translations or critical editions. Those should be directed to other series. The editorial board should make the decision about books that are half-monograph and half-translations. Board directs C. Beeley to work with Cornell and not to pursue further with Cambridge.
- F. Board directs C. Beeley to consult with Treasurer on series budget for future years.

VIII. New Business – 1 item

Digital patristics projects (J. Kalvesmaki)

- A. J. Kalvesmaki is a NAPS member and the associate editor of Byzantine studies at Dumbarton Oaks. He distributes multiple handouts, including a proposal for an ad-hoc digital publishing committee [all handouts are available in the office of the Secretary]. J.K. reviews the details of his proposal for the ad-hoc committee. He reports there is inadequacy in digitally-available and reliable

information on early Christian studies. Would NAPS be willing to lend its name and support to the project of digital publishing in some format that the ad-hoc committee would work out? K.Steinhauser thanks J.Kalvesmaki for his report. Opens the floor to questions.

- B. T.S. expresses some need for clarity about what a standing committee would do. J.K. says the committee would meet (online) regularly to assist members with projects (incl. standard-setting and possible venue for publication/release). C. Schroeder says her work with digital scholarship is that standard-setting and standard-following is a big issue. C. Schroeder says that such projects are quite large and that those who do them would like it to be seen as equivalent in work to a book. So, peer review process would be quite helpful. Finally, the publishing on NAPS' website would be ideal for members who seek institutional recognition for the work. J. Kalvesmaki says the ad-hoc committee would establish a peer-review process and the policies associated with publishing the material online (via NAPS' site or not). T. Sessa asks does the NAPS endorsement really matter? C. Schroeder and R. Jensen says the endorsement of NAPS would be helpful for further grant applications. R. Jensen says we should move forward with an ad-hoc committee. J. Kalvesmaki says he would be happy to develop just such a committee. D. Brakke expresses his support for the Society to form this ad-hoc committee. It would enhance future endeavors. D. Trout proposes the Board deputize J. Kalvesmaki and C. Schroeder to form this committee. R. Jensen moves we establish the ad-hoc committee. G. Dunn seconded. All approved.

K. Steinhauser adjourns the meeting at 11:15.

General Business Meeting Minutes
May 25, 2013
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

K. Steinhauser called the meeting to order at 5:30.

- I. Moment of silence
Deceased members of the society are honored, including: Abraham Malherbe, Pamela Bright, Gerald Bonner, Bernard Green.

- II. Officer Reports
 - A. Report of the President (K. Steinhauser). No report.
 - 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 no income. 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 (R. Jensen)
 - 1. Registration is good this year. 356 this year compared to 350 in 2012.
 - 2. 2013 meeting: 240 proposals submitted, 103 of which from graduate students. We had 263 presenters within 72 sessions.
 - 3. Encouraged everyone to turn in a survey about the meeting before leaving.
 - 4. One member asked, “Any idea of ratio of regular/student member presenters?” She answered, “more regular than student members, but it is close to even.”

- III. Editor and Committee Reports
 - A. Report of the JECS Editor (D. Brakke, but presented for him by Virginia Burrus)
 - 1. 79 submissions came in last year. Long-term, acceptance rate varies between 25-30%. Papers continue to represent divergent interests of members of our field. A sample of the topics covered last year is then presented to the membership.
 - 2. Thanks expressed to the associate editors, members of the advisory board and the anonymous article reviewers.
 - 3. Thanks expressed to Rick Layton for his completed service as JECS Book Review editor. Membership thanks Rick Layton for his years of faithful service. David Eastman (Ohio Wesleyan Univ.) is introduced as the new book review editor.
 - 4. Thanks expressed to Hannah Ewing, JECS' associate editor.
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. Series will have a new name: “Christianity in Late Antiquity.”

2. There will be a new, international advisory board. Invitations to join this will be going out in the coming weeks.
 3. Two associate editors will be Elizabeth Clark and Robin Young.
- No questions from the floor.

C. Report of the Nominating Committee (C. Chin)

1. Announces the names of the other two members of the Nominating Cmte.: Blake Leyerle and Jonathan Yates.
2. Announces there were eight nominees for VP, ten for MatL and six for Stud Rep.
3. The committee formally nominated Susanah Elm (VP), Ellen Muehlberger and Stephen Cooper (for MatL) and Sandy Haney (Student Rep). A summary of remarks about each candidate sent to the nominating committee is read aloud to the business meeting.
4. No nominations are given from the floor. The committee moves to close nominations. M. Tilley seconded. Voice vote is taken on the nominees. All approved. No nay votes.

D. Student Paper Prize Committee (D. Trout)

1. Names of winners are announced. Those in attendance come forward to receive their award.
2. Announces next year’s deadline will be March 15 for paper prizes.

IV. New Business – 1 item

Graduate student and junior faculty support (D. Trout)

- A. Members of the task force who worked with D. Trout on this are named and thanked.
- B. NAPS will continue to offer the best first article prize and to offer the graduate student paper prizes. NAPS will begin to offer a new award: best first book award, in the amount of \$1,500. NAPS will begin to offer two categories of grants: (1) dissertation grants – (a) research grant and (b) writing grant; and (2) small grants for junior faculty (within 5 years of Ph.D. completion).
- C. D. Trout announces the work of the task force is now complete and so is dissolved.
- D. One question from the floor: does this begin now, or is it subject to further discussion and vote at next year’s meeting? D. Trout confirms this is now in effect. Board invites comments and discussion.
- E. Another question from the floor: do we need to vote on this? D. Trout responds no.

K. Steinhauser adjourns the meeting at 6:10.