

2019 NAPS Board of Directors Meeting
Oxford
Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 20, 2019

Attendees: Robin Darling Young (President), Clayton N. Jefford (Vice President), Jeffrey Bingham (Immediate Past President), Rick Brumback (Secretary-Treasurer), Sophie Lunn-Rockcliffe (MatL), Brian Dunkle (MatL), Candace Buckner (Student MatL), Christopher Beeley (CLA Editor), Georgia Frank (Nominating Committee)

Absent: Stephen Shoemaker (JECS Editor)

Call to Order at 11:30 A.M. and Welcome

I. Approval of 2018 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. President's report:

2. Vice President's report:

3. Secretary/Treasurer's report: (see attachment). We are in good shape. Membership is down in the Oxford year, but that is consistent with previous Oxford years. But we have also had a good participation of student members who are accepted to present at Oxford and have received the Oxford Travel Scholarship (\$500 each).

GF also asks if it is possible to have auto-renew for membership. We will ask JHUP if that is possible.

The question is asked about having the NAPS Reception at Oxford at the same time that plenary sessions are scheduled. RB responds that this year's schedule was in the same spot as in 2015, but note is made to check in succeeding Oxford years to try and avoid a similar conflict. This will be investigated with the Oxford conference management.

III. Report of JECS Editor: Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer's office.

There is discussion about the Associate Editors and the terms/renewals that are possible for these positions.

SLR looks at the supplied data on JECS article submission and acceptance rates, noting that the acceptance rates for female authors are a bit higher than for the men. The question arises about whether data can be tracked on article submissions and acceptances regarding international vs. U.S. submissions. This might show that JECS is an international journal.

Discussion focuses on this additional information on the nature and quality of JECS and how this information could be useful outside the Society as well. RDY and

SLR point out that this information may help institutions and libraries know that JECS is worth having as a subscription, especially when funding is scarce and subscriptions are being cut. GF says that this also could be useful in one's CV since one could point to the ranking of JECS in our discipline and having an article accepted in JECS is a significant achievement. RB says that he has been contacted asking where JECS ranks in our discipline because that person's institution was evaluating whether JECS is a leading publication and should continue to be subscribed to. CB mentions SJR Imago and the fact that JECS is a number 1 ranking. Perhaps this should also be included on the NAPS website demonstrating the quality of the journal.

- IV. Report of the CLA Editor: Report is on the file with the Secretary/Treasurer's office. Ch.B. says that 2018-2019 has been a great year for the CLA series. With eight volumes in print or in the pipeline, the series is achieving its intended purpose of representing a variety of approaches of treating early Christianity. CNJ asked whether Ch.B. is happy with the submissions to the series, and Ch.B. says that there are good submissions and the quality has continued to be very high.

GF asks about the breadth of topics covered, including archaeological studies, material culture, etc. Ch.B. notes that the editorial advisory board includes figures who work in these various areas, making sure these are represented.

Ch.B. points out that his second and final term will be expiring in May 2021, and he recommends the Board appoint the new editor this coming year so that there will be one year of overlap. He recommends that the Board post a job description in the next few months and then the figure be appointed at the May 2020 meeting. G.F. asks whether the Nominating Committee would be involved in this process of receiving information about prospects. RB says that we will consult the by-laws to confirm the process. CNJ says that Paul Blowers was involved in the first appointment of the CLA editor, so we can consult him about the process he used. Ch.B. suggests that he have some input on what the position description be though the Board finalizes the content. CNJ makes a motion that we move forward with Ch.B.'s proposal and start a by-law-compliant process of trying to have a new editor appointed in May. Seconded and passed unanimously. ChB says this appointment is an important one because the series has been garnering greater esteem in the academy, including international attention, and we want to maintain this momentum.

ChB will send RB the content for the 2020 Best First Book Prize so that it can be announced and nominations due in January 2020.

Ch.B. asks the Board to approve his 2019-2020 budget, which is consistent with the numbers for the past four years. RB motions that the request be approved. Seconded and passed unanimously.

CNJ asks how the series is advertised. ChB says that Univ of California Press is very good for the marketing, but we can look into the ways in which the series can be made more visible. The question arises if different academic societies like SBL have ads for our series in their conference materials; ChB says that the press handles these connections, but we can ask and explore.

GF asks if series volumes are printed in paperback, and ChB says yes, volumes are, especially if thought to be a potential course textbook. And he says there is good conversation and planning in conjunction with the press.

RDY asks about the first eight volumes that are either in print or in press, noting that all but one are on Greek patristics. ChB says that other books on Latin patristics and wider topics are also in the pipeline.

- V. Report of the Nominating Committee: Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer's office. Georgia Franks is reporting on behalf of the committee.

GF says the NC has been attentive to maintaining transparency in the process and evaluating wide pools of nominations. The NC advocates that there be a record of nominees and record of some participation in the society, especially for positions that require some experience with the society. The NC has a concern for making sure there is continuity and by-law compliance in the process. It is pointed out that by-laws indicate the slate of nominees each year are to be circulated to the society prior to the May meeting. RB indicates that though this is the by-law, the practice in past years evolved so that the slate was just put before the society at the conference. GF asks should the society adjust to the by-laws to match practice or adjust practice to match the by-laws. CNJ says he has never known the practice to follow the by-laws. GF wonders if we can share the proposed slate of nominees could be shared with the society via email in advance of the meeting along with other announcements before the meeting. RB points out that the by-laws indicate the NC nominees be shared with the society, but the notification does not ask for the society's second-guessing of the nominee slate. Then the same approval can happen at the General Business Meeting. But this is really a matter of timing. But RDY asks what happens if there is an objection? SLR says this arrangement seems to mingle the language of "nomination" and "election." She asks if there is a reason for practice not matching the by-laws. BD and SLR say that they weren't notified that he had been nominated for the slot. But the NC does actually contact the nominees now.

JB says the President should be appointing individuals to the NC after speaking with NC appointees and trying to keep institutional memory in mind. The President should appoint persons not a novice to the society for the reason that they need to have knowledge of the society and the appointee's past activity in the society. And the President should also make it a point to speak with the NC appointee about the service they are providing, including approaching the intended nominee about their selection and asking if they are willing to serve.

GF summarizes the by-law process of circulating the slate of nominees to the society three weeks before the meeting, indicating that this is slate that will be advanced to the Board for its approval, and then put before the GSM. SLR asks whether there has been an instance in which the Board has not been approving of the slate. But the group knows of no such instance. CNJ says he does not know about any instance where there was an objection at the GBM, but that may be due to the surprise element and the GBM attendees hearing the names for the first time in that moment. SLR wonders about the outcome if the names are circulated three weeks in advance, and the names are then being discussed through social media, etc., and how that would affect the dynamics at the GBM. GF says the aim was to have a good distribution of nominees from public and private universities. And it is possible that truly qualified individuals are not being nominated. CNJ asks what we do if someone proposes an alternate name at the GBM. JB notes that there is always the statement made at the GSM, "Are there any other nominations?" CNJ says he has never seen that, but if there is a response, what do we do?

So discussion turns to having ballots, a vote for each having to be taken. RB points to the work in recent years by the NC to have good nominee-evaluation guidelines, the use of Qualtrix in the nomination process, the attempts to field slates of nominees that represent experience and diversity, and then have all that informed, deliberate work undone by a challenge in the GBM and the new name mentioned not be vetted the same way the slate of nominees was vetted by the NC. And further, the new nominee and slate is voted on only by the rather small section of persons present at the GBM. The discussion turns to being careful about changing the by-laws to match practice because it would require asking for society approval to make the changes, and that might provoke a flurry.

It is noted that in the Oxford year, appointments are extended by one year. However, two Members-at-Large for the Awards and Prizes Committee need to be appointed. The two nominees put forward are (1) Taylor Petrey and (2) Melissa Harl Sellow. GF moves that the Board appoint these two appointees. Seconded and passed.

GF hopes that the Board will continue to give attention to these matters.

VI. Report of the Award and Prizes Committee: Report is on file with the Secretary/Treasurer's office.

JB summarizes the prizes awarded. GF asks if we announce the names of the projects of those who receive these awards. We do not announce them, but the question comes whether we would like to add award recipients to the webpage.

VII. Additional Business

1. RB mentions the Digital Humanities Committee's proposal to have a Lightning Talk Session or two at the next May meeting, allowing persons five minutes to present something about their work but without this counting toward the person's one presentation at the conference. There is broad approval for this among the Board members. GF says she has seen this done at other conferences and could be done early in the conference so that members can be talking about these things over the follow days. CB wonders about these being scheduled before the dessert reception.
2. RB states that the DHC has also been working to build a new website for NAPS. We are using a very old version of WordPress, and there are security issues, updating issues, that make it advisable to have a newer template. The look will be very similar. In addition, the DHC has been revising and curating the Resources page and entries while eliminating broken links, etc.
3. RDY asks about the Sexual Grievance Policy process that has been put forward by Blossom Stefaniw. RDY asks if NAPS has an attorney. RB points out that we do not, though the question was asked also in previous years with the work on a grievance process by Christine Luckritz-Marquis. RDY motions that we forward Stefaniw's policy proposal be forward to legal counsel for examination. This is seconded and approved.