Trout called the meeting to order at 1:45.

Trout welcomed the two new members to the board present at the meeting: C. Schroeder and C. Beeley

Review/Approval of the 2010 Board Meeting Minutes

1. V. Burrus proposed we amend 6.f. to reflect the Board’s decision to create a task force to evaluate better ways to support junior faculty and grad students. The minutes as presently written only indicate the formation of a committee to create a grad student paper prize competition. Discussion then followed by those present at last year’s meeting, who agreed we had discussed two separate committees – both a task force and a paper prize committee. The proposed amendment is to add at the conclusion of 6.f., “The Board also discussed the formation of a task force to consider additional ways to support the work of grad students as well as junior faculty with the funds at NAPS’ disposal. It was agreed D. Trout would identify members to join the task force.” L. Dysinger moved that we approve the Minutes with this amendment. D. Brakke seconded. All approved.

2. V. Burrus raised the issue that we have not yet resolved the matter of the Immediate Past President’s role on the Board, which she says was also a subject of some discussion at the 2011 meeting, but is not reflected in the minutes. It was agreed by everyone that the informal practice of inviting the Immediate Past President to the Board meetings was helpful for the sake of institutional memory. D. Trout said he would meet with B. Matz and craft language for the Constitution and/or By-laws to be voted upon at the 2012 meeting that formalized the role of the Immediate Past President. V. Burrus wondered if it was to be a voting or non-voting position. C. Beeley proposed it be a voting position if the count of voting members was already even. B. Matz confirmed we have eight voting members. It was suggested that the Board rarely, if ever, has such close votes. Nevertheless, it was agreed the Immediate Past President should be a voting member of the Board. D. Trout was directed by the Board to work with B. Matz to get these changes in place during the 2012 general business meeting.

Officer Reports

1. Secretary-Treasurer
   A. B. Matz reviewed the financial report of the society. A copy of the report is on file with the Sec-Treas and available for members of the society upon request.
   B. Matz discussed four main points with respect to the society’s financial health:
      1. Due to reduced expenses for not meeting in Chicago this year and due to a particularly robust stock market, the society’s financial health is
particularly good. Recent market fluctuations will certainly adjust those numbers down somewhat, but not considerably, as our investments are in especially conservative funds.

(2) Income from JECS continues to rise. B. Matz noted that the 2011 check more than $2k higher than 2010.

(3) Due to reduced expenses and higher income, B. Matz announced he transferred $40k from checking to investments so far this year and that more transfers are likely to come before the end of the year. This is due to the fact we invest for the long-term and, at least right now, stocks are relatively inexpensive.

(4) Reiterating a point made in 2010, B. Matz proposed the society give careful consideration to treating the investment accounts as an endowment fund. NAPS should then craft a policy whereby annual withdrawals of 4-5% may be made to support strategic initiatives of the society. There was considerable discussion at this point in the meeting on what would constitute strategic initiatives and on what types of things the society could spend its money. B. Matz proposed supporting with additional funds (as opposed to raising registration rates) an expanded dessert reception on Thursday night of the 2012 meeting, for this is likely to be used to honor L. Swift. Further discussion followed about next year’s dessert reception. There was some confusion about whether we were honoring L. Swift at that event or following the Friday banquet. In the main, confusion was due to just where we would use any funds contributed by Univ. of KY in support of honoring L. Swift. It was eventually agreed these funds would be used to offset any of NAPS’ costs in hosting the dessert reception. D. Brakke proposed the following language be added to the 2012 program in connection with the Thursday dessert reception, “NAPS is grateful for the support of University of Kentucky in helping sponsor this reception.” All agreed this would acceptable. Further discussion led to an agreement that L. Swift would be acknowledged at the Thursday reception, but that he would be publicly honored at the Friday banquet. D. Trout eventually intervened to suggest we table the discussion until VPres report, since, at least officially, the matter of honoring L. Swift had not yet been formally proposed. All agreed to table further discussion.

B. B. Matz then briefly reviewed the membership health of the society. The numbers are found at the bottom of the financial report, which is available from the NAPS Secretary. In brief, the membership report reveals a drop in membership by about 75 from 2010 to 2011. B. Matz suggested this is likely due to not having a meeting in 2011. Thus, some members do not see a need to continue their membership this year. It is anticipated 2012 membership data will be higher.

C. D. Brakke moved to accept the Secretary-Treasurer report. D. Trout seconded. All approved.

2. Vice President
A. K. Steinhauser reminded everyone he had earlier circulated his report with the text of the forthcoming “Call for Papers” via email and that there already had been comments back to him on that proposal. [This document is on file in the Secretary’s office].
B. Since the matter of honoring L. Swift was raised earlier, K. Steinhauser announced formally he wants to honor L. Swift at next year’s annual meeting with the NAPS Lifetime Achievement Award. D. Brakke moved that we give the award to L. Swift. V. Burrus seconded. All approved. It was also mentioned as a reminder that the Board’s intent was to give this award occasionally, not annually.

C. Then followed a discussion about the expenses to be reimbursed that L. Swift will incur in traveling to the 2012 meeting to receive the award. Discussion was on whether the meals would be reimbursed and, if so, to what extent. B. Matz reminded Board we have not traditionally paid meal expenses for plenary speakers, but that it would be appropriate to do so for L. Swift. D. Brakke, V. Burrus and D. Trout all noted there are IRS regulations on allowable, per diem rates. All agreed we should reimburse either actual receipts or pay a per diem, whichever L. Swift preferred. B. Matz moved to pay his travel, hotel, meals (actual or per diem) and registration fee. D. Trout seconded. All approved. Another matter was then raised, but not yet resolved, as to whether or not NAPS would reimburse L. Swift for the cost of traveling with his spouse or another companion. It was agreed K. Steinhauser would talk with L. Swift about this, and then K. Steinhauser would approach the Board through email communication with the possibility of also paying such travel costs.

D. V. Burrus asked K. Steinhauser to add to Call for Papers the details of a paper competition for the grad student paper prize. Discussion followed about what was realistic in terms of evaluating the grad papers for the prize. D. Brakke proposed applicants for the award submit at some early stage a 1,000 word abstract plus bibliography for evaluation by the prize committee. C. Beeley countered we should not give a paper prize without seeing the whole paper. This led to a discussion about whether knowing one was to receive the $250 prize would make-or-break the decision to attend NAPS. D. Trout suggested it was sufficiently small not to be a deterrent to attend the conference, and so we should advertise the award as a paper prize and not a travel support grant. All agreed this was probably correct. Discussion then turned to when such an award should be announced at the annual meeting. One proposal was to announce the prizes at the Thursday dessert reception. Another was to do so at the Friday banquet. Both of these ideas were then dismissed for conflicting with the desire to connect those events in 2012 with the honoring of L. Swift. B. Matz said we should do it at the business meeting, for that was when the society’s other paper prize, Best First Article Prize, is announced. Some discussion followed about the problem of too few people attending the meeting. B. Matz countered those in the running for the prize certainly would attend it. D. Brakke then added his agreement we should announce at the business meeting and see how it goes in 2012. C. Beeley wondered if we should consider for the prize non-conference papers in the field. D. Brakke responded this year’s prize competition was a pilot project and that we should stick with the original plan and see where it goes. All agreed. K. Steinhauser was directed to include an announcement of the grad paper prize in the Call for Papers.

3. President

D. Trout announced he had nothing to report. He mentioned only his disappointment that the organizers of the Oxford meeting failed to announce the NAPS reception in
the conference program. It was asked where NAPS did announce the event. It appears that it was announced only on the NAPS website. B. Matz was asked that NAPS be sure to announce the reception also via email just before the Oxford conference in 2015.

Committee Reports
1. Nominating Committee
   Nothing to report

2. Journal of Early Christian Studies
   A. D. Brakke circulated his report in advance of the meeting via email. It is on file with the Secretary’s office.
   B. He moved that the NAPS Board approve the appointment of V. Burrus and Andrew Jacobs to serve as Associate Editors. D. Trout seconded. All approved.

Continuing Business
1. Patristic Monograph Series
   A. C. Beeley begin his report by stating his pleasure to be in this position and extended his thanks to the Board for appointing him.
   B. C. Beeley articulated several plans he has for the series:
      (1) Make it a premiere series among other early Christian monograph series (cf. OUP).
      (2) Re-establish the series with regular publications, quality titles, competitive pricing and speed to publication.
      (3) Connected with the previous item, a change in the name of the series to “Early Christian Studies.” L. Dysinger asked C. Beeley if he wanted to change the definition of what the series is, or if it is just a name change. C. Beeley responded no change in definition except he wanted the definition of “monograph” to be broad enough to include books of translations and studies of texts. [Secretary’s note: in an email sent to Board members on 8/22/2011, W. Mayer informed everyone, “The name Early Christian Studies is already attached to the monograph series published by the Centre for Early Christian Studies in Australia. The Oxford series distinguishes itself by adding Oxford (Oxford Early Christian Studies), so if NAPS decides to use the name, it will need a distinguishing descriptor as well. Perhaps NAPS Early Christian Studies (?)”]
      (4) Consider changing presses away from CUA due to perceived editorial delays on their end. Some discussion followed about just what those editorial delays were. It was not entirely clear, but it seems CUA may have caused delays by sending out the series’ approved monographs to another community of reviewers before agreeing to publish them. This was deemed unnecessary because of NAPS’ already rigorous review process. V. Burrus agreed that, if such things were happening, that C. Beeley should confer with other university presses about taking on the series. Indiana Univ. Press was one she specifically proposed.
      (5) Create an editorial board for the series with rotating associate editors. D. Brakke, V. Burrus and C. Schroeder said having an established editorial board is important for credibility sake. D. Brakke clarified this group should not be responsible for all the refereeing of manuscripts.
Refereeing and decision-making are connected but separate parts of the process. The refereeing should be done with the assistance of external reviewers. The editorial board would, nevertheless, read manuscripts and work with the press to ensure proposed revisions to accepted manuscripts are completed.

C. D. Brakke moved C. Beeley is authorized by the Board to talk with other presses and to discuss with them the series title and editorial board arrangements. B. Matz seconded. All approved.

2. 2012 Board Meeting

D. Trout reminded everyone of C. Schroeder’s earlier email asking whether or not we needed to meet as a Board on Wednesday before NAPS in addition to just on Thursday morning. D. Brakke said that, watching meetings for eight years now, he has become convinced that a society with no permanent or full-time staff needs to have a more deliberative Board. Thus, more time dedicated to handling the society’s business was needed. He felt meeting for more than two and one-half hours was appropriate. It was discussed how much additional time was needed and what options there were for meeting on Wednesday. It was agreed the Board would meet also on Wed, May 23 from 2-5pm. D. Brakke further proposed that that meeting solely be devoted to discussing how best to utilize the society’s invested funds. B. Matz’s proposal to treat it as an endowment with an annual draw should be fleshed out more in advance through a sub-committee, and that sub-committee’s recommendations were to be the subject of discussion at next year’s Wednesday session of the Board. D. Trout was directed to appoint a committee that included not only himself and B. Matz but also at least two other members, including possibly one non-NAPS member who has financial and/or administrative background.