

Minutes
March 30, 2016
Prospect Room
Westin Bayshore Hotel
Vancouver, BC, Canada

Present: Kathleen Musante, Sandy Ervin (pres. Elect), Roberto Alvarez, Jessica-Jean Casler, Amy Faust (student rep elect), Jennifer Wies, Roland Moore, Miguel Vasquez, Neil Hann, James Loucky, Maria Cruz-Torres, Laurie Krieger, Ruthbeth Finerman, Jane Gibson.

Absent: Alicia ReCruz

Welcome, Review Agenda (Musante)

Kathleen expressed the Board's concerns for Alicia and her son who was in an accident. With new, incoming Board members, all introduced themselves to begin the meeting.

Updates and Visioning (Musante)

Founders' Initiative Committee Report: The idea of the Founders' committee is to stabilize the society financially. Under Robert's chairship, the Founders' initiative has started to gain steam; the last six months' donations have been remarkable compared to the previous six months.

This is Robert's third year and he asked that the Board talk about appointment of a chair designate, and one other member is needed. (The committee has no fixed number of members, nor terms of service.) Kathleen Musante is nominally a member of this committee as well as the liaison for the Board. The Board discussed several excellent chair and member possibilities and left the door open for additional suggestions to be sent to Kathleen.

The Founders' Committee report also included a request for \$5k for a brochure. Because the budget is approved in November, the Board will defer this request for consideration at the Fall 2016 meeting.

Roberto Alvarez moved that the Board accept the committee's report without the \$5k request. James Loucky seconded the motion, and the Board approved unanimously.

Internationalization

The Board continued discussion of its interest in promoting the Society's internationalization through, for example, our co-sponsorship and participation in the IUNAES interim meeting and membership in the WCAA to which Roberto Alvarez is the Society's delegate. Meetings outside the United States promote internationalization but, as treasurer Jennifer Wies points out, at a cost.

Roberto attended the interim meeting of the WCAA held at the AAA meetings in November and reported attendance from all over the world and engagement with various issues. For example, someone from Greece talked about refugees there and what they are doing to address the situation. The main thing was that the WCAA

represents the different ways anthropologists from different countries approach anthropology. Roberto noted that the WCAA presents anthropology as an international idea, not just a global one. The WCAA will have a session at the IUNAES in which each of the delegates does a paper on applied anthropology from their group's perspective. Roberto encouraged the Board to think about how to institutionalize our own internationalization as with the now defunct International Task Force. Kathleen noted the WCAA meets every two years and she and President Elect Sandy Ervin will talk about whether they can keep Roberto as our delegate.

Jennifer Wies, referring to minutes of an earlier Board meeting, shared the motion that established the International Initiative Task Force. In fall 2011, the Board created an ad hoc committee to explore this possibility and created the task force in 2014. The committee was not given a charge but members were instead to define their own role. The International Task Force will be revived with co-chairs Roberto and Maria, both cycling off the Board, and James Loucky as liaison. In the next couple of months, they will propose a charge to the Board that will then be asked to reauthorize the task force and approve the charge.

The Board agreed to amend the Saturday agenda to include discussion of interim meetings.

PMA Report (Neil)

PMA staff person Melissa Cope continues to work virtually from Germany. That arrangement has worked very well. She provides a lot of support to the program chairs, producing the meeting program and schedule of about 300 pages. That has continued to work well and they anticipate she'll continue that arrangement. PMA didn't have new interns this year but Silas Day from last year is with them again in Vancouver. He is excellent help. This year he is in charge of all the AV needs, setting these up for each room, and trouble-shooting issues during the meeting. He'll be with PMA in Santa Fe. This summer PMA will seek another intern or two to provide needed assistance. Trish does a great job managing day-to-day operations. She's good at assisting members with various needs and is very patient.

Erve has worked out really well as our annual meeting coordinator. Neil observed a direct connection between the success of Erve's work and the success of the meeting. Vancouver is the largest meeting so far; his work clearly has made a difference; and he is already working hard on Santa Fe. PMA is considering adding an additional staff person to begin in 2017 to help with things such as publications, promotion, the SfAA newsletter, and other duties in the SfAA office. The position would add \$26k to the staff budget that PMA believes will be offset by an increase in subscriptions. Because the position has budgetary implications, the Board agreed to take up the proposal in the fall.

PMA is also seeking another intern who will graduate with a BA, will work full time, and gain experience in a non-profit. The hope is that the individual can grow from intern to a full-time staff person.

The Board passed the following resolution in appreciation of the highly valued contributions Trish and Melissa make to the society.

The Board of Directors of the Society for Applied Anthropology wishes to express its deep appreciation to Melissa Cope and Trish Colvin for their extraordinary efforts and significant contributions to the success of the 2016 meetings of the Society in Vancouver.

Secretary's Update (Gibson)

Secretary Jane Gibson reported on discussion and votes taken by the Board since the November 2015 meeting in Denver. Among these was the statement on "Concealed Carry" of guns on university campuses, a statement to which the Society is a signatory. We need now to post the statement to the SfAA website.

The Board discussed the issue as a possible focus for another Critical Conversation and as the focus of another TIG, possibly one made up of people who know how to influence policy. The issue applies beyond university campuses and so affects practicing and applied anthropologists beyond the academy. It has implications for academic freedom, inclusion of controversial discussions in and beyond the classroom, and the kinds of dialogues among diverse groups that applied social scientists want to promote. As currently written the statement is as follows:

The undersigned learned societies are deeply concerned about the impact of Texas's new Campus Carry law on freedom of expression in Texas universities. The law, which was passed earlier this year and takes effect in 2016, allows licensed handgun carriers to bring concealed handguns into buildings on Texas campuses. Our societies are concerned that the Campus Carry law and similar laws in other states introduce serious safety threats on college campuses with a resulting harmful effect on students and professors.

The Board agreed to take several further steps. First, the statement above will be posted to the SfAA website and then a modified version that goes beyond the Texas issue will be considered as a replacement. Second, an article will be published in the SfAA news with an invitation for online discussion. Third, Jessica-Jean and Laurie will monitor the online conversation until September and bring to the November meeting a synthesis of the range of views presented by participants. Fourth, these will be used to create a broad statement, a "white paper" representative of Society members' views on the subject of "Concealed Carry," one that also brings to bear the mission of the Society, its position on safe learning environments, and social science expertise, to be posted to the website and published in the SfAA News.

Treasurer's Report (Wies)

After a break, Jennifer Wies presented the treasurer's report. Referring to the detailed written report in members' packets, she reported that 2015 revenues were higher than expenditures. Subscriptions have been decreasing steadily, but our annual meetings have been increasing and are the most significant source of revenue. As a result of the 2007 recession we had a dip, and a lower-than-anticipated turnout for the Baltimore meeting. Now we are seeing growth and maintenance of high revenues generated by annual meetings, and because support from cosponsoring entities allows us to channel resources where needed.

We are a strong and healthy organization with membership that has held steady at about 3000 for the last four years. Members care about awards and give money to support them. And they care about general organizational health as evidenced by the Founders' endowment. Yet we like to prepare for an annual meeting that has been

affected by some external factor that threatens our financial health. And Tom has worked to protect us by, for example, assuring we don't have to pay penalties to hotels if something unforeseen happens.

Jennifer reported that we have a \$49k surplus. Priorities for the Society's budget are assurance of adequate operating funds and the ability to sustain the society through a bad meeting year and through medium and long-terms. Proposed uses for the surplus include money for the Founders Endowment, strategic initiatives, big ideas, special projects, and new possibilities for international meetings. Jennifer explained that we have our annual operating budget, the Founders' Endowment, and we maintain two trusts, the annual awards and Peter K. New Trust. Every year, the trusts pay for the award winners' trophy, cash prizes, and travel. The annual awards include student awards and Sol Tax, all wrapped into a separate pot. We should think of our reserve funds as money that will sustain the society over the very long term. In past years, when we have had meetings with lower attendance, we have used the reserves to cover operating expenses for that year.

The Board discussed an allocation of \$15k to the Founders Endowment that would get them halfway to their goal, and additional matching funds to incentivize members who want to contribute to the momentum. These allocations would reward the committee for successful fundraising efforts. The remainder of the surplus would then go to the reserve funds. We have two such funds, one longer term for operating shortfalls; the other shorter-term fund is used to manage money throughout the year. Reserve 1, for short-term needs, has \$156,783 in it. Reserve 2 has \$13.5k. When it comes to allocations, Board members are the agents of managing the Society's reserve funds. Committees can make requests for funds, and the Board votes to allocate money from a \$5000 line already in the budget. The operating budget is managed by PMA.

James Loucky moved, with Laurie Krieger seconding, that the Board commit \$15k to the Founders' Endowment plus another \$5k to be used as matching funds to incentivize additional giving, and that an additional \$30k be placed into the medium-term reserve. The motion passed unanimously.

In response to the Board's request in the November 2015 meeting in Denver, the treasurer's report also contained four models for membership dues increases to begin in 2018. The four options are as follows:

Option A: Raise dues and fees more frequently, at a lower rate of increase (6-11%).

Option B: Raise dues and fees less frequently, at a high rate of increase (7-20%).

Option C: Raise dues and fees more frequently, at a higher rate of increase (38-60%).

Option D: Raise dues and fees more frequently, at a significantly higher rate of increase (40-90%)

The Board's discussion considered a number of issues. These include that revenue from increased dues should be mission-driven so that the benefits are returned to the membership, that funds for travel are diminishing everywhere, that increases in different categories may affect membership, that the Society is often a secondary membership among anthropologists, and that some membership categories can offset the costs for others. Jennifer moved, with Miguel seconding, that she be authorized to move forward with budget development for 2018 using Option C. The final numbers will be approved at the November meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The last element of the treasurer's report concerned support for Board members to attend meetings. Members understand that Society support is to be the last dollar we request after seeking institutional support elsewhere. Jennifer asked for completed, signed forms by April 15th.

Roberto moved, with Laurie seconding, that the Board accept the treasurer's report. The motion passed unanimously.

Before adjourning for a working lunch, the Board reviewed the consent agenda. Items included reports from the Spicer Award Committee, Fisheries and Coastal Communities TIG, Business Anthropology TIG, the Hackenberg Committee, the Higher Education TIG, Gender-Based Violence TIG, and the Tourism TIG. James motioned, with Miguel seconding, that the Board accept the reports and approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting registration waivers

Between the November 2015 and March 2016 meetings, the Executive Committee (EC) considered whether we make enough meeting registration waivers. Waivers are used to bring individuals who are not members of the association but who are invited to be on panels or to attend for other reasons. Last year in Pittsburgh, for example, the program chairs offered two waivers to the mayor's office that used one. They wouldn't have come otherwise. The question regarding the number arose because more than were authorized were given for the Vancouver meeting, and these have budgetary implications in unrealized revenues. The EC approved a temporary override and gave a number of waivers in the 20s, but recommended to the Board that no policy change occur.

To think about this issue, the EC considered the practices of the AAA that has been generous with such waivers, allowing panel chairs to request them and deciding on a case-by-case basis. We don't require waivers for community members whom we do not charge registration fees on the first day of the meetings. We take the position that community members ought to be able to come when we're talking about community issues. The Board discussed the benefits of the waivers in enriching conversations, the need for flexibility, the policy of checking badges at the annual meetings of other organizations such as LASA and the AAA, the possibility of a due date for requests, the use of a button on the registration website for making requests when panels are registered, and the needs of people coming from developing countries, especially to meetings held outside the U.S. For now, the Society will look at adjustments to the number of requests on a case-by-case basis, leaving the policy unchanged.

Winking Proposal

The Executive Committee discussed the Winking proposal to conduct research at the Vancouver meetings. At issue, and discussed at the Board meeting, were the requirements of Belmont regarding human subjects research: the meetings as a private space requiring informed consent which could not be obtained, an inadequate plan for debriefing after the study, and no information on the disposition of findings. The Board also discussed problems with the research design. Kathleen reported that she wrote a letter to Prof. Winking to let him know we could not approve his proposal.

On the matter of future requests

Kathleen asked, "What should our policy be regarding such requests?" A number of policy statements were suggested: We should do this on a case-by-case basis. If there are budget implications, they should be covered by the researcher. Our members have to be informed that research is taking place, and they need to be able to opt out. Any request to conduct research at our meetings should come to the board (as opposed to the AAA process in which staff approved). Participants have the right to know what will become of the data and findings, and whether participation entails any risks. We should agree our meetings occur in private spaces and so require consent. When participants are not fully informed and able to opt out, they should be debriefed after the fact. Proposals that come to the board should be held to a high standard for design. We should preserve the right of refusal for organizations with which we do not wish to partner. We should respect members' expectations of a high level of service, lack of spam, and protection of privacy. We should uphold the tradition of keeping mailing addresses and contact information private and protecting the membership from unwanted hassles without stymying research. Our policy should be flexible and requests should be forwarded to the EC for a board decision. Confidentiality should be protected.

These statements were discussed and there seemed to be a consensus that Kathleen would develop a checklist that could be given to prospective researchers.

Student Report

Jessica-Jean noted that on the SfAA's community network site, there is a male/female checkbox that seems out of date. She and moderators Roland and James then reported on successes and lessons learned from the inaugural Critical Conversation focused on homelessness. About seven of the twelve people showed up with the total count in the room of 25. A homeless person participated as a community expert, and a city planner in Vancouver paid her an honorarium. Jessica-Jean expressed a desire to continue working on this project for next year. Because some funds are needed, she proposed creation of a small committee or perhaps just a letter from event organizers to request funds.

The committee to organize the 2017 Critical Conversations will include Jessica-Jean, James, Roland, and Amy. For this event, organizers wanted to involve non-academics, practitioners, and students, so it would be helpful to have a non-academic Board member included, and it was suggested that they might want to include another person from off the Board.

James commented that non-anthropologists made the people issues the center of the conversation, and there was a lot of knowledge in the room. A useful discussion at the end of the event asked, What are Critical Conversations for? Are they for us to discuss what we know, what we don't know, what we should do to translate anthropological insights into real world problems, or all of the above?

Additional questions and issues prompted discussion. Do we want to continue hosting these on the first day? Is the noon hour appropriate? (Participants from the city came because they got lunch off.) What are the questions policy makers or people in the public have? One of the participants said the questions she received in advance of the event were academic and alienating. Roland commented that the group created a circle

and most people came in fairly close. He had produced a form to allow people to submit questions, something that would have been useful with a large group but less so for this smaller one. The twitter account was helpful for advertising, but some came because they were curious without knowing the topic. One key question is, Should organizers select the topic in advance to get it into the program, or wait for the last minute to get the question *du jour*? If the topic is selected in advance, James said the key would be making sure information about the event is delivered to Melissa in time to be included in the program.

Because the focus may be tied to the local community to get non-anthropologist experts involved, it makes sense for it to be on the first day, and to keep the numbers relatively small to facilitate conversation. James expressed an interest in piloting a second Critical Conversation in Santa Fe rather than just one. It was agreed that organizers would submit one or two topics to Melissa by February 1, 2017, and let the program chair know early enough to hold the spaces for one or two critical conversations.

Review of Committee Reports with Issues for Board Consideration

Del Jones Committee

The pool of prospective recipients was smaller than in previous years, and Kathleen asked for recommendations from the Board as to committee membership and ways to improve the applicant pool. There were 17 applications, 12 fewer than last year, a consequence of the small number of African American members in the Society. This is a challenge for the future of the Society in its desire to promote inclusion. Kathleen noted that awards need not be limited to anthropology grad students, but could include undergrads and other disciplines such as sociology and public health. Advertising the award is thought to be most successful through faculty members who encourage their students to apply. The desire for inclusion could inform a topic selected for a Critical Conversation, one that is initiated in a newsletter article. Sarah Lyon suggested it be useful to develop some kind of commentary on the subject in HO to lend an aura of legitimacy that a newsletter piece might not be able to do. Another strategy might be holding future meetings in areas with larger concentrations of African-Americans such as Detroit, Baltimore, or New Orleans. Kathleen will repopulate the committee.

Pelto International Travel Award

Kathleen has appointed a new committee that will be stronger and more active. She also worked with the committee to revise their timetable for more effective dissemination by the new deadline of May 1, changed from the January 1 deadline that produced no applicants. The committee also needs a standardized approach to and clear understanding of awardee support, particularly how much money the endowment will yield in a given year. Kathleen will continue as Board liaison to assure expectations are set out clearly. US expats are eligible for the award.

Roland suggested that the award might be given every two years rather than every year, but if it must be every year, he asked if it would be possible to reduce expectations of the award winner. He also suggested changing guidelines to appoint an expat "if you can't find anyone else." One of the purposes is to bring people here, not just one person. If the award were given every other year, the winner might, for example, bring a student. Kathleen will give the committee feedback from the Board

discussion. The current committee is made up of the major donors who decide who gets the award. No Board action beyond Kathleen's liaison role is required.

Oral History Committee

The committee asked in its report for \$7100 to transcribe the backlog of interviews, though, as Jennifer points out, budgetary decisions are made in the fall meeting. She suggested we look at what is remaining in the committee line and allocate what we can to add to the \$500 they already have to start working on the backlog. We could invite them to spend up to \$1000 this year because it is already committed in that line. The Board discussed this suggestion as well as changes that might be made on the committee. Roland moved, with Roberto seconding, that we allocate \$1000 to the committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Malinowski Award Committee

The committee report included a recommendation that Louise Lamphere receive the award, and a minority report was included with a recommendation of Mike Agar. Of particular concern was the perception of a committee member that the selection process was deeply flawed insofar as the view of one member may have been ignored. As of the Board meeting, Kathleen had not had an opportunity to discuss the issue with the chair or investigate the claim. The question the Board had to answer was whether we could go forward and approve the committee report as presented. Discussion of the nominee ensued with consideration of selection criteria: scholarship and policy influence. Board members expressed concern that the committee selection process, particularly information about nominees, was shared beyond committee members, and it was agreed that Kathleen would contact the Malinowski and other awards committees to remind them that their work is to be kept confidential. Roland Moved, with Miguel seconding, that we accept the report. The motion passed with 7 voting yes to accept and 2 abstentions.

Peter K New Awards and John Bodley Student Travel Award

Roland moved with Miguel seconding that we accept the New and Bodley reports. The motion passed unanimously.

Editors' Reports with Action Items

Publications Committee

All appointed members to this committee are at the end of their terms this year, so Kathleen, who sent a thank you to the current members, asked for discussion and suggestions for new members. Lance Gravlee accepted and Nancy Schoenberg agreed to stay on the committee. An ideal person to add would be tech savvy and able to think about publishing into the middle of the 21st century.

Neil informed the Board of a proposal from JStor to post some of our back issues. An issue for us is that people not affiliated with a university have no access to JStor though it was pointed out that one can log in as a Society member and get all the back issues. No action was taken.

Human Organization

Sarah Lyon provided a hard copy of the table of contents of the special issue coming out June 1st. It contains abstracts in both Spanish and English. She expressed gratitude to Neil and Roberto for their contributions to its publication. Some great issues have

been published with reduced time on editorial decisions, down to 82 days on average, ideally with 3 reviewers for every manuscript. Her biggest concern is the long-term trajectory of the journal and thinking about where it will be in 10 years when the landscape of scholarly publishing will be very different. She asked for suggestions for how we can publicize its important content, broaden readership, and increase the journal's impact factor.

Ideas for increasing readership will be relevant to the new staff member PMA will hire to work on publications (see below under *Practicing Anthropology*). These ideas include: publishing online commentaries; developing a teaching guide for one article per issue; borrowing the Cultural Anthropology model that links past and current articles and invites commentary; publishing one article per issue in Spanish by a well-known individual in Latin America; invite a prominent applied anthropologist from outside the U.S. to contribute a paper. Sarah asked for help with identifying candidates for the latter two suggestions, and she noted that Tom has been talking about creating an international editorial board, people she could contact to ask for submissions. Additional suggestions are to add book reviews and technical reports to the journals the Society publishes, and to commission lit reviews on topics of interest.

Sarah has been working with authors about speaking to a broader audience. They need to say in two or three sentences how their contribution is of practical value to applied anthropologists. She anticipates that online readership will raise the impact factor.

Practicing Anthropology and SfAA News

PMA proposes to add another staff member who would have as part of their responsibilities editing, copyediting, formatting, and some of the soliciting activities that have been done by the *SfAA News* editor. The editor's position is demanding, yet individuals in that role don't get release time from their institutions. By relieving some of those responsibilities, a half-time staff person could make us more successful in attracting an individual who will agree to be a member editor of the *SfAA* news. And the staff person can help with a rolling, online newsletter instead of a publication every few months.

Santa Fe 2017 Meeting Update and Presentation: Nancy Lewis, Erve Chambers

Review of Meeting Theme Proposal

The Board received a CV and discussed the proposal from Nancy Owen Lewis to organize the 2017 meetings in Santa Fe. There was interest in the theme becoming more inclusive to welcome a broader range of interests. The Board agreed Nancy Owen Lewis would be a strong leader for next year's meetings. James moved, with Miguel seconding, to accept the program chair candidate and her proposal. The motion passed unanimously. James moved, with Jessica-Jean seconding, that the theme title be modified from "Trails, Traditions, and New Directions" to "Trails, Traditions, and Trajectories." The motion passed unanimously.

Presentation by Program Chair for Santa Fe 2017

Nancy Owen Lewis then joined the Board where she was informed by Kathleen that we are delighted to move forward with her proposal. Lewis then presented an update on plans for the Santa Fe Meeting. Hotels at a good rate and with 16 meeting rooms have

been lined up. Because this is two rooms fewer than in Vancouver, Lewis with Erve are talking about how to address the problem of scheduling by keeping people at the meetings through Saturday. They want also to increase local participation as was done with good success in Vancouver by inviting faculty to bring students. They will continue to encourage development of clusters and their transformation into TIGs, a strategy expected to increase interdisciplinary participation. To date, the Society has about twelve clusters that develop informally at first. When related sessions appear, Erve meets with them to help formalize their association with thoughts about what to do the next year. Organizers are planning tours in Santa Fe, and they want to continue what they did in Albuquerque, to link tours to sessions, e.g. a homelessness session and then tour a homeless shelter. Nancy is working with Michael Brown in SAR development to think of ways SAR can support the meetings. She sits on the public safety committee and has ideas of getting involvement from the local community on issues such as substance abuse. As vice president of the historical society, she will also tap into those resources for sessions and expertise. Erve is going to Santa Fe at the end of April and will try to develop a network of New Mexico communities involved in the meetings. The Board expressed its appreciation for the progress they have made on the 2017 meetings, and Nancy and Erve then left the meeting.

Co-sponsorship Agreements

This issue arose out of a request by INDR to formalize their sponsorship agreement. We currently have handshake agreements with PESO, SMA, CONAA, and Society for Science and Anthropology, so the Board considered what a formal agreement might look like with organizations co-sponsoring our meetings.

A draft proposal from Tom outlines what should be in such agreements. There are no formal MOUs. No money changes hands, but cosponsors benefit from reduced rates for attending, savings from not paying the costs of organizing a meeting, and perhaps SfAA sponsorship of a reception for a large group. The SfAA benefits from the revenues generated by additional participants, such as the 150 SMA members who attend, and negotiating advantages that come with larger conferences. Depending on how many people they bring in and how many sessions they develop—below some minimum would not benefit us—a co-sponsor could have about five sessions or a group like SMA could have up to 15. PMA would like to have guidance from the board on a minimum number of sessions for a co-sponsorship. They recommended that the maximum we'd want would be about 15 and a minimum should be at least 5 sessions.

Miguel moved, with Roland seconding, that we accept the proposal by INDR to become permanent co-sponsors. The board voted unanimously in support of the motion.

Miguel moved with Roland seconding that we accept INDR's proposal to become a permanent co-sponsor. Approval was unanimous.

Roberto moved we accept Tom's draft guidelines, with Laurie seconding, and with the addition that we require a minimum of 5 sessions per meeting for a co-sponsorship.

Approval was unanimous.

Recognition of the Service of Members Cycling Off the Board

Several members of the Board will rotate off after the March meeting. Kathleen noted that each has contributed dramatically to the success of the Society. She expressed her heartfelt gratitude for herself and the Society to Maria, Miguel, and Jessica-jean, and she presented a plaque to each.

Roberto Alvarez received a chair last year at the conclusion of his term as president of the Society. After the March meeting, he is also rotating off. He graciously thanked the members of the Board and expressed his appreciation for their integrity as well as that of the SfAA office, the commitment, and the energy that everyone puts into the organization. He said he has benefitted from his association and feels honored to have worked with the Society.

The meeting adjourned.

Minutes

Saturday, April 2, 2016

Meeting of the Board of Directors

Director Room

Westin Bayshore Hotel

Vancouver, BC, Canada

Present: Kathleen Musante, Jennifer Wies, Roland Moore, Ruthbeth Finerman, Molly Shade, Neil Hann, Sandy Ervin, Amy Foust, Laurie Krieger, James Loucky, Jane Gibson

Absent: Brian Tilt, Alicia ReCruz

The Board reconvened Saturday to finish its spring 2016 business.

Remaining business from Wednesday's meeting

Del Jones Committee

Regarding the need for appointment of new members to the Del Jones Committee, Laurie followed up with two people she had recommended. Both responded with enthusiasm to her emails so Laurie will send their names to Kathleen.

LPO Round Table Report

Laurie also reported on the Board-sponsored round table concerning LPO's bridging the academic-practitioner divide. The conversation was intense, drawing lessons from students, and the podcast is available for classroom use. Though some who were contacted by Alicia and Laurie did not attend, some from Alaska did. Laurie's overall assessment was that it was a successful event.

Report of the Publications Committee

Neil summarized a meeting of the Publications Committee. JStor has proposed to archive material from HO and PA. We would do it on a 5-year rolling wall, meaning JStor would be publish material 5 years old or older. The incentive is they'd pay us \$1300/yr. for each publication; JStor estimates an additional \$600 in revenue from sales of article downloads. Neil sees no downside to the proposal. Instead, there is the potential to increase our impact factor, for HO in particular. The only possible cost to the Society would be a decrease in subscriptions if libraries subscribe to JStor instead of to us, but the 5-year rolling wall likely addresses that concern. Members would still access our site for newer publications, so the JStor proposal offers another outlet for our older publications.

The question arose concerning the disposition of Allen Press to JStor's having articles Allen published. Neil did not think there would be a problem but he will check on that. The Publications Committee recommends that we enter this agreement. Roland moved we approve the JStor contract. Laurie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Another issue discussed on Wednesday concerned a new staff person PMA hopes to employ. The Publications Committee wants to develop a more formal proposal that includes budget impact and potential offset if the person could enhance subscriptions to HO and PA.

Concealed Carry

We resolved on Wednesday to write something for the SfAA News regarding the concealed carry issue. Laurie volunteered to work with Mark Edburg, who agreed to do the writing based on Laurie's research. They will get it out in a couple of weeks.

Podcast Team Report

Molly Shade is the outgoing chair of our podcast team. Molly reviewed the history of SfAA podcasts, underscoring how the project has grown in the number of podcasts, the size of the podcast team, and the quality of podcasts that began with students and microcassette recorders. This is the 10th year of podcasts produced in 10 cities that have received more than 110k views from 6 continents. Neil and Ray have helped with a website move this year and the podcast team is glad to be part of the SfAA domain. Molly thanked Jenn, Christina Watson, Tom May, Neil, and Ray for their support over 10 years. She also noted how invaluable Melissa and Trish have been to their success. She thanked the University of North Texas (UNT) and SfAA for funding the project that has been good for those who come to the sessions and for those who can't come. Podcasts are a valuable way for the SfAA to showcase social science in general and anthropology in particular outside the wall of the conference.

Sessions are chosen on the basis of a 5-minute selection survey that goes out on Survey Monkey in late November or early December. The survey relies on the preliminary program whose sessions are loosely categorized. From survey results, the team extracts a list of the top 30 sessions from which the team tries to spread representation of different anthropological genres. Then they bring the proposed

podcast list to the Board in early January after which they may make adjustments in response to the Board's suggestions. In response to a concern about unauthorized recording, they require consent from all authors and co-authors now. At least half of each session needs to consent to optimize use of podcast equipment and time. An improvement in broadcasts now is that one may listen to individual talks, so there is no gap in the recording for those who do not consent.

Half of the funding comes from SfAA and half from UNT. The SfAA pays for team members' conference registration, SfAA membership dues, out-of-pocket expenses, compensation for professional audio, and hotel costs. Neil noted that the 2016 podcast budget is over \$11k. There is no line item in the budget for podcasts; they are instead folded into the meetings line. UNT contributes airfare for the team and meals.

From the Vancouver meetings, 20 sessions were podcasted, about 5 papers per session, for an estimated 100 audio files. The 2016 podcasts will be available in one or two weeks. The hosting domain VIMEO requires a title and that adds a few extra days. Anyone, including non-members, can access these from the website. To improve audience comprehension of those presentations that rely on visual materials, the team will upload PowerPoint presentations with the audio files. Videotaping sessions is an option neither within student capacity nor budget.

The podcast team is made up of five individuals at a time, two on the tech team who put everything on the website and social media, and a communications team that obtains consent, helps with the local volunteer recruitment, and does the background work at the meetings. Molly is rotating off the podcast team; John Sarmiento will be the new chair and Josey Williams will move into the communications team position.

The Board discussed with Molly the possibility of an index that could link podcasts to the Oral History project. Molly said the next natural step is to develop a tagging system. Another interesting idea suggested by James for an upcoming meeting is to podcast a panel that traces the history of presentations from oral history to carbon paper to podcasts. James suggested this could be the SfAA Gold Star Panel that traces our history from clay tablets to techno-nerds. James will explore the possibility of such a panel.

Venues for 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021

[Note from the Secretary: The next paragraph was recorded on Wednesday. This was a random thread in the middle of the treasurer's report, moved here to keep the parts of our venue discussion together.]

International meeting schedule and venues

Because of the significance of annual meetings to the Society's budget, Kathleen suggested that the Board might want to consider six-year cycles for international meetings. Jennifer noted that this schedule would allow sufficient lead-time for the Treasurer to be able to harbor the needed funds. A number of venues were briefly discussed: Addis Ababa (elevation is a challenge for some people), Paris (could attract people from Africa but not from much of the developing world), and Havana (objection to the lack of free expression). No motion was made.

[Saturday discussion of venues, continued]

Erve Chambers joined the meeting. Neil reported that the 2017 meeting in Santa Fe is ready to go with signed contracts. The main venue will be La Fonda and Laredo hotels. For the benefit of those not at Wednesday's meeting, Kathleen reviewed the Board's meeting with program chair Nancy Lewis. Erve asked the Board to promote the Santa Fe meeting continuously until the meetings. Roland suggested we add to the signature lines of outgoing emails, "See you in Santa Fe 2017!"

Erve then reviewed the criteria for site selection: hotel capacity so we have sufficient meeting and sleeping spaces; local support; affordability for members; location, ideally an attractive site with cultural and historic interest; factors that might interfere. With New Mexico as a possible example, Kathleen suggested the possibility we might exhaust our potential cosponsors if we go back over and over again. Discussion concerning this issue included how a university name in association with the meetings is good for the university and incentivizes local contributions, and that going to more different sites would allow more schools the opportunity to promote themselves.

The Board discussed a number of sites for the 2018 meeting. These included New Orleans, ruled out because it is prohibitively expensive; Charleston that does not have good hotel capacity near the historic district but does have a convention center; Denver where the Convention Center was thought to have been alienating (Neil noted that space is increasingly an issue and we don't want to switch to a convention center if we can avoid it); Austin and Houston, both very expensive; Nashville and Memphis. Nashville is a little bit more expensive. Memphis has reasonable hotel rates, is near the city center, has strong local support, and lots of cultural interest. Both Nashville and Memphis are attractive sites but for the political costs of hosting a meeting where discriminatory legislation has passed. Other sites mentioned were Atlanta and Savannah; Tampa and Miami; Cincinnati; Billings, Montana; Jackson Hole, Wyoming; Detroit; Toledo; San Antonio; St. Louis, Milwaukee; and Kansas City.

Steve Langdon and Kerry Feldon joined the meeting.

The consensus was that PMA should look at a short list that includes Charleston, Memphis, and Nashville for 2018.

The Board then took up the question of meeting location in 2020 when the site could be international or the US east or west coast. One suggestion, considering the SMA that currently meets with us in even years, is that we could do one more 3-year rotation in New Mexico and then get on a 4-year schedule for those sites and a 6-year rotation at international sites. Suggested international sites included Vancouver, Merida, Guadalajara, Oaxaca, Jamaica, Belize, Quito, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Reykjavik, Australia, Guam, and Japan. The group briefly discussed the costs of airfare, altitude, involvement with the field of anthropology, governments' disposition to free speech and academic freedom, ease of access for anthropologists, and costs to the Society of shipping equipment. Jennifer noted the importance of planning ahead for such expensive meetings to allow time to plan and save for those costs. Every year's meeting between then and now has to be very deliberate about realizing the extra revenues we will need to support the international meeting. There appeared to be a consensus that the international meeting should be scheduled on a six-year rotation.

Returning to the location of the 2020 meetings when we will partner with SMA. SMA likes New Mexico and they bring to our meetings 200-300 registrants whose fees support the Society. The relationship is mutually beneficial because we organize the meeting, provide registration assistance, and so on. The question was asked if we should return to New Mexico. Other sites suggested include San Antonio, Salt Lake City, Las Vegas, Seattle, Portland, San Diego. To go back to New Mexico in 2020 would be to foreshorten the rotation again, or we could go elsewhere in 2020 and back to New Mexico in 2021. Kathleen asked for a straw poll of views on going to New Mexico in 2020. Most seemed to support the idea. Two were opposed and at least one abstained.

Program Chair Report

Kerry Feldman then gave his report for the three co-chairs about the 2016 meeting. All feedback suggests the meetings were well attended and well received. A challenge for the chairs was their, Melissa, and Neil all living in different time zones. They worked by phone and email with each other and with 24 program-planning committee people. They also worked with people leading the various clusters. Overall there were successes and challenges about which the chairs have written for the benefit of future planners.

They followed SfAA traditions but also wanted to do something nontraditional, so they worked hard with the CIE (Center for Imaginative Ethnography). Kerry recommended future chairs pursue such innovations. He attended and was very impressed by some of their sessions. He said it is a kind of anthropology that hits the "sensorium." The good news is that it's different and younger people are responding to that. He also said the SfAA needs to think about being open to "digital anthropology," people who use 3D presentations: films, literary presentations, dance performances. He suggested the possibility of a digital anthropology contest as a complement to the poster competition. He mentioned that digital anthropologists are printing apps where you can learn about potlatch through a

game on a laptop. They present differently and younger people are excited, but with a budgetary implication if the hotel charges for power if they need more projectors for more digital tech. If we're going to have installation art, we need to think about having one of them as a consultant.

The meetings, Kerry reported, were successful quantitatively and qualitatively. Over 2100 attended, and he credited the co-chairs' teamwork with others. He said there should be a manual prepared for how to chair a meeting. Erve is working on one. Don Stull wrote one year ago but they didn't get it until the end. They had great guidance from Melissa, Neil, Trish, Tom and Erve. He described Erve as a master who can listen to people without being upset by them.

Steve Langdon's idea for the Berger Award produced a highly successful session, one with First Nations representatives attending, presentations following the oral tradition, and concluding with a reception underwritten by Steve. The idea was to honor the land where we hold our meetings. The lesson Kerry took away from these experiences is that we can learn from what those who host us "think is real." In America it isn't just indigenous, he said; it is business, and other things we do.

Another suggestion Kerry offered future program chairs is the need improve publicity, something he thinks could have better served the Society in the Berger presentation. Venue sessions in New Mexico could be about the water. Kerry said they were overwhelmed at the end with more sessions than we had rooms for. Tom found a few more rooms. They were working with 24 clusters and also had 600+ volunteer papers. Melissa took over and did a great job of taking the sessions and sorting them into appropriate categories. Kerry suggested that people put their 5-6 keywords down and, mindful of clusters, do the sorting at the front end of the process. Kathleen noted that Orit said she tried to block rooms for related papers, so all extracting TIG papers in Pittsburgh were in the same room.

Having enough rooms and rooms of the appropriate size is a challenge. Neil said they make sure to fill up Wednesday through Saturday first and the Tuesday can become an option if needed. Another issue is getting the program cleaned up and ready for printing on time. Neil noted that the printer in Vancouver needed a full two weeks.

Kerry said they would be sending thank you messages to those who worked with them. He said we have always to be thinking of the SfAA brand, so we should be nice wherever we are, give thanks to all, and hope that in the end, "Everything was beautiful and nothing hurt."

Kathleen noted one kerfuffle. She got a letter expressing concern from a Canadian member that we did not have the president of the CASCA on the welcoming program. That was an oversight, she said, and thought it would have been good, too, to have a president-to-president meeting. She apologized to him and will write a formal letter of apology as well. She thought he should also have been invited to do a

welcome. Historically, our usual practice is the welcomes come from those who pay for the thing, but since CASCA was our principle local co-sponsor, that should have taken place. James pointed to an anthropological lesson in this faux pas. An appropriate protocol, Kerry said, for working with CASCA would have sought co-sponsorship and advice on the appropriateness of ideas and decisions for the meeting. Kerry said there was an effort to relate in culturally appropriate ways with CASCA.

Follow-up on issues of the Malinowski and Peltó Committees

Kathleen reported that she interviewed the chair of the Malinowski committee who also sent her a memo, not yet shared, that describes the process of selecting the award winner, and that has the multi-dimensional scaling plots of the rankings of the nominees. She still needs to interview the other senior members to corroborate that report. Chair Bill Dressler states that during the conference call, there was consensus about the final nominee. Kathleen provided background for the benefit of new Board members. In the end, the Board agreed to approve the committee's recommendation and report.

Three members of the Peltó committee resigned in protest over their process and nominee. Then, Kathleen explained, we reconstituted the committee and now need one more person if Merrill resigns. The chair said only three were on the conference call that made the decision, but there was no quorum requirement. While the Malinowski process was probably not flawed, the Peltó process she believes probably needs improvement.

Review of Action Items

Kathleen asked Board members what on the action items list was not done for which we need to make provision going forward.

Jennifer provided an update on hers. She looked at institutional memberships that were created by the Board in March 2012 and included in the bylaws update that the membership voted on. We have 2-3 members in that category. In reviewing these, Jennifer said we should push these and use them to increase international memberships. There is no clause as to when we would end those, so we will keep the category open for now, but we should do something with it.

Jennifer also followed up on oral histories, particularly the problem preventing members from seeing transcriptions. The Nunn center will help figure out how to get people access to the audio. The second part of the backlog cleanup is that we need people to polish the transcription before posting it to the Nunn Center. She asked if there might be classes that could help with this or if each of the SfAA Board members might volunteer to get one done. Roland offered to do one. To volunteer, one should email Jennifer or Jon van Willigen directly.

Kathleen asked for recommendations to populate committees in ways that would diversify them in ethnicity, age, and any other way we can think about diversity. Kathleen and Laurie will continue to work on World Anthropology Day.

The Critical Conversations Committee was reconstituted for next year with Amy joining Jessica Jean who will chair the committee, Roland and James who want also to remain involved. They would like to include someone from New Mexico. Kathleen noted that the topic needs to be chosen by Feb 1 to get it in the program. Because the focus is to be a burning issue, the group may organize two, one that is determined fixed in advance, the other more fluid to respond to any issues that come up closer to the deadline.

The Board briefly discussed the problem of missing TIG liaisons. Kathleen will find TIGS without liaisons and will send out a call for volunteers. She will contact Brian Tilt to appoint him as liaison to the Risk and Disaster TIG.

Roland will find out why all Kushner members rotate off in 2017. Kathleen noted that all were donors, and as we start to replace members we should try to keep some donors.

Kathleen will contact what remains of the Public Policy Committee to find out “next steps.”

New Business

Discussion then concerned a lack of clear criteria for the Sol Tax award. Is the award for service to the SfAA or service to applied anthropology? Should the recipient be someone who is a good scholar who has done applied work, or just someone who is a good scholar? The committee would like clarification. The deadline is Oct 1. Kathleen noted that all awards committees face the challenge of identifying who is and who is not qualified. In the poster sessions, for example, almost everyone listed her/his major professor as a co-author though online guidelines say this is not allowed. One suggestion, borrowed from the ethnobotany meetings, is to require that students get advisors to write that students are doing their own work. Another is that advisors of students who do their own work should be listed in the acknowledgements instead of as co-authors.

The Board then discussed a request to help with the costs of getting Ralph Bolton's library to Peru. Roland has been corresponding with Tom May about this. They will talk to the state department to see if they can get some help.

The next issue concerned the unresolved issue of the international task force. Do we want to continue it? How do we repopulate it? This task force was to help the Society think through internationalization, a task the Board has since made a significant focus. Rather than sunseting the task force, the Board tabled the

discussion for later consideration. One possibility is that the task force might be revived to take up interim meetings, the protocols for these, and the costs of partnerships as their charge. Kathleen will discuss interim meetings further with Roberto.

July 25, 2016
Board Meeting by Conference Call

Present: Amy, Kathleen, Jane, Laurie, Erve, Ruthbeth, Tom, Roland, Jennifer, Sandy

Kathleen asked and received permission to record the meeting.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the 2018 venue for the Society's annual meeting in a year the SMA expects to meet with us. Those on the call first discussed Tennessee sites in light of legislation that legalized discrimination against LGBTQI people. Two options were considered: engagement with publicity concerning the issue, and boycotting Tennessee. Unable to reach consensus, the Board turned to two additional venues: Anaheim and Philadelphia. Sandy moved with Roland seconding that the 2018 meetings be held in Philadelphia. A friendly amendment was passed to change the motion as follows: Philadelphia will be ranked #1 with Anaheim #2, both to be explored by PMA for information on hotels and other selection criteria. The vote unanimously favored the motion.

Mention was made of the 2020 meeting, the possibility of a future meeting on Native American land, and the possibility of a 2022 international meeting. No actions were taken. Kathleen concluded the conference call stating that we will make a decision on 2018, will have a vote by beginning of next week. We will then try to get farther along to plan for 2019 and will try for Albuquerque in 2020.