

2022 Board Meeting Minutes

Call to Order 2:07 PM

Attendees: Clayton N. Jefford, Andrew Jacobs, Robin Darling Young, Jonathan Yates, Rebecca Falcasantos, David Maldonado Riviera, Nathan Tilley, Joel Kalvesmaki, Erin Walsh

- I. 2021 Minutes are approved unanimously.
- II. President's Report—Clayton N. Jefford
 - A. There was an initiative to revise the By-laws and Constitution, and this was led by a committee including Robin Darlin Young and other individuals. The group discussed this later in the meeting.
 - B. There was a legal action taken by an individual in association with a review in a JECS issue. NAPS's legal counsel looked at the complaint and communicated with the plaintiffs attorneys. Discussion also occurred with JHUP individuals. In the end, the complaint was dropped having never been brought to court. However, in the proposed bylaws changes is a new paragraph about indemnification.
 - C. CNJ also notes that we have a new standing committee, a NAPS Guidance Committee (NGC), that is in place. This group is meant to assist the Board as a clearing house of information involving the various committees in place at any given time.
 - D. CNJ has been in contact with the directors of the Oxford conference, and they have decided to postpone their meeting by one year. However, NAPS will stick to its normal schedule. There is no meeting of either group in 2023, and both will hold their conferences in 2024.
- III. Vice President's Report—Andrew Jacobs
 - A. AJ provides a review of the sessions accepted and scheduled for this conference. The number of presentations was comparable to prior years.
 - B. The virtual presentations are 32, and there are, currently, more than 60 registrants. This component seems to be a popular course worth pursuing as a feature of future conferences.
- IV. Secretary-Treasurer's Report—Rick Brumback
 - A. Review of the membership statistics. The numbers have been very steady, although we continue to want to grow graduate student membership.
 - B. There is a review of the financial statements. The Society's mutual fund holdings have continued to grow, although the financial headwinds of 2022 have affected the holdings.
 - C. The cost of the 2021 virtual conference was reviewed, and it was an expensive event due to the extra hours and software required by TER to hold the virtual conference.
 - D. RB also reviews the cost of hosting an in-person conference in 2022. In reviewing the numbers, it is noted that the Society covers much of the per-person expense for all attendees. Costs are higher than they were in 2018.
 - E. RB reports having solicited proposals from a number of events management companies because our contracts with TER only go through 2022. There are three companies that are bidding: TER, MGPG, and Meetings & Incentives Worldwide.

We are awaiting the proposal from MGP, and when that arrives in next weeks, the Board can evaluate the proposals and select an events company.

- F. Also, TER has suggested some changes that we might make in venue, hotel, other things, to reduce our costs moving forward. NAPS is under contract with the Hyatt for 2024-2026, but it is a good time to look at possible changes. This also provides time to plan any adjustments. TER has offered to help us in this process to try and cut costs while hosting a top-tier conference.
- V. Student Report—Nathan Tilley
 - A. NT reports on the room-sharing initiative, noting there was a smaller number of persons taking part in this.
 - B. The graduate student participation has been going well. There is a Graduate Student Mixer scheduled, and NT is open to any suggestions about how to increase student involvement.
 - C. NT also thanks RF for organizing an effort for persons to sponsor graduate student participation. He suggests that this can be reviewed and participation by potential sponsors encouraged, including the soliciting of donations by individuals to help offset graduate student costs.
 - D. He also suggests that it might be worthwhile to restart the Student Advisory Board and some of their efforts from previous years like the mentoring program. He envisions the Student Member would coordinate this.
- VI. JECS Report—Given by Clayton Jefford
 - A. Looks good. Submissions and production look very good.
 - B. The Board unanimously approved the new associate editors proposed by Stephen Shoemaker: Caroline T. Schroeder (till 12/31/2023), and Andrew Crislip and Brian Dunkle (till 12/31/2024).
- VII. New Business
 - A. Conference Program Manager: AJ indicates that there was uncertainty last year about the exact role of the CPM. The discussion is around the proposal given by B. Matz.
 - 1. AJ asks about specific tasks and even term length for the CPM.
 - 2. CNJ notes that there is no term limit for the position and that the difficulty prior has been that the cancelled 2020 conference and the virtual one of 2021 has not helped provide the type of clarity of task and structure that would normally be present.
 - 3. The position had been approved in 2019 but with the interruptions in 2019-2021, the details still needed to be hammered out.
 - 4. AJ proposes that an ad hoc committee of CNJ, himself, the next VP, Sec-Treas, and Shawn Wilhite to use the 2023 year to give shape to the tasks of the CPM. CNJ suggests working with the NGC to achieve this. The Board approves this.
 - B. Contract with events management company. RB provides the proposals from TER and Meetings & Incentives, reminding that a third proposal should come in shortly. The proposals are from companies recommended by former TER personnel.

1. There are differences in how the pricing is done among these companies, but the Board is aware that there is a need to manage costs from the events company as well as the expenses of conducting the conference.
 2. JY points out that while we look at ways to look at costs, there are questions to be answered concerning membership fees, etc., that will factor into the pricing. Perhaps these matters including cost levels and increases should be put to the membership.
 3. RDY asks about matters concerning expectations for the Society re: growth, etc. Long-term projections might be worth evaluating. Maybe a subcommittee for this?
 4. RF notes that all of this still depends on entering into contract with an events company. CNJ wonders about the need to have a contract in 2022-2023 with an events company in an “off” year. RB points out that the events company will work for the Society in 2023. There may be measures we can enact to reduce costs even while under contract with the Hyatt.
 5. RB proposes to ask John McHugh and Bonnie Coop about how the expenses could be managed, etc., when they come on Thursday morning to do the TER report.
- C. AJ asks about possible subventions for helping members to attend.
1. To help provide funding for conference attendance, AJ proposes looking at some of the measures taken by SBL and AAR.
 2. Perhaps we could add the option for registrants to donate additional funds to help another be able to attend. People could also make donations at any time.
 3. RF notes that this happens at SBL and there are good results. Discussion also notes that some schools are willing to sponsor a student, especially from an under-represented group. AJ thinks (1) people could give at any time, and then (2) when a person registers for the conference they could contribute as well. These avenues could be advertised to the membership for those who would like to contribute. Possibly TER or the events management company could help in the collecting of such funds from both categories. The plan is to ask about these matters during the TER report Thursday morning.
 4. NT suggests prioritizing registration support over something like a banquet ticket. It is noted that there is a two-year gap till the next conference to try and put things into place. Perhaps the presence of a CPM would allow the Sec-Treas to give some attention to this rather than helping with the conference program planning.

Adjourn 3:43 pm

Thursday, May 26, 2022

Attendees: CNJ, AJ, RDY, RB, EW, JY, RSF, DMR, NT, JK, Michael Cameron

Call to Order 9:01 am

VI. Report from Total-Event Resources (John McHugh and Bonnie Coop)

- A. JM notes that the NAPS conference runs at a net loss. He provides an analysis of expenses for our conference identifying the cost to NAPS to run the conference on a per-person basis. The analysis identifies the specific costs and income elements related to registration, food and beverage, sponsorships, and hotel rebate. JM notes that the Society is currently paying about \$40,000 of the cost for Food & Beverage for the conference above what the attendees also pay. The AV costs are about \$31,000. The TER costs and hard costs like signage, etc., are about \$105,000, for a total cost to the Society of ~\$177,000 for the conference. Based on the ~300 attendees, that is a cost of about \$600 per person that the Society pays. JM details the costs of the various conference aspects like reception, banquet, etc. The result is the revenues do not cover costs.
- B. CNJ points out that our aim is to provide a good event for our members/attendees, and we know that we run the conference at a loss. But the concern is to balance so that it is sustainable. JM points to a few ways to help offset costs. This includes review of registration costs and tickets to meals, sponsorship levels and costs, the matter of virtual conference elements. The registration costs do not meet the expenses for the conference. But he highlights ways to offset costs such as registration costs, sponsorships, or fees for participation in virtual sessions after the conference.
- C. Discussion turns to the question of recording the virtual presentations, but CNJ points out that most don't want their presentations recorded simply for proprietary concerns.

JM points out that the Society is subsidizing about 75% of the cost of attendance for every attendee. Could the everything about the conference event and venue costs is increasing rapidly. It may be that we can increase membership amounts in a reasonable way, especially for regular members if not for student members. RF asks if we can do two-year memberships. JM asks if there is a possibility of having something like corporate memberships for publishers, etc. But not sure what the incentive would be. But BC wonders if there could be a visibility issue for book sales that comes through emails to membership through the year. JM wonders if larger publishers would be willing to spend a larger amount (~\$10,000) to sponsor a dessert reception and they have a few minutes to speak to the audience, etc.

RB asks if we could make more widely known the appeal for institutional sponsorships. Perhaps ask the society as a whole to ask their institutions. BC suggests looking at possible benefits for institutions that have multiple attendees as a way of boosting attendance. JY asks if the rise in costs for food and hotel use is expected to continue rising in the foreseeable future. JM says yes because of (1) rising food costs; (2) rising labor costs; (3) efforts by hotels and other entities to claw back some losses during Covid years; and (4) general inflation.

CNJ asks about the change of venue possibilities. NAPS has contracts with the Hyatt from 2024-2026, but JM says that we can look at other potential venues that will meet our needs. RB asks when that process would start, and JM says it could begin immediately. In fact, we could look at the cost of potential of early termination of the Hyatt contract and if the savings in going elsewhere offsets the cost, this might be worth it. BC notes that the earlier we can lock in

arrangements the better for getting current rates before later increases. JM mentions some other venues such as the Q-Center, moving to St. Charles, or Eagle Wood in Itasca. Also Renaissance at Schaumburg. AJ notes that the downtown Chicago experience is not really what people are looking for as we come to the conference.

JM notes that universities in downtown Chicago areas are monetizing their “off-season” periods by hosting camps and other events. This means they are not as open to hosting a conference like ours. BC indicates that part of the cost for AV at the Hyatt is that it is a union property, which increases costs. But most properties outside the city are not. This would be a reduction in cost. She also says that some of the communities offer rebates or incentives to the Society such as money back for hitting room reservation numbers, etc. Also, the tax rates for gratuity, tax, services charges, etc., are about 40-45% above the price on a menu when in Chicago. In the suburbs it will be ~36-37%.

BC reminds that the Society is subsidizing the drink tickets at the Dessert Reception and Banquet, whether the tickets are used or not. But by moving to a cash bar the Society can save a large amount.

RB notes that the cancellation amount with the Hyatt for the 2025 conference is ~\$50,000, and he asks if the potential savings to be had by moving to one of these other properties is realizable. JM and BC say it’s possible; it would be necessary to run numbers to see.

VIII. Digital Humanities Committee Report—Micah Saxton

- A. MS relates the activities of the DHC, especially their primary activity of hosting the pre-conference digital workshops.
- B. One thing that has been tried in the last couple of years is the use of Lightning Talks. This was a component in 2021 but not as much interest in 2022, so LTs are not part of this conference. But this does not rule out future LT activities.
- C. CNJ asks what we can do to assist the DHC with their work, but MS says things are going well and he feels the DHC is well-supported.
- D. There is only one name nominated for the two DHC spots that need to be filled, so it is pointed out that there will be a call for additional nominees from the floor in the General Business Meeting.

IX. Nominating Committee Report—Michael Cameron [in place of Georgia Frank, chair]

- A. MC presents the activities of the NC for this past year. The call for nominations went out in February and some response, but there was a re-send in March to try and fill other vacancies. This led to a good response of nominations.
- B. The NC met in late April and evaluated the nominations, selecting the individuals they wished to include in their slate. They then contacted those they would like to nominate, and there was 100% response by the potential nominees.
- C. It is noted that we need one additional nominee for the DHC, and this will be solicited from the floor during the GBM.

X. Awards and Prizes Committee Report—Robin Darling Young

- A. RDY details the process and the discussions that the APC pursued in selecting the awardees.

- B. She notes that if the discussion involved an applicant from a committee member's institution, that committee member did not take part in the deliberations for that category.
 - C. We have changed the way the Graduate Student Paper Prizes submissions are given, sending them to the Sec-Treas just to keep things organized and streamlined. All award and grant application submissions are then sent to the appropriate figures.
- XI. NAPS Guidance Committee Report—Delivered by Clayton N. Jefford
- A. The NGC recommends members the following members:
 - 1. Inclusivity Committee—Young Richard Kim and Julia Kelto Lillis (co-chairs), Alexandria Istok, David Maldonado Rivera, Peter Martens, and Helen Rhee
 - 2. Committee on Professional Challenges—Tiggy McLaughlin, chair, Greg Given, Paul Dilley, Dawn Normal LaValle, Laura Locke Estes, and David Eastman
 - 3. Committee on the Society's Name—Yulia Minets and Mark DelCogliano (co-chairs), Jennifer Barry, Michael Magree, Travis Proctor, and C.J. Schmidt
 - B. The NGC also recommends the committee addressing the “landscape of work for earlier career scholars” be designated the Committee on Professional Challenges (CPC) rather than the Professional Challenges Committee (PCC) to avoid confusion with the Professional Conduct Committee.
 - C. One of the recommendations is that the Board establish the Professional Conduct Committee as a standing committee. It is determined that the Board can do this without needing any by-law changes; they allow for this type of appointment.
 - D. There is unanimous willingness to have the elements 1-7 (except 5 & 6) accepted.
 - E. The recommendations 5 & 6 tie to the discussion of the Professional Conduct recommendations. JY addresses the ways he, EW, and the NGC worked on this statement. EW says that the initial desire was that the Inclusivity Committee be part of appointing members. The committee looked at the code of conduct for other organizations but then crafting a policy that fits the needs of NAPS, especially addressing needs of graduate students, non-tenured members, and others in precarious positions. JY points to a policy of recusal if there is a need to take action since the society is so small and the members are often connected, especially high-profile members.
 - F. RDY asks if the society's attorney, Rick Greenberg, has seen this policy, and he has not. She says this would be important to have done concerning the meaning of terms like “consensual,” etc., to make sure it is legally appropriate. How our committee members be trained to manage this? Also where is the burden of proof? This would touch on Illinois criminal law. Greenberg has not seen our Standards of Professional Conduct and our Conduct Investigation, but they both need to go to our attorney.
 - G. The Board unanimously agrees with the intent of these documents and will forward them to legal counsel for review. EW will forward the two documents to RB to go to our attorney.
- XII. CLA Report—Joel Kalvesmaki

- A. AJ asks if there are any ways that the Board can assist, and JK says yes, especially in soliciting manuscripts. An email can be sent to membership soliciting manuscript ideas to be forwarded to the CLA Editor.
- B. JK says the work this past year has been evaluating a few manuscript proposals.
- C. The next item of business is that RDY is rotating off the committee, and JK proposes Mary Farag. The Board unanimously approves.
- D. AJ asks about the reprint possibilities, and JK indicates that he has been doing some work on identifying the IP rights for each of the volumes. There are four books printed by Mercer that have been signed over rights to NAPS. For CUA press and UC press, additional digging need to be done to determine our possibilities for reprinting.

XIII. New Business

- A. By-Laws Revisions.
 - 1. CJ notes there have been two suggestions from membership for adjustments to the revised By-Laws as circulated. The first involves concern that in Article V there should be a provision for a meeting to be able to be initiated and held at the impetus of a number of members (like our quorum of 30) if the Board decides not to have a meeting. The suggestion states that if the Board members decide to never hold a meeting, there is no way to remove the Board members. RB notes that Article VI, Sec. 7.B allows the removal of any Board members by the majority of society members. After discussion, the Board feels that there is no need to accept this recommendation since (1) it is an unlikely scenario, and (2) the aforementioned mechanism would allow remedy.
 - 2. The second recommendation has to do with calling of special meetings (Article V). The question is whether there is a potential conflict when the President wants to call a meeting when the rest of the Board does not, or if the Board wishes to call a meeting and the President does not. How would this be resolved? Is a majority of the Board or unanimous action of the Board required? The discussion leads to recognition that the Board always operates on a majority basis. There is no perceived need to make an edit for this.
 - 3. The question arises concerning the procedure to follow at the GBM. According to Rick Greenberg, the old by-laws would need to be removed before the revised ones put in place. It is proposed to have a straw poll on accepting the revised By-Laws, and if the 2/3 majority is willing, then remove the old and formally enact the new.
- B. CNJ asks about the matter of an Oxford subvention for the 2024 conference. Is NAPS willing to make a subvention? Concerning the subvention possibility in 2019, the Oxford directors indicated they preferred our proposal to offer travel grants to NAPS graduate students who were presenting. CNJ says he would be willing to ask the Oxford directors to do this for 2024, noting that NAPS will also meet in 2024. RB says we will award ~\$22,000 in other awards, and so if we want to do a subvention of \$15,000 or \$25,000 as travel grants. The direct subvention was \$15,000 to the conference; the 2019 amount was increased because it was all directed to travel. AJ asks if other organizations provide subventions to Oxford. It

is not known. JY encourages the student support for Oxford travel that we tell them how we would like to support the conference via student participation. CNJ notes that the Oxford conference is going to be held in a different location than the Examination Halls, and the logistics are still being evaluated. NT also encouraged supporting NAPS grad student travel, knowing that some institutions only support grad students attending one conference per year. But in 2024 there will be the two. The board agrees to inform the Oxford directors of our desire to support students. JY wonders if there is some flexibility on the part of the Board's plans to help at potentially higher dollar levels. The concern is that a \$500 grant is good but small. EW asks about the possible pressure that grad students may feel to go to Oxford, including the matter of how invested NAPS may appear to be in attending Oxford. Is such discussion and financial point an indirect way in which grad students feel pressure to go. AJ acknowledges it is a challenge to have both conferences in 2024 and wonders if we are ready to make a commitment to the Oxford directors. He proposes that we inform them that if we are able to do anything, it will be supporting student travel similar to 2019. This will also give us time to evaluate what we can do financially for our grad students.

RDY suggests that there are other conferences in Europe that are very good, and would it be good to offer support for attending a variety of options rather than limiting assistance to attending Oxford.

JY asks about the matter of addressing the Society's financial situation and expenses going forward. RB points out that much of this is going to be addressed in conjunction with the events company we select. He suggests that the first question to ask is what company NAPS uses, who will then be our working partner to help us look at venue and other matters. He will receive the third proposal and then circulate to the Board. But the first step is to identify the events company to hire.

Adjourn 11:32 am

Agenda
NAPS General Business Meeting

May 27, 2022
Hyatt Regency (Chicago)

Call to Order by Clayton N Jeffords at 6:30pm
There is a quorum.

- I. Moment of Silence:
Francine J. Cardman, Elizabeth A. Clark, Peter Grossman, Nona Harrison,
Benedicta Ward
- II. Officer Reports
 - A. Report of the President (C. Jefford)
 - 1. The proposed revision of the By-laws is mentioned, with discussion to come in the New Business later in the meeting.
 - 2. There had been a possible legal action related to JECS by an individual whose work was reviewed there. However, the complaint was removed and everything resolved without any legal action.
 - 3. There has been a new committee established known as the NAPS Guidance Committee. The purpose of this committee is to manage the constitution and communication of the Board with the various ad hoc committees that are formed from time to time.
 - 4. The audience is informed about the Oxford directors' decision to postpone their conference to 2024. The NAPS Board is committed to maintaining the Society's normal schedule for a meeting 2024. Lewis Ayres indicates that after 2024, the Oxford conference will return to its normal cycle.
 - B. Report of the Vice President (A. Jacobs)
 - 1. The submissions were robust, with 245 submissions, but not enough Lightning Talk proposals to have a session. There are also virtual sessions that have been well received.
 - 2. Overall, the program came together well.
 - C. Report of the Secretary/Treasurer (R. Brumback)
 - 1. The membership information is presented.
 - 2. The financial information is explained. This includes an explanation of the larger expenses for the 2021 virtual conference.
- III. Editor and Committee Reports

- A. Report of the JECS Editor (T. Shepardson)
 - 1. TS provided the report prepared prior by Stephen Shoemaker, the JECS Editor.
 - 2. The winner of the Best First Article Prize is Michael Motia.
- B. Report of the CLA Editor (J. Kalvesmaki)
 - 1. JK encourages individuals to submit manuscripts to publication in the CLA series.
 - 2. Thanks are extended to Christopher Beeley, former CLA editor, and David Brakke, associate editor who stepped down and was replaced by Aaron Johnson. Robin Darling Young, associate editor, also stepped down last year, and she is replaced by Mary Farag.
 - 3. The winner of the Best First Book Prize is Mattias Gassman.
- C. Report of the Nominating Committee (M. Cameron)
 - 1. In lieu of Georgia Frank, MC provides the report and details the nomination process followed in compiling the list of nominees. This work included call for self-nominations for subcommittees headed by the NAPS Guidance Committee: the Inclusion Committee, Committee on Professional Challenges, and the Committee on the Society's name. The nominees for these committees were forwarded to the NGC and then to the Board. All nominees
 - 2. Election
 - a. Vice President—Lewis Ayres
 - b. Members-at-Large, Board (2 Positions): Thomas Clemmons and Jennifer Knust
 - c. Members of the Awards & Prizes Committee (2 Positions): Veronica Ogle and Justin Rogers
 - d. Student Member-at-Large, Board (1 Position): Michelle Freeman
 - e. Members of the Digital Humanities Committee (2 Positions): Matthew Bertels
 - f. Guidance Committee: Jen Ebbeler
 - g. The nominees were accepted unanimously.
 - 3. Regarding the one DHC position for which there was no nominee, nomination is taken from the floor. Micah Saxton, chair of the DHC, provided a brief description of the work of the committee, and then MC called for nominees from the floor. Paul Saieg was nominated, but he was not present. Jonathan Zecher was nominated and accepted the nomination. He was unanimously approved.
- D. Awards and Prizes Committee (R. Darling Young)
 - 1. RDY reports on the process of selecting the award recipients.

2. The recipients are these:
 - a. Dissertation Completion Grant: Carl Vennerstrom
 - b. Dissertation Research Grant: Amy Allan
 - c. Regional Study Initiatives: John Solheid and Don Springer
 - d. Small Research Grants: Gabriel Jaramillo, Davi Ribiero Lin, Travis Proctor, Jonatan Simons, Don W. Springer
 - e. Graduate Student Paper Prizes: Philip Abbot, Thomas Pietsch, Andrew Tucker

IV. New Business

A. Proposed By-Laws Revision

1. Clayton N Jefford reminds that the proposed by-law revisions were circulated were more than 30 days in advance, and that there were two matters brought to the Board about possible amendments. However, the Board discussed these matters were important but did not require any changes to the proposed by-laws.
2. He opens the floor to questions or comments about this revision. Patout Burns asks about a change made to the matter of how membership dues are adjusted. He noted that in the old by-laws this required a vote of the membership and in the revised version it is a decision of the Board. His comment is not a challenge to the proposed policy as much as a point of interest. He also notes they have not been changed in many years. CNJ notes that this may be necessary because of the size of the Society, and there may be needs to adjust membership dues because of increased expenses.
3. CNJ details the process: (1) a straw poll of those who would approved the revised by-laws; (2) if the straw poll indicates there is support, then a vote will be taken to vacate the old by-laws; and (3) there will be a vote to adopt the revised by-laws.
4. There was greater than 2/3 majority in the straw poll. The vote was taken to vacate the earlier Constitution and By-laws, and the vote was unanimous in favor. Then the vote was taken to adopt the revised by-laws; this was approved unanimously.

B. Lewis Ayres reports on some of the changes to the Oxford Conference and the decision to postpone the 2023 year.

1. He notes that it has been held in the school building and the costs go up and up. Also, he notes that those who sign the contracts are legally liable for the entire cost of the conference. This alarmed the individuals who would be responsible for this cost.
2. So it is almost certain that the location of the conference will be moved to the area around St. Giles, and the Classics Department will allow the use of their building for no cost. This represents a tremendous savings. There is also a new conference management company in place. The conference will be held in 2024 but then back to the regular cycle. The question from the floor is when in August 2024 the conference would be held. LA indicates it is up in

the air at the moment, dependent in part on when the facilities are free for use. The Oxford directors know they need to work these matters out and inform as soon as possible.

Adjourned 7:27 pm.