

NAPS Board Meeting
Oxford August 11, 2015

Attendees: Christopher Beeley (CLA ed.), Kate Cooper (VPres), Stephen Cooper (MatL), David Eastman (JECS review ed.), Susanna Elm (Pres), Robin Jensen (PastPres), Ellen Muehlberger (MatL), Young Kim (MatL), Travis Proctor (MatL-GradStudent), Tina Shepardson (MatL), Stephen Shoemaker (JECS ed.)

Absent: Brian Matz (Secretary-Treasurer)

Susanna Elm called the meeting to order at 12:09p.

- I. Ellen Muehlberger agreed to serve as recording secretary.
- II. Stephen Cooper moves to approve the minutes. Young Kim seconded. Minutes approved.
- III. Officers' reports
 - a. President's report: (see attachment). Additional: need to discuss reconstitution of the prizes committee. Lillian Larsen wants to also have DH committee discussed and more permanently established. Lifetime achievement award: it is a board award and board can make the decision now, but should it eventually be an award decided by Prize Committee, or should it remain a board decision? We should all consult the list of retirees to nominate some potential awardees by an email to Susanna. Final issue: What to do about NAPS/Oxford overlap in the future?
 - b. Vice President's report: Kate Cooper has planned to meet with MatLs and Robin Jensen this Thursday to transfer knowledge of the program process (i.e., types of papers, creating a CFP, then evaluating abstracts and creating panels). Kate Cooper has ideas about new program formats, esp. a new category of engagement that might reframe grad engagement. Is there any reason that the program committee can't try new categories of event? (Trying out a roundtable format, for example?) Stephen Cooper remembers a limit on the number of AV-equipped rooms. Robin Jensen adds that she is the only person here who knows what the hotel looks like, because last year's venue was an avoidance of construction. Kate Cooper says she can get a plan from the hotel so that she has the option of thinking through how differently formatted sessions might work. Susanna Elm says SCS (formerly APA) now stipulates that unless a presenter says he/she absolutely must have AV for presentation, A/V is not an option; she suggests we adopt a similar stance. Robin Jensen: A limited number of session rooms w/ AV; requests for AV actually drove the design of the program. Susanna Elm: a second suggestion from last year is that each person who submits an abstract agrees to be available at any time during the conference. Ellen Muehlberger: religious observance excepted. Tina Shepardson: include the full time of the conference in the call for papers. Susanna Elm: those who present must be members at the time they submit the abstract (even during Oxford years, i.e., this year, when abstracts

will be submitted during 2015). Susanna Elm: we need a list of prior plenary speakers. Ellen Muehlberger will generate a list of prior plenary speakers by September 1. Susanna Elm: Can Brian also update the website to include a list of those who have won the Lifetime Achievement Award?

- c. Secretary's Report (see attachment). Susanna Elm summarizes: we are in great shape. Stephen Cooper moves to accept the proposal to raise the stipend, but to do retroactively for one year. Young Kim seconds. Board approves.
- IV. Report of JECS editor (see attached). Been on job for 3 months; overall, on track for 80 submissions eventually this year. Changes: new editorial assistant. David Maldonado-Rivera stepped down to take a fellowship; Jonathan Stanfill (Fordham). Nominations for Associate Editor: Charles Stang to replace Stephen Shoemaker (effective immediately). Two others who are term limited: Paul Blowers and Paula Fredriksen; replacing them Wendy Mayer and Ben Dunning. Stephen Cooper moves, Kate Cooper seconded, board approves. Other changes: The submission process. David Brakke doesn't think this needs board approval, but a good idea to present to NAPS board. When Brakke took over it was 40 submissions, now at 80; Shoemaker has done a demo with the software. The only concern: impersonal emails to reviewers of MSS. Stephen Shoemaker will keep the personal appeal to MSS reviewers. There is some cost, but because JECS is the income center of NAPS, it makes sense to keep it running well. JHUP hosts for \$2000 (1000 paid by them, 1000 paid by NAPS), and then \$18/submission (\$9 paid by NAPS, \$9 paid by JHUP). Robin Jensen moves to approve, Young Kim seconds. Board approves. One last change: changing the book review situation. David Eastman talks about the issues: what types of books we review (ex: we don't do critical editions or festschriften); length of reviews (750 words is too short!). Like SBL spun out RBL, we want to have an online system: need to be a member of NAPS/subscriber of JECS, reviews can be as long as we want them to be, and the reviews can come out faster. David Eastman says he's approached those publishers who have not traditionally sent books to use: Harvard, Cal, for example. He's been trying to expand the scope of who/what we review. Also, frees up pages in the journal. Allows for review essays, which are longer (3-6K words). Robin Jensen and Kate Cooper suggest keep the review essays in the journal. Young Kim: are all reviews that go online open access, or do you have to be member? Kate Cooper: keeping them open might actually be positive for NAPS visibility? Young Kim: who will edit the reviews themselves? David Eastman says he'll do the editing. David Eastman says he could create also an email for JECS reviews to come in; keeping tabs on reviews due is the hardest part, and having an email that can pass to the next eventual editor makes it easier to keep tabs. Susanna Elm: design should match JECS. Stephen Shoemaker: where to host this? And where do the book reviews fit structurally? Does it stay a part of JECS, and a new review editor appointed by JECS editor, or is it a new NAPS publication? Stephen Shoemaker and David Eastman agree: best to keep it attached to JECS for branding. Susanna Elm: JECS editor and book review editor should work together tightly. Travis Proctor: how to publicize that reviews have been posted? Maybe include a list of reviews in JECS. Tina Shepardson: is the role we're creating for review editor too big? And are we limiting this role to people who are comfortable working online. Susanna Elm: The role should come with a couple of hours of assistance and perhaps a stipend. Tina

Shepardson: If online, no reason the assistant has to be at the review editor's school. Susanna Elm: Let's add to proposal that we discuss in the future whether there needs to be an assistant to the review editor. Tina Shepardson: Solicit feedback from all NAPS members? Board in general says no: we can decide. Stephen Shoemaker: A con---this could become low-quality, like RBL. David Eastman: Question of grad students seeking to review. Susanna Elm: suggests BMCR model, in which grad students can review if whole ed board approves. [Ellen Muehlberger: My understanding is that BMCR allows grad students to review if they are directly recommended by an advisor]. David Eastman: I would start figuring out how to execute. Stephen Shoemaker: Do we move online before next May, i.e., before the NAPS board meets next year? Susanna Elm: David should go ahead and work up and show/propose a model ---as Young Kim says, create a beta, an intermediate step. Susanna Elm: moves to have board give provisional approval and then a board vote in six months when we see it. Christopher Beeley: actually, this is not a matter of approval---according to bylaws. Instead, it is a matter of board resolving to support the move; because reviews are under JECS, it's a JECS matter but JECS wants the board support. Robin Jensen: why not have the JECS ed board do the approving. Tina Shepardson: I don't want a chance in six months so I can say no, but rather a chance to offer feedback. Kate Cooper: is there an issue having JECS branding if we host the reviews on the NAPS site? Stephen Shoemaker: No. Board expresses consensus for support; would like to see beta test so we can offer feedback.

- V. CLA editor report. Christopher Beeley handed out a report and will send an e-copy to Brian Matz. Int'l advisory board is broad---about 20, meeting tomorrow here at Oxford. Beeley asks all of us to think about our projects as a part of the series and also to keep an eye out for good projects. Kate Cooper: should we continue numbering from PMS? Christopher Beeley: it helps with our plan to buy out inventory and honors earlier books in PMS. Christopher Beeley: Budget needs approval: MS review stipends, lunch meeting at Oxford for international advisory board, book exhibit table, and inventory buyout from CUAP, who holds PMS back inventory (a one-time expense). Ellen Muehlberger moves to approve the budget, Kate Cooper seconds, board approves.
- VI. Prize Committee report: attached. Susanna Elm: make it a standing committee, because the committee has taken on a lot more evaluation, to encompass both Prizes and Awards. Though not necessary according to the bylaws, Susanna Elm says it would be more democratic for the nominating committee to nominate to the Prize committee, with the exception of the fact that the past president will be the one who chairs it. Nine people, with two Members at Large on the board; best MatLs are the second-year ones, so as to not double the workload of MatLs who in their first year do the program. First round: President is doing the appointing this time, and next nominating season, the nominating committee will do it. Staggered terms of two years. Kate Cooper: should VP also be on it? Susanna Elm and Robin Jensen: there's already so much for the VP to do, also staggered membership of other committee members. Next time: we will vote whether we want the Lifetime achievement award be part of the Prize Committee charge. Stephen Cooper moves, Young Kim seconds, and board approves.

- VII. Digital Humanities report: Susanna Elm suggests we move to 2016 agenda. Stephen Cooper moves, Young Kim seconds, we all approve.
- VIII. Ad hoc committee: to report to us next year the various ways to collaborate with the Oxford Patristics Conference in the future. This committee will have directors of Oxford Patristics Conference on it. Current year was funded by NAPS to the tune of \$15,000. Meant to make it reasonable; in reality, only slowed down the escalation of cost. Robin Jensen: Concern about having Oxford director on the committee. Better to have the Oxford member as a liaison. Susanna Elm: what is proposed will eventually be voted on by members; board will see a proposal next year, but membership probably after that. Kate Cooper: it would be good for Oxford directors to know the mood of the NAPS board next May already. Susanna Elm: Various options, eg, rather than giving \$15K to the Oxford budget, the Prize committee would award travel stipends to attend Oxford. David Eastman: On Oxford years, NAPS memberships tend to lapse; could actually help us to have continuous membership. Board authorizes the formation of this ad hoc committee.
- IX. Lifetime achievement award: Board will nominate by email. Susanna Elm moves to discuss online.
- X. No other business.

Adjourned at 1:54pm.
ellen.muehlberger@gmail.com