NAPS Board Meeting Minutes
May 21, 2014
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

Attendees: Robin Jensen (Pres), Susanna Elm (VPres), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas), Ellen Muehlberger (MatL), Stephen Cooper (MatL), Tina Sessa (MatL), Khaled Anatolios (MatL), Sandy Haney (MatL-GradStudent), David Brakke (JECS Ed.).

Absent: Ken Steinhauser (Immediate Past Pres), Christopher Beeley (CLA Ed.), Blake Leyerle (Nom Cmte).

R. Jensen called the meeting to order at 2:12.

I. Review/Approval of the 2013 Board Meeting Minutes
   A. It was noted the year was wrong on the date for the board minutes. This was corrected by B. Matz. T. Sessa moved to approve the minutes. All approved.
   B. D. Brakke moved to accept the Minutes. T. Sessa seconded. All approved.

II. Officer Reports
   A. Secretary-Treasurer
      1. Treasurer report
         a. B. Matz reviews the financial report of the society from FY 2013. [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 two years ago. 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 healthy revenue from JECS profit, which has meant we have kept the cost of membership dues and conference registrations relatively flat for the past few years and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.
         b. Board discussion on A/V costs at the annual meeting. As before, it came up whether or not to buy equipment for use at the annual meeting. Due to the Oxford year in 2015, this was tabled for discussion at next year's business meeting.
      2. Secretary report
         a. Journal subscription and all membership numbers were reviewed. This data is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office.
         b. T. Sessa asked about membership checks on presenters. B. Matz confirmed this is done by random selection of presenters rather than checking the status of every presenter. S. Haney asks about multiple-year memberships and whether or not this would encourage broader student membership during Oxford years. Board discussion suggested concern with capacity both for JHU Press and, for that matter, the society's Secretary to properly manage multiple-year memberships with the systems currently

in place. Besides, dues are so low that there is little incentive for individuals to buy multi-year memberships.

b. Reviewed relationship with Total Event Resources. The relationship is good, working well and the Secretary has every expectation it will be even better for the 2016 meeting, since this year was one in which they had to learn about our processes and our meeting planning needs.

c. Reviewed hotel changes. More space, nicer space and presumably better food should be highlights of the experience with the new hotel.

3. S. Cooper moved to accept the Secretary-Treasurer report. T. Sessa seconded. All approved.

B. Immediate Past President

Grad Student Paper Prize. [K. Steinhauser 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. This year there were 16 submissions. Five papers selected; one was co-authored. Thus, there were six award recipients this year.

C. Vice President Report

1. Written report from the Vice President is on file in the Secretary's office. S. Elm reviewed the report and the difficulties experienced by the program committee in terms of scheduling papers.
2. A/V concern – VP recommends future Calls for Papers request that presenters rank their need for A/V as either "Crucial", "If Available" or "Not Needed". The demand for A/V by presenters with different topics presents difficulties in crafting good, theme-driven sessions. <u>This proposal is accepted by acclamation of the Board</u>.
3. The A/V concern is exacerbated by the fact that many presenters stipulate their availability to speak on different days. It is proposed the future Calls for Papers stipulate that presenters accept the responsibility to be available to present their papers for the duration of the conference. S. Elm proposes the language be put in the positive on the submission website, e.g., "Paper proposals should be submitted with the understanding that the paper may be scheduled for any day/time on the conference." <u>This proposal is accepted by acclamation of the Board</u>.
4. Proposes looking again at the proposal review process to determine if it is possible to reject more papers. VP feels there are too many proposals that seem to be trying to do too much in a 20-minute paper. Really, the issue is to what extent does NAPS want this conference to be a graduate student conference. Board discussion is deferred until consideration of the "Briggman Proposal" later [see below].
5. R. Jensen asked about the experience of how to handle the various cancellations that inevitably occur. There were about 10 this year. Sense of the Board is that the current practice should be followed of holding firm to a cutoff date for program changes and then noting later

changes on an addendum to the program distributed at the meeting itself.

D. President's report: this will be given at the next day's Board meeting.

III. Briggman Proposal

A. Society member Anthony Briggman submitted a proposal to the Board for consideration as to how better to manage the formation of the annual meeting program. The proposal was introduced to the Board by R. Jensen. [A copy of the written proposal is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].

B. Board discussion focuses first on the proposal's suggestion that the graduate students have completed first year of coursework in a doctoral program.

1. One Board member suggests NAPS is treated as a regional, graduate student conference by local institutions. This impression ought to be changed. Also discussed was what actually constitutes the end of a first year of study. Some schools shift students from an M.A. to doctoral studies a bit more seamlessly. Perhaps a better way forward is to ask non-ABD students to submit the whole paper at time of proposal. Another question is whether or not a separate venue for regional conferences is appropriate? It was then clarified that the concern is not grad students' versus full members' papers, but between quality and non-quality papers.
2. S. Elm raises the possibility that we establish some bar to submitting proposals. S. Cooper says we should go with a requirement that at least one-year of doctoral studies is complete. E. Muehlberger asks that we go with ABD candidates as able to submit abstracts. The question about organizing a pre-conference meeting for grad students is rejected because of the extra costs participants in such a session would incur (e.g., hotel).
3. K. Anatolios asks whether we could break up the program committee to have separate reviews of proposals by experts in different fields. That is determined to create more work, not less, for the VP.
4. T. Sessa asks what is the source of the critique that the paper quality is lower. Sense of Board is that it is anecdotal from various quarters. D. Brakke said that, in his thirteen years now of board service, the issue with the perception of lower quality of the papers at the meeting comes from the growth of the number of papers at the meeting. With growth in number of papers comes growth in number of low-quality papers.
5. T. Sessa says that, if what we want is an APA-style organization to the meeting, then we need to expand the committee.
6. E. Muehlberger notes that, if blind review had been in effect, probably 30 more proposals would have been rejected than had been.
7. D. Brakke interjects with data from JECS submissions/acceptances. He thinks there is a need at JECS for graduate students to have their papers vetted by a director before submitting. He feels the program committee should have the ability to put up more barriers to submitting a proposal to aid their selection work.
8. R. Jensen wonders about blind review. What would the Board like to do? K. Anatolios proposes we go with the requirement that ABD status be necessary for paper proposal. S. Elm says we should be giving

graduate students some guidance on not just submitting seminar papers but instead dissertation chapters for the conference.

9. R. Jensen asks if we have a consensus on requirement that submissions be from ABD candidates. B. Matz was directed to review the by-laws to determine whether or not any such changes are required to accommodate this proposal. T. Sessa asks whether or not this proposal is really going to fix the problem of quality versus non-quality papers. It seems it will likely reduce the number of papers, but not necessarily improve the quality.
10. R. Jensen proposes we move ahead in a few stages: (1) soft language next year on the Call for Papers that encourages pre-ABD students to self-select out of the proposal process; (2) move to blind review; (3) possible additional quality criteria for graduate student papers. Board approved this proposal.

C. R. Jensen expressed affirmation on how VP worked with the other two members. She asked the members how the experience went. The committee said it worked well to meet in person to plan the process at SBL and then had regular Skype chats for a few weeks to discuss issues that had come up. All were pleased with the process.

D. Board discussion then turned to another key element of the proposal: reduction of the paper delivery time to 17 minutes with 8 minutes for Q&A. This would not increase the time allotted overall for a paper, but it would mean presenters come with 3 minutes less worth of material. Sense of Board is that this is largely resolved by both letting presenters know they have 17 rather than 20 minutes and, equally important, directions to session chairs that they be more vigilant in monitoring time used by the speaker.

IV. Grants and Awards report

A. R. Jensen submitted a written report, which is on file in the Secretary's office.
(1) Small research grants – 3 people applied; 3 selected
(2) Diss research grants – 2 applicants; 1 selected
(3) Diss completion grants – 7 applicants; 2 selected

B. T. Sessa commented, from the perspective of the review committee she was on, that it was strange to have had so few applicants. K. Anatoloios said the applications were quite strong for the third category. S. Elm says we could perhaps focus more on helping the graduate students who are in the research gathering phase of their work. Sense of Board is that we should look for ways to give less money (per person) but to more people. Except, D. Brakke said we should not reduce the amount to the completion grant, since $8k is a good amount and it would be helpful to many more people.

C. R. Jensen proposes we revise (1) to allow applications up to $1,500 and (2) to allow applications up to $3,000 and we try to give 2. Board approved the proposal.

D. R. Jensen wondered if there is a need to add scholarship support for graduate students to attend the annual meeting. Sense of Board is to set up a fund and process for students to apply for funds to assist with their registration costs. R. Jensen agrees to form a group to evaluate this, including looking at what a few other academic societies do. She will report on the process to the Board at the 2015 meeting in Oxford.

VI. JECS Editor report (D. Brakke)

[Written report of the editor is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].

A. Announcement of the best first article prize – Jacob Latham for an article he wrote published in *Church History*.

B. Reports 78 papers submitted; 24 accepted. 30.8% acceptance rate. Additionally, D. Brakke notes the Journal can only print 20 papers per year, including 1 from the President's address. So, cannot accept such a large number of papers in future years, since now we are 5 papers ahead this year of what can be fit into the volumes in next year.

C. Asks for Board to support the appointment of two new associate editors. Call for a vote. All approved.

D. Announced the appointment of a new editorial assistant: David Maldonado, Indiana University. D. Brakke mentions NAPS needs to be aware of the possibility in the future of paying additional expenses for support for office equipment for the assistant (e.g., computer, printer, office space). He says the university where the student is located should provide this, since the student's educational experience is truly enhanced by this experience. But, if the university says no, he asks that NAPS be willing to assist. Future JECS editors should be advocating for future assistants to have these resources made available.

VII. Report of the JECS Editor Search Committee

R. Jensen announces the committee members were herself, S. Elm, K. Steinhauser, William Harmless and Michelle Salzman. Committee nominates Stephen Shoemaker. D. Brakke says there should not be considered any problem with him working electronically at a distance with a graduate student assistant. B. Matz moved we accept the committee's nomination. T. Sessa seconded. All approved.

Meeting adjourns at 5:10.

NAPS Board Meeting Minutes
May 22, 2014
Holiday Inn Mart Plaza (Chicago)

Attendees: Robin Jensen (Pres), Susanna Elm (VPres), Brian Matz (Sec-Treas), Ellen Muehlberger (MatL), Stephen Cooper (MatL), Tina Sessa (MatL), Khaled Anatolios (MatL), Sandy Haney (MatL-GradStudent), David Brakke (JECS Ed.).

Absent: Ken Steinhauser (Immediate Past Pres), Christopher Beeley (CLA Ed.).

R. Jensen called the meeting to order at 9:36.

I. Conference management report from the staff of Total Event Resources (Colette Givens and LuAnn McNaughton)
   A. Questions about the internet service in the conference area. This is not part of the free wifi area offered by the hotel. [Secretary's note: later discussion with TER staff included a request that they work with hotel to secure wifi access in the conference area at least for the exhibitors, even if NAPS had to pay this cost, which they agreed to do].
   B. Reported total exhibitor count of 14, which is the max our exhibitor space can accommodate.
   C. Reviewed the finances of the meeting. This report is on file in the Secretary's office.
   D. Announced that parking passes are available for members who had to drive to the hotel.
   E. T. Sessa asked about the breakfasts on Fri and Sat morning. They are not mentioned in the program. Colette confirmed the breakfasts are scheduled, and they had forgotten to add them in to the program. Signs will be posted that announce this.
   F. Board congratulated Total Event Resources on their work.

II. Nominating Committee report (B. Leyerle)
   [The committee's written report was submitted to the Board. It is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].
   A. Mentioned that the numbers of nominations were down this year compared to her previous two years on the committee.
   B. Leyerle thanked her fellow committee members and then introduced her committee's nominees for each position:
      VP: 4 nominations total. Committee selected Kate Cooper (U. Manchester)
      MatL: 11 nominations total. Committee selected Christine Shepardson (Univ. of Tennessee) and Young Kim (Calvin College).
      Student MatL: 2 nominees total. Committee selected Travis Proctor (University of North Carolina).
   C. T. Sessa moved to accept the report. R. Jensen seconded. All approved.
   D. Two concerns were then expressed.
      1. Can a non-North American employed individual be nominated for a position? It seems the title of the society privileges people working on this continent. Or, perhaps we should see the world as ever-smaller and so non-North Americans should be encouraged to be involved. D. Brakke said the nominees should be regular participants in the

meetings. It's not an attendance reward, but they should be engaged in the society. S. Cooper says we should not bring in a VP who does not know the culture of NAPS. R. Jensen says, since the VP needs to put the program together, they need to know the culture of NAPS. Several Board members indicated that, with the electronic communication tools available, there is no problem with working on program planning with people in various contexts. Proposal is put forward that the Call for Nominations should indicate the nominees should be persons who are "familiar with" or "regular participants in" or have "active involvement in" the society and it should be clear that non-North Americans are welcome to participate. Also need to mention the duties of the Members-at-Large.

2. Student member issue – B. Leyerle asks that similarly-clarifying language be added to the Call for Nominations that makes it clear who is eligible to serve as a student member. S. Haney suggests that maybe the two year position for this next term is responsible for why so few nominations came in for this position.

E. Board approves that the Committee's proposed, revised language be used in future years.

III. CLA Editor report (C. Beeley; report given by R. Jensen in his absence)
[Printed report of the editor is on file in the Secretary's office].

A. R. Jensen reviews the highlights of the proposed contract with Univ. of California Press. Asks for Board to ratify this selection of a press. D. Brakke asks which arm of the Press are we working with. S. Elm confirms our contact, Eric Schmidt, is overseeing the classics-religion-late antiquity-early medieval section of the Press. She also confirms he is excellent at incorporating high-quality scholarship that crosses several boundaries, and this would be a good series to fit into that vision. Eric Schmidt sees this series as a complementary series to their already-popular series edited by Peter Brown. E. Muehlberger asks how many volumes per year? Answer is, initially, one per year. Eventually, two per year. Also, she asks about non-Roman fonts. Answer is they are welcome.

B. T. Sessa moved we accept the report and approve the selection of Univ. of California Press for the CLA series. All approved.

IV. Grad Student Member Report (S. Haney)

A. Would like to organize some type of contact mechanism. Email listservs are not viable. Need to put up a webpage on NAPS for students. S. Haney thinks a Google Groups system is perhaps best and it is portable.

B. Roommate matching – need to switch this over to meeting planning company. This year, two women and six men requested this service. These are not viable numbers for the Grad Student Board Member to be creating a parallel system for managing hotel accomodations of society's student members.

C. Mentoring program. This is the first year for it. Goals are (1) to create opportunities for senior faculty to get to know graduate students and vice versa, and (2) to allow students to have one more person in the NAPS crowd that they know and they might be able to have an opportunity to socialize with.

D. Suggestions for the future: Session on publishing. Session on job applications. Session on grants/fellowships. Designated meeting place for people who want

to go to lunch with – perhaps a "take a student to lunch" day, in particular for first-time NAPS attendees. S. Haney suggests something along the lines of, after the dessert reception, have a place to meet for post-reception socializing. S. Cooper wondered whether there is a place for people to socialize after conference hours. R. Jensen proposes we ask next VP to work with conference managers to find a space for socializing after the Thursday and Friday evening events in 2016 meeting.

V. New Business

A. Report of the ad-hoc, Digital Patristics Committee (J. Kalvesmaki, committee chair)

[A written copy of the committee's report is on file in the Secretary-Treasurer's office].

1. Reports it was difficult to get a quorum together for our business discussions. Proposes members to a standing committee be prepared to spend 1-2 hours/month. Chair should expect 2-3x that number of hours. Opens the floor for comments/questions.
2. R. Jensen summarizes the three suggestions of the committee. She asks J. Kalvesmaki if he knows of people who will want to serve. He points to the report where people indicated their level of interest. Lillian Larsen is proposed as a good chair. J. Kalvesmaki says Roger Bagnall proposed we keep the number of committee members small.
3. By-laws changes may need to be drafted. The Secretary will look into it. A new ad-hoc committee will be formed to carry us through to 2016. The committee can report to Board in 2015 Oxford meeting how they want to proceed for events/programming at the 2016 meeting.
4. The appointment of members to this Digital Committee will, in the future, be made by the President. It is resolved that J. Kalvesmaki will announce at this year's business meeting the work of the committee.

B. Standing committee for prizes and awards. Board discussion centered on number of people. Group decided on at least 10 members. T. Sessa is appointed chair of an ad-hoc committee that will work with the Secretary to formulate by-laws for 2016, if they are needed, that will enact this group as a standing committee. It is also clarified that the committee will include scholarship funds for graduate students, per the discussion noted as IV.D in the Minutes of the previous day's board meeting (see above).

Meeting is adjourned at 11:21.

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

R. Jensen called the meeting to order at 5:30.

I. Moment of silence
Deceased members of the society are honored, including: David Balas, Rowan Greer, Pamela Bright, Thomas Halt.

II. Officer Reports
A. Report of the President (R. Jensen).
1. Prizes and awards. She announces the recipients of the grants and prizes.
2. JECS editor nomination is announced: Stephen Shoemaker

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 from 2012 and 2013 – i.e., why we have no income. It was explained this is really an adjustment of income minus expenses after SMI payed all hotel bills. There were no additional questions.

C. Report of the Vice President (S. Elm)
1. Registration is good this year. 392 registrants this year compared to 364 in 2013.
2. 2014 meeting: increase in sessions, which probably has contributed to higher attendance numbers. VP discusses the Board decisions to add language to the Call for Proposals that encourage people to send in higher-quality abstracts. Also discusses elimination of possibility for future presenters to indicate which days they do/do not want to present at the conference.
3. Call for questions. No questions.

III. Editor and Committee Reports
A. Report of the Nominating Committee (B. Leyerle
1. Announces the names of the other two members of the Nominating Cmte.: Jonathan Yates, Vasiliki Limberis.
2. The committee formally nominated Kate Cooper (VP), Young Kim and Tina Shepardson (for MatL) and Travis Proctor (Student Rep). A summary of remarks about each candidate sent to the nominating committee is read aloud to the business meeting.
3. No nominations are given from the floor. The committee moves to close nominations. R. Jensen seconded. Voice vote is taken on the nominees. All approved. No nay votes.

B. Report of the JECS Editor (D. Brakke)
1. Announces the biennial "best first article" prize. Award goes to Jacob Latham for an article he wrote published in *Church History*.

2. 75 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. He announces Virginia Burrus completes her term of service as associate editor.
3. Thanks expressed to David Eastman for his service as JECS Book Review editor.
4. Thanks expressed to Hannah Ewing, JECS' associate editor, who is completing her service and beginning a position at Rollins College. The new associate editor, David Maldonado, graduate student at Indiana University, is introduced.
5. Call for questions. No questions from the floor.

B. Report of the CLA Editor (C. Beeley)
1. Reports on the changes coming to the series, in particular the decision on a new press for publishing the series: University of California Press. Explains they are willing and interested in publishing the full range of methodological approaches that NAPS members take in their study of the field. Strong copy-editing, design and production staff. Interest in developing electronic and web-based materials of our monographs in the future. Hard cover copies will be $75-95 with a standing discount for NAPS members of 20% for volumes in the series.
2. The names of those appointed to the series' international advisory board are announced.
3. The two associate editors are identified as Elizabeth Clark and Robin Young.
4. Call for questions. A member asks about out-of-print, former books in the series. The answer is that Wipf and Stock is willing to reprint volumes for which CUA is willing to release the copyright. A member asks about the relationship between CLA and the Transformations series that UC Press already publishes. C. Beeley reports the conversations with the Press are that they see the two series as mutually complementary and that they feel they appeal to different audiences.
5. He reviews responses to his call for monographs in the past couple years and discusses some possible titles to appear in the next couple years.
6. NAPS "First Book Award" is announced. 5 nominations submitted. Eric Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum* (OUP-USA).

IV. New Business – 1 item

Digital Patristics Ad-hoc Committee (J. Kalvesmaki)

A. Reviewed the work of the ad-hoc committee, including especially the survey responses. Responses suggested the society should (1) develop a regular feature at our conference for digital publishing, (2) develop an accreditation system, and (3) regular communication with members.
B. A new ad-hoc committee has been appointed in the interim to facilitate creation of a new, standing committee of NAPS

No other new business.

R. Jensen adjourns the meeting at 6:16.