

Society for Applied Anthropology Fall 2012 Board Meeting
November 13, 2012, 8:00 AM – 5:15 PM
Holiday Inn, San Francisco, California

In attendance: Roberto Alvarez, Susan Charnley, Rebecca Crosswaith, Merrill Eisenberg, Joe Heyman, Tom Leatherman, Tom May, Michael Paolisso, Lois Stanford, Tim Wallace, Jennifer Wies

I. Agenda Review

Merrill opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda and asking whether Board members had anything to add to it. One topic suggested was the status of committee booklet revisions, which Merrill has been leading the effort on. Merrill gave a status report on this effort. She stated that they are starting off by revising one booklet. Once that revision is complete, they will proceed with the others. The first booklet is that of the Social Justice Committee. Revisions to that booklet were suggested by Professional Management Associates (PMA) staff; the Board voted to approve the suggested revisions; these were then sent to the Social Justice Committee. The Committee had additional comments on the booklet and hasn't yet finally approved it. Once the Social Justice Committee finalizes and approves their revised booklet, the others will be revised.

It was suggested that committee chairs should go ahead and take the lead on revising the booklet for their committee, rather than wait. However, this was decided against because there is boiler-plate language that needs to be consistent across booklets. Once the first one is finished, we will send it as an example to the other committees, and then proceed to revise the rest.

Susan reviewed the votes taken electronically since the Spring 2012 Board meeting. She also called for a status report on the outstanding action items that Board members were to follow up on following the Spring 2012 Board meeting, which members provided. The following votes were taken electronically since the spring 2012 Board meeting:

- The SfAA Board approved the Spring 2012 Board meeting minutes from the Baltimore, MD (March 28-April 1, 2012) Board meetings.
- The SfAA Board approved the 2013 annual meeting theme: Natural Resource Distribution and Development in the 21st Century.
- The SfAA Board approved the nomination of Dr. Erin P. Finley for her book, *Fields of Combat: Understanding PTSD among Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan*, to receive the 2012 Mead Award.
- The SfAA Board approved the Student Committee's proposal to create a new student paper prize that would be overseen by the Student Committee, with revised proposal language.
- The SfAA Board approved the Human Rights and Social Justice Committee booklet that was revised in August 2012.
- The SfAA Board voted to co-sponsor the summer 2013 meeting of the Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA) to be held in Miami.

Action Item for Board members: Follow through on any action items from the Spring 2012 Board meeting that you have not completed yet. Refer to Spring 2012 meeting minutes to refresh your memory on what these were.

II. Committee Liaisons

Every SfAA committee should have a liaison on the Board. The role of committee liaisons is to be a conduit for communication between the SfAA Board and the committees. Each committee liaison should touch base with the committee chair(s) for the committees they are serving as Board liaison to, and let them know they are their designated contact for communication with the Board. In addition, each Board liaison should touch base with their committee chair(s) before their biannual Board reports are due to ensure that they have been undertaking their follow-up items from the previous Board meeting, and are preparing upcoming Board reports. Committee liaisons should also contact the committee chairs and let them know what actions the Board has taken on their Board reports, if any.

Committee liaisons are as follows:

Lois Stanford:	Bea Medicine, Spicer, Peter K. New
Tim Wallace:	Valene Smith, Tourism TIG, Newsletter
Jennifer Wies:	Del Jones, Gender-based Violence TIG, Finance, Oral History
Susan Charnley:	Hackenberg, Mead, Sol Tax, Malinowski
Nancy Schoenberg:	Grassroots Development TIG, Local Practitioner Organizations
Michael Paolisso:	Publications, Practicing Anthropology, Human Organization
Merrill Eisenberg:	Podcasting, Information Technology, SAR/SFAA Collaboration, N&E
Tom May:	Annual Meeting, AAAS Collaboration, N&E, Awards, Beyond 75
Rebecca Crosswaith:	Student
Tom Leatherman:	Human Rights & Social Justice
Joe Heyman:	Public Policy

Action Item for all Board members: Contact the committee chairs for the committee(s) you are the designated liaison for and let them know about your role as Board liaison to their committee.

III. Consent Agenda

Four committee reports were removed from the consent agenda: Hackenberg, Publications, Newsletter, and Human Organization.

Michael Paolisso made a motion to vote on the consent agenda, and to accept the reports on the consent agenda.

Vote: There was unanimous approval of the consent agenda.

IV. Reports not on the Consent Agenda

a. Hackenberg Committee Report

We pulled this report from the consent agenda because it contains a proposal to have a reception at the Spring 2013 SfAA meetings in Denver. This committee has raised a lot of money. When a committee raises a lot of money, is it logical to let the committee have the flexibility to decide what to do with that money? For example, can they use the money for a reception at the annual meeting?

The Hackenberg Award is given every other year. The committee wants to have an extended session at the Spring 2013 meeting to honor Bob Hackenberg (whose career was at the University of Colorado, Boulder) that includes a lunch for panelists and attendees. The Board has approved a biannual lecture, but not a lunch. The lunch would cost \$1,400. The committee would raise half the money, and take the balance of the money out of the awards trust.

Action Item for Susan: Contact Don Stull, Hackenberg Committee Chair, and inform him of the following. The Hackenberg Committee must submit a proposal to the Board for having a session that includes a lunch. They need to write a proposal to sponsor an extended session at the Spring 2013 SfAA meetings that includes a lunch, so that the Board can discuss and vote on it. They should include in their proposal how that lunch will be paid for. Susan should copy Jennifer on the email to Don.

Lois Stanford made a motion to accept the Hackenberg report.

Vote: Unanimous approval by the Board.

b. Publications Committee Report

This report was pulled because it contained a proposal to publish the 2012 Hackenberg lecture in Human Organization.

The Malinowski lecture has always been automatically published in Human Organization. Should the Hackenberg lecture also be automatically published? Or should we consider the Peter K. New model? The Peter K. New paper winner is invited to submit their paper to Human Organization; if it goes through peer review and is accepted, then we publish it and note it as the Peter K. New award winner. Publication is not automatic.

Action Item for Michael: Follow up with Mark Moberg on the proposal to have the Hackenberg lecture published in Human Organization. It should be the decision of the editor (Mark) about whether to automatically publish the lecture or not. Should Human Organization review these lectures and give them a priority for possible acceptance?

Joe Heyman made a motion to approve the Publications Committee Report.

Vote: The report was unanimously approved.

c. The Newsletter Report

The Newsletter Report was pulled from the consent agenda to discuss the issue of succession to Tim Wallace (current editor). Tim's term ends in May 2013. Who will succeed him? We have published a notice in the Newsletter that we need a new editor, but haven't received any interest yet. How will we recruit someone? Tom May will talk with Merrill, Roberto, and Michael tomorrow about how to ramp up the effort to recruit a new editor. That new editor will then take up the question of how to develop a new format for the Newsletter in response to member survey comments.

Joe Heyman made a motion to approve the Newsletter Report.

Vote: Report unanimously approved.

d. Human Organization Report

The Human Organization report was pulled from the consent agenda because of a need to recruit readers to do peer review. Human Organization is making more use of its editorial board to do this. Authors who submit to Human Organization are supposed to submit the names of five potential peer reviewers – are they doing this? What does the request to review letter contain? Is there a structured format for doing the review? Perhaps HO could provide a format that would be less onerous for the reviewer. Does the journal have a database of people and their expertise? The journal should ask people who reject the invitation to review to recommend alternative reviewers. We could mine the database that is coming out of the member survey to identify the areas of expertise members have that we could draw on. If we develop a list of members and their expertise, it could be used to help suggest reviewers.

Action Item for Michael: Follow up with the Human Organization editor to help problem solve this issue. Some suggestions: find out if authors are listing the five reviewers; identify new reviewers from the member survey; develop a format for the review; make sure people on the editorial board are doing a certain number of reviews themselves or are finding others; ask reviewers to recommend alternatives if they don't accept; make an announcement in the Newsletter about the review experience and request assistance – maybe someone can write a Newsletter article about this problem? The Student committee should encourage students to do reviews and editors should draw on student members to do reviews.

Joe Heyman makes a motion to accept the report.

Vote: Report unanimously accepted.

e. Del Jones Report

The Del Jones Committee raised the issue of the number of award applicants in its report. The committee wants to increase the number of qualified students applying for the award. They also asked for suggestions for another possible committee member.

This report caused Merrill to identify two common themes running throughout the committee reports:

- a need for more applicants for our awards; and

- a need for more and new committee members.

On the topic of committee members – Merrill will get committee vacancies filled before she leaves her presidency. She outlined the process for committee membership, as follows. The SfAA President appoints the full committees, with suggestions from the Board, or with concurrence from the Board. If the committee chair wants to include specific individuals on their committee, the President will go to them and try and recruit them, but many chairs don't want to appoint their own committees; they need help. So the President does this. Merrill has lists of all of the committees and their members. Other people can participate in committee discussions even if they aren't committee members. Two people are rotating off of the Del Jones Committee in 2013: Antoinette and Kerry. They will need to be replaced.

On the topic of needing more applicants for the Del Jones award – could we send an announcement to faculty members in advance of advertising the student awards in order to get them to encourage students to apply?

Tom May outlined the current process for advertising the awards. In mid-summer, an email message goes out to members saying that the awards exist. Then students are encouraged to submit abstracts when the call for papers occurs. Accepted abstracts are announced in early December. Shortly thereafter, those students whose papers are accepted are targeted with advertising about the student travel awards. You must have a paper accepted for the annual meetings in order to be eligible to apply for a student travel award. The PMA office sends an email to students with accepted papers letting them know that travel awards are available. About 450 students are on the annual meeting program each year, and these are the people targeted for advertising about the student travel awards. There is no real alternative in terms of timing for advertising the awards. Dec. 31 is the deadline for applying for the Peter New award; the deadline for applying for the others is January 15.

It was suggested that during the summer, when we do the pre-abstract submission student travel award publicity, this publicity should go to the general membership, not just to students, so that faculty can encourage students to submit paper abstracts and think about applying for the travel awards. This would give them more time to prepare.

Action Item for Tom May: Publicize early among all members, not just student members, about the awards that are available for student prizes so that the summer publicity blast goes out to all members.

Action Item for Rebecca Crosswaith: Talk to the Student Committee and encourage them to get more students to apply for the student awards.

Joe Heyman made a motion to accept the Del Jones report.

Vote: Report unanimously accepted.

f. Sol Tax Report

The report raised the issue of increasing awareness of this award, as we just discussed with Del Jones. They would like the Board to help them find ways of increasing the visibility and awareness of the award among SfAA membership. They also asked the Board to be more active in encouraging nominations for the award. Finally, they asked the Board to help them recruit replacement committee members for two members whose terms will expire in 2013. Regarding the latter, they ask the Board to consider making it a condition of the award that the recipient serve a 3-year term on the selection committee.

Should we require award recipients to serve on the Sol Tax Committee? It was decided that we should suggest that recipients serve on the committee in the publicity for the award, but not require committee participation to be a condition of the award.

Action Item for Tom May: Send out an email to members to remind them about nominating people for our awards in the summer.

Other ideas were offered for increasing the number of award applicants. (1) Get committee chairs to have tables at the annual meetings where they provide information about their awards, provide nomination forms, assist people by giving them information on how to nominate people, list who has won the awards in the past, etc. This would help increase awareness of the awards and encourage people to nominate others. (2) Advertise the awards more at the awards ceremony, at award lectures, and at the receptions that follow them at the annual SfAA meetings. (3) All Board members and committee chairs should be encouraged to think of potential nominees, and of people who could nominate others for our awards, and encourage them to contact Board members or committee chairs to learn more about how to nominate people.

Action Item for Susan Charnley: Communicate with the academic award committee chairs about these ideas. Committee chairs should take it upon themselves to come up with nominations forms that make it easier to nominate people.

Michael Paolisso made a motion to accept the Sol Tax report.

Vote: Report unanimously accepted.

g. Practicing Anthropology Report

The Practicing Anthropology Report raised two issues for Board consideration:

- A need for more submissions – Anita encouraged Board members to seek submissions or submit articles themselves;
- Article length – several potential authors have asked her to extend the length of articles to 4,500 or 5,000 words. She is not against this if the articles meet other PA criteria.

Anita wants to know, what does the Board think about extending article length? The main issues associated with doing so were articulated. Can the editors handle it? Would we double production costs if we jumped to 55 pages or so? How much of this additional content should be digital articles?

What is the purpose of articles in PA? How does length relate to content? Why aren't authors sticking with the word length? What are the financial implications of doing this in terms of production costs?

The financial implications are unclear because they depend on whether or not people are getting electronic or hard copy versions of PA. Students are required to get it electronically unless they are willing to pay for it. There are financial implications of extending article length, but it is hard to pin them down and quantify them.

Tom May provided some background information about PA. Three years ago there was a lot of talk about peer review for this journal so that people in applied departments could use these articles for tenure. We convinced past editors to comment on this issue, and they agreed it would be an interesting idea worth considering but one that should be approached carefully. This is a serious decision. Anita is supposed to give us a report on whether or not to do peer review for PA articles (a follow up item from the Spring 2012 Board meeting that she has not completed yet).

Currently Anita chooses the articles. There is a review board that helps generate ideas for special issues, and looks at articles that come in. She is working on revising the review board. This board could play an active role in helping review what comes in and editing it. Perhaps we should leave it to the editor's discretion about whether or not to publish a long article. The current article length is 3500 words; going up to 4500-5000 words could happen with fewer articles and still retain the overall length of PA. What do we want this journal to be? It is a costly journal to produce.

Action items for Michael Paolisso:

(1) Talk to Anita and discuss the pros and cons of increasing article length and having fewer articles. What would this mean for the articles that get crowded out? Also, get Anita's assessment of what the financial implications of extending the article length would be.

(2) We would also like to get more information from the editor about who is submitting to PA, and what kinds of articles they are getting. Michael should take a more active role in getting meaningful Board reports from the publications people. Michael will pull old models for the publications reports that had more information in them for the publications people to look at, so that they can improve their Board reports.

Joe argued that people who want longer, peer-reviewed articles should be steered to Human Organization. People in practicing anthropology jobs should be recognized for publishing in Practicing Anthropology, which is an important journal for practitioners, even if it is not peer reviewed. He thinks we should push back on the peer review issue for Practicing Anthropology.

The general consensus among Board members about this issue was that we should provide guidance to authors submitting to PA that their articles should be 3500 words; but the editor can decide whether or not to provide them with a few extra words. In answer to Anita's question: no, don't extend article length, but she can accept something longer once in a while if she thinks it's a good article and if it isn't squeezing out other useful things. She needs to continue to operate within the existing budget. So, if

something is going to be published that is longer, there need to be fewer articles published so that she doesn't go over her budget.

The question was raised: Could we have an on-line version of PA that is longer and more diverse, and a print version that is shorter and more focused on peer-reviewed articles? This could create a 2-tiered system and discourage the evolution of a higher quality on-line publication. The idea was rejected.

Jennifer made a motion to approve the report from Practicing Anthropology.

Vote: Report is unanimously approved.

*** The Board took a break from 9:45 to 10:00 AM ***

h. Podcast Report

The Podcast Committee presented the Board with some options for their budget.

The podcast people think that their guest rooms at the annual meetings are free to us and to them. It's not true; SfAA pays for their guest rooms at the annual meetings. How can we economize on this project? We could get local volunteers to do the technical podcast work at the meetings instead of having the podcast project fly their own people there that we have to pay for. But UT contributes a lot, and wants us to help pay for their students to come to these meetings. Anyway, they must understand that the hotel costs are not in-kind support that we provide. We only get one free hotel night for every 50 nights we book. This doesn't even cover Board members, much less the podcast people, with free hotel rooms. For example, in Denver we will get 28 room nights, which doesn't even meet Board needs (5 nights times 13 people). So they need to understand that they don't get rooms in kind. Their participation costs in the Podcast project are almost met by our costs. We really give them \$3,500 in funding, not in kind.

Do we make enough use of the podcasts? Do we get outreach value out of these?

Merrill provided an overview of survey results on the podcasts. Many people didn't know we had them at all, but some people do use them. The Podcast Committee also got qualitative data broken down from the survey about the podcasts. The students are still analyzing these data. We need further analysis of the Podcast data from the survey before we can figure out whether this project is worth our investment. We will use the information from the survey to inform where we go next with these and how to choose what is podcast.

Other issues discussed: Podcasts aren't posted until June following the spring annual meetings, so that loses the momentum of the meetings. Can we get podcasts up quicker? What would it take to get these up sooner so that they get more use? It's also hard for people to figure out how to access the podcasts. They are on a podcast website, but not on the SfAA or UT websites. It needs to be obvious from the SfAA website how to get to the podcasts. Outreach and publicity are good uses of the podcasts to help increase participation in SfAA.

Can we identify topics from the podcasts that faculty will assign students to pursue in class? If faculty members assign their students to review a podcast as part of a project, it would increase their value. Very few people use podcasts for teaching. We should be using them to generate excitement among a future generation of applied anthropologists.

Key sessions should be podcasted. We need a committee – the Program Committee, for example – to work with the Podcast Committee and figure out what to podcast.

Podcasts go onto a podcast website – this is not a SfAA website or a UT website. Location and ownership of podcasts is a bigger question that we have tried to resolve previously but haven't. You can't get to podcasts if you go to the SfAA website.

Action Item for the IT Committee: Figure out how to make podcasts more accessible to people, ie., find out how to link to them to the SfAA website; work on advertising them as a teaching tool; etc.

Action Item for Podcast Committee (to be communicated by Merrill): Analyze membership survey data about podcasts so that the Board can discuss how to prioritize podcasts. Improve advertising about podcasts at the SfAA meetings.

Action Item for Merrill: Put on the session abstract submission form a question about whether the session being proposed has the potential for being used in teaching if podcast. For example: If this session were podcast, would it have potential for being useful for teaching?

Action item for Merrill: Tell the Podcast Committee to resubmit their budget option 1 because the budget can't be accepted if it shows hotel rooms as being in kind.

Other comments on the Podcast Project budget proposals:

Joe noted that pens are not worth the money. So a budget option that includes paying for pens is not a good investment option.

UNT does a reception at the SfAA meetings to publicize and market their university program that costs them about \$5,000. This is not included in their budget.

Budget Option 1 is the one the Board prefers. SfAA needs to do more outreach. The podcasts are an untapped resource. If people can just click links on the internet and find out about SfAA through them, it will help us. But we are not going to vote on their budget until they resubmit it to us.

Action Item for Merrill: Send the Podcast Committee a revised Budget Option 1 that shows the hotel room costs and suggests we will accept the Option 1 budget if it shows the real hotel room costs.

Joe makes a motion to accept the Podcast report minus the budget.

Vote: The report is accepted unanimously.

Action Item for Tom May: Follow up with the Program Committee chair to ensure that they are working with the Podcast Committee to address the issue of what gets chosen for podcasting.

Action item for IT Committee/Merrill: Work on increasing publicity relating to the podcasts, and how to do this. Megan Gorby is on the committee, so there is a direct link there.

i. Student Committee Report

Joe Heyman made a motion to accept the Student Committee report.

Discussion: The Student Committee wants money for their newly-established student paper prize. We told them initially that there was no money for this prize. We told them that one of their responsibilities if they wanted money for it was to figure out how to raise this money, and that the honor of receiving the prize and the associated help with turning the winning paper into a publication should be incentive enough to apply for it. If they want money in addition, they need to come up with a plan to raise it.

One idea offered for fund raising: the Student Committee could add \$1 to the student membership fee as a way of raising money for the award. Tom May explained that not a single student responded to his mailing to students asking for donations.

Tom May also stated that we can't just let a committee go off on its own to raise money because the Board has fiduciary responsibility for that. If a committee raises or spends money in the name of the Society without our approval, the Board is still responsible. He thinks that we should be careful about asking them to raise money because we need to approve it first.

Should this be an incentive to ask students to donate money to awards more generally?

Another idea for creating incentive to apply for the award: What about having a plaque for putting award winner names on?

Action Item for Rebecca Crosswaith: Ask the Student Committee if they really want a monetary award associated with the student paper prize; it would only be a small amount of money. It's a lot of work to raise money and there is enough incentive associated with saying you got an award on your CV and having an opportunity to publish to apply for it. If they decide they want a monetary award, they need to submit a plan to the Board for how they will raise the money.

The Student Committee also requested that we re-open a dialogue about having a student member listserv that the Student Committee controls, just as many sections of the AAA have access to their constituents. Tom May responded to this request, speaking for Neil Hann: We have an online community and an outdated web page that will be dealt with next summer. If we start another listserv it will compete with the existing one. Can we instead generate energy among students towards a more successful use of existing resources? We don't want to encourage each group to do its own thing. Instead, we want to keep people focused on the organization as a whole. The online community could be segmented into smaller interest groups, like students.

Joe noted that listservs don't often work out very well because either no one uses them, or some crazy person dominates. They really require an aggressive moderator to keep them functional.

What the Student Committee is really asking for is increased access to their membership and constituents. But we cannot give the Student Committee a list of contact information for all student members. The Student Committee can generate information or announcements that they want to be sent out to students and send it to Neil Hann, and Neil will send it out. They can send out messages to all students whenever they want by sending them to Neil. They will likely be better off going through the PMA office anyway because it will make people more thoughtful and intentional about what they communicate.

Action Item for Rebecca Crosswaith: Tell the Student Committee in a politically sensitive way that we are not going to let them have their own listserv. Explain the reasons. If they want to communicate with their constituents, they can go through Neil Hann and request that he send out information to them. We need to convey to the Student Committee our concerns about their proposal. We will let them think about it, and if they want to come back to us with a revised proposal, then that is welcome.

Vote: The report was unanimously accepted.

j. Public Policy Committee Report

Joe Heyman made a motion to accept the Public Policy Committee report.

Discussion: The report raised 3 issues that were discussed.

(1) There continues to be a lack of response to the Committee's request for syllabi and workshop agendas used in training applied social scientists in the area of public policy.

Action item for Joe Heyman: Approach Robert Rubenstein (chair) and suggest he approach the Public Policy section of AAA to see if they have people in their group who could help round up or provide syllabi for classes related to teaching public policy.

(2) Joe Heyman who served on the Public Policy Committee was elected to the SfAA Board and thus rotated off. The Board needs to take action to replace him and to replace other committee members whose terms expire later in 2012 and in 2013.

Action Item for Merrill: Take action to appoint new members to replace the people rotating off the Public Policy Committee.

(3) The committee wants to work with the SfAA office to arrange conference calls so that they can communicate with each other better. Tom M. said that the PMA office can do this but will charge the cost to the committee's budget.

Action item for Joe: Communicate to Robert R. that if the committee wants to have conference calls, they need to include the cost of doing so as a line item in their budget request to the Board. Jennifer or Neil can work with them to help them figure out how much this would cost.

Vote: The report was unanimously approved.

k. Oral History Project Report

Joe Heyman made a motion to approve the Oral History Project report.

Discussion:

The Oral History Project committee has been conducting interviews with people as part of their oral history project. However there is a backlog of untranscribed interviews. How can we fund transcriptions and how can we get them done faster? We could hire a court reporting group to do the transcription. The chair (John van Willigen) is putting one oral history in each Newsletter. It's a good effort. We should give them more money for transcription. AAA is also taking an interest in recording the history of their anthropologists for the section of Senior Anthropologists. They are doing video recordings of senior anthropologists in their section. Should we be doing digital video tapes as well? It makes it more complicated, and people still want transcribed words from interviews – oral historians do this.

Action item for Jennifer Wies: Tell the committee to come back to the Board with a proposal about how to enhance the Oral History Project, whether through making videos or whatever, and an associated budget. Also, tell us what it will take to reduce the backlog of untranscribed interviews. We are willing to give them more money for this. Follow up with options for transcribing to help reduce the backlog. In addition, talk to Neil H. about creating a link on the SfAA website to the oral histories. The format for the interviews also needs to be made accessible, so that the subjects will be prepared. Make John aware of what Allan Burns is doing with the Beyond 75 video interviews, so they can coordinate if called for.

John also stated in the committee report that he thinks they should be doing more new interviews. He asks that Board members think of one anthropologist in their area of specialization that should be interviewed, and send their name and email address to him (ant101@uky.edu).

Action item for Jennifer Wies: Get a list from John van Willigen (chair) of who has been interviewed for the oral history project so far. We want the list before we provide suggestions for who should be interviewed.

Vote: The Oral History Committee report and budget were unanimously accepted.

V. Bylaws Discussion

Joe Heyman made a motion to accept the Bylaw Report submitted to the Board by Merrill.

Discussion (***) note that Anita Puckett joined us by conference call for the discussion of whether editors should be Board members (***):

A key question raised in the Bylaws Report is, should editors be members of the Board? Since spring 2012, the Board has told them no, they are not voting Board members, based on an initial reading of the Bylaws by Merrill. But upon reviewing the Bylaws again, Merrill discovered additional text saying that editors are indeed voting members of the SfAA Board because they are officers of the Society. So now we need to discuss draft recommendations to the membership about what role the editors should play on the Board. The February newsletter will include information about what changes we propose to make to the Bylaws. Some of these changes will be small (such as making the Bylaws electronic); others will be big (for example, who should be a voting Board member?).

Merrill reviewed material in her report in the Board packet about the process and principles we should operate by in redoing the Bylaws. Key questions we need to address are:

- Should all Board members be elected or should we have appointed Board members?
- Should editors be required to be on the Board?
- Should appointed members be allowed to vote?

We want all SfAA members to come to the spring meeting with a clear idea of what the proposed Bylaw changes are. We also want to provide them with some options to consider, though they may raise additional options. Should we ask members to vote on changes section by section, or on all changes as a whole?

Tim Wallace asked: What is our goal now? To identify options associated with each issue and lay them out for members so that they can discuss them? Or to identify which options we favor?

Response from Merrill: We are not going to vote on options until next summer as a Board. So we will not say which options we favor now, we will just identify the options we want to put forward to members for their consideration.

Tim wants the Board to discuss now why we want SfAA members to consider a Bylaw revision. Lots of time will go into it, so we need to make clear to them why a revision is needed.

The Bylaws were originally drafted in the 1940s. There were eight bylaws revisions between 1968 and 1998. Here are the reasons for revising the Bylaws again:

1) The Society needs to be better prepared for the future. The Bylaws are out of date (for example, they say we can't vote electronically) and were developed when there were fewer members. We have since grown and will keep growing so we need to make the Bylaws ready for the future direction of the Society. They also need to better represent what the Society is doing now.

2) They need restructuring because they are hard to read, disorganized and obtuse.

3) There are contradictory statements in the Bylaws that need to be fixed (for example, the role of the Secretary vs. Nominations & Elections in overseeing elections).

4) Our Board is over 30 percent non-elected, which means that the Board doesn't represent our membership to a large degree. Membership has grown and we are getting flack about being a closed

group with decisions made by a small handful of people, many of whom aren't even elected. We may need more member leadership on the Board. Perhaps we need to designate seats on the Board for particular categories of people, i.e. more than just students.

6) The budget has grown a lot since the Bylaws were written, so when we talk about making decisions about member money we need to be clear about who is making decisions about where the money goes. Bylaws need to be better connected to the budget.

7) There were lots of issues that needed to be addressed once we started going through the Bylaws.

Merrill will identify the issues that need to be considered for change; not the specific language that will be used to address the issues. That will happen next summer.

Perhaps some straightforward issues could go to the ballot next fall that don't need a lot of discussion, (for example paper vs. electronic voting).

A question was raised: Since Board membership is changing, who will participate in the discussion and vote next August? New people won't know the issue; old people won't all be voting.

Tim made a motion: Current Board members who are involved with the Bylaws revision should be invited to participate in the August teleconference along with new Board members who join in March and specific people who have been involved in the process (ie., the Bylaws Committee and Policy Committee) to discuss what should be put on the ballot for members to vote on in the fall. These people would participate in the conversation but not the vote. Then there would be a second, separate conference call next summer to discuss and vote on what should be on the ballot in the fall.

Vote: The motion was approved unanimously.

Thus the process would be: have a big teleconference where people participate who aren't Board members in August. From this we will come out with material that we then write up for Board vote/consideration later at the second conference call.

Tom May said, the Board cannot take a vote to do something different from what is in the Bylaws. We have to be very clear about who we are inviting to participate in this conversation; the two conversations would have to be discrete and separate. There would be two conference calls, with no vote taken at the first one, just have a conversation. During the second call, there would be a vote and just Board members would participate. Membership needs to understand what the process will be.

New Board members are official Board members the day after the business meeting occurs at the spring meeting. As soon as the new Board members are elected, we should ask them to come to a discussion of the Bylaws at the spring meeting.

The current SfAA Board composition is: 14 people, 10 elected, 4 appointed.

Should we expand the Board's size since membership has increased? Should appointed members have voting privileges?

If we add more elected members we will have a smaller proportion of appointed members.

Michael pointed out that the Treasurer and three editors are not elected by voting membership but have been approved by our Board, and our other Board members are elected. Should they be allowed to vote? They bring unique expertise and represent different parts of the Society. When you are a voting member you are more engaged and responsible. If they don't vote there is a risk of them disengaging from the Board. That would be unfortunate. The Board has elected them so they are somewhat representative. Publications editors are voted on by the Board. It is an honor to be on the Board and people appreciate it; they deserve the honor. It is more work to be an editor and be on the Board but they contribute a lot.

Tom Leatherman asked if it is a problem for editors – when you sign on to be an editor you take on a lot of work; do you also want to take on the work of being a Board member? And should we consider the issue of whether the Treasurer votes separately from whether the editors vote because it's a separate role?

We discussed the pluses and minuses of the Treasurer voting:

Minuses – there is a conflict of interest because the Treasurer has a lot of sway over the budget.

Jennifer pointed out that there is a perception that there is a closed group that makes decisions about the Society, many of whom are not elected. This makes it seem like the Board isn't an open group. If we designate seats on the Board to editors, what are the essential job functions of those seats and why don't other people get designated to Board seats? These are three special seats so you act on their behalf. Are editors representing journal readership or authorship or what?

Editors represent the constituencies of people who publish in their publications.

Merrill explained that she often hears complaints that a lot of decisions get made and no one knows why, and is questioned about who the people on the Board are. We have the consent of the members to elect people to make decisions on their behalf. Members pay dues, so they should get to decide who represents them. Merrill feels strongly that all voting Board members should be elected by the people they represent. News editors should be at Board meetings so that they know what is going on. Does this mean they should be Board members? People can always participate in our meetings. The Board should be representative of the Society and elected by the Society. If the Treasurer and three editors are not Board members, we have four additional positions that could be elected. Many people give service to the Board that aren't on the Board – for example the Program Committee chair and other committee chairs.

Anita said that she is not an elected member so doesn't feel qualified to vote on every item that comes before the Board. She doesn't want to take the time to get up to speed on all the issues voted on. But if there are votes related to the journals, she would like to have a voice. Should we circumscribe what

editors can or can't vote on? She thinks editors should be on the Board, whether voting or nonvoting. She would like to have some Board status, but given the responsibility of the journal and how time consuming it is, doesn't want to have to participate in every issue. However, she thinks their voices should be heard. The level of participation would also be affected by how much reimbursement they get for attending meetings.

Tom Leatherman asked how much editors communicate with each other. They are all on the Publications Committee. So to represent the editors, Michael P. (Board liaison to this committee) would have to represent them if they weren't on the Board or didn't have voting rights.

Jennifer asked who the editors represent. Authors and readers? The budget is not an issue in this discussion because the editors get reimbursed for meeting attendance through their editor budget line item, so their reimbursement isn't connected to the Board line item for reimbursements. Maybe if we gave more money to editors in their line items, they would participate more. The Publications Committee could address this issue and submit budget proposals for the editor budgets.

Tim asked if the money for editors to attend two meetings per year comes from the Board or the editor budget? The answer is that they come to both and the money for them to attend comes from their editor budget.

The discussion about editors being on the Board – whether or not they vote – needs to be tied in with a conversation about what the total number of people on the Board should be. Let's talk about what the total Board package is, and who else should have a designated seat exactly.

We are reminded that what we want to do here today is to identify issues that should be vetted with the membership. Then in the newsletter we can say, here is the issue, here is the argument for and against. Stimulate the members to think about the issues.

What is the problem with having elected editors? If we identify editors, then we should ask if they want to also run as a Board member to be elected.

Merrill has looked at other organizations. Most organizations have elected Board members who represent them, they do not have editors who are voting Board members.

Roberto noted that given the workload, there should be some separation between being a Board member and being an editor. Editors are editors and should be responsible for the journals. That is a separate job from being a Board member. Unless editors themselves think that it is necessary for them to be on the Board, they shouldn't need to be. Editors should be focused on the journals. They should provide input to our Board meeting. Being an editor shouldn't automatically make you eligible to run for the Board. Editors should come and report to the Board and solicit information, but not be voting Board members.

Tom Leatherman suggested that anyone who votes should be elected. We could have an elected position who is designated to represent publications. But we need a larger discussion on the size of the Board and what positions should be designated.

Jennifer: She has gone both ways but thinks that the Treasurer, if appointed, should not be allowed to vote. He/she should be a Board member though.

Action Item Michael Paolisso and Tim Wallace: Write an argument in favor of having editors be voting Board members.

Action Item for Jennifer Wies and Merrill: Write an argument against having editors be voting Board members.

Pass these by the Publications Committee before they go into the newsletter. They will be merged. Each argument for and against should be no more than 500 words.

The alternative to being voting Board members is to be ex-officio Board members without voting privileges. Or, to be proposed by the Board and ratified by the membership. Michael P. and Tim W., and Jennifer W. and Merrill E., can decide whether or not to consider another option: Should editors be elected? Focus on the issues of representation on the Board and having greater transparency – if these are our goals, here are some options.

Action Item for Jennifer Wies: Write an argument for and against whether the Treasurer should be a voting Board member, and whether or not the Treasurer should be an elected Board member by the membership.

Elected voting, appointed nonvoting, appointed voting are the options to consider.

Tim proposed that it should be appointed and voting, or appointed but suggest to membership that they ratify the person.

There are four options for Treasurer then: Appointed and voting; appointed and non-voting; recommended by the Board and ratified by the membership and voting; elected by the membership and voting – could be nominated by N&E or the Board.

Deadline for these pieces: Send Susan the arguments for and against in first draft form by Dec. 12, 2012.

Other Bylaws issues are less controversial and more straightforward in terms of changes. Non-controversial changes include the language used for committees and interest groups. Right now there is no language in the Bylaws pertaining to standing and ad hoc committees. There doesn't have to be any such language, but Merrill expressed the view that there should be some language in the Bylaws regarding topical interest groups, for instance. The Bylaws should reflect the structure of how we do business. There should be flexible language.

We discussed whether we should formalize a male/female rotation for the SfAA President. The general view was no, because then it would be required to follow a certain procedure for finding a president, and could be interpreted as discriminatory. If it were in the Bylaws however, it would be more defensible to have a man one term, for example, and not the next term. We've been doing such a

rotation for a long time, but it isn't in the Bylaws. If we are only considering candidates of one gender on our voting slate, it is more defensible to have this rotation written into the Bylaws.

On establishing institutional memberships: we decided this shouldn't be in the Bylaws because Allan's proposal in regard to institutional memberships was to try it for a few years and then evaluate how well it is working.

One thing we didn't know was in the Bylaws is a two-year rule on voting (members are supposed to belong to SfAA for two years before they can vote). This rule is very difficult to enforce. We want people to feel included and like they can vote if they are members. But perhaps they should be required to be a member for a while before they can vote?

Action Item for Merrill Eisenberg and Roberto Alvarez: Write up the arguments for and against the two-year rule on voting and whether to get rid of it or not.

Next we discussed whether the Nominations and Elections Committee chair should be a Board member, and whether the past president should be a member of N&E. We need N&E to be more aware of what we do and talk about on the Board so that they have that information when recruiting members. There is currently a disconnect between N&E and the Board, and we discussed some options for how we might address this. Another problem: the Chair of N&E is appointed by Board.

Action Item for Tom Leatherman: Think through the pros and cons of different options for improving connections and communications between N&E and the SfAA Board, and provide us with an overview and some recommendations.

Next we discussed lifetime memberships. We don't have this category. Should we? What are the economics of it? Only a few of our members have asked about it, and we have considered making an exceptional case for the few people that come to us who want it. The Board considered a proposal for having a lifetime membership category 6-7 years ago, and it was rejected. The level of interest in this is low among the membership.

Action Item for Membership Committee: Consider the issue of lifetime membership, work with the PMA office to consider the financial implications lifetime memberships, and write up the pros and cons of having this category for the members to consider in the newsletter. Tim will be the chair of the Membership Committee, and Robert Rubenstein will be a member.

We also discussed Board size. The size of the Board hasn't changed since 1966, except that one student position was added. Adding more Board positions would increase representation, given that our membership has grown a lot. Board size could stay the same by adding more members if we make the editors and treasurer nonvoting members. Does adding more Board members add representation? Maybe not, unless they are designated positions. Large groups don't function very well. Our current size of 14 is workable. But moving slots around or doing some designating could create better representation.

Action Item for Joe and Lois: Write up the pros and cons of different options relating to Board size and composition so that it improves representation. This includes whether to include designated seats on the Board, and what they would be.

What constituents should be represented/designated? One person suggested practitioners. If there was a designated slot for practitioners, would other practitioners think that they couldn't run for a position? N&E should work harder to get practitioners on the ballot. Having a designated seat for them might create a divide between practitioners and academics that we don't want to foster. N&E should have a practitioner on their committee.

International people: we need representation for our international members, and we need criteria for what constitutes an international person. We need to bring them into the governance part of the organization better. N&E doesn't usually make an effort to recruit such people.

All of the Bylaw-related action items are due by Dec. 12.

We also discussed the issue of what we should do with Board members that do not participate with the Board and don't come to Board meetings.

Action Item for Roberto: Work with N&E to develop a job description of Board membership, N&E committee membership, Treasurer, and Secretary so that people know what they are getting into before they agree to run for the office. Perhaps they should sign a commitment agreeing to what is entailed with the job. This includes coming to meetings and participating in them, as well as being active between meetings as part of a working board. We won't address this issue yet in the Bylaws.

VI. Financial Report

Tom L. made a motion to accept the Treasurer's report.

Jennifer gave the financial report and discussion followed.

The proposal was for a 2013 budget of \$509,165. Revenues have grown a lot since 2008. This year expenditures were proposed in the amount of \$497,110, giving us a net in 2013 of \$12,055. The increase in revenues in 2012 was from increased membership dues (which no one complained about!) and increased annual meeting registration. Jennifer went through the budget numbers. Journals are about 20% of our revenues each year. Annual meetings are about 40-45% of our revenues and are projected to increase, assuming we have desirable meeting locations. Contributions vary year to year.

Expenditures: We are increasing the line item for reimbursements for Board members to attend the meetings, but this is just to restore it to what it was historically (\$8,000). For some reason that no one could explain, last year it was only \$5,000.

Action item for Jennifer Wies: Develop a budget narrative to accompany the budget for Fall 2013. She will provide whatever narrative information is available at the Spring 2013 meeting.

We are also increasing expenditures on PMA office space rental so that PMS can have more space and a nicer office. Jennifer raised the question of whether there should be a PMA merit increase.

Tom May commented that the current contract with PMA states that each year inflation from the previous year will be built into the staff salaries. People are hired on Jan 1 and salary is guaranteed for 12 months. They are reviewed after 6 months, and if the review is positive, another 6 months is added to their contract. So, employees always have 12 months of employment ahead of them. When they start increasing staff they will need to regularize merit increases. These should be linked to performance. Contract review could be linked to staff performance and considered as the basis of merit increases.

There is a problem with this system: Contract review takes place after the budget is set for the year, so the contract is reviewed and 10 months later the budget/salaries are set and the contract review is almost forgotten. It would help if these were more congruent.

Should we put this merit increase into the 2013 projections, or say that we need to address it in 2014?

Tom May suggested that we wait and address it in the FY 2014 budget, but link it to the next contract review so that they are synced up.

Our budget year is January to January.

Action Item for Jennifer Wies and Tom May: Get to Board for approval the PMA contract review, timed to be undertaken prior to the budget presentation for the following year so that there is an opportunity to put into the budget money for a merit increase.

Action item for Roberto Alvarez: Go to Oklahoma next summer to review the PMA office.

Reimbursements: The current reimbursement policy doesn't begin to cover the real cost of Board members attending meetings. This is a problem and in particular it is a problem for student Board members and potentially for international Board members. The policy is that SfAA reimbursement for travel to meetings should be the dollars of last resort. The policy does not set out a specific amount for reimbursement; it is our budget line item that determines what the amount is. The policy is reflected in the budget.

Action Item for Susan Charnley: Review minutes to see why the budget for reimbursing Board members for travel to meetings was \$5,000 in 2012.

Issue: It is unfair to put Jennifer in the position of making decisions about who gets how much money for travel reimbursement. The budget guidance currently says, each member gets \$250. But if some people want more or something different than what the policy says, Jennifer is in an awkward position about deciding how much to give whom.

Lois Stanford made a motion to accept the Treasurer's report.

Vote: All voted to accept the report, but Jennifer abstained.

VII. Business Office report

The Business Office report was given by Tom May.

a. Miscellaneous

We will no longer provide an option for getting an electronic program at the annual meetings. Although many people opted for one in Baltimore, when they arrived at the meeting 250 of these same people requested hard copy programs and we ran out. This is considered a failed experiment that we won't do again.

They are working on a template for a board packet so that we can regularize reporting for different groups/committees.

The PMA staff still includes the same people: Neil Hann, Melissa Cope the officer manager, Trish Colvin the assistant, and Lori Buckwalter who does the copyright work for Human Organization and Practicing Anthropology. No one has talked about leaving. They hope to move into new office space in January 2013.

b. The Fellow Upgrade Campaign

On the Fellow upgrade campaign: there are 234 nominations of people to become Fellows. Of these, 74 agreed to be nominated. A motion of the Board is needed to accept them. Tom May has 2 disks with 74 CVs on them. How should we approve them? We need a volunteer to review them, or see if we just want to trust the staff review (they have found no duds to date).

Lois Stanford made a motion to accept the 74 fellow nominations that were received and reviewed by PMA.

Tim said he thinks that the Board needs to be responsible for doing a review, and not just accept the PMA review. There are 2 disks; perhaps 2 people could do the review, one for each disk. To go from regular member to Fellow means paying \$20 more each year. But from being a Fellow to being a Sustaining Fellow is a big increase in dues. This is a great way to engage people. We do this every third year.

Lois withdrew her motion and changed it to move that we accept the 74 fellow nominations, pending approval of the people on the list by two Board members.

Action item for Jennifer Wies and Tim Wallace: Review the CVs of the 74 people nominated, and notify the Board as to whether they propose removing anyone from the list.

Of the original 234 people nominated, some did not respond.

Action Item for Tom May: send out reminders to non-responders.

433 people were invited to become Sustaining Fellows. As of Nov. 7, 2012, 21 individuals said they would become Sustaining Fellows. 231 paid their Fellow dues – a passive way of rejecting the invite.

Tom May will send a reminder note to the balance of the people who have not responded. A list of Sustaining Fellows is included in Human Organization each year. The associated dues increase is \$40 per person.

c. Contributions

With the effort to increase contributions to the Spicer award, it became clear that SfAA members are generous. This made it evident that we needed to establish a database to track who contributes and for what. PMA did this in 2006. Tom handed out the numbers for contributions between 2006 and 2012. Some of the contributors are non-members. Who are they? Tom handed out another list of who they are. He also handed out a list of all members who have contributed anything over \$25. Bottom line: we have some very generous members. People are willing to give money if they like what we are doing. They also found that people who like contributing to certain awards continue to contribute to them each year. So they have developed letters to send to these individuals to let them know more about what is happening to the money they are contributing. Personal letters were sent to these contributors together with pictures and bios of everyone who has received these awards, and what those people are doing now. It meant a lot to the contributors. Continual givers should be told what we are doing with their money. We will keep this up in the future. The descriptions of award winners are on the SfAA website.

The question was raised, should we put total dollar contributions by year in bar charts up on a poster at the annual meeting, and have it show contributions by members vs. nonmembers? Yes.

Action Item for Tom May: Put up a poster at the annual meeting that shows donations over time by members vs. nonmembers. Encourage people to give and to see Tom if interested or if they need more information.

The question was also raised, should we charge an administrative fee on contributions? The general consensus was, we should not ask for an increase in management fees on contributions. Tom May prefers not to assess a fee on these until we have a few years under our belt with these contributions. Conventionally: 1-3 percent is charged as a management fee on investments. But Tom didn't think this was appropriate. He wanted to wait and see how much time PMA spends on managing contributions, and then come back to the Board with a proposal.

d. Annual Meetings

We know how to get people to come to a meeting and register. We don't know how to get external support for our meetings and should work on that more, including more activities linked to external organizations.

Note: participation by our regular membership in the annual meeting in Baltimore declined dramatically. The annual meeting is the greatest source of new members. The Program Committee needs to work hard to recruit attendees and make connections with external groups in order to generate more participation in the meetings, and recruit more members.

On the topic of meeting themes: Is it worth having a meeting theme? This can be confusing for members. We send out lots of messages encouraging people to organize sessions, etc. Are there other things we could be doing to encourage meeting participation?

Tom May said that they do target members for meeting participation – you have to hit someone seven times before you get their attention. They also target nonmembers in surrounding states. They assume people can drive 300 miles to a meeting, no problem. PMA staff go to all of the 4-year colleges within this radius and publicize the annual meeting and encourage people to attend. They only target Jr. Colleges that are local because they assume these people have no travel money. They also target groups in the metro area where the meeting will occur that do work related to social science, public health, etc. When we co-sponsor meetings with the Society for Medical Anthropology (SMA) we get a lot more attendees – 150-200 additional registrants. SMA will co-sponsor with us 3 years on, 1 year off. They will not be co-sponsoring the Denver meeting in 2013.

PMA has started to track data on the annual meetings because they are so important. About 65% of meeting registrants participate on the program. Tom handed out data on meeting registration status. Tom uses it for showing hotels how many rooms we think we will need. Right now we are a bit behind Baltimore in terms of registrations. We have about 220 sessions for Denver. We only got a program chair this past week: Margaret Le Compte. We have some good special events and sessions and tours lined up with co-sponsors; Tom described them.

The question arose as to whether the 2013 meeting in Denver is occurring at a union hotel. Tom isn't sure; Merrill thought that our policy was to always hold meetings at unionized hotels. Tom was not aware that he was ever directed to only hold meetings at unionized hotels. He explained that it is very difficult to have a policy about whether to hold meetings in a state or in a place/hotel around a single issue, i.e. is the hotel unionized, does the state have sodomy laws, etc. We should try and keep from being caught in single issues that determine whether we have meetings or not in certain locations.

Action Item for Tom May and Merrill: Tom will find out whether the Denver hotel is a union hotel or not. Tom and Merrill will work together to write something for the next newsletter about the hotel we will be having the annual meeting at in Denver, and explain why we are holding the meeting there, and what the status of the hotel is.

There will be an article in the next newsletter about things to consider before you make a decision about what hotel to have a meeting at. The article by Tom and Merrill can be a companion piece to this article. They would have to get something to Tim in the next 24 hours though.

Tom May does know that there is not currently a labor dispute at the hotel we are meeting at in Denver. But he raised the question: What about the hotel owners? What if it's a union hotel but the owners are contributing to causes that are not consistent with the values of the Society?

The Marriott Denver City Center hotel is not on the AFL-CIO boycott list right now. (303) 297-1300

The Human Rights Committee is going to work on a policy for us about where to have our annual meetings and criteria to use for choosing hotels.

Action Item for Tom Leatherman: Talk with the Human Rights Committee about the policy; ask whether they are planning to present a hotel policy at the meeting in Denver; ask what the status is of a session at Denver to have a dialogue about what our policy should be for holding annual meetings; and ask for a schedule explaining when the Board can expect information back from them to help us make decisions about where to have our annual meetings.

If there is no forthcoming policy, the Board needs to write down its procedures for making decisions about what hotels to have meetings at. Right now we do not have a policy stating that we always have meetings at unionized hotels. We look for a hotel we can afford, find out if there is a labor dispute, and if there is no dispute we sign a contract.

What if New Mexico has no unionized hotels? Our Albuquerque hotel is not unionized but is not on the list of banned hotels.

Action Item for Lois Stanford: Provide Merrill with one paragraph on the Albuquerque hotel to include in the newsletter.

A few newsletters ago – in May 2012 – we wrote down what our policy was about hotels and annual meetings.

Tom May's process is to look for a city that has something to offer and will draw members; look at the capacity of hotels there; solicit bids; and assess the quality of the hotels. There are roughly 14 variables that PMA looks at in evaluating the bids. These revolve around pricing, quality of staff, location/neighborhood, and the facility itself. Management disputes are one of the criteria high on the list. Tom can stick with union hotels if that is the direction from the Board, but it has not been the direction to date. The reality is that Albuquerque doesn't have unionized hotels. This is not a clean cut issue. We should look at a number of issues in selecting hotels, not just worker/labor issues, but for example, how are the hotels contributing to the community? These are not black and white decisions.

Tom May passed out membership and subscription data. There were no questions.

We discussed potential sites for the 2015 meetings. Roberto did some research about San Diego as a potential site, following on his action item from last spring. UCSD contacts were supportive but some were outgoing (ie, leaving the university). San Diego State was supportive – they have a Friends for Anthropology committee there and were enthusiastic about co-sponsoring the meetings and said they could help with the hotel. The University of San Diego is also there but they have no anthropology department, and Roberto hasn't talked to folks in their social science departments. There is co-sponsor support but question is what hotel to choose. Town and Country is far away from everything, in Mission Valley – inland. The Sheraton would also require a shuttle. Another problem is that San Diego is in the west, and going there would mean too many meetings in the west since it is the east coast's turn.

Action Item for Tom May: Explore 2015 meetings sites in the following East Coast locations: Philadelphia, Charleston, Pittsburg (Kathleen de Walt), Charlotte, Chicago, Savanna, Miami, Richmond, Austin, and New Orleans.

e. SfAA Name Change

We have not yet adopted a name change (adding a tag line to our name: Society for Applied Anthropology – A world-wide organization for applied social science”). We will take this decision to the membership. There is nothing in the current Bylaws about whether the membership needs to vote on a name change. This change will go on the list of changes proposed along with changes to the Bylaws and will be part of that discussion. Members will vote on Bylaw changes a year from now.

Are we going to call this a name change or a tag line change? We aren’t changing the name of SfAA, we are adding a tag line.

Action Item for Merrill: Bring the issue of the added tag line to our name to the membership when bringing changes to the Bylaws to the membership.

Lois Stanford made a motion to accept Tom May’s business office report.

Vote: The report was accepted unanimously.

VIII. Replacing Journal Editors

Human Organization: No names have been brought to us as potential new editors for Human Organization. Mark Moberg’s term at HO ends in 2014. Tom May is soliciting names of potential replacements. So far a few names have come up. Tom has contacted some potential candidates, some of whom have refused and some of whom he will be meeting with. One person is definitely interested, another is a potential candidate. Should we sweeten the deal by adding money to it to pay for an assistant? Or wait and see if a particular individual we are interested in needs the extra support or not? Some people can’t do it unless they get support from their University. You really need an assistant to track all of the articles. We agreed that we should first find good editors, see what they can come up with in terms of support, and then decide what we need to do to assist them. They need to have a graduate student assistant at least.

Newsletter: No names have been brought to us for the new Newsletter editor, and so far we have gotten no expressions of interest. No one has contacted Tom May expressing interest, so he is considering other newsletter models. PMA has looked at sample newsletters from different social science institutions to see how they are done. If it’s lots of work, we could break the work down into different areas. Neil Hann has identified what some of those areas are. The content could be shifted to being more newsy and to promote SfAA, rather than having articles. The PMA office could track the newsy info and put it together for the newsletter and provide a copy editor. The best example they have found was from the American Sociological Association: “Footnotes”. But they have a full-time staff person who runs it. We would have to pull together a cadre of people to track news in their area of

expertise under the new model. The PMA office could identify really interested individuals to track certain areas, but someone would have to oversee them.

Action Items for the Publications Committee: Get involved with what to do about Newsletter editorship, and work with Tom, Roberto, and Merrill on visioning about the Newsletter and how we will sustain it if we don't have an editor.

Regarding open access: Judith wrote a piece in the newsletter about open access and laid out some points on it. But how are we going to fill the budget hole created by reduced subscriptions? We are already seeing reduced subscriptions to our journals.

Joe asked if perhaps the AAA situation is different from ours. Are we really threatened with reduced subscriptions and if so, why?

Jennifer pointed out that articles published in open access journals are not necessarily considered to be as rigorous as articles published in other journals, so academics are reluctant to publish there. This is a big issue for pre-tenure faculty. Another question: What do we want these journals to do for people working in applied social science?

Joe explained that open access doesn't really work for most journals in terms of cost structure. It has to be subsidized by membership dues or the funder of the research. We could charge extra for physical copies and less for just electronic copies.

Tom May suggested we make a statement to the membership that we will keep our current policy for three years and then do a thoughtful analysis of whether or not to shift to open access, with a business plan to support it if we propose to change over.

Joe wanted to see a subscription analysis – what are the trends in subscriptions and why, is this a real or perceived problem? Lots of the subscriptions that are being dropped are to the expensive science journals.

Can we go along as is and monitor trends? The Publications Committee should do this.

Action Item for Tom May: Do a subscription analysis. Monitor subscriptions.

Action item for Publications Committee: Develop ideas, approaches, and options re subscriptions and open access, and provide us a report by Spring 2013 to tell us what the tradeoffs are of open access.

MEETING ADJOURNED