

2017 NAPS Board of Directors Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 24, Dusable Room, 2:00-5:00 P.M.

Attendees: Kate Cooper (President), Jeff Bingham (Vice President), Rick Brumback (Secretary-Treasurer), Mark DelCogliano (MatL), Young Kim (MatL), Christine Shepardson (MatL), Christine Luckritz Marquis (MatL), Erin Galgay Walsh (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 2016 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

A. President Report (Kate Cooper)

Written report submitted [on file in the Secretary's office]

1. Raised issue of NAPS meeting during the Oxford Conference years.

Suggestion is to address this soon and perhaps announce at the General Business Meeting (GBM) with the topic open to some discussion, and then to do a postal vote.

S. Shoemaker says the Board should make a recommendation at the GBM.

K. Cooper identifies key questions: (1) Does NAPS meet in that year? (2) Does NAPS subsidize the Oxford Conference?

Board discussion ensues. Y. Kim says it is conceivable that people choose one or the other, meaning there may be a smaller attendance at NAPS. K. Cooper states that costs are spiraling out of control at NAPS, but at Oxford there is more willingness to draw upon conference groups for costs. There is discussion about efforts by some to make the Oxford conference a more European event rather than just a British one based at Oxford. Discussion continues that costs are rising at Oxford, and other groups seeking to conduct events at Oxford may try to outbid the patristics event. T. Shepardson suggests conversation be had with the Oxford Conference organizers. K. Cooper says that according to conversations with figures at Oxford, there does seem to be international interest in continuing to hold the conference there. And there is also a feeling of nostalgia for continuing to meet there.

J. Bingham wonders if having a rotating location will adversely affect attendance. E. Walsh is asked if she has a sense that students would like to go to

Oxford or attend NAPS instead, especially if they both happen in the same year. K. Cooper wonders what the cost would be to have NAPS in the Oxford year; that information is supplied by Total Events Resources and similar to other years, although the price drops if there is an expectation of lower attendance at NAPS. E. Walsh indicates students want to go to Oxford, but it is expensive. It is also remarked that some professors would want to go to Oxford, but it is sometimes too expensive for them also. Y. Kim asks whether, if both Oxford and NAPS were held in the same year, NAPS would still help underwrite the cost of the Oxford conference with a \$15,000 donation or would it no longer be given since NAPS would also meet? C. Shepardson wonders if a reduced attendance due to having NAPS in the same year would result in highest Oxford costs.

Several members observe that in going, the collegial and professional connections are made and maintained at Oxford. But it is also cautioned that there needs to be much data gathered to make a case for holding NAPS in 2019. Any efforts need to show how this would benefit NAPS and not just other groups. S. Shoemaker and C. Luckritz Marquis wonder if we don't support Oxford financially if the same \$15k could be used to help NAPS members attend other conferences.

K. Cooper want to establish a plan for discussion. Options are to send the discussion on what to recommend to the General Business Meeting. Do we subsidize Oxford; do we hold our conference here; or do we do both. M. DelCogliano asks who the governing body is for Oxford. K. Cooper indicates it is Carol Harrison at Christ Church, Oxford. And there are some efforts to turn the conference more to IAPS. S. Shoemaker proposes tabling this subject until Thursday when we have information we need concerning TER and the possibility of a NAPS conference in 2019. It is then suggested by several that there be a poll and vote of membership about this overall subject. R. Brumback suggests leaving off the discussion of any particular year of both NAPS and Oxford (like 2019 or 2023) while still having the general discussion. This would allow the society to chart a course without obligating to any particular Oxford year. Y. Kim points out that we will have to look at society by-laws about the terms of officers, etc., associated with the potential of having a NAPS conference in Oxford years and how that would affect appointments, etc. K. Cooper asks to have this tabled to give all time to ponder these questions.

2. K. Cooper turns attention the matter of diversity issues within the society. Y. Kim recalls previous efforts at gathering stats about gender involvement and full-inclusivity. C. Shepardson and Y. Kim, having looked at how other scholarly societies have addressed such topics, propose two issues be a part of the renewal and registration process. C. Shepardson states data is need about conference program and JECS diversity involvement. K. Cooper asks if we want to see if the diversity of the membership is reflected in the journal and conference. C. Shepardson says we need to see the data, but she also desires to see a statement on diversity and inclusion at the society level, along with a non-discrimination clause. The board members report allegations of sexual harassment issues at the 2016 meeting. C. Shepardson proposes having a committee to look at how to address claims of sexual harassment.

Y. Kim identifies three proposals: (1) address the language of the society's diversity statement; (2) use a questionnaire to collect demographic data; and (3) set up an ad hoc committee to examine the topic of sexual harassment and a subsequent grievance process. He asks that the first two proposals come up for a vote at the General Business Meeting. K. Cooper asks about proposal (1) concerning some of the key terms in the proposed diversity statement. Discussion ensues over certain elements of the statement, and C. Shepardson indicates the proposed statement is constructed with a number of other societies' statements in view.

Regarding proposal (2), there is discussion over the wording of the questionnaire seeking information, particularly concerning an option "Prefer Not to Answer." C. Luckritz Marquis motions to put the matter before the General Business Meeting with the specified amendment, and R. Brumback seconds this motion. It passes unanimously. This will be included in the General Business Meeting handout along with the proposed diversity statement for the society.

It is again mentioned that there have been anecdotes of alleged sexual harassment at the annual meetings, but without a grievance process, some members have chosen not to attend the annual meetings. After general discussion about the need to establish a grievance process, C. Shepardson makes a motion to create an ad hoc committee to begin the process of establishing a grievance process. Y. Kim seconds and it passes unanimously. K. Cooper asks if C. Luckritz Marquis would chair the committee, and then C. Shepardson suggests linking the grievance polity to match the non-discrimination statement.

B. Secretary-Treasurer Report (Rick Brumback)

1. Membership report [written report on file in Secretary's office].
2. Financial report [written report on file in Secretary's office].
3. From 2016 Board Meeting, the NAPS Regional Initiative Grant is implemented. Also from the 2016 Board Meeting, the honoraria for plenary speakers is \$750.
4. The membership and financial information will be shared at the General Business Meeting.

C. Vice President's Report (Jeffrey Bingham)

Written report submitted [on file in Secretary's office].

1. J. Bingham thanks others for help in reviewing the large number of submissions. A suggestion is put forward to ask those convening pre-arranged panels to attempt to include diverse speakers. It can be difficult to have diversity among conference presentations because selection depends upon the topics. But the board can request pre-formed panels to seek to include diverse participants.

M. DelCogliano suggests the use of keywords in submission of abstracts, thus allowing easier categorization and grouping. This is strongly supported among the board members present. The decision is to ask the staff at Total-Event Resources to arrange the submissions platform to request and accept keywords along with the abstract submissions. This will also help eliminate any double submissions.

2. K. Cooper asks about the program and the A/V needs. J. Bingham indicates there have been some late requests for A/V, and there has been some ability to accommodate this. S. Shoemaker remarks that we want to discourage superfluous

A/V requests because of the large expense in providing these resources. K. Cooper adds that we want to encourage but manage A/V needs effectively. There is a strong interest in having a clear statement about A/V needs on the registration page.

3. J. Bingham asks if a statement can be used in the call for pre-formed sessions requesting sponsors give attention to the diversification efforts, looking at Oxford as an example. M. DelCogliano asks if we want a stronger statement of encouragement for broad inclusion. Discussion closes.

D. Student Report (Erin Galgay Walsh)

Written report submitted [on file in Secretary's office].

1. E. Galgay Walsh suggests having a time-window for any requests for shared accommodations at the annual meeting. She will help formulate a general statement about this service and how it can operate most effectively. K. Cooper also suggests using the NAPS Facebook page to help.
2. K. Cooper asks about the Student Advisory Board, and E. Galgay Walsh indicates it is ready to be set up.
3. R. Brumback asks if we could have graduate conference sessions. J. Bingham asks if there are enough rooms to accommodate such, and R. Brumback asks if there will be enough rooms to rent for additional space. C. Shepardson wonders if graduate students would be interested in this. E. Galgay Walsh asks if there is a way to lower registration rates, etc., to incentivize students coming if not giving a paper (which papers make it possible for students to come). R. Brumback makes a motion to establish an ad hoc Student Advisory Board committee, and C. Luckritz Marquis seconds this motion; it passes unanimously. C. Shepardson suggests the committee can take care of doing a questionnaire; E. Galgay Walsh will start the process of forming the committee. Then the process of reporting on the committee's establishment can begin. The board agrees.

E. JECS Report (Steven Shoemaker)

Written report submitted [on file in Secretary's office].

1. About 18-19 papers are published each year. There is increased activity by female authors and reviewers. S. Shoemaker nominates K. Cooper and C. Shepardson to help with this process. This nomination is motioned, seconded, and unanimously accepted.
2. S. Shoemaker makes a request for a standing arrangement for a JECS luncheon during each annual meeting as long as JECS is producing a financial benefit to the society. This request is motioned for a vote, seconded, and unanimously passed.
3. K. Cooper closes this discussion with a request for all to encourage submissions to JECS.

Meeting Adjourns.

Thursday, May 25, Dusable Room, 9:00 A.M.-12:00 P.M.

Attendees: Kate Cooper (President), Jeff Bingham (Vice President), Rick Brumback (Secretary-Treasurer), Mark DelCogliano (MatL), Young Kim (MatL), Christine Shepardson (MatL), Christine Luckritz Marquis (MatL), Erin Galgay Walsh (Student MatL), Stephen Shoemaker (JECS Editor), Christopher Beeley (CLA Editor).

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

F. CLA Report (Christopher Beeley)

Written report submitted [on file in Secretary's office].

1. C. Beeley asks for approval of the CLA budget. K. Cooper motions approval, C. Luckritz Marquis seconds, and it passes unanimously.
2. C. Beeley nominates David Brakke as Associate Editor to replace Liz Clark. The board needs to appoint David and reappoint Robin Darling Young. C. Luckritz Marquis makes a motion for approval, R. Brumback seconds, and the motion passes unanimously.
3. C. Beeley requests that the Board consider an amendment to NAPS By-Laws concerning CLA and the appointment of CLA associate editors. In 2012 the board voted to appoint the current editors for an initial, five-year term (2012-2017) and then revisit the topic in 2016. But it has not yet been addressed. C. Beeley recommends that the associate editors continue to be appointed for a five-year term and that the number of associate editors remain at two. He requests Board support for a motion to the General Business Meeting to amend the By-Laws. His report includes the proposed language of the amendment. S. Shoemaker asks about using a three-year appointment like JECS; C. Beeley points to the length of time involved in seeing a book project from submission to publication. Also he points to the length of initial term of Robin Darlin Young and Liz Clark. K. Cooper says the board can recommend approval to the General Business Meeting.
4. C. Beeley reminds that the aim in having the book series to provide an excellent series of monographs that have a broad spectrum of topics. He requests that we continue to promote submissions to the series.

III. Committee Reports

A. Nominating Committee

Vasiliki Limberis is absent, but the written report is submitted [on file in Secretary's office]. K. Cooper notes that some of the nominated names are already being circulated as though confirmed. She asks Kristi Upson-Saia, a member of the Nominating Committee, to present the committee report to the General Business Meeting. C. Luckritz Marquis moves to accept the panel of nominees and put before the entire society at the business meeting. R. Brumback seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

B. Awards and Prizes Committee

Susannah Elm is absent, but the written report is submitted [on file in the Secretary's office].

1. K. Cooper asks C. Shepardson if she would announce the nominees at the General Business Meeting for approval, and she agrees to do so.
2. C. Shepardson asks that the guidelines have clear language about the length of papers submitted for the paper prizes. R. Brumback will ensure wording is included in the published submission information.
3. K. Cooper asks about the NAPS Regional Meeting and Study Group Initiative award. C. Luckritz Marquis indicates it is for use in conducting a separate syllabus workshop being convened by Kristi Upson-Saia at the tail-end of the SBL/AAR meeting in Boston.

IV. Other Business

- A. K. Cooper brings up the involvement by ReMeDhe at Chicago and NAPS's helping this group. Should this assistance continue? R. Brumback points out that the ReMeDhe entity is not a part of the NAPS society, though members are, so do we continue to help as a separate organization, and if so, in what way? Y. Kim indicates a need for a structure for those who want to come under the NAPS umbrella. K. Cooper asks if we should have a mechanism for welcoming other groups into the NAPS umbrella? Maybe a proposal on the mechanism that is either cost-neutral or of such value to NAPS as a whole. Do we have empty rooms that could be used on Thursday morning? S. Shoemaker asks if it could be expanded into Saturday?
C. Shepardson asks if there is a reason ReMeDhe does not come under NAPS's organizational structure like the Digital Humanities group has done. Y. Kim mentions that ReMeDhe is larger than just being involved in NAPS; for example, they take part at SBL/AAR. K. Cooper asks R. Brumback if he would be happy if ReMeDhe partnered with NAPS in some fashion. We would not be informally hosting and subsidizing ReMeDhe, but we invite them to put together a proposal that would benefit NAPS and offer value so that it is worth it to NAPS to partner in some way. J. Bingham asks about A/V and room costs for ReMeDhe sessions. K. Cooper asks C. Luckritz Marquis and C. Shepardson to work with R. Brumback to contact ReMeDhe to look at the possibility of finding a way to work together. K. Cooper motions this be undertaken, Y. Kim seconds, and it passes unanimously.
- B. K. Cooper asks about the diversity statement in light of discussion in Wednesday's board session. C. Shepardson and Y. Kim had worked after the meeting on Wednesday to adjust the wording of the diversity statement to reflect the prior discussion, and they emailed the updated version to all board members. This met with general approval. S. Shoemaker, after speaking with an attorney whom he knows, suggested the language of "criminal record" for the statement rather than "conviction status." C. Shepardson agrees to alter that wording as well. K. Cooper proposes changing the language of another section to read "marital or family status." K. Cooper makes a motion that this diversity statement be approved by the board, and J. Bingham seconds. It passes unanimously and will be presented to the General Business Meeting for approval.
- C. K. Cooper asks about the sexual harassment statement. After discussion on specific wording over a few elements, C. Luckritz Marquis amends the statement to reflect this discussion. K. Cooper motions for its acceptance. J. Bingham seconds, and it passes unanimously.

- D. K. Cooper asks that discussion turn to the grievance process and committee to address complaints. C. Luckritz Marquis proposes two candidates for inclusion on this committee. S. Shoemaker shares an attorney's concerns regarding creation of the grievance process and the execution of it. Just an encouragement to be very careful in this process. Y. Kim asks if NAPS already has legal counsel, but it appears the society does not. K. Cooper asks if the General Business Meeting can be informed that an ad hoc committee is being established to address these concerns about harassment. Perhaps the committee should include some members of the board. K. Cooper and C. Shepardson mention having an exploratory committee for this topic.
- E. Digital Humanities Report (Lillian Larsen and Joel Kalvesmaki)
Written report submitted [on file in the Secretary's office].
1. K. Cooper asks L. Larsen to summarize the status of the DH committee and the needs for DH. L. Larsen says DH has Standing Committee status, and the need is to make sure A/V and Wifi are available. It is requested that Sarah Bond, DH committee member and presenter, can be given a room with the hotel allowing her to come the day prior in order to set up all equipment. K. Cooper suggests this be done.
 2. K. Cooper proposes stating to the General Business Meeting that the board has agreed to establish the DH Committee and receive suggestions on who should be on the that committee. J. Kalvesmaki and L. Larsen ask if a member of the board could be on the committee. J. Kalvesmaki will be the contact for receiving suggestions. Carrie Schroeder is suggested as being on the committee. L. Larsen thanks Y. Kim for his help in moving the committee forward in this process.
J. Kalvesmake asks if the board member will be an ex officio member of the DH committee as opposed to a DH committee member being an ex officio member of the board. K. Cooper believes this requires having a committee representative on the board like JECS and CLA. J. Kalvesmaki would like to have 3 members on the DH Committee. Discussion ensues about having 4 members that serve two-year staggered terms. K. Cooper asks L. Larsena and J. Kalvesmaki to advance a proposal of the first phase that the member of the DH committee be an ex officio member of the NAPS board. This would require a By-Law change and more than thirty days pass for a By-Law change. So DH becomes a standing committee and therefore there can be an informal involvement of the DH committee representative with in the board activities and next year we address the By-Law change. J. Kalvesmaki proposes four committee members plus one ad hoc, in two-year staggered terms, and a chair of the DH Committee. It is suggested that the chair of the DH committee be appointed by nomination just like the JECS and CLA editors. K. Cooper motions that this be pursued and that Y. Kim can help. Seconded. Passed.
- F. K. Cooper introduces topic of the fourth year conference in the Oxford year.
1. It appears that Oxford is capped at about 1000 presentations. If there are more than 1000 submissions, they privilege first-timers. According to Carol Harrison, the funding supplied by NAPS is not crucial to fund Oxford, but there is a strong desire for collegial relations to continue. C. Beeley notes that Oxford involvement is helpful for CLA.

2. S. Shoemaker asks if there is any indication about moving the location of the Oxford conference. Apparently there are no such plans for 2019, but there is interest among individuals in having the conference in other locations.
 3. K. Cooper asks if the board wishes to mention to the General Business Meeting a proposed vote that will follow asking if there is a desire to have NAPS in 2019. It is acknowledged that the board will have to act quickly if there is a desire to have the extra conference.
M. DelCogliano cautions that 2019 is too soon to gather data and then have a vote. K. Cooper suggests we could just ask membership if persons would be willing to come to a 2019 NAPS. S. Shoemaker encourages not to have a 2019 meeting. Instead look at 2023 as a possibility. He wonders if we announce to the General Business Meeting that the board is looking at having NAPS and Oxford in same year. M. DelCogliano suggest it will not be an announcement for discussion but rather for awareness.
 4. After discussion with Audrey Bitzer of TER, it is learned that the facility is not available for 2019 for NAPS use.
- G. K. Cooper introduces the topic of the society name and possible name change.
1. At the General Business Meeting, the ad hoc committee on name change will address the GBM. There are two possible paths: (1) discuss aligning the society's name with the journal's name; and (2) open up a process of discernment of the purpose and name of the society. Need to be sure to speak with younger members about their input. Y. Kim points out that in the past it is easier to work on the basis of aligning the names.
 2. Other argues may lead to more expansive dialogue. In aligning the name, perhaps a candidate is ECSA, the Early Christian Studies Association. Another possibility is the Patristics and Early Christian Society (PECS).
 3. J. Bingham and K. Cooper indicate the GBM is about trying to inform membership about the need and put forward a modest alignment proposal. J. Bingham advises to give the ad hoc committee full freedom to move forward. There is some general endorsement using the alignment approach along with a caution about not wanting to be perceived as an anti-"patristics" shift. K. Cooper points out this is a procedural issue for the GBM and at this stage the ad hoc committee is exploring options.
 4. J. Bingham says the committee needs to be consulted on any adjust of the committee's purpose. Also there is a desire by all to have continuity with the members of the ad hoc committee. The board would like the ad hoc committee to work in conjunction with the board and not go to membership directly without board information and input. C. Shepardson says the DH committee went through a similar process. Ask the ad hoc committee to communicate with the board electronically throughout the year on progress. K. Cooper suggests setting a date for the committee to report back to the board by email. She is the chair of the ad hoc committee and can set a date for this report.
- H. K. Cooper notes that Robin Jensen has contacted officers to advance pre-ABD involvement in conference paper presentations. No action taken.
- I. R. Brumback points out that 2020 is the 50th anniversary of the society. He motions that an ad hoc committee be established to plan a milestone celebration in conjunction

with the conference. He proposed that J. Bingham be the chair of the committee and that R. Brumback be a committee member, that J. Bingham arrange the committee, and be allowed to spend a figure like \$30K on the celebration. K. Cooper seconded, passed.

- J. K. Cooper asks about the \$15K typically sent to Oxford and whether it should be redirected. She would like the board to revisit this in 2018.

Meeting adjourned.

NAPS General Business Meeting
May 26, 2017
Hyatt Regency (Chicago)

Meeting Minutes

Called to order at 5:32 PM

- I. Moment of Silence
Society members observed a moment of silence in honor of NAPS member Frederick Norris, who had passes since the last annual meeting of the Society (May 2016).
- II. Officer Reports
 - A. Report of the President (K. Cooper)
 1. A comparatively smooth year with a smooth transition to a new Secretary/Treasurer. Compliments to Total-Event Resources for a good conference.
 2. Addresses the subject of the relationship to the International Patristics Conference and Oxford. Considering a proposal to continue meeting in the Oxford year. Not possible for 2019, but perhaps 2023.

With comments from the floor, an individual remarks that some information polling at the 2016 meeting revealed a lukewarm interest in the fourth year meeting. K. Cooper notes that the board meeting this year asked about polling the society for interest. An individual asks if there is a minimum needed for the NAPS event to keep it affordable; K. Cooper indicates that appears not to be an issue.
 3. Y. Kim and C. Shepardson are asked to report on the ad hoc committee on diversity and inclusion. Requests have come asking about gender/sexuality/ethnicity involvement, so there has been an effort to create a policy statement on diversity and an effort to collect data on membership and representation in publications/presentations. In 2016, data was collected and saw about a 3-1 ratio men-women in paper presentations. To address the policy statement matter, a statement was developed roughly consistent with what other societies have in place. The one proposed for NAPS was presented with the business meeting handouts. This statement has been accepted by the board, and K. Cooper asked the meeting attendees to decide on accepting this statement. The proposal passed.
 4. C. Luckritz Marquis is asked to discuss the sexual harassment statement that has been developed. The proposed statement is similar to that used by other societies. And there will be an ad hoc committee meeting this next year to begin exploring a society grievance process. There is discussion from the floor about having some university counsel examine the language of the statement. K. Cooper proposes that the meeting adopt the current form on a temporary basis and then amendments come as needed. Motion passes.

5. E. Galgay Walsh gives the Student Report. She and Travis Proctor propose a Student Advisor Board, with T. Proctor serving as the first faculty representative with additional members to be added. The first task will be a survey of students for matters of involvement, etc. Also there is a Facebook page for the students and NAPS organization managed by Rebecca Falcansantos.
 6. K. Cooper addresses the matter of the ad hoc committee on the society name and possible change. Members are urged to be watching for a survey about how the current name is received and a second email to follow suggesting how to move forward with the results of the first query. If the Board senses a mandate, a vote will be taken on the name change at the 2018 meeting. The hope is to conclude this investigation within one calendar year. Committee members are K. Cooper, J. Bingham, E. Galgay Walsh, Jonathan Yates, Ellen Muehlberger, and Maria Doeffler.
- 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. The Society had slightly higher expenditures for conference expenses in the last year, but that was due to some lingering expenses associated with Oxford 2015 as well as with NAPS 2016 and 2017. There was a larger number of recipients for awards and grants this year than in 2016, but health of financial markets has helped the Society's investment accounts to increase.
 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.
 3. There were no questions or remarks from the floor.
- C. Report of the Vice President (J. Bingham)
1. Thanks are extended to C. Luckritz Marquis and M. DelCogliano for their help in evaluating presentation submissions, along with thanks to Zachary Lycans for his assistance. There was a high number of submissions and high acceptance rate. Also a positive to see about 20 students participate in the two pre-ABD workshops.
 2. Floor was opened to questions, and one individual asked about the number of conference attendees this year. There were approximately 400 attendees.
- III. Editor and Committee Reports
- A. Report of the JECS Editor (S. Shoemaker)
1. Editor reports there were fewer submissions to the journal, but the published articles show the diversity of areas of the Society.
 2. Thanks to David Eastman and the other review members and advisory board. Andrew S. Jacobs will end his term as Associate Editor and C. Shepardson will assume that position. K. Cooper will continue her role. Thanks go to David Maldonado for his work as Editorial Assistant. His is succeeded by Tola Rodrick. Thanks also go to the various anonymous reviewers.
- B. Report of the CLA Editor (C. Beeley)

1. This has been a good year for the series with several new titles out. There are several titles under contract and the quality of volumes is excellent. The aim is three titles per year. The best first book prize will be awarded in the 2018 convention year.
 2. Liz Clark is stepping down as Associate Editor. Robin Darling Young will continue in that role, and David Brakke will come on board as the second Associate Editor.
 3. There is a proposal to amend the Society's by-laws, and the information about this is provided on the materials supplied to meeting attendees. The current by-laws make provisions for the ongoing service of Associate Editors for JECS but not for CLA. CLA is requesting that Associate Editors be appointed for a period of five years due to the length of time associated with the final publication of these books. The Board has already heard this proposal and approved its recommendation. Questions from the floor are solicited. One individual asks if there is a need for a 30-day prelude to a vote; this is true of constitutional changes, but what about by-laws? After reading through the by-laws, one individual informs the attendees that the by-laws do not show a need for a 30-day period. After a question about needing to mention CLA by name in case of later name changes, it is replied that this is just a clarification. The motion passes.
- C. Report of the Nominating Committee (Kristi Upson-Saia reports in the absence of V. Limberis)
1. Thanks are given to the other members of the Committee (V. Limberis and Daniel Caner). A review of the work of the Committee since the last annual meeting is given.
 2. K. Upson-Saia presents the candidates for the several offices the Committee was tasked to fill.
 - a. Vice President: Robin Darling Young
 - b. Members-at-Large, Board (2 positions): Brian Dunkle and Sophie Lunn-Rockcliffe
 - c. Members for the Awards & Prizes Committee (2 Positions): Brenda Llewellyn Ihssen and Sandy Haney
 - d. Student Member-at-Large, Board (1 Position): Carson Bay
 3. K. Upson-Saia 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. Shepardson reports in the absence of S. Elm)
- C. Shepardson reports on the work done over the last year and announces the recipients for the awards and prizes for 2017.
1. Dissertation Completion Grant: Erin Galgay Walsh
 2. Dissertation Research Grant: Andrew Henry and Karen McGugan
 3. Small Research Grant: Philip Forness
 4. Regional Study Initiative Grant: Kristi Upson-Saia

5. Graduate Student Paper Prize: Jeremiah Coogan, Blake Jurgens, Luis J. Salés, and Erin Galgay Walsh

IV. New Business

- A. K. Cooper announces the Digital Humanities group has proposed and been supported by the Board to become a standing committee. A membership approval is required. J. Kalvesmaki and L. Larsen come forward to relate the history of the DH group, the status of its members as NAPS members, and to ask the membership to have representation as a standing committee on the Board. There will be four members from the Society, each serving two-year renewable terms, with the chair chosen from these members. They will organize DH workshops for the annual meetings and interact with the Board. Because there is no slate of committee members already, nominations should be sent to J. Kalvesmaki and the NAPS President will appoint figures to the DH Committee.
- B. Discussion is opened to the floor. One individual asks what the charge of the DH Committee is. L. Larsen reads this to the attendees. The concern is the size of its scope, but L. Larsen says that it can be refined as needed now that the Committee has some permanence. K. Cooper states the belief that this will be beneficial for the DH Committee and also for the Society as a whole. The question is raised concerning what type of change this involves, and B. Matz indicates the Board has no power to make this a standing committee; this requires the membership's approval. Motion to make this a standing committee passes. J. Kalvesmaki asks for nominations to the Committee by August.

Motion is made to adjourn. Seconded. Passed. Meeting adjourned.