

2018 NAPS Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 23, Dusable Room, 2:00-5:00 P.M.

Attendees: Jeff Bingham (President), Robin Darling Young (Vice President), Rick Brumback (Secretary-Treasurer), Mark DelCogliano (MatL), Christine Luckritz Marquis (MatL), Sophie Lunn-Rockcliffe (MatL), Brian Dunkle (MatL), Carson Bay (Student MatL), Stephen Shoemaker (JECS Editor).

Absent: Susanna Elm (Immediate Past President), Christopher Beeley (CLA Editor), Vasiliki Limberis (Chair of the Nominating Committee).

Call to Order at 2:00 P.M. and Welcome

I. Approval of 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

A copy of the minutes is on record in the office of the secretary and available at the NAPS website.

Minutes were reviewed. No changes proposed. Motion made to approve the Minutes. Seconded. All approved.

II. Officer Reports

1. Jeffrey Bingham, President

1. Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer
2. The Digital Humanities Committee has become a standing committee this past year.
3. There have been discussions with NAPS members about various concerns.
 - a. There has been work by the committee charged with examining the issue of the society's name. Due to unforeseen difficulties this past year, progress has not been made to the degree hoped by the committee, and the best option is to restart the process. This will allow the time of the Oxford year to ensure a good process and results.
 - b. Another issue has been graduate student participation in the annual meeting. The matter was discussed at the 2017 board meeting, but no policy was adjusted and the previous policy was left in place. There have been concerns about the way in which pre-ABD students have been allowed to participate in the program. There is a need to discuss a revised policy that is merit-based and allows pre-ABD participation in the regular program.
 - c. There is also a desire to form an ad hoc committee to examine the ways in which the annual program is put together. There may be some measures on how the program can be improved.
 - d. We want to continue the work in framing a sexual harassment policy. This work has been carried out by CLM and committee, and a

statement was approved last year. This year will allow us to hear about the advances made to establish a grievance policy.

- e. The issue of possibly holding our annual meeting during the Oxford years is also a pressing question. This past year a survey was taken of membership on this matter, and the results were very divided. We will not have a NAPS conference in 2019, so the discussion is really for 2023 and beyond. Also, the matter of possible financial support for graduate students presenting at Oxford is a topic to be discussed.
- f. In 2020, NAPS will have its 50th anniversary celebration. There is a committee formed for arranging the 50th celebration, and JB and RB are co-chairs of that committee. More details will be forthcoming as we move closer to that date.

2. Rick Brumback, Secretary/Treasurer Report

- 1. Financial Report on file with the Secretary/Treasurer.
- 2. The society is in good financial health. JECS has been a strong source of revenue generation for the society.
- 3. MD asks about the variation in conference costs from year to year. The variances are due to when expenses come due. NAPS operates on a calendar year as the fiscal year, so it may be that some expenses come due in a year after the particular conference is held, thus accounting for when the expenses appear. Overall, the cost for the conference is about \$34k per year.
- 4. SS asks about the yearly variation in JECS profits. These come to us from JHU Press so they can answer about the revenue fluctuation. It is still fairly consistent year over year.
- 5. SLR asks about the fluctuation in award amounts each year. RB replies that there is the fluctuation yearly with the number of submissions for grants, awards, etc., and this affects what is awarded. There also may be some fluctuation in what is submitted and awarded in the year following the Oxford conference.

3. Robin Darling Young, Vice President Report

- 1. Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer
- 2. There were well over 300 submissions, with 280 accepted. Some had to withdraw before the meeting. Acceptance rate was about 90%. There will be 70 panels, 9 Open-Call panels, and 24 pre-arranged panels, 3 pre-conference workshops. There are 3 plenary lectures scheduled.
- 3. RB asks about the naming for the submissions process to avoid confusion. Is it worth reconsidering how the session groups are named, like "Open. Call" or others. The structure of how the sessions are categorized may be confusing to those new to our annual meeting and conference call for submissions. JB suggested that this might be worth having discussed if there is an ad hoc committee to consider how the conference is executed.

III. Carson Bay, Student Member-at-Large Report

- 1. Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer.

2. CB mentions the Student Advisory Board. Having the SAB allowed the division of labor to arrange activities or efforts to serve the graduate student community.
3. He says that the room-sharing efforts went smoothly in pairing up students, though the level of participation was a bit lower this year.
4. M. Kitsos serves as the communication figure for the SAB, and he has arranged some social media methods that are starting to be used for advertising NAPS and involving graduate students in the program.
5. CB says that discussions have been ongoing among SAB members concerning the purpose for the SAB, the ideas that can be generated and pursued for grad students.
6. CB proposes that it may be useful for the Student Member-at-Large to be drawn from the officers of the SAB so that these individuals can better relate to the Board and represent the students.
7. JB asks if CB heard any concerns about the pre-ABD question concerning presentations. CB says that there have been some discussions, but that there has also been some confusion about who has been able to submit and present over the past few years. There seems to be uncertainty of what the standard practice has been.
8. There has also been some concern that in the pre-ABD dissertation workshops there were so many individuals that the time slots were small and there was uneven quality.
9. CB mentions the Graduate Student Caucus and the mentoring efforts as well. SLR asks if the mentoring has continued as it was in previous years. CB mentions that he had to ask what the Caucus was, so RB asks if there is a value in reconsidering the name and the way it is advertised for clarity and greater participation.

IV. Stephen Shoemaker, the JECS Report.

- A. Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer.
- B. SS notes that there has been a lower level of participation in 2016, but 2017 has been much higher with great gender distribution.
- C. There are some changes coming. There is a change in book review editor as of July 1, 2018. David Eastman is stepping down and Jaclyn Maxwell will begin. Also Ben Dunning and Wendy Mayer have their associate editor terms coming to an end, but they are eligible to be reappointed. SS desires that that they be so appointed. Motion made, seconded, and passed.
- D. SS is making proposal for a new procedure in appointing the BRE. The NAPS board would be involved in selection under this new proposal in the same way the board has oversight of the JECS editor. And the request is to have a 5-year term; currently there is no term length. MD asks how it came to be that there was no term for the BRE, but no one knows. SR asks if the JECS editor and the associate editors have terms, but the BRE does not? Seems odd. SS asks what it would take to set up terms. RB recalls in 2017 the CLA Associate Editor terms were set at 5 years at the request of Christopher Beeley, with approval of Board and acceptance by the Society in the General Business Meeting. This required Society approval because it was a change in the by-laws. RB will look to see if we can see anything

about the same for the JECS BRE. On Thursday, RB reports that the by-laws indicate that there has to be Society approval for appointing associate editors, but does this include the BRE?

- E. SS says the question has been asked of him if it is possible to not get print copies of the JECS. If this were to happen, it would have to be resolved at the Society level and with JHUP. The querist says he reads all articles digitally. MD asks if there would be a lower rate for receiving only a digital copy. This would again be a NAPS level discussion with JHUP. So the question is asked who in the Society has the power to negotiate such things. RDY says for the CLA series the switch from CUA to UCP was really done through the CLA Editor. SS says that this would also involve membership, so this would have to be done also in relation to JHUP. CM asks if this would just be asking the member if they wanted to opt of receiving the paper copy format. JB says if we are only receiving one or two requests about this, should we be able to think about it but hold off on any specific action at this point. SR asks if there would be lower membership dues for not receiving the paper copy. MD says this doesn't need to be a membership poll but RB can communicate with JHUP about the current arrangements and what might be involved in such a change—just information gathering. SS says this is a good thing for us to think about right now, and the JECS board is just thinking about this.
- F. RB asks if there is anything that can be done about the slow pace of book review responses. SS says it is a challenge for the article reviews as well. Discussion ensues about ways to prompt those who agree to do book reviews to complete the task within the expected time frame. MD says that the JECS book reviews are generally fairly short, so maybe more latitude to the reviewers to do more than just a summary. SS says there is the possibility of having “review articles” in the journal that are longer, but this is done on an ad hoc basis. DC asks if a person can nominate themselves to be in a “pool” of book reviewers. JB says that in the American Society of Church History there is a survey taken when a person becomes a member asking what they would be willing to do for the society. SS says he could make an announcement to the Society asking for reviewer volunteers who would contact the BRE if interested in writing a review. JB asks if SS can make this announcement at the GBM. He says he will. JB also asks if there is an interest in putting this in the yearly membership renewal form. SS says that Jaclyn Maxwell if she would like to come up with categories that could be added to the membership form. Also ask her if she wants to circulate a “books received” list that would be ones to review. But RDY says it might be helpful to have different lists of “books received” versus “books available for review” since not every book received is desired to be reviewed. SS says he will mention to Jaclyn (1) the check-boxes for membership renewals; (2) the quarterly list of “books available to review”; and (3) the announcement on Friday's GBM.

V. JB begins discussion of Graduate Student Presentation at the Annual Meeting.

- A. JB mentions the materials circulated in the board packet and notes there has been dissatisfaction about whether pre-ABD students are allowed to present in the main program. He notes that various societies handle this question differently. He notes

this has been widely discussed, and says that he is advocating for greater involvement.

- B. MD says the original 2014 Briggman letter was really about master's students; this is not reflected in the Board Minutes. RB points to excerpts from 2014 and 2016 to show prior discussion and the way the setup was established in 2016 by the then vice president. It is noted that in 2017 and 2018 the current vice presidents then maintained the same practice. It appears that despite the "soft-language" restriction on pre-ABD submissions, there were several that were sent in. RDY says that there is a statutory force to Kate Cooper's call for papers for the 2016 conference, which was then utilized in subsequent years. Discussion ensues about the fact that different criteria are needed for different groups of graduate students. The consensus is that we need to formalize some policy. The discussion turns to the need for a more formal vetting committee and guidelines, especially if only using an abstract and blind review for all submissions.

RDY says we could have full-on graduate panels, with people who mentor them. We want to encourage graduate student participation at the meeting however, so the question is how to do this. RDY wonders if a short statement of endorsement by a student's advisor or mentor as part of the submission. And discussion says maybe a regular member of NAPS in place of an advisor that provides the statement. Discussion continues about how to ensure that the graduate student papers are adequate quality but without create barriers to their involvement.

SS asks if we really have a problem with space; do we have to limit the number of sessions and thus have rejections? But discussion points out that there will be rejected abstracts no matter what. The question is how the decision is being vetted. MD proposes that all "soft language" be eliminated, that there be a truly Open Call for papers, and then that there be mention of an option for pre-ABD students be able to connect with a scholar or mentor for involvement.

JB motions that this be tabled until Thursday morning. Seconded and passed.

- VI. JB now turns discussion to the question of how the conference program is managed and put together. This would be to select the papers, how the sessions are named and constituted. MD has proposed there be an ad hoc committee to examine how we might more effectively manage the conference program.

RB brings forward a proposal from Brian Matz about creating a "Conference Program Manager" under the supervision of the NAPS Secretary/Treasurer and working with the Sec/Treas and VP to arrange the conference. This met with strong approval and will be discussed further along with other discussion on the conference program on Thursday's meeting.

- VII. JB turns discussion to NAPS funding of a yearly Graduate Student Mixer for graduate student encouragement and involvement. At current levels, the cost for the hotel to cater such an event is \$20 per person, and this year the estimate is for as many as 30-40 students. So the upper bill that NAPS would be responsible for would be about \$1000. CB brings up that each year the Student Member-at-Large might ask their own institution to help fund this mixer, so there might be little to no cost for NAPS in any given year. JB proposes that we commit to funding this yearly. Seconded and passed.

Thursday

- VIII. Colette Givens and LuAnn McNaughton, TER Report
 - A. Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer.
- IX. Daniel Caner, Nominating Committee
 - A. Report on file with Secretary/Treasurer
 - B. DC suggests that it be a regular practice to contact the potential nominees in advance and ask if they are willing to serve. Infrequently a person has declined the nomination, so checking in advance of the annual meeting is good.
 - C. There is a new approach to the nominating process: using an online, digital nominating site that asks for a number of key pieces about any nominees. It will be necessary to have the NC each year, with changeover of members, learn how to use the Qualtrics process.
 - D. MD says the process of nomination and selection has been perceived as opaque, and he wonders if there is anything that can help to make things more transparent. JB and DC both detailed the time they have served on the NC and that it was a straightforward process. DC points out that often names are nominated without any supporting information to assess the nominees. The Qualtrics process has helped with that.
 - E. The discussion turns to the voting process by the membership at the GBM; is there a need to have the slate of nominees before the society three weeks in advance of the meeting? The by-laws seem a bit unclear.
 - F. JB proposes that the slate of nominees be accepted. Accepted and passed unanimously.
- X. Joel Kalvesmaki, DHC Report
 - 1. Report on file with the Secretary/Treasurer.
 - 2. JK mentions the DHC has been working to improve the Resources section of the NAPS website and curate that aspect of the site. RB mentioned how good it has been to have the work to improve the Resources section, especially making sure that all resource links and information are current and active.
 - 3. The DHC continues to put on the Thursday morning DH workshops, and they have been very successful.
- XI. Kate Cooper, Awards and Prizes Committee (Presented by RB in KC's absence)
 - A. Report on file with the Secretary/Treasurer.
 - B. After reading the mention of winners, conversation turns to the issue of how to handle the possibility of repeat winners. Should student winners be allowed to submit for a prize in subsequent years? JB asks if we can propose some basic guidelines to the APC that indicate students can subsequently submit to a category they have already won, but that in the case of a tie, preference is given to the one who had not won the award.
 - C. The APC asks about the propriety of awarding Small Research Grants to individuals who indicate that a part of the award will be used for salary if unemployed, and the research project would be a work mentioned to help gain employment.
 - D. The proposal is made to have the next APC try to consider and establish guidelines/criteria for their future work.

- X. Christopher Beeley, CLA Report
 - A. Report on file with the Secretary/Treasurer
 - B. The Board in 2015 approved the buy-out of all CUA volumes, but so far CUA has been unresponsive to CB's request to finalize this transaction.
 - C. CB asks for approval of the budget for \$2250 (consistent with 2016 and 2017). RB motions the budget be accepted. Seconded and passed.
- XI. New and Continuing Business
 - A. Graduate Student Paper Presentations (continued)
 - 1. MD recommends that the current instructions on abstract submission be amended to allow pre-ABD abstract submissions. After some discussion, MD will type out the language and circulate for use in future calls for paper submissions.
 - B. Book Review Editor (continued)
 - 1. SS asks that the by-laws be changed to appoint a BRE, using the language of the Associate Editor by-laws but with a 5-year term, renewable once.
 - 2. MD motions that the Board approve this change and appointment. Seconded and passed.
 - 3. This will be put before the GBM on Friday.
 - C. Conference Program Manager (continued)
 - 1. The notes from Brian Matz about the general description about the Conference Manager Program, supplemented by additional descriptions from RB, are circulated to the Board.
 - 2. MD is wary about approving the creation of this position so quickly. He reminds that there is a proposal of a committee to look at how this person could be appointed. RB points out that the Board can then use this CPM to work with the committee formed to address the larger concerns.
 - 3. JB proposes that the Board establish an ad hoc committee to look at the execution of the program for the yearly meeting. This board will also look toward a candidate to fill the CPM. This motion is seconded and passed.
 - D. Reconstitution of the Committee to Examine the NAPS Name
 - 1. JB reminds the makeup of the original committee proposal, with two co-chairs. This also includes having the same positions filled by nomination of the president, the incoming president, the student member and one appointed by the Board.
 - 2. SS states it might be useful to have some continuity with some members from the previous iteration. The Board is in favor of retaining Ellen Muehlberger and have her serve as co-chair with RDY. There is also a question about the diversity of the Society being reflected in the composition of the committee.
 - 3. Robin and Ellen as co-chairs, Adam Ployd as the Board appointment, RDY will appoint one person, and Clayton Jefford will appoint one person. Clayton will also be on this committee. The student appointee is Candace Buckner Ducharme.
 - 4. CLM proposes that this be accepted, MD seconds, and motions passes.
 - 5. This committee will report on progress back to the Board at the 2020 meeting.
 - E. The 50th Anniversary Celebration at the 2020 Meeting.
 - 1. JB brings up the matter of having invited speakers of Everett Ferguson and also Liz Clark.
 - 2. BD says that it might be good to have a journal article in JECS on the history of the society.

3. Committee would be constituted of JB, RB, Clayton Jefford, and another member or two.
- F. The Distinguished Service Award for 2020
1. The proposal is to present this award in 2020. Seconded and passed.
- G. NAPS and the Oxford Conference
1. The question is about a subvention for Oxford. SLR will check with the Oxford directors to see if the claim that the \$15k subvention is truly needed.
 2. JB proposes that \$10k be used to fund up to 20 students at \$500 each to attend Oxford with the stipulation that the student be presenting. Seconded and passed.
 3. SLR will report back to the executive committee of the Board about the \$15k subvention. If not required, this could also be used to support students to Oxford.
- H. Sexual Harassment Policy and Grievance Process.
1. CLM reports that there is a committee established looking at the structure of a grievance process.
 2. She indicates the aim is to utilize the Sexual Harassment Policy and the Diversity Statement pieces approved at the 2017 GBM actually be combined to establish a professional conduct policy. The committee is examining the methods used by other societies and perhaps the use of colleagues who are attorneys and would be willing to work with NAPS *pro bono*.
 3. Does NAPS have some liability even at Oxford because we have a reception there and we may subvene Oxford. RDY suggests talking with AAUC about possible policy and procedures. SS asks if Oxford would need to have its own policy. RDY says that we need to investigate. The CLA International Advisory Board also meets at Oxford.
 4. CLM simply asks that the Board allow the ad hoc committee to be able to continue its work.
- I. The holding of NAPS in the Oxford Year
1. CLM brings up the idea that the 4th year conference could be a “shadow conference,” for graduate students or small attendance. This could also move location to make it more affordable.
 2. MD asks about the survey and proposed that we contact David Eastman and Robin Jensen to ask about the committee’s status and then also their recommendation based upon the data they’ve gathered. Then they would present this recommendation to the Board at 2020.
- J. The Mentoring Program
1. SLR wonders about the status of any mentoring effort. Should this merit an ad hoc committee, or how should it move forward?
 2. MD mentions this could be built into the evaluation and recommendation of the committee on the conference program.
 3. CB indicates that restarting a mentoring program, using Travis Proctor’s report on this, would actually be challenging. It seems that the previous effort may have been stopped because it was inefficient and ineffective. So this would need to look at what would be proposed and how these challenges would be managed. CLM indicates that there was not a high level of participation in the previous efforts.

4. This issue would also bear upon the matter of the language used in the Call for Papers and what we ask the students to provide.
- K. The Description of Services Provided by Nominees to Various Offices
1. CLM mentions that when she was nominated for a Board position, she was not aware (1) of what she was looking at doing if she accepted the nomination to a position, and then (2) what to actually do in the year(s) following appointment.
 2. RB indicates he can share with the NC a basic description of the tasks the MatL and Student MatL and other positions so that potential nominees know what will be expected of them.

Meeting adjourned: 12:01 pm.

**NAPS General Business Meeting
May 25, 2018
Hyatt Regency (Chicago)**

Meeting Minutes

Called to order at 5:32 PM

I. Officer Reports

A. Report of the President (J. Bingham)

1. Thanks are extended to Robin Darling Young and Rick Brumback for their work in helping to execute the annual meeting.
2. The DHC was formed this past year as a standing committee of the Board and has been working with the society on workshops and other activities.
3. The ad hoc name change committee began its work in the summer of 2017, but with some difficulties, it was decided to reconstitute the name change committee and then give a report in 2020.
4. The matter of concerns over participation by the pre-ABD student participation in the regular program has led to a revision of the submissions policy. The Board passed a motion to have all doctoral students submit.
5. Also a decision to help fund the Grad Student Mixer every year has been made by the board. This is an effort to encourage graduate student participation at the annual meeting.
6. Efforts to review how to improve the planning and execution of the program are being undertaken. This will be pursued by an internal Board committee.
7. C. Luckritz Marquis, following up on her report to the 2017 Meeting, gave a report about the status on the ad hoc committee that worked on crafting a sexual harassment grievance policy. In working this past year, the scope actually expanded to consider a grievance policy incorporating both the sexual harassment and diversity statements approved at the meeting in 2017. This is being done with a look at what is done with other societies, and with adequate preparation about proposing a very sound and legally enforceable policy. The hope is to report back to the board in the fall and have something in place to vote upon by the 2020 conference.
8. NAPS during Oxford years. The recent survey of membership concerning the meeting in Oxford years was quite divided. There is no NAPS meeting in 2019, so the decision will be looking toward the possibility for 2023. There is financial support approved by the Board for helping graduate students who present papers to attend Oxford. Thanks to Robin Jensen and David Eastman for working to survey the membership, and there is hope for some results by 2020.

A question from the floor is about the reason for the Oxford conference being set two weeks later; starting to interfere with academic schedules. J. Bingham does not know why it was moved. The querist suggested that this

difficulty be communicated to the Oxford organizers. Also, comment is made encouraging any members who did not already complete the survey to please do so.

9. There is preparation underway for the 50th anniversary held in 2020. J. Bingham and R. Brumback are co-chairing a committee to work in preparation for this celebration.

B. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer (R. Brumback)

1. Reviews the financial health of the Society. Meeting attendees were given a copy of the Society's annual budget report for their review.
2. Reviews the membership statistics of the Society. Membership remains high among all categories. There are continuing efforts to round up individuals whose memberships had lapsed but who wish to participate in the annual meeting. Also, it is mentioned that with 2020, we want to promote membership and participation by any lapsed members and by graduate students.
3. A question from the floor was asked about whether NAPS' conference expense included the registration fees paid by members, and the answer was no. The conference expense is just for society-level expenses.

C. Report of the Vice President (R. Darling Young)

1. We received well over 300 proposals from around the world, and 280 were accepted and scheduled. There were some who had to withdraw. Among the participants are 14 pre-ABD students. 70 panels, including 9 Open Call panels. 3 Pre-Conference workshops on Thursday, and there were 3 plenary lectures.
2. No questions from the floor.

II. Editor and Committee Reports

A. Report of the JECS Editor (S. Shoemaker)

1. JECS remains editorially healthy and financially profitable. Data on submissions, reviews and acceptances are good and are available in the Editor's report.
2. JECS was recently awarded the "Codex Award" for the best journal on any subject before 1500 by the Council of Editors of Learned Journals at the recent Modern Language Association annual meeting.
3. There continue to be good variety among articles.
4. Ben Dunning and Wendy Mayer have been reappointed as Assoc. Editors.
5. David Eastman will be stepping down as the Books Review Editor (BRE) as of July 1, 2018, though he will continue in an advisory role. The new BRE will be Jaclyn Maxwell, and she will begin her work on July 1.
6. Members are encouraged to volunteer to do book reviews. The general policy for reviewers is that they be done with Ph.D. and have some publications completed.
7. The past procedure is that the BRE has been appointed by the Editor and with no specified length of term. A proposal is put forward that the appointment of BRE be a process like the appointment of the Editor and Assoc. Editors. There is also a proposal to change the by-laws to set a 5-year term limit, renewable

once, for the BRE. J. Bingham asks for a vote on the by-law change, and it passes unanimously.

8. Rebecca Stephens Falcansantos is awarded the Best First Article prize.

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

1. This has been a good year for the series with several new titles out. The report on submissions and publications is available in the Editor's Report.
2. The terms of our agreement with the UC Press are very favorable. Things are going very well with the press in the execution of these publishing ventures.
3. Thanks are extended to R. Darling Young and D. Brakke for associate editorship, as well as to all who have helped with reviews, etc.
4. Brian Dunkle is named as the recipient of the Best First Book prize.

C. Report of the Nominating Committee (D. Caner)

1. Thanks are given to the other members of the Committee (Kristi Upson-Saia and Brian Matz). A review of the work of the Committee since the last annual meeting is given. This includes mention of the online form for submissions that seeks to acquire more information about all nominees. This will aid in making selections.
2. D. Caner presents the candidates for the several offices:
 - a. Vice President: Clayton Jefford
 - b. Members-at-Large, Board (2 positions): Blossom Stefaniw and Jennifer Barry
 - c. Members for the Awards & Prizes Committee (2 Positions): Jonathan Zecher and David DeVore
 - d. Student Member-at-Large, Board (1 Position): Candace Buckner Ducharme
 - e. Members for the Digital Humanities Committee (2 Positions): Joel Kalvesmaki and Micah Sexton
3. D. Caner opens the floor to additional nominations for each position. No nominations are made from the floor. Motion is made to close nominations. Seconded. Call to question. The vote is unanimous in favor of electing the above-named individuals to the respective offices.

D. Report of the Awards & Prizes Committee (C. Luckritz Marquis reports in the absence of Kate Cooper)

C. Luckritz Marquis reports on the work done over the last year and announces the recipients for the awards and prizes for 2017.

1. Dissertation Completion Grant: Karen L. Carducci
2. Dissertation Research Grant: Cody Strecker
3. Small Research Grants:
 - a. Sean Hannan
 - b. Ky Heinze
 - c. Adam Rasmussen
 - d. Jennifer Strawbridge
 - e. Eric Wickman
4. Regional Study Initiative Grant: Adam Ployd
5. Graduate Student Paper Prize: Candace Buckner, Blake Jurgens, Kathleen Kirsch, Mark Lettney, Corey Stephan

III. New Business

- A. J. Bingham asks for mention of those members who have passed. A moment of silence is observed in honor of Eugene TeSelle and Charles Kannengiesser.

Meeting adjourned at 6:21 PM.